



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 11, 2000

No. 58

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Robert Rosenberg, Calvary Lutheran Church, Oshkosh, Wisconsin, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, ruler of all things and all men, You have set all things to move in harmony; You desire that men dwell in unity and love.

Cause people everywhere to respect law and justice. Where people are unjust, inhuman, and cruel, send correction. Where they are at war, send peace.

Give to those whom You have placed in the seats of honor and power the blessing of sound judgment, the skill of making wise decisions, the patience to act in due time, and the tact for being mutually helpful.

May wisdom and knowledge be the stability of our time, and our deepest trust be in You, the Lord of nations and the King of kings. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The 1-minute will be at the end of the legislative business today.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND ROBERT ROSENBERG AS GUEST CHAPLAIN

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Reverend Robert Rosenberg, who has just delivered the opening prayer.

Pastor Rosenberg is a resident of Oshkosh, Wisconsin, which is in my district, and has been the pastor of the Calvary Lutheran Church in Oshkosh since 1973.

He graduated from Iowa's Wartburg College and its Theological Seminary in 1965. Pastor Rosenberg is active in the community. He serves on the Board of Directors of the Big Brothers and Big Sisters of Oshkosh, and is also the volunteer chaplain for the Oshkosh Police Department. He and his wife have three children.

We appreciate Pastor Rosenberg's giving the prayer today.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 4205, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, today a "Dear Colleague" letter will be sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of May 15 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on H.R. 4205, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2001.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment by 5 p.m. on Monday, May 15, to the Committee on Rules in room H-312 of the Capitol.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute reported by the Committee on Armed Services on May 10. That amendment in the nature of a substitute is available at the Committee on Armed Services and will be posted on their web site by 12 noon tomorrow.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 497 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 701.

□ 1006

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 701) to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on the legislative day of Wednesday, May 10, 2000, amendment No. 18, printed in House Report 106-612, by the gentleman

□ 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.

H2907

from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) had been withdrawn.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE
OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 9 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON); amendment No. 10 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS); amendment No. 11 offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE); amendment No. 12 offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS); amendment No. 13 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY); and amendment No. 14 offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. PETERSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania:

Page 18, after line 15, insert the following:

**SEC. . FEDERAL ACQUISITION OF LANDS ONLY
WITHIN DESIGNATED BOUNDARIES.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, or any other provision of law, amounts made available by this Act (including the amendments made by this Act) may not be used for any acquisition by the Federal Government of an interest in lands except lands located within exterior boundaries designated before the date of the enactment of this Act of an area designated by or under Federal law for a particular conservation or recreation use, including lands within such boundaries of a unit of—

- (1) the National Park System;
- (2) the National Wilderness Preservation System;
- (3) the National Wildlife Refuge System;
- (4) the National Forest System;
- (5) the national system of trails established by the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1241 et seq.);
- (6) federally administered components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; or
- (7) national recreation areas administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 108, noes 310, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

AYES—108

Aderholt
Archer
Arney
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Berry
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Brady (TX)
Buyer
Cannon
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cubin
DeLay
DeMint
Dickey
Doolittle
Duncan
Emerson
Everett
Fossella
Gekas
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Istook
Johnson, Sam
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Manzullo
McKeon
Miller, Gary
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Paul
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts

NOES—310

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goss
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)

Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (CA)
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—16

Burton
Campbell
Coble
Cummings
DeGette
Hunter
Jefferson
Kasich
Lofgren
Lucas (OK)
Sherwood
Skelton

□ 1029

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Messrs. TRAFICANT, HOFFEL, CHAMBLISS, BATEMAN, TANCREDO, MCHUGH, SKEEN, and ROTHMAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 166. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO
TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. CHAMBLISS
The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. CHAMBLISS:

Page 19, line 3, strike "without further appropriation" and insert "subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter".

Page 30, line 12, strike "without further appropriation" and insert ", subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter".

Page 48, line 8, strike "without further appropriation, in each fiscal year" and insert ", subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter".

Page 56, line 6, strike "without further appropriation" and insert ", subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter".

Page 63, line 5, strike "without further appropriation" and insert ", subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter".

Page 64, line 17, strike "without further appropriation" and insert "subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2005 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2005 and each fiscal year thereafter".

Page 70, line 10, strike "without further appropriation" and insert "subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter".

Page 71, line 20, strike "without further appropriation" and insert ", subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter".

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 142, noes 281, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

AYES—142

Archer DeLay Hoekstra
Army DeMint Hostettler
Ballenger Dickey Hoyer
Barr Dicks Hulshof
Barrett (NE) Dixon Hutchinson
Bartlett Doggett Isakson
Barton Doolittle Istook
Berry Duncan Jackson (IL)
Bliley Emerson Johnson, Sam
Blunt Ewing Jones (NC)
Boehner Gekas Kasich
Bonilla Gibbons Kingston
Brady (TX) Goode Gutkenberg
Burton Goodlatte Kolbe
Calvert Goodling LaHood
Cannon Goss Largent
Chabot Graham Latham
Chambliss Granger LaTourette
Chenoweth-Hage Hall (TX) Lewis (CA)
Coburn Hansen Linder
Collins Hastings (WA) Luther
Combest Hayworth Manullo
Cook Hefley McKeon
Cox Herger Miller (FL)
Cubin Hill (MT) Miller, Gary
Cunningham Hilleary Minge
Deal Hobson Mollohan

Moran (KS) Radanovich Spence Serrano Tanner Visclosky
Moran (VA) Regula Stearns Shaw Tauscher Vitter
Murtha Rogers Stenholm Shays Tauzin Walsh
Myrick Rohrabacher Stump Sherman Taylor (MS) Waters
Nethercutt Roybal-Allard Sununu Shimkus Terry Watt (NC)
Ney Royce Talent Shuster Thomas Waxman
Northup Ryan (WI) Tancredo Sisisky Thompson (CA) Weiner
Norwood Ryun (KS) Taylor (NC) Skelton Thompson (MS) Weldon (PA)
Nussle Sabo Thornberry Slaughter Thune Weller
Obey Salmon Tiahrt Smith (NJ) Thurman Tierney Wexler
Ose Sanford Toomey Smith (WA) Tierney Weygand
Oxley Scarborough Walden Snyder Towns Whitfield
Packard Schaffer Wamp Snyder Towns Wilson
Paul Sensenbrenner Watkins Wamp Souder Traficant Wilson
Peterson (PA) Sessions Watts (OK) Spratt Turner Upton Young (AK)
Petri Shadegg Weldon (FL) Spratt Udall (CO) Wynn
Pickering Shows Wicker Strickland Upton Young (AK)
Pitts Simpson Wolf Stupak Velazquez Vento
Pombo Skeen Young (FL) Sweeney

NOES—281

Abercrombie English Lipinski
Ackerman Eshoo LoBiondo
Aderholt Etheridge Lowey
Allen Evans Lucas (KY)
Andrews Everrett Maloney (CT)
Baca Farr Maloney (NY)
Bachus Fattah Markey
Baird Filner Martinez
Baker Fletcher Mascara
Baldacci Foley Matsui
Baldwin Forbes McCarthy (MO)
Barcia Barcia Ford
Barrett (WI) Fossella McCallum
Bass Fowler McCreery
Bateman Frank (MA) McDermott
Becerra Franks (NJ) McGovern
Bentsen Frelinghuysen McHugh
Bereuter Frost McInnis
Berkley Gallegly McIntosh
Berman Ganske McIntyre
Biggert Gejdenson McKinney
Bilbray Gephardt McNulty
Bilirakis Gilchrest Meehan
Bishop Gillmor Meek (FL)
Blagojevich Gilman Meeks (NY)
Blumenauer Gonzalez Menendez
Boehlert Gordon Metcalf
Bonior Green (TX) Mica
Bono Green (WI) Millender-
Borski Greenwood McDonald
Boswell Gutierrez Miller, George
Boucher Gutknecht Mink
Boyd Hall (OH) Moakley
Brady (PA) Hastings (FL) Moore
Brown (FL) Hayes Morella
Brown (OH) Hill (IN) Nadler
Bryant Hilliard Napolitano
Burr Hinchey Neal
Callahan Hinojosa Oberstar
Camp Hoefl Oliver
Canady Holden Ortiz
Capps Holt Owens
Capuano Hooley Pallone
Cardin Horn Pascrell
Carson Houghton Pastor
Castle Hyde Payne
Clay Inslee Pease
Clayton Jackson-Lee Pelosi
Clement (TX) Peterson (MN)
Clyburn Jenkins Phelps
Condit John Pickett
Conyers Johnson (CT) Pomeroy
Cooksey Johnson, E. B. Porter
Costello Jones (OH) Price (NC)
Coyne Kanjorski Quinn
Cramer Kaptur Rahall
Crane Kelly Ramstad
Crowley Kennedy Rangel
Danner Kildee Reyes
Davis (FL) Kilpatrick Reynolds
Davis (IL) Kind (WI) Riley
Davis (VA) King (NY) Rivers
DeFazio Kleczka Rodriguez
Delahunt Klink Roemer
DeLauro Kucinich Rogan
Deutsch Kuykendall Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart LaFalce Rothman
Dingell Lampton Roukema
Dooley Lantos Rush
Doyle Larson Sanchez
Dreier Lazio Sanders
Edwards Leach Sandlin
Ehlers Lee Sawyer
Ehrlich Levin Saxton
Lewis (GA) Lewis (GA) Schakowsky
Lewis (KY) Lewis (KY) Scott

Serrano Tanner Visclosky
Shaw Tauscher Vitter
Shays Tauzin Walsh
Sherman Taylor (MS) Waters
Shimkus Terry Watt (NC)
Shuster Thomas Waxman
Sisisky Thompson (CA) Weiner
Skelton Thompson (MS) Weldon (PA)
Slaughter Thune Weller
Smith (NJ) Thurman Tierney Wexler
Smith (WA) Tierney Weygand
Snyder Towns Whitfield
Souder Traficant Wilson
Spratt Turner Upton Young (AK)
Stabenow Udall (CO) Wynn
Stark Udall (NM) Wynn
Strickland Upton Young (AK)
Stupak Velazquez Vento
Sweeney

NOT VOTING—11

Buyer DeGette Lucas (OK)
Campbell Hunter Sherwood
Coble Jefferson Wise
Cummings Lofgren

□ 1038

Messrs. SKEEN, LUTHER, MINGE, MORAN of Virginia, and PORTMAN changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MRS. CHENOWETH-HAGE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE:

Page 23, in line 18, strike 'except that a coastal political' and all that follows down through line 3 on page 24.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 259, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

AYES—166

Aderholt Coburn Gekas
Archer Collins Gibbons
Army Combest Gillmor
Ballenger Cook Goode
Barr Cooksey Goodlatte
Barrett (NE) Cox Goodling
Bartlett Cubin Goss
Barton Cunningham Graham
Bereuter Deal Granger
Bilirakis DeLay Green (WI)
Bliley DeMint Gutknecht
Blunt Diaz-Balart Hall (TX)
Boehner Dickey Hansen
Bonilla Doolittle Hastings (WA)
Brady (TX) Dreier Hayworth
Bryant Duncan Hefley
Burton Dunn Herger
Buyer Emerson Hilleary
Calvert English Hobson
Camp Everett Hoekstra
Canady Ewing Hostettler
Cannon Fletcher Hulshof
Chabot Hunter Fossella
Chambliss Fowler Hutchinson
Chenoweth-Hage Ganske Hyde

Isakson	Nussle	Shadegg	Rothman	Smith (NJ)	Turner	Goodling	McHugh	Sessions
Istook	Obey	Shuster	Roukema	Smith (WA)	Udall (CO)	Goss	McInnis	Shadegg
Jenkins	Ose	Simpson	Roybal-Allard	Snyder	Udall (NM)	Graham	McKeon	Shaw
Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Skeen	Rush	Souder	Upton	Granger	Metcalf	Shimkus
Johnson, Sam	Packard	Smith (MI)	Sabo	Spratt	Velazquez	Green (WI)	Mica	Shows
Jones (NC)	Paul	Smith (TX)	Sanchez	Stabenow	Vento	Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Kasich	Pease	Spence	Sanders	Stark	Visclosky	Hansen	Miller, Gary	Simpson
Kingston	Peterson (PA)	Stearns	Sandlin	Stenholm	Vitter	Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)	Skeen
Knollenberg	Petri	Stump	Sawyer	Strickland	Walsh	Hayworth	Myrick	Skelton
Kolbe	Pickering	Sununu	Saxton	Stupak	Waters	Hefley	Nethercutt	Skelton
LaHood	Pickett	Sweeney	Schakowsky	Tanner	Watt (NC)	Herger	Ney	Smith (TX)
Largent	Pitts	Talent	Scott	Tauscher	Waxman	Hill (MT)	Northup	Spence
Latham	Pombo	Tancredo	Serrano	Tauzin	Weiner	Hilleary	Norwood	Stearns
Lewis (CA)	Portman	Taylor (NC)	Shaw	Taylor (MS)	Weldon (PA)	Hobson	Nussle	Stenholm
Lewis (KY)	Pryce (OH)	Terry	Shays	Thompson (CA)	Wexler	Hoekstra	Ose	Stump
Linder	Radanovich	Thomas	Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Weygand	Hostettler	Oxley	Stupak
Manzullo	Ranstad	Thornberry	Shimkus	Thune	Wolf	Hulshof	Packard	Sununu
McCollum	Regula	Tiahrt	Shows	Thurman	Woolsey	Hunter	Paul	Sweeney
McHugh	Reynolds	Toomey	Sisisky	Tierney	Wu	Hutchinson	Peterson (PA)	Talent
McInnis	Riley	Walden	Skelton	Towns	Wynn	Istook	Petri	Tancredo
McIntosh	Rogers	Wamp	Slaughter	Traficant	Young (AK)	Jefferson	Pickering	Taylor (NC)
McKeon	Rohrabacher	Watkins				Jenkins	Pitts	Terry
Metcalf	Royce	Watts (OK)				Johnson, Sam	Pombo	Thomas
Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Weldon (FL)	Campbell	Greenwood	Lucas (OK)	Jones (NC)	Pryce (OH)	Thornberry
Miller, Gary	Ryun (KS)	Weller	Coble	Jefferson	Sherwood	Kasich	Radanovich	Thune
Moran (KS)	Salmon	Whitfield	DeGette	Lofgren	Wise	Kelly	Regula	Tiahrt
Myrick	Sanford	Wicker				Kingston	Reynolds	Toomey
Nethercutt	Scarborough	Wilson				Knollenberg	Rogers	Walden
Ney	Schaffer	Young (FL)				Kolbe	Rohrabacher	Wamp
Northup	Sensenbrenner					LaHood	Roukema	Watkins
Norwood	Sessions					Largent	Royce	Watts (OK)

NOES—259

Abercrombie	Doyle	Lazio
Ackerman	Edwards	Leach
Allen	Ehlers	Lee
Andrews	Ehrlich	Levin
Baca	Engel	Lewis (GA)
Bachus	Eshoo	Lipinski
Baird	Etheridge	LoBiondo
Baker	Evans	Lowey
Baldacci	Farr	Lucas (KY)
Baldwin	Fattah	Luther
Barcia	Filner	Maloney (CT)
Barrett (WI)	Foley	Maloney (NY)
Bass	Forbes	Markey
Bateman	Ford	Martinez
Becerra	Frank (MA)	Mascara
Bentsen	Franks (NJ)	Matsui
Berkley	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (MO)
Berman	Frost	McCarthy (NY)
Berry	Gallegly	McCrary
Biggert	Gejdenson	McDermott
Bilbray	Gephardt	McGovern
Bishop	Gilchrest	McIntyre
Blagojevich	Gilman	McKinney
Blumenauer	Gonzalez	McNulty
Boehlert	Gordon	Meehan
Bonior	Green (TX)	Meek (FL)
Bono	Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)
Borski	Hall (OH)	Menendez
Boswell	Hastings (FL)	Mica
Boucher	Hayes	Millender-
Boyd	Hill (IN)	McDonald
Brady (PA)	Hill (MT)	Miller, George
Brown (FL)	Hilliard	Minge
Brown (OH)	Hinche	Mink
Burr	Hinojosa	Moakley
Callahan	Hoefel	Mollohan
Capps	Holden	Moore
Capuano	Holt	Moran (VA)
Cardin	Hoolley	Morella
Carson	Horn	Murtha
Castle	Houghton	Nadler
Clay	Hoyer	Napolitano
Clayton	Inslee	Neal
Clement	Jackson (IL)	Oberstar
Clyburn	Jackson-Lee	Olver
Condit	(TX)	Ortiz
Conyers	John	Owens
Costello	Johnson, E.B.	Pallone
Coyne	Jones (OH)	Pascrell
Cramer	Kanjorski	Pastor
Crane	Kaptur	Payne
Crowley	Kelly	Pelosi
Cummings	Kennedy	Peterson (MN)
Danner	Kildee	Phelps
Davis (FL)	Kilpatrick	Pomeroy
Davis (IL)	Kind (WI)	Porter
Davis (VA)	King (NY)	Price (NC)
DeFazio	Kleczka	Quinn
Delahunt	Klink	Rahall
DeLauro	Kucinich	Rangel
Deutsch	Kuykendall	Reyes
Dicks	LaFalce	Rivers
Dingell	Lampson	Rodriguez
Dixon	Lantos	Roemer
Doggett	Larson	Rogan
Dooley	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell	Greenwood	Lucas (OK)
Coble	Jefferson	Sherwood
DeGette	Lofgren	Wise

□ 1048

Mr. REYNOLDS and Mr. WELLER changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

Page 31, after line 24, insert:
 "(3) APPORTIONMENT FOR MAINTENANCE.—Not less than 50 percent of the Federal portion shall be used by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture only for purposes of carrying out maintenance operations on Federal lands managed by such Secretaries."

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 169, noes 256, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

AYES—169

Aderholt	Burton	DeLay
Archer	Buyer	DeMint
Armey	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Ballenger	Camp	Doolittle
Barcia	Cannon	Dreier
Barr	Chabot	Duncan
Barrett (NE)	Chambliss	Dunn
Bartlett	Chenoweth-Hage	Ehrlich
Barton	Coburn	Emerson
Bateman	Collins	Everett
Bereuter	Combest	Ewing
Berry	Cook	Fletcher
Bilirakis	Cox	Foley
Bliley	Crane	Fossella
Blunt	Cubin	Fowler
Boehner	Cunningham	Ganske
Bonilla	Danahy	Gibbons
Brady (TX)	Davis (VA)	Goode
Bryant	Deal	Goodlatte

Abercrombie	Dixon	Kennedy
Ackerman	Doggett	Kildee
Allen	Dooley	Kilpatrick
Andrews	Doyle	Kind (WI)
Baca	Edwards	King (NY)
Bachus	Ehlers	Kleczka
Baird	Engel	Klink
Baker	English	Kucinich
Baldacci	Eshoo	Kuykendall
Baldwin	Etheridge	LaFalce
Barrett (WI)	Evans	Lampson
Bass	Farr	Lantos
Becerra	Fattah	Larson
Bentsen	Filner	Lazio
Berkley	Forbes	Leach
Berman	Ford	Lee
Biggert	Frank (MA)	Levin
Bilbray	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (GA)
Bishop	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Blagojevich	Frost	LoBiondo
Blumenauer	Gallegly	Lowey
Boehlert	Gejdenson	Lucas (KY)
Bonior	Gekas	Luther
Bono	Gephardt	Maloney (CT)
Borski	Gilchrest	Maloney (NY)
Boswell	Gillmor	Markey
Boucher	Gilman	Martinez
Boyd	Gonzalez	Mascara
Brady (PA)	Gordon	Matsui
Brown (FL)	Green (TX)	McCarthy (MO)
Brown (OH)	Greenwood	McCarthy (NY)
Burr	Gutierrez	McCrary
Callahan	Gutknecht	McDermott
Canady	Hall (OH)	McGovern
Capps	Hastings (FL)	McIntosh
Capuano	Hayes	McIntyre
Cardin	Hill (IN)	McKinney
Carson	Hilliard	McNulty
Castle	Hinche	Meehan
Clay	Hinojosa	Meek (FL)
Clayton	Hoefel	Meeks (NY)
Clement	Holden	Menendez
Clyburn	Holt	Millender-
Condit	Hoolley	McDonald
Conyers	Horn	Miller, George
Cooksey	Houghton	Minge
Costello	Hoyer	Mink
Coyne	Hyde	Moakley
Cramer	Inslee	Mollohan
Crowley	Isakson	Moore
Cummings	Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)
Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Morella
Davis (IL)	(TX)	Murtha
DeFazio	John	Nadler
Delahunt	Johnson (CT)	Napolitano
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Neal
Deutsch	Jones (OH)	Oberstar
Dicks	Kanjorski	Obey
Dingell	Kaptur	Olver

Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman

Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Wilson
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Coble
DeGette

Dickey
Lofgren
Lucas (OK)

Sherwood
Weller
Wise

□ 1056

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. SWEENEY

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. SWEENEY:

Page 36, after line 13, insert:

“(D) No State political subdivision has transmitted to the Secretary administering the acquisition a copy of a resolution adopted by the governing body of such subdivision disapproving of such acquisition within 90 days after receiving notice of the proposed acquisition under subparagraph (C)(iii).

Page 41, line 8, after the period insert: “The State shall notify each affected political subdivision of each land acquisition proposal included in the State action agenda. Such notice shall include a citation of the statutory authority for the acquisition, if such authority exists, and an explanation of why the particular interest proposed to be acquired was selected.”.

Page 42, after line 9, insert:

(c) LOCAL GOVERNMENT VETO.—Section 6(f) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

“(9) No funds made available under this Act may be used by a State to acquire any land or interest in land if the political subdivision of the State in which the land or interest in land is located has transmitted to the State agency administering the proposed acquisition a copy of a resolution adopted by the governing body of such subdivision disapproving of such acquisition within 90 days after receiving notice of the proposed acquisition under subsection (d)(2).”.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 238, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

AYES—187

Aderholt
Archer
Army
Baca
Bachus
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Berry
Bilirakis
Bilely
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coburn
Collins
Combust
Cook
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Gallegly
Ganske
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode

Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Regula
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Manzullo
Martinez
McCollum
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Peterson (PA)

Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sandlin
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Walden
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—238

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggett
Billbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Boyd

Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart

Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon

Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoefel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Insole
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
Klink
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowe
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)

Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema

Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell
Coble
DeGette

Gekas
Lofgren
Lucas (OK)

Rangel
Sherwood
Wise

□ 1104

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. WATTS for Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained today, and missed recorded vote No. 172 on the Calvert amendment to H.R. 701. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. SIMPSON

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 14 offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) on which further proceeding were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 offered by Mr. SIMPSON: Page 36, strike the close quotation marks and the second period at line 16, and after line 16 insert the following:

“(h) STATE APPROVAL OF CERTAIN LAND ACQUISITION REQUIRED.—The Federal portion may not be used by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire any interest in land located in a

State in which 50 percent or more of the land in the State is owned by the Federal Government if the acquisition would result in a net increase in the total acreage in the State owned by the Federal Government, unless the acquisition is specifically approved by the law of the State."

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 266, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

AYES—157

Aderholt	Goodling	Pitts
Archer	Graham	Pombo
Armey	Granger	Pryce (OH)
Baker	Green (WI)	Radanovich
Ballenger	Gutknecht	Regula
Barr	Hall (TX)	Reynolds
Barrett (NE)	Hansen	Riley
Bartlett	Hastings (WA)	Rogan
Barton	Hayworth	Rogers
Berry	Hefley	Rohrabacher
Bliley	Herger	Royce
Blunt	Hill (MT)	Ryan (WI)
Boehner	Hilleary	Ryun (KS)
Bonilla	Hobson	Salmon
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Sanford
Bryant	Hostettler	Scarborough
Burr	Hulshof	Schaffer
Burton	Hunter	Sensenbrenner
Buyer	Hutchinson	Sessions
Callahan	Hyde	Shadegg
Calvert	Istook	Shimkus
Camp	Jenkins	Shows
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Shuster
Cannon	Jones (NC)	Simpson
Chabot	Kasich	Skeen
Chenoweth-Hage	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Coburn	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Collins	LaHood	Spence
Combust	Largent	Stearns
Cook	Latham	Stenholm
Cox	Lewis (CA)	Stump
Crane	Lewis (KY)	Stupak
Cubin	Linder	Sununu
Cunningham	Manzullo	Sweeney
Danner	Martinez	Talent
Davis (VA)	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
Deal	McKeon	Terry
DeLay	Metcalf	Thomas
DeMint	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Dickey	Miller, Gary	Tiahrt
Doolittle	Moran (KS)	Toomey
Dreier	Myrick	Trafficant
Duncan	Nethercutt	Walden
Dunn	Ney	Wamp
Emerson	Northup	Watkins
Everett	Norwood	Watts (OK)
Ewing	Nussle	Weldon (FL)
Fletcher	Ose	Whitfield
Galleghy	Oxley	Wicker
Gekas	Packard	Wilson
Gibbons	Paul	Young (FL)
Goode	Peterson (PA)	
Goodlatte	Pickering	

NOES—266

Abercrombie	Bishop	Clement
Ackerman	Blagojevich	Clyburn
Allen	Blumenauer	Condit
Andrews	Boehler	Conyers
Baca	Bonior	Cooksey
Bachus	Bono	Costello
Baird	Borski	Coyne
Baldacci	Boswell	Cramer
Baldwin	Boucher	Crowley
Barcia	Boyd	Cummings
Barrett (WI)	Brady (PA)	Davis (FL)
Bass	Brown (FL)	Davis (IL)
Bateman	Brown (OH)	DeFazio
Becerra	Capps	Delahunt
Bentsen	Capuano	DeLauro
Bereuter	Cardin	Deutsch
Berkley	Carson	Diaz-Balart
Berman	Castle	Dicks
Biggert	Chambliss	Dingell
Bilbray	Clay	Dixon
Bilirakis	Clayton	Doggett

Dooley	LaFalce	Rahall
Doyle	Lampson	Ramstad
Edwards	Lantos	Rangel
Ehlers	Larson	Reyes
Ehrlich	LaTourrette	Rivers
Engel	Lazio	Rodriguez
English	Leach	Roemer
Eshoo	Lee	Ros-Lehtinen
Etheridge	Levin	Rothman
Evans	Lewis (GA)	Roukema
Farr	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Fattah	LoBiondo	Rush
Filner	Lowe	Sabo
Foley	Lucas (KY)	Sanchez
Forbes	Luther	Sanders
Fossella	Maloney (CT)	Sandlin
Fowler	Maloney (NY)	Sawyer
Franks (NJ)	Markey	Saxton
Frelinghuysen	Mascara	Schakowsky
Frost	Matsui	Scott
Ganske	McCarthy (MO)	Serrano
Gejdenson	McCarthy (NY)	Shaw
Gephardt	McCollum	Shays
Gilchrist	McCrery	Sherman
Gillmor	McDermott	Sisisky
Gilman	McGovern	Skelton
Gonzalez	McInnis	Slaughter
Gordon	McIntosh	Smith (NJ)
Goss	McIntyre	Smith (WA)
Green (TX)	McKinney	Snyder
Greenwood	McNulty	Souder
Gutierrez	Meehan	Spratt
Hall (OH)	MEEK (FL)	Stabenow
Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Stark
Hayes	Menendez	Strickland
Hill (IN)	Mica	Tancredo
Hilliard	Miller, George	Tanner
Hinojosa	Minge	Tauscher
Hoefel	Mink	Tauzin
Holden	Moakley	Taylor (MS)
Holt	Mollohan	Thompson (CA)
Hooley	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Horn	Moran (VA)	Thune
Houghton	Morella	Thurman
Hoyer	Murtha	Tierney
Inslee	Nadler	Towns
Isakson	Napolitano	Turner
Jackson (IL)	Neal	Udall (CO)
Jackson-Lee	Oberstar	Udall (NM)
(TX)	Obey	Upton
Jefferson	Olver	Velazquez
John	Ortiz	Vento
Johnson (CT)	Owens	Visclosky
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Vitter
Jones (OH)	Pascarell	Walsh
Kanjorski	Pastor	Waters
Kaptur	Payne	Watt (NC)
Kelly	Pease	Waxman
Kennedy	Pelosi	Weiner
Kildee	Peterson (MN)	Weldon (PA)
Kilpatrick	Petri	Weller
Kind (WI)	Phelps	Wexler
King (NY)	Pickett	Weygand
Klecza	Pomeroy	Wolf
Klink	Porter	Woolsey
Kolbe	Portman	Wu
Kucinich	Price (NC)	Wynn
Kuykendall	Quinn	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell	Frank (MA)	Millender-
Coble	Hinchey	McDonald
DeGette	Lofgren	Sherwood
Ford	Lucas (OK)	Wise

□ 1114

Mr. KOLBE changed his vote from "aye" to "no".

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1115

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word so I can engage in a colloquy with the chairman of this committee, and also ask for his forgiveness on that last vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to engage the distinguished chairman of the committee in a colloquy, and thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to engage the gentleman from Alabama. Although he voted against me on that last amendment, I do want to thank him for his cosponsorship in support of this bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. And the gentleman and I have spoken previously regarding my specific concerns about 701, but I would like this opportunity to engage once again and highlight those concerns to our colleagues; although CARA will be extremely beneficial to the wildlife and conservation in the State of Alabama as written, there is a provision that is included in this Senate companion legislation, which I strongly support.

This provision allows for funding parity between oil- and gas-producing states and those that do not engage in these activities. As currently written, States in the Gulf of Mexico which do not support oil and gas exploration and production stand to disproportionately benefit from formulas for State-side allocations.

In some cases, these are States that not only do not support those OCS activities, but actively oppose exploration of these resources in their region.

I believe this is inherently unfair to the citizens of the States like Alabama, that do support OCS activities and provide the necessary infrastructure and oversight for these activities.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I want to thank my friend for his remarks, and I appreciate his concerns about this issue.

The gentleman and I have spoken on this subject previously, and I know it is an important issue for him as the citizens for Alabama. As I mentioned to him previously, I will continue to work to find an acceptable resolution with him and other interested Members, but I believe the right time to address this issue is during the conference with our colleagues in the other body.

The gentleman from Alabama has my assurance that we will keep his concerns in mind as we move this important legislation through the process.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the gentleman's willingness to address this issue in the future and his willingness to discuss it here. Again, I would like to reiterate my support for CARA. I thank the distinguished Committee on Resources chairman for his continuing efforts with respect to my concerns.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 106-612.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 19 offered by Mr. CALVERT:
Page 44, after line 11, insert the following:
SEC. . LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CONDEMNATION.

Title I is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CONDEMNATION

“SEC. 15. None of the amounts made available by this title may be used for adverse condemnation of property.”.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me start out by saying that I fully support the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This fund is one of the most successful conservation programs in history. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has helped support everything from parks to playgrounds, wilderness to wetlands, open trails to open spaces.

Nevertheless, I want to ensure that landowners are not forced to sell their property and that all land owners are treated fairly in the process.

My amendment ensures that landowners are not forced to sell their property, and that all landowners are treated fairly in the process. CARA provides for \$900 million to be appropriated annually for Land and Water Conservation Fund for the purposes of purchasing land. Private landowners are understandably nervous that such a huge sum of money available, their land may be easily condemned for public use.

My amendment helps alleviate these concerns by providing an effective check against overzealous agency acquisitions. With regard to the bill that we are looking at today, there is a loophole, not Federal “willing seller” portion. In its present form, the willing seller provision in the Federal portion of this bill allows acquisition of property if the owner is willing, or by an Act of Congress. By allowing for an Act of Congress, this bill creates a loophole through which Federal agencies could trample on the private property rights.

In addition, CARA contains no private property rights protection for funds funded to State and local governments.

Let me be clear, this amendment only applies to adverse condemnation or an unwillingly seller. Friendly condemnations, willing sellers, will be allowed.

Some argue that my amendment would infringe on States’ rights by not allowing the State to condemn. Let me

address this point for a moment. As we all know, the 10th amendment to the Constitution states “powers not delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the States”; however, the fifth amendment states that no private property shall be taken without just compensation. Clearly, our founding fathers directed the Federal Government to protect private property rights.

Mr. Chairman, I support allowing States the maximum amount of flexibility, whether we are talking about welfare or education or labor laws. I voted for the 1996 Welfare Reform law. I have cosponsored Dollars to the Classrooms, but, Mr. Chairman, the protection of private property rights is a distinct and clear Constitutional responsibility of the Federal Government.

No matter how noble the objective, we should not abdicate our constitutional responsibility to protect private property rights.

Further, this amendment applies only to funds provided to the State via the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a Federal fund. In addition, States will use this money to respond to Federal requirements, such as the Endangered Species Act.

Without my amendment, Federal agencies could coerce States and local governments to condemn property in order to satisfy Federal land acquisition laws.

Members should listen to the concerns of their constituents, especially their farmers, who are justifiably concerned that this bill will create an even bigger government. I cannot support a bill which does not take their concerns into account.

This amendment is straightforward. It goes to the core of the willing seller issue. It comes down to the fact that the government should not be able to force taxpaying citizens off their land, land that has sometimes been owned by generations of families.

I do not think anyone believes this should take place. My amendment goes a long way in preventing this from happening. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this amendment, which goes a long way in protecting rights of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on my amendment. It is a vote to protect average Americans and maintain the sanctity of property private rights.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) seek the time in opposition?

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I seek the time in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, for purposes of controlling time, I yield 5 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

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

Mr. Chairman, let me first assure my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) that his language was considered in the negotiations on this bill. Language protecting willing sellers was eventually adopted in this bill. It is contained in the bill today.

It is done in a better way than the language the gentleman proposes, however, and that is why I suggest you reject the gentleman’s amendment.

Under current law, agencies can condemn property through adverse condemnation proceedings. They can also take your property through regulation, that is called inverse proceedings. So there are two ways that property can be taken.

CARA changes that. CARA says, and let me quote the language to my colleagues, on page 31, line 18, Willing Seller Requirement: The Federal portion may not be used to acquire any property unless (A) the owner of the property concurs in the acquisition or (B) the acquisition of the property is specifically approved by an act of Congress.

In other words, the bill provides that unless a seller is willing to sell the property, the only way the government can take that property is to come to Congress and get a specific line item authorization authorizing the taking of that property through adverse proceedings.

Now, the reason we chose this language instead of the language my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), is offering, is for two reasons: Number one, this language does not interfere with State law, and the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) wants to. I do not think we should. I do not think we can.

When a State takes Federal money under our program, it has to match it with State money. And if a State law allows condemnation, that is a State’s business. When a State uses its money in that mix, or the Federal money, it is all fungible. Any attempt to interfere with that is meaningless and would be inconsequential. It would not have any effect anyhow. But the attempt to interfere with the State law in this Federal statute is, I think, something we ought to avoid.

If my colleague does not like his State’s laws on condemnation, he should appeal to his legislature in Sacramento and get those laws change, as we appeal to ours in Baton Rouge and arrange for our laws on condemnation.

Again, this CARA statute protects willing sellers, but it does it in a way that is even better for willing sellers than the Calvert amendment, and here is how. There is no such thing a non-adverse condemnation. All condemnations are done in an adverse fashion, unless it is through regulation.

In an adverse condemnation, sometimes willing sellers get together and ask the court to help them. They want to sell the property, but they want to do it through a condemnation proceeding in order that they can get best value, or perhaps there is some dispute over the property ownership or some limitations on the property that have to be settled by the court. So condemnation proceedings are used very often by willing sellers to get the job done in the best way for the willing seller. The Calvert language would eliminate that capability, that process for willing sellers.

Let me say it again. Under the bill, the willing seller can object and the condemnation is over. There is no taking of his property under any circumstances under the bill's language, unless the willing seller agrees or unless my colleagues and I, and all of us in Congress, after all kinds of notice to everyone locally and federally, eventually agree in a line item to do otherwise.

So, in essence, the current bill is stronger for the landowner, gives the willing seller more options than the Calvert language, and so the Calvert language ought to be defeated.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The language in my amendment does not eliminate a willing seller entering into a voluntary condemnation. In my previous life, I negotiated those agreements frequently. This does not do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

If someone loaded a gun and handed it to somebody and then pointed that person at a target, the person providing the gun could not plead innocent when the other individual pulled the trigger. But that is what the authors of this bill are suggesting, that they are innocent of any condemnation because they are not the ones that are going to pull the trigger.

Now, it is true that language in this bill that directed the Secretary to establish a process for condemnation has been removed, and I offered an amendment to do that in the committee. And I applaud the chairman for having done that. However, if we go to page 33, subparagraph (iv), it directs the Secretary to identify properties that are proposed to be acquired from willing sellers and to specify a need for which adverse condemnation is being requested.

That is what this bill does, it tells the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture to go out and find property that they want to condemn and then provide a list to the Congress so the Congress can act on it.

Now, this bill leaves open two loopholes; one, that loophole, but the second loophole is the local government loophole. Federal rules and regulations

virtually compel State and local governments to condemn private land in order to meet those requirements. And so the authors of this bill cannot stand back and say, after they have given the loaded gun, this bill, to local governments, they cannot stand back and say, well, we are innocent bystanders in the process.

So we need to close this local government loophole. We need to close this back-door loophole that directs the Secretary to do that.

The great irony of this is that the lands we are talking about are the lands that so many have come down here to talk in favor of, and that is farmland. Many people have talked about the need to maintain open space and green space, and I support that, and I support the use of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, through easements, to do that. But this bill virtually says that we are going to require the purchase of those lands. And I can tell my colleagues this. Those lands are in better shape, that they provide more habitat for wildlife than they ever will once they are acquired by the Federal Government.

So the authors cannot stand aside and say this bill does not provide condemnation. It does. It directs the Secretary to identify lands for condemnation. It creates a huge loophole for local governments to be able to accomplish that task. And the only way to close it is to close it with the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, and I urge its support.

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

Let me refer to the section of law that the gentleman referred to, on page 32 and 33. The only reason it is there is to make sure we all get notice so that Congress knows if any agency wants to take any property and there is an unwilling seller. That way the Congress ends up making that decision under the bill. We end up deciding in a line item whether we are going to authorize any agency to move or not.

The bill, in essence, says, and let me say it again, willing sellers have total control of any proceeding, unless Congress, by direct action in a direct separate line item, appropriates and authorizes a taking. The notice is simply to make sure we know what is going on. It is a good provision of the law, not a bad one.

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

□ 1130

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) has clearly made the case. The rights of landowners are dramatically, dramatically improved under this legislation in the event that an agency would seek condemnation. The rights of the Members of Congress are dramatically improved under this legislation. The rights of the

mayors and the city councils, the boards of supervisors, county government are dramatically improved. The governor, for the first time, has full notification. Every political subdivision in and around the considered land has full notification.

None of that is required under today's law. And why is that there? Because people concerned about these issues in the negotiating sessions and in the committee expect a very deep and serious concern about what is a very serious power of the Government to condemn.

But the fact of the matter is, in some instances, very, very rarely, the Federal Government may resort to condemnation. My colleagues would not think for a minute of putting this requirement on the U.S. Army as they want to deal with Ft. Irwin and they want to start acquiring property lands for bombing ranges. My colleagues would not think for a minute of putting this in the Department of Highways as they acquire land for the development of highways. They would not think for a minute of putting this in the Department of Energy if they were seeking to locate a lab or expand one of our national labs that we have in California.

But they sure as heck want to make sure that the property owners, them as Members of Congress, their local officials are not identified and aware of that. And then the Secretary has to say why, and this is the superior route, that there is not an alternative, that there is not comparable lands.

All of those things today at the insistence of people advocating the rights of private individuals.

The other thing the gentleman does here in his amendment is he now steps over and tells the States what to do. I mean, this is a real mixed bag here. I can understand the concerns of the gentleman on the Fed, but he also now moves on to the States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), does he know what the problem with his language is? First of all, he is going to really muck up California law, because our State Constitution has had a long-standing and a well-litigated understanding of what adverse condemnation is.

What the gentleman does, this is how he mucks up the legislation, and I do not think that was his intent, but he does it, he does not delete language in this legislation, he just adds to it.

So with the provision that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) pointed out on page 31, starting with line 18, where the gentleman describes how land can be acquired, the gentleman then comes at the end of the bill and says "none of the amounts

made available by this title may be used for adverse condemnation."

Now, the word the gentleman is adding in here which has never been put into law is what is "adverse." They are going to have to have a finding of fact every time a person wants to sell property. Because most property, as the gentleman knows, is done by paper condemnation. That is, it is an advantage to the seller to go through a paper condemnation.

Is that paper condemnation adverse or not? If it is adverse, they cannot use these funds. And what the gentleman is doing, I think he is trampling not only on well-established law of this country both at the Federal level and at the local level, but he is also trampling on the rights of property owners who may want to sell under adverse conditions.

The gentleman defines that as "may not be used."

In the bill, it says "any property unless the owner of the property concurs with the acquisition or the acquisition of that property is specified by an act of Congress."

The gentleman has the adverse condemnation as an issue of fact of what is adverse or not adverse.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair would remind all Members that comments made during the debate should be directed to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to only say that the coercive power of the Government to recommend condemnation in itself has a destructive effect on the value of property.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I think to understand the Calvert amendment, what we really need to do is go back to the basic philosophy of the bill, which is to say that the \$5.4 trillion debt ridden national government is going to take \$3 billion a year and give that to the State governments and other Federal government for land buying. Even though the State governments have a 70-billion surplus, we are going to take our money and give it to these cash-risk States.

Now, what the Calvert amendment does say is, okay, even under that crazy logic, let us try to put some common sense in it and say that, under this any-willing-buyer clause, they need to make sure that it really means any willing buyer. Because the bill clearly says, or, if by act of Congress, Congress decides to buy something, it does not matter if they are willing or not, they are going to come after them. The Calvert amendment addresses that, number one.

Number two, what it says is that the State governments are not governed by the any-willing-buyer provision.

All the Calvert amendment says is that, since we are giving the money to the State governments and it is Federal money that they will be using to purchase this land, we are simply saying that they should have to go by the any-willing-buyer provision.

This is a private property issue. This is a fundamental Constitutional right of Americans. This is a no-brainer. I do not think we should even have a vote on it. I encourage people just to accept this amendment and let us move on.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say simply to my friend the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) that the line he refers to on page 33 is a notice requirement of the lands that are requested of Congress to act upon, the lands in which in fact Congress is being asked to appropriate money and to take.

In those cases, it helps us to know what they want to do. They cannot do it without Congress knowing. They have got to notify us. That is all this section does. Even if the language of the gentleman was adopted, Congress would have the right, as the gentleman knows, next year to approve an expropriation of some property with Federal money. It is not going to stop that.

The bill protects willing sellers completely, gives them the right to use this process to get the best deal. It is a much better version of what the gentleman is trying to do than the language he has submitted.

I urge Members to reject this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) has 2¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) still has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO).

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would have to say to my friend the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) that I wish the property rights language in the bill did what he says it does. Because he knows that we both worked extremely hard to try to get to that point and, unfortunately, that is not where we are.

The language that is actually in the bill when it comes to condemnation leaves one very big loophole, and that is that unless it is authorized by an act of Congress, which is a huge loophole. What it says is that under the generic authorization of the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, it allows condemnation. Therefore, condemnation is allowed in the bill.

That is identified in the bill on page 33 when it talks about taking land by

adverse condemnation. It is identified in the bill. It is quite clear why this was put in. I was part of the negotiations, and we all know why it was put in, because it was insisted that the Government be allowed that their right of condemnation be protected. And that is why it is in the bill.

Now, what the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) is doing is he is saying that if the States are going to take land that they should not be allowed to take the land by condemnation.

The fifth amendment of the Constitution was put in place to protect the property rights of individuals. It is a Federal issue. And there is no way around that. It is our responsibility to stand up for the property owners.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) has 15 seconds remaining and the right to close. The gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) has three-quarters of a minute remaining.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment which requires that a seller be a willing seller. This is as simple as that. Everyone here agrees that that is what they want. They want willing sellers. Well, then, I would suggest that they accept this amendment.

The fact that a list can be made up of sellers' property somewhere, trust me, will have an adverse effect on the values of that property. And then to have the Government come back and negotiate to acquire that property from a so-called willing seller in itself is quite remarkable in this country.

I think that this is a workable way to resolve this issue. I would hope that my colleagues would support this, and this would make it I think a much better bill.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, let me first answer my friend the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO). Look at page 31. It provides that the money may be not expended except for those acquisitions that are specifically referred to and approved in an act of Congress. The bill requires that every act of purchase be specifically identified in an appropriation by an act of Congress, in fact, in a line item specifically referred to, not in any kind of a report language but in the bill, in the act of Congress.

Secondly, the bill contains a statement of our basic property rights in the fifth amendment that no property can be taken without compensation. But do not be kidded about that. It is in the bill.

Third, let me read the clear language of the bill. The clear language of the bill "willing seller requirement: The

Federal portion may not be used to acquire any property unless (a) the owner of the property concurs in the acquisition," and that means the owner can object to any condemnation, "or, Congress itself decides to take the property."

Congress always has that right whether the amendment of the gentleman passes or not. What we have done is given the willing seller total control of the situation unless Congress supersedes it with a direct appropriation and taking. The willing seller has total control, can object to the condemnation or use it if it helps him get a better selling price.

The amendment should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of clarification related to title II of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman and I both know, this bill makes available \$450 million each year for Federal land acquisitions under the Land and Water Conservation Fund. While I am reticent about doing this through a permanent appropriation, I am pleased that the legislation specifies that these funds may only be expended for purchases which are included in a list of acquisitions which is approved by Congress in an annual appropriations bill.

There is some confusion, however, about how the final list of land acquisitions will be determined. Under this bill, the process begins with a list submitted by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. It is my understanding, however, that the list transmitted to the Congress is just the executive branch's proposal. The Committee on Appropriations would be obliged to review this list but then would recommend to the House those acquisitions which it considered to be the highest priority in the amounts that it considered prudent. It could add projects, delete projects, or change amounts allocated to any project based on its best judgment.

In short, my reading is that the Secretary's list is just a proposal and that

the committee has broad authority in making recommendations to the House on how the \$450 million for land acquisition will be allocated among competing needs.

Is this also the understanding of the gentleman?

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. The list the administration is required to submit each year through CARA is only a request.

□ 1145

The Committee on Appropriations will have the final say for Federal Land and Water Conservation projects and acquisitions when it decides whether or not to approve each new tract requested by Federal LWCF acquisition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 106-612.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. HILL OF MONTANA

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Mr. HILL of Montana:

At the end of title II (page 44, after line 11) add the following (and make appropriate conforming amendments):

SEC. . REQUIREMENTS FOR ACQUISITION OF LANDS IN MONTANA WITH FEDERAL PORTION.

Section 7 (16 U.S.C. 4601-9) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) REQUIREMENTS FOR ACQUISITION OF LANDS IN MONTANA.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal portion may not be used by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire lands in the State of Montana until the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture issue a plan in accordance with this subsection.

"(2) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly develop and issue a plan for acquisition and disposal of lands in the State of Montana that will result in consolidation of private lands and Federal public lands. The plan shall be designed to ensure that—

"(A) acquisitions of lands with the Federal portion consolidate Federal ownership of lands in Montana under the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture; and

"(B) any increase in the total acreage of lands in Montana under the administrative jurisdictions of those Departments that results from acquisitions of lands with the Federal portion is de minimis."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) and a Member opposed, each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes. This is an amendment, Mr. Chairman, that ad-

resses a problem that is specific to Montana. Like most of the western States, much of the State of Montana is owned by the Federal Government. But what is unique to the problem in the State of Montana is that this land is owned in a checkerboard ownership pattern. The consequence of that is it makes it virtually impossible for us to manage the private and the public lands in the State of Montana.

It makes it very difficult to deal with the environmental impacts of activity on those lands; it makes it very difficult to manage the resources on those lands, it creates a lot of conflicts in the land as private landowners seek access through public lands to get to their land, or the public seeks access across private lands to get to public lands. Montana today ranks last in the Nation in per capita income. That is a decline from, at one time we were 12th in the Nation not long ago. This is substantially a consequence of the change in the management of the public lands. What this amendment does is it requires the secretaries of agriculture and interior to develop a long-range plan, to identify what lands they want to purchase or exchange, what lands should be available for sale. It allows them to bring mineral interests into that equation. And it directs them to do that in a way that would have a de minimis impact on how much of the Federal lands there are in Montana.

There are about 93 million acres in Montana. 19 million of those are owned by the U.S. Forest Service. That is an area that is approximately equal to the State of Maine. 8 million of those acres are owned by the BLM. That is equivalent to the combined areas of Connecticut and Massachusetts. 1.2 million acres is owned by the National Park Service, another 600,000 by the Fish and Wildlife Service. That is about a third of Montana that is directly owned.

In addition to that, the Federal Government manages through the BIA another 11.8 million acres of trust lands, Indian trust lands. But on top of all that, the BLM owns subsurface interests in the State of Montana of another 37.8 million acres. To put that into perspective, the Federal Government controls lands in the State of Montana that is about equal to all of the New England States added together. It is owned in a checkerboard pattern.

I have helped support efforts before this Congress to use the LWCF to purchase lands. I have worked with the ranking member and the chairman on exchange bills, and I have worked hard to accomplish the goals of trying to find a way to consolidate lands to improve the management. But Montanans believe that the Federal Government controls and owns more land in the State of Montana than they ought to. They also believe that we need to consolidate those lands to improve its management and to create opportunities to lift us from the bottom of the economic barrel. Montana is a very special place. I am privileged to have

the opportunity to represent it. But as we just acquire lands which, is what the bill before us now would do, it erodes our tax base, it undermines our economy. I would urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I seek the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me first thank my friend for the great work he did at the committee level and with all of us in trying to negotiate as many pro-property rights provisions in this bill as I think we have been able to negotiate.

Let me secondly concede to him that the checkerboard land ownership pattern in the west is something that, frankly, I hope this bill helps in a big way to end and to ease.

Third, to indicate to him that he knows that I have favored, in fact we have included language in the bill that will encourage land swaps and surplus land sales as opposed to new acquisitions in States that are already heavily owned. But what is good for Montana may not be exactly as good for Nevada, or Nevada as good for Montana, but the problems are common in all those States in terms of the high percentage of State and federally-owned property.

That is why when the bill was written, we set as a top priority that the government must seek, number one, to consolidate Federal land holdings in the States with checkerboard Federal land patterns. That it must, two, consider the use of equal value land exchanges where feasible and suitable as an alternative to land acquisition. That it must consider easements over acquisitions wherever possible. And even on page 33, we require the secretary to submit to us annually a list of those lands that the secretary has identified as surplus and eligible for disposal.

There is a lot of language in the bill that moves in the direction the gentleman wants without setting up a special case of no net gain for one State. I would encourage, therefore, that this amendment be rejected, because, in fact, the bill provides relief for all States commonly situated rather than setting up a special plan for Montana with, in effect, a no net gain provision.

Again, I sympathize with the gentleman's problems in those States as we all have and we have written language, I think, that addresses in a large way a resolution of many of those problems. I urge a rejection of this amendment.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The gentleman from Montana and I have talked about this problem for some time. Again, this is a problem that I think Members from other parts of the country have to be sensitive to. But the idea of prohibiting any Federal land acquisition until this study is done and that the outcome of the study has to be a de minimis change.

As the gentleman knows when he did the Gallatin, we worked very hard on the Gallatin exchange because we were exchanging some really good timberlands for some cutover lands that needed a lot of rehabilitation and restoration, stream restoration and all those other things. The Federal Government ended up with a lot more land than it gave because of the value of those lands. I do not know if that is de minimis or not. I do not think we should get into that argument.

Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to give him the study. If he wants a study of land patterns and land ownerships and disposals and all the rest of it, that would be fine. Right now I do not know of any plans for Federal acquisition, unless there is something right on the edge of Yellowstone that has to do with some church-owned property that may be for sale, some of the farmers think we should buy because the bison would go there.

I do not know that much about it. He does not have any bills in and I do not think we have any other bills in front of our committee. If he wants to have the department make a full-blown study here and tell the people of Montana what their plans are, I do not have any problem with that. But prohibiting this, in all likelihood, he does not need the prohibition and he could still get the study done.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I think I identified that the Federal Government controls or owns about 79 million acres. Actually the BLM has done a study. They identified 75,000 acres that potentially would be available. 75,000 out of 79 million. The reason that they do not have any incentive to offer any more lands is because they can just continue to purchase them. I am as guilty as others. I have supported land acquisitions and exchanges that have added to the total amount of land. But at some point, we cannot just consolidate the public land. We also need to work to consolidate the private land holdings because those resources are important to the economy and the opportunities of the people of the State of Montana. The bill does not do that.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Let me reclaim my time. The man sit-

ting next to the gentleman has the authority to do this. If the study has been done and you want to review it and you want some action on the study, the committee is available for that. I do not pretend to speak for the chairman. But putting in this prohibition just is not going to work.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, at the end I will ask the chairman, of course, to do the study. But beyond the study is the emphasis that the secretaries need to have, that any plan has to put the emphasis on consolidation of private lands and eliminating public lands. I want to make one other point here. That is, that while the bill provides for exchanges of land, the bill, CARA, does not provide for the exchanges of mineral interests in the land. This amendment would provide that. I pointed out to Members that there are 37 million acres in the State of Montana where the BLM has subsurface rights but not surface rights. Those subsurface interests also ought to be incorporated into any effort to consolidate lands.

There are many things that I like about this bill. I have expressed concerns about the lack of sufficient protection for property rights. But I also believe the bill does not go far enough to set forward a plan on when do we buy land, why should we buy land, how is that going to impact the communities that are associated with that. That is what this amendment would do.

Yes, this amendment is specific to Montana. But there was an amendment earlier where the gentleman from California had a provision in this bill that was specific to his district for a specific need. I am simply suggesting that Montana deserves an equal standing. This bill addressed a specific concern in Louisiana, coastal areas and provides \$1.5 billion for that purpose, \$1.6 billion for California, \$800 million for Alaska.

I do not think that it is unfair for the people of Montana to ask that they be treated equitably in this bill addressing a unique problem with a specific solution and a mechanism to do that that protects the important wildlife values, the important environmental values, but also recognizing the importance of the economic benefits and opportunities to the people of Montana.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman may be able to have his cake and eat it too. As the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) has read the language, it is highly unlikely that there is going to be condemnation or Federal purchases in Montana.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) has expired.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, is there a way to get the gentleman 30 seconds so he could respond?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in all likelihood you are not going to have Federal land acquisitions. So if you struck section 1, then you would get your cake and eat it, too, because you get your study under the terms and conditions that you have set forth.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. HILL OF MONTANA

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike section 1 and offer the amendment with that section struck.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not believe I will object. We are looking at the language right now. I think my staff agrees with it. The gentleman means paragraph 1, is that not correct?

Mr. HILL of Montana. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. It would be paragraph 1.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. If the gentleman will yield, where it says "in general." Lines 7 through 12.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Yes, that is my unanimous consent request.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object just to make sure. If what remains of the bill is section 2, the language says that not only do you get a study, it has to result in a certain outcome. I just want to point that out in terms of the negotiations here. I realize that the gentleman is saying our friend from Montana ought to have his study, but I would caution the chairman to look at the language in section 2 that says the study has to produce a specific outcome.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. If the gentleman will yield, I am going to suggest because there is some type of cooperation occurring here, if the gentleman will assure me that he is going to enthusiastically support the bill, I am willing to accept that part of the provision with the understanding that you and I are going to work together.

Mr. HILL of Montana. You would have to strike the provision enthusiastically.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I will ask you directly, quietly.

Mr. HILL of Montana. As I have told the chairman in the past, if I can have this provision in the bill, that I would be willing to support the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. And be willing to work with me to try to make sure that this is balanced out correctly?

Mr. HILL of Montana. I would commit to that.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Is that agreeable to the gentleman from California?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. In that case we will accept his original proposal striking and accept the rest of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. If the horse trading is done and we could back up for a second.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I know we are on television, but I will trade horses anyplace in the street, believe me.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 20 offered by Mr. HILL of Montana:

In the matter proposed, strike out line 7 through line 12.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the modification?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment is modified.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

□ 1200

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House report 106-612.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. BUYER

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 21 offered by Mr. BUYER:

Page 45, line 5, strike "wildlife conservation organizations,".

Page 47, line 1, strike "wildlife conservation organizations, and outdoor recreation and conservation education entities".

Page 68, strike line 23 and all that follows down through line 11 on page 69.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the Conservation and Reinvestment Act. My amendment would keep the private transactions of nonprofit, nongovernmental conservation groups a private matter by stopping government money from going to these groups for the purpose of purchasing conservation easements.

We all share the goal of promoting conservation of our natural resources, and we all understand the importance of passing these resources from one generation to the next. But private environmental groups do not need the Federal Government's support. Nonprofit groups are already acquiring

land for preservation purposes without government support. Private organizations are raising hundreds of millions of dollars each year which donors can take as a deduction on Federal taxes. In fact, according to the IRS and Philanthropic Research, Incorporated, the 10 largest environmental nongovernmental organizations have a combined annual revenue of over \$1 billion.

Now, what these groups do with the money they raise is their own business. If they want to purchase conservation easements, that is great. But they should not expect the Government to fund their activities. As currently written, CARA allows nonprofit environmental groups to acquire land, hold title and enforce easements, while Washington picks up half the tab.

The funding of private groups for conservation easements is an unnecessary expansion of government. At a time when we should be holding the line on the amount of money that Washington spends and the influence it has over our people, it makes no sense to create a \$100 million program to fund work that is already being done in the private sector. Moreover, Federal support of conservation easements is a back-door way of the Government to control even more land and exercise land use policies in a quasi-governmental function.

The Federal Government already owns 670 million acres of land, about one-third of the land in the United States, land that it cannot properly maintain. Federal funding of private groups' land acquisition is another way for government to promote restrictions on land use without actually having to purchase the land.

Now, there is a bit of confusion based on what has been shared among Members between the minority and the majority about what is actually in the bill and how it mirrored exactly what was taken out of the 1996 farm bill, Freedom to Farm. I would like to clarify. The 1996 farm bill included a program, the Farmland Protection Program, or FPP, intended to keep farmland in agricultural production. The program featured Federal funds to assist with the purchase of easements that would permanently restrict the use of land agriculture. Under the program, private nonprofit groups could receive Federal funds if they were partnered with a government entity and only for the purpose of keeping farmland in agricultural production. The money flows from the Federal Government to the State or local government entity, which in turns channels it to the private partnering groups. Under the FPP, there is no direct pipeline to these groups from the Federal Treasury.

Now, what is in CARA that is different from the Freedom to Farm? Under title VII of CARA, there are two significant and troubling differences. First, under the CARA provision, private, nonprofit groups do not have to be partnered with a government entity.

This means that for the first time, these groups have a direct pipeline to the Federal Treasury for the purposes of acquiring easements. The second difference and significant difference is that under CARA, the easements have been expanded to include general conservation purposes, such as wildlife preservation as opposed to simply keeping farmland in agricultural production.

A second area of confusion is about the impact that our amendment would have on private, nonprofit groups under FPP. Some of the groups are concerned that our amendment would take away funding that they currently receive or jeopardize future funding under the FPP. This notion is mistaken. Our amendment only impacts CARA. If adopted, our amendment would not take away any of the nonprofit groups' funding under the FPP or impose further restrictions on their activities. We simply are preventing them from building a direct pipeline to government money under CARA and from using money for nonagricultural purposes. Under our amendment, these groups could still receive Federal funds if they partnered with a government entity.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to prohibit nonprofit organizations from using funds under the bill to acquire conservation easements. This would be exactly the wrong thing to do. Let me talk a little bit about what is going on in Colorado.

In Colorado, we have the Colorado Cattlemen's Agricultural Land Trust, which helps ranchers and other property owners to avoid the need to sell their lands to developers. In fact, if we look at their brochure that they put out, that gives a lot of great examples of easement purchases, and they specifically talk about the fact that cattlemen formed the trust so that easements could be held by private parties. They want private sector control. This amendment would eliminate that possibility.

We also have organizations like the Continental Trails Alliance, which can acquire easements instead of having to purchase full fee interests in lands and that makes them able to make effective use of their limited funds.

When we look throughout the country, we have soccer clubs and other nonprofit groups that are acquiring easements that makes it much more feasible for those communities to provide recreation areas for soccer and for open-space recreation and to help deal with the sprawl that is consuming so much of our precious open space.

So this bill helps these groups carry out these vital activities. This amendment would make it much more difficult, if not impossible, for them to do

that. For that reason, we should reject the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire as to the time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I represent probably one of the most productive agricultural communities in the United States. Our county alone produces 55 crops. We do about \$2.4 billion in sales. This is the County of Monterey and the Salinas Valley, also known as Steinbeck country because that is the area that John Steinbeck wrote about.

What is happening with the land use pressures in California where we have 33 million people in the State; we are growing very fast, and for these productive agricultural lands, the farmers are getting together. As the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) indicated, we also have the California Cattlemen's Association, which has created a private nonprofit to allow the transfer of a lot of easements, because that way the land still stays in private ownership, only what one is selling is the development rights.

Now, what the gentleman's amendment would do is just prohibit these wonderfully new inventive tools that have been used by the private sector, by willing sellers. Nobody comes in and takes these things. Why they are so creative is that it allows the family that owns the land to have some income that relieves some of the pressures for ownership and some of the liabilities for ownership so that they are not taxed on best use and all of that. The gentleman's amendment would just not allow these people to be recompensated for those efforts.

Now, what happens in land use, it is sort of like when one is trying to build housing. We do not just do this with one single source of revenue. What happens in California is that a lot of these, particularly in the farmland areas, is it is private money coming out of farmland trust. People give private contributions. It comes out of foundation money, conservative organizations like Hewlett and Packard Foundations. These are private sources money which are matched, oftentimes with local, like county money or State money that comes; we just passed a bond act in California that authorizes this.

The gentleman is saying that we cannot pool any of that money with Federal money under this program and

allow this to continue. I know what the gentleman is getting at, is that these organizations should not be compensated as real estate agents, but frankly, they are doing the real estate business under willing sellers. I think it is a bad amendment.

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

I would say to the gentleman, I come from a district that represents 20 counties of Indiana, one of the largest districts that is to the east of the Mississippi, with a strong agricultural base. I would disagree with the gentleman's assertion that somehow this prevents private organizations from purchasing lands, purchasing those easements and doing what they want with it.

What I am saying is, if the sponsors of this bill sell the bill to the Members of this body by saying oh, what we have done is just took exactly what was in Freedom to Farm and placed in the bill, and I am going to clarify this with the chairman, then we have a problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) has expired.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, whoever is running this mike, they better start learning how to run it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify one thing. We believe, from the letters of the Committee on Agriculture, it was exactly the same, because we sent this bill to the committee and they worked on the committee through the exchange of letters.

Now, if there is a misinterpretation, I do apologize, and I do believe the staff screwed up. But we are going to work on that part to make it work, that last provision.

Now, the rest of the amendment disturbs me. This is my part of this bill, the wildlife restoration part. And what the gentleman does is eliminate the ability of Ducks, Unlimited, eliminate the ability of Safari International, the ability of those organizations that believe in wildlife restoration in participating in that program, with the gentleman's amendment.

So I respectfully ask the gentleman to consider that, and let us work on that provision which, if the gentleman thinks I misled, I apologize, but I did not do it intentionally, because it came out of another committee. We will work on that provision as we go through this process. I will do that. But those other two provisions I adamantly oppose, and anybody who understands Ducks, Unlimited and Safari, they are the biggest contributors to wildlife restoration and sustainable yield of those species. I have to oppose the amendment as proposed, but I will

work with the gentleman on that last provision.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I would echo what the chairman has suggested, but again I emphasize that this amendment would eliminate the opportunity for the private sector to be involved. In fact, CARA is constructed in a way that the private sector is fully involved in the holding of conservation easements.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in House Report 106-612.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MRS. CHENOWETH-HAGE

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE:

Page 46, strike line 5, and all that follows down through line 19 on page 47 (all of 302(d)).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE).

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes a provision in title III of the bill which opens the door for funding to go to organizations which engage in "public outreach" and species reintroduction and numerous other uses not currently in law. The amendment would keep in place current law.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am really especially concerned that this definition will allow for the great expansion of the management of non-game species that is contained in the present bill before the House. It will also allow funding for very highly controversial measures such as wolf and grizzly bear introduction as is occurring in my State of Idaho. But most egregious is the term "public outreach," which makes organizations who engage in advocacy and lobbying eligible to receive funds under the Pittman-Pobertson act. This means that extreme organizations will be eligible for funds to actively lobby and advocate against activities such as hunting and recreational access.

Now, again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote from Mr. Ray Arnett, who is the former President of the National Wildlife Federation and former Direc-

tor of the California Fish and Wildlife Service. He said in his letter that CARA is a very dangerous bill. He said,

Every owner of a ranch or a farm or wood lot or a game preserve will be at risk of being targeted by not only agencies, but organizations working in tandem with environmental anti-hunting, animal rights pressure groups.

□ 1215

Ironically, since they hold the most desirable properties, the private landowners, who have been the most diligent caretakers of their holdings, will be on the top of the list for land grabs and government takeovers under this bill.

CARA is destined to be a disaster for one of its intended beneficiaries, and that is, the sporting community of hunters and fishermen who are the true and most able conservationists in America. The unprecedented flood of money provided by CARA will enable buying and turning over to the government the private lands historically and currently used for hunting and fishing. This will subject the properties' sporting use to the whim of public opinion and a bureaucracy increasingly hostile to sport hunting, fishing, trapping, and gun ownership.

CARA, he said, fits perfectly into the plans of the anti-hunting Animal Protection Institute, since it will provide the very revenue source outside of the sportsman-paid excise taxes to fund Pittman-Robertson.

There is no question that animal rights advocates will target for acquisition fish and game clubs, leases, and other private land where the taking of renewable wildlife resources is permitted. Once the land is purchased and under government control, these well-funded anti-sportsmen groups will lobby Congress and government agencies for the elimination of any consumptive use of wildlife resources. This is a correction that needs to be made to this bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman's amendment, if it had been narrow, would have been somewhat easier to look at and maybe understand, but it is so broad that it concerns me, because she strikes all the definitions, including the definition of "wildlife-associated recreation."

In our negotiations, I worked very hard to include in that hunting and fishing to be considered as one of the recreation activities to occur on these lands. Under her amendment, by striking the definitions, it would give the Department of the Interior, the Sec-

retary of the Interior, the ability to define what could occur on these lands. That is why I am worried about the amendment. It is so broad, it strikes everything. This, very frankly, is not the intent.

I am a hunter. I am a fisherman. I am a person who participates in the outdoors for a great many hours. Every hunting group that has any recognition at all supports this bill. The one group that does not support it is the animal rights group. There is a little contradictory work there. In fact, I am going over here in a little while to talk to the Safari Club that is actively involved in promoting this legislation. Members may not like that, but that is the fact of life, because they are the best conservation organization in existence in this world today, and I will say that without any reservation, and they are supporting this overwhelmingly.

I also recognize the importance and definition of activities that can include archery ranges and things like that. If we strike all these definitions, we really go to the problem of letting, again, the Secretary of the Interior make those decisions. I think that is incorrect.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. I want to express the same sorts of concerns that my colleague, the chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) expressed.

It seems that while this proposed amendment may be intended to prevent title III funds from being used for public outreach, species reintroduction, and other uses not currently authorized in the law, it actually could have the opposite effect, is what the gentleman is suggesting.

By deleting all the definitions in the title, that being title III, but maintaining the rest of the title, it establishes a new wildlife conservation program for the States with a variety of terms of reference that are not defined, including wildlife conservation project, wildlife recreation project, wildlife education project.

The way I see it, if the amendment was passed the administration could write new regulations interpreting these provisions in any way they want. Potentially, they could determine that these projects could include public outreach or species reintroduction, which I think are the very things that the sponsor is attempting to prevent.

Mr. Chairman, again, I think this would be ill-advised. I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I think the legislative process

and particularly the committee process is designed to draft legislation so that ambiguities are spelled out and worked out so that the bill as we enact it, as it becomes the law of this country, we can understand what it means.

I think what the problem with this amendment is, and some of those that we have been speaking on today, I believe they are kind of reckless.

This amendment deletes definitions. There is a whole section on definitions. If Congress has not defined what it means by the use of those funds, it leaves it up to others to define. As the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) said, it leaves it up to the States to define it, it leaves it up to the Secretary of the Interior to define it, it leaves it up to an uncertain process.

Frankly, when it comes to dealing with land, management of land, acquisition of land certainty is key. By this amendment, we eliminate the line that says, "The term 'wildlife conservation and restoration program' means a program developed by a State Fish and Wildlife Department and approved by the Secretary." They delete that, so they can do it any way they want. They do not need it approved by the Secretary.

It goes on to say, "The term 'wildlife-associated recreation' shall be construed to mean a project intended to meet the demand for outdoor activities associated with wildlife, including but not limited to hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, photography, such projects as construction or deconstruction of wildlife viewing areas, et cetera," they delete all that. They leave it up to vagaries and uncertainty. That is not good law. Bad amendment.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is sound, this amendment is sound. Let me just read what I believe is reckless in terms of what is included in the term "conservation."

Normally, we would think of conservation as Teddy Roosevelt would, caring for the resources. But actually, here there are so many ambiguities in here that the term "conservation" means "a standard that is desirable to sustain healthy populations, including all activities associated with scientific resource management." Whose science? That includes "research, census, monitoring of populations," but another key word, Mr. Chairman, "acquisition," acquisition. This falls under the definition of "conservation."

So, Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simply put together to clear up the ambiguities. The term "conservation" has been widely used and widely understood, but it is being exceedingly broadened in this new bill. I would urge the support of this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was written with the cooperation of not only the staff but cooperation of the outdoors coalition. It was written and reviewed. They are supporting this, those people who directly use this.

I have things in here that a lot of people would not vote for. I have trapping, hunting, fishing. Those are the things I would like to see left in this bill because it is part of wildlife rehabilitation and wildlife restoration.

Again, I suggest, respectfully, the amendment as offered is so broad it defeats all the purposes that we have worked for to try to have the wildlife included in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). All time has expired on the discussion of the amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 106-612.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Chairman pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 23 offered by Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

Page 70, line 14, strike "and".

Page 70, strike the period on line 17 and all that follows through line 22 and insert the following:

“, and

“(3) the Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program established under section 9 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2105).”

Page 10, line 21, after "(note)" insert “, the Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program established under section 9 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2105).”

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment not just on my own behalf, but on behalf of a number of other Members, including the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is simple. It would add authority for the

Secretary of Agriculture to use funds under the bill for urban and community forestry, in addition to the authority the bill provides for funding the farmland protection and forest legacy programs.

The amendment would not require a specific level of funding, it would merely require and allow the Secretary to have the discretion to provide the program with some of the funds available under Title VII of the bill.

The urban and community forestry program helps communities protect their air and water, save energy, increase property values, and create healthy environments by enabling the Forest Service to provide technical and financial assistance to local governments and to nonprofit organizations in partnership with the State forestry agencies.

The program helps urban communities with tree planting and urban planning. It helps suburban communities like mine respond to the problems of growth and sprawl, and it helps rural communities, as well. For example, in the last fiscal year, the program assisted more than 50 projects in Colorado. It helped dozens of communities of all sizes, from Lyons, Larkspur, and Leadville, to Dacono, Denver, and Dinosaur, and many others across our State.

Besides local governments, such as Jefferson, Gunnison, and Eagle Counties, and many cities and towns, its partners included dozens of groups like Volunteers for Outdoor Colorado; Trees, Water, and People; the Denver Urban Resources Partnership; garden clubs, schools, and many others too numerous to list.

The story is the same all across the country. In fact, nationally, more than 10,000 communities and some 7,000 volunteer organizations participate annually.

The program operates on a partnership basis and Federal funds are heavily leveraged. In fact, \$4 of private donations and in-kind contributions are involved for each dollar provided by the Federal government.

We are still not meeting all of the needs out there. In fact, the Forest Service tells me that they have eight times more requests for assistance than they have resources to provide. So I think it just makes good sense to give the Department of Agriculture the ability to use some of these funds that would be made available by this bill to continue this important work.

In short, I think adding this program would add a useful element to this good bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) rise?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized in opposition for 10 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of discussion, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO).

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, not because I do not feel that this is a good program, because it is, and I have supported it in the past. At the same time, we have heard over the last 2 days repeatedly about the delicate balance that exists in this bill, and how important it is to hold the bill together and not accept any of the amendments.

I had amendments that added money to urban parks, and all my friends voted against it. I had amendments that added money to endangered species recovery, and all my friends voted against it, including the chairman and those that are in favor of this particular amendment. They were all opposed to all the good things that we were trying to do to this bill.

I would ask for a no vote on this particular amendment, because if there is such a delicate balance and if it is so important not to accept any amendments, then we should not accept this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentleman, I am going to support the amendment, and the good gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

I think what we have to do is plant more trees. We also have to harvest them at the appropriate time, but there have to be more trees planted, because our forestry in the urban areas and in the rural areas is in decline because management has been very poor.

I have to lecture a little bit here. There is a concept that trees last forever. They do not. We ought to recognize that, because they do the best to clean the air up. They are the one, true purifier of our air, and dead trees or old trees that have reached their maturity and have begun to die do not clear the air.

I do not know how many read in the paper, we have a fire now in the Los Alamos area where there is a fire threatening our nuclear capability. We have to recognize that nature is well and good, but it is not necessarily as good as we can be in managing our forests.

I have traveled to Sweden, I have traveled overseas, where they today have managed their forests over the years because they recognize the value of live trees and what they do and how they clean the air and how they help mankind live.

□ 1230

So I am in strong support of this amendment, and I want to tell the gentleman, we will be willing to accept the amendment. And because the gentleman is running the time, I guess he will not object to his own amendment. But I do want to suggest to my colleagues that we have to look at the big picture. This is part of the big picture.

As far as the delicate balance, I have to tell the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), my good friend, we have adopted five of the amendments that have been proposed to us. We have listened to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). We accepted one of his amendments. We have taken one from the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER). So we have adopted amendments.

So this debate has been very good, because we have listened to both sides. And where the amendments really can make sense, we have accepted them. But, again, I congratulate the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) on this amendment because I think it adds to the bill, and I hope the people of America recognize the importance of sound management, planting of new trees for the betterment of those people who live in the urban areas as well as the rural areas.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume only to, I think, summarize what the gentleman said: We have to plant before we can harvest, and I continue looking forward to working with the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG.)

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) for his recognition and support of making a good bill even better. And to the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), my colleague and my friend from the Committee on Agriculture, we will have another day to work together. We are friends, and I hope he continue to support this program.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and myself and others, and also rise in support of the base bill.

This amendment, I think, enhances the base bill. The Urban and Community Forest Program has been in existence since 1978. This program has been widely used throughout the United States, assisting 80 percent of all Americans. Assistance is provided by the program for both urban and rural areas, as well as suburban communities and small towns that fall in between.

As our rural areas and small towns, communities, cities have developed, the Urban and Community Forest Program has become an integral part of building and sustaining them. Important connections existing between the liveability of communities and the service functions provided by trees, forests and related green space. These connections includes improved air and water quality, control of storm runoffs,

sufficient soil aeration and energy conservation.

These connections are important due to increasing demands on natural resources by developers, as evidenced by tremendous urban sprawl, along with pressure to develop rural areas. Without property conservation, our quality of life will be greatly diminished throughout all of our communities.

USDA's Forest Service works with State forestry agencies, local tribal governments, and the private sector in urban and rural settings to conserve and manage natural resources. Let me cite a few examples of how this program has assisted some communities.

In 1999, Elizabethtown, North Carolina, which has a population of 3,839 citizens, forestry funds were used to implement a highly visible tree-planting project to develop a community forestry program.

"Hand Made in America," a nonprofit organization in western North Carolina, formed a partnership with six small mountain towns and two private colleges creating a collaborative effort to plant trees in an endeavor to achieve sustainable communities.

The South Carolina School for the Blind established a quarter-mile natural trail. The natural trail has Braille signs, wildlife footprints, bird sounds, and three natural wildlife habitat areas to teach plant science, animal characteristics and natural resource management.

The City of Herndon, Virginia is using a \$2,500 public-private partnership grant for tree planting to encourage homeowners to properly plant and maintain trees.

Mr. Chairman, these are excellent examples of how the Urban and Community Forest Program is working to improve the quality of life in both rural areas as well as urban areas.

I urge my colleagues to support this program. It is good both for urban and rural America.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have come today to the floor to urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), which simply restores the Urban and Community Forestry Program. This is, indeed, a bipartisan bill and I am very thankful to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for their hard work on it.

In fact, this program restores the green infrastructure that is disappearing so dramatically in our cities and in our towns throughout America. And we are really substituting cement and asphalt for trees and greenery.

The Urban and Community Forestry Program would also make it possible

for youth at risk to learn how to clean up their communities and educate their parents and neighbors about conservation practices like waste removal, recycling, planting, et cetera. We must continue to teach our youth and involve them so that we can continue growing these green trees for effectively preserving the natural environment.

Studies have shown that preventing the spread of deforestation in our cities decreases energy and storm water runoff costs, increases air quality and improves the liveability of our communities and our neighborhoods. It does attract businesses who love to have their employees in a greener community, the better employees.

Mr. Chairman, this also is the only current Federal program that can so comprehensively help improve the environmental quality of urban Americans. Note that this is not an increase in funding authorization of the CARA bill. Instead, it simply allows the program to receive some of the funds already earmarked for the USDA bill. This is almost a four-to-one match, the one Federal program dollar with in-kind and donated services.

More than ever, we need to not only sustain but also encourage the livelihood of projects like the Urban and Community Forestry Program. I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) for introducing this amendment, and I encourage all my colleagues in this House to support the inclusion of the Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program in this final version of H.R. 701.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time we have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), my good friend, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado, my good friend and colleague. This amendment would provide a dedicated stream of funds for the Urban and Community Forestry Program, a valuable yet underfunded program.

As the only Member from the New York State delegation on the Committee on Resources, and representative of the most urban district on the committee, I have realized that the Urban and Community Forestry Program is vital to the regreening of our Nation's cities.

In my home State of New York, over the last 4 years, the Urban and Community Forestry Program has provided more than \$1 million to contain and

prevent further tree loss associated with the Asian longhorned beetle, an invasive species that has destroyed thousands of trees throughout both New York City and Chicago metropolitan areas.

The Urban and Community Forestry Program has provided technical assistance to help local officials plant and care for trees that are resistant to the beetle to prevent future outbreaks in the City of New York and throughout the United States.

The Urban and Community Forestry Program currently assists over 13 major U.S. metropolitan areas, including Denver, Atlanta, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, East St. Louis, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Seattle, and South Florida. With additional assistance, this worthwhile program could provide even more assistance.

Additionally, the Urban and Community Forestry Program has provided technical assistance to help community groups plant trees, restore riverbanks, improve watersheds and provide conservation education that makes our urban communities a better place to live and to work.

Therefore, I am pleased to stand with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) in strong support of this amendment. Again, I thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for this landmark legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say one thing to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and compliment him on his statement. But this is the difference between some of our agencies' attitudes than what the City of New York has done. Because we have the same problem with beetles. We have 47,000 acres of beetles in the Kenai Peninsula that kills every tree down there and we are trying to eliminate the beetle on Federal land, eliminate the beetles and harvest that timber before it burns up our community, and the Federal Government says we cannot do that. To me, that does not make a whole lot of sense.

But I compliment the people in New York for recognizing that if we do not get rid of those beetles, they will keep going and going and going and create a deforested area, which occurred in my district. So I compliment the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I do, as I mentioned before, support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues for a loud "yes" voice vote in accepting the amendment.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for working with me on this amendment. I urge support of it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, further proceeding on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider the amendment that is numbered 24 in House Report 106-612.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. GIBBONS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. GIBBONS: At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE —PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

SEC. ___01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Public Land Management Act of 2000".

SEC. ___02. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the large amount of federally controlled land in the United States and the lack of an adequate private land ownership base has had a negative impact on the overall economic development of rural counties and communities and severely degraded the ability of local governments to provide necessary services;

(2) in resource management plans, the Bureau of Land Management has identified for disposal land that is difficult and costly to manage and that would more appropriately be in non-Federal ownership;

(3) implementation of Federal land management plans has been impaired by the lack of necessary funding to provide the needed improvements and the lack of land management programs to accomplish the goals and standards set out in the plans; and

(4) the lack of a private land tax base prevents most local governments from providing the appropriate infrastructure to allow timely development of land that is disposed of by the Federal Government for community expansion and economic growth.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this title are to provide for—

(1) the orderly disposal and use of public land; and

(2) the maintenance and repair of Federal facilities on public land.

SEC. ___03. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CURRENT LAND USE PLAN.—The term "current land use plan", with respect to an administrative unit of the Bureau of Land Management, means the management framework plan or resource management plan applicable to the unit that was approved most recently before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) SPECIAL ACCOUNT.—The term "Special Account" means the account established by section ___06.

(4) UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term "unit of local government" means the elected governing body of any city or county in a State.

SEC. ___04. DISPOSAL AND EXCHANGE.

(a) **DISPOSAL.**—In accordance with this title, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), and other applicable law and subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary may dispose of public land under current land use plans maintained under section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1713)

(b) **RECREATION AND PUBLIC PURPOSE CONVEYANCES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not less than 30 days before offering land for sale or exchange under subsection (a), the State or the unit of local government in the jurisdiction of which the land is located may elect to obtain the land for local public purposes under the Act entitled “An Act to authorize acquisition or use of public lands by States, counties, or municipalities for recreational purposes”, approved June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the “Recreation and Public Purposes Act”) (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).

(2) **RETENTION BY SECRETARY.**—If the State or unit of local government elects to obtain the land, the Secretary shall retain the land for conveyance to the State or unit of local government in accordance with that Act.

(c) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land selected for disposal under subsection (d)(1) is withdrawn from location and entry under the mining laws and from operation under the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws until the Secretary terminates the withdrawal or the land is patented.

(d) **SELECTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary and the State and unit of local government that has jurisdiction over land identified for disposal under subsection (a) shall jointly select land to be offered for sale or exchange under this section.

(2) **COORDINATION.**—The Secretary shall coordinate land disposal activities with the unit of local government under the jurisdiction of which the land is located.

(3) **LOCAL LAND USE PLANNING AND ZONING REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary shall dispose of land under this section in a manner that is consistent with local land use planning and zoning requirements and recommendations.

(e) **SALES OFFERING, PRICE, PROCEDURES, AND PROHIBITIONS.**—

(1) **OFFERING.**—The Secretary shall make the first offering of land as soon as practicable after land has been selected under subsection (d).

(2) **SALE PRICE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall make all sales of land under this section at a price that is not less than the fair market value of the land, as determined by the Secretary.

(B) **AFFORDABLE HOUSING.**—Subparagraph (A) does not affect any authority of the Secretary to make land available at less than fair market value for affordable housing purposes under any other provision of law.

(3) **COMPETITIVE BIDDING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The sale of public land selected under subsection (d) shall be conducted in accordance with sections 203 and 209 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1713, 1719).

(B) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The exceptions to competitive bidding requirements under section 203(f) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1713(f)) shall apply to sales under this title in cases in which the Secretary determines that application of an exception is necessary and proper.

(C) **NOTICE OF COMPETITIVE BIDDING PROCEDURES.**—The Secretary shall also ensure adequate notice of competitive bidding procedures to—

(i) owners of land adjoining the land proposed for sale;

(ii) local governments in the vicinity of the land proposed for sale; and

(iii) the State in which the land is located.

(4) **PROHIBITIONS.**—A sale of a tract of land selected under subsection (d) shall not be undertaken if the Federal costs of sale preparation and processing are estimated to exceed the proceeds of the sale.

(f) **DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.**—

(1) **LAND SALES.**—Of the gross proceeds of sales of land under this section during a fiscal year—

(A) 5 percent shall be paid to the State in which the land is located for use in the general education program of the State;

(B) 45 percent shall be paid directly to the local unit of government in the jurisdiction of which the land is located for use as determined by the unit of local government, with consideration given to use for support of health care delivery, law enforcement, and schools; and

(C) 50 percent shall be deposited in the Special Account.

(2) **LAND EXCHANGES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In a land exchange under this section, the non-Federal party shall provide direct payment to the unit of local government in the jurisdiction of which the land is located in an amount equal to 15 percent of the fair market value of the Federal land conveyed in the exchange.

(B) **TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS AS COST INCURRED.**—If any agreement to initiate the exchange so provides, a payment under subparagraph (A) shall be considered to be a cost incurred by the non-Federal party that shall be compensated by the Secretary.

(C) **PENDING EXCHANGES.**—This title, other than subsections (a) and (b) and this section, shall not apply to any land exchange for which an initial agreement to initiate an exchange was signed by an authorized representative of the exchange proponent and an authorized officer of the Bureau of Land Management before the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) **ADDITIONAL DISPOSAL LAND.**—Public land identified for disposal under a replacement or amendment to a current land use plan shall be subject to this title.

SEC. ___05. MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR ON FEDERAL LANDS.

The Secretary shall use amounts available under section ___06(c)(1)(B) for repair and maintenance on Federal lands managed by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. ___06. SPECIAL ACCOUNT.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a separate account to be used in carrying out this title.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The Special Account shall consist of—

(1) amounts deposited in the Special Account under section ___04(f)(1)(B);

(2) donations to the Special Account; and

(3) appropriations to the Special Account.

(c) **USE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Amounts in the Special Account shall be available to the Secretary until expended, without further Act of appropriation, to pay—

(A) subject to paragraph (2), costs incurred by the Bureau of Land Management in arranging sales or exchanges under this title, including the costs of land boundary surveys, compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), appraisals, environmental and cultural clearances, and public notice;

(B) costs incurred in carrying out section ___05;

(C) the cost of carrying out any necessary revision or amendment of a current land use

plan of the Bureau of Land Management that relates to land sold, exchanged, or acquired under this title; and

(D) related costs determined by the Secretary.

(2) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(A) **COSTS IN ARRANGING SALES OR EXCHANGES.**—Costs charged against the Special Account for the purposes described in paragraph (1)(A) shall not exceed the minimum amount practicable in view of the fair market value of the Federal land to be sold or exchanged.

(B) **ACQUISITION.**—Not more than 50 percent of the amounts deposited in the Special Account in any fiscal year may be used in that fiscal year or any subsequent fiscal year for the purpose described in paragraph (1)(B).

(3) **PLAN REVISIONS AND AMENDMENTS.**—The process of revising or amending a land use plan shall not cause delay or postponement in the implementation of this title.

(d) **INTEREST.**—All funds deposited in the Special Account shall earn interest in the amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities. Such interest shall be added to the principal of the account and expended in accordance with subsection (c).

(e) **COORDINATION.**—The Secretary shall coordinate the use of the Special Account with the Secretary of Agriculture, the States, and units of local government in which land or an interest in land may be acquired, to ensure accountability and demonstrated results.

SEC. ___07. REPORT.

The Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives a biennial report that describes each transaction that is carried out under this title.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

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

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is part of the big picture of sound land management. This is a common sense, bipartisan amendment which addresses the large amount of federally controlled land in the United States.

In no way, Mr. Chairman, would this amendment change CARA. All it would say is if the Federal Government is going to spend approximately \$1 billion per year on land acquisition, then there should be a simple, fair and thoughtful way for the Federal Government to sell its unwanted land.

In my State, where almost 90 percent of the land is government-owned, our rural counties have been placed under tremendous financial strain due to the lack of private property taxes as a tax base. This has severely degraded the ability of these local governments to provide necessary services such as school repairs, police and fire protection, medical service and infrastructure improvements.

This amendment provides a mechanism to sell back lands that the Bureau of Land Management, that in their own land management plans, has identified to be unwanted, difficult, costly or unnecessary to manage. Currently, there is no effective means by which the BLM can, in a timely and efficient manner, sell government land that they do not want.

First, the Secretary and the State and the counties that have jurisdiction over government land identified for disposal can choose, jointly, the mechanism of disposal, be it offered for competitive sale or exchange. Additionally, this amendment allows States and counties to file for an R&PP to obtain the land for local public use or recreational purposes before it is offered for sale.

The Secretary will also have to coordinate land disposal activities which affect counties so they take into account local land use planning and zoning recommendations. It is important to note that the public and the government will be justly compensated for land disposed under this amendment. This amendment instructs the Secretary to sell the land at a price that is not less than the fair market value as determined by the Secretary.

Additionally, the sale of this public land must be conducted through a competitive bidding process that allows fair and equal footing to all interested parties.

Also of note is that a proposed sale of land will be terminated, should it be determined that the Federal cost of sale preparation and processing are going to be more than the proceeds of the sale.

This amendment also sets up a distribution of the monies generated by the sale of land. The money will be divided into three categories: A small percentage will go to the State in which the land is located for use in their general education fund. A percentage will go to the county for use in health care, law enforcement and schools, and the remaining funds shall be used by the Federal Government to repair and maintain existing government lands.

□ 1245

This amendment creates a fair and equitable mechanism to dispose of unwanted Federal property, and without it, the Federal Government will continue to own more land without being able to give up any, even the stuff they say they do not want. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully encourage favorable consideration of this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Does the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) seek the time in opposition?

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I seek the time in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, for purposes of controlling time, I yield 2½ minutes to the

gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 2½ minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me urge the Members to reject this amendment. While many parts of this actual bill are worthwhile, the bill is before our committee. The committee has filed a bill similar to this, I think, before the committee and, therefore, it is under consideration of the committee. And I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Resources would be more than willing to work with the gentleman in regards to working on that bill.

The problem is adopting this bill in this package means that we would be making a lot of decisions that the committee would probably want to look at. For example, in this bill there are exceptions in the land sales from fair market value for perhaps socially good purposes, low-income housing, but nevertheless there are exceptions from receiving fair market value in this act. There is even an exception on page 6 that allows the Secretary to determine that he can waive the competitive bidding requirements for the sale of public lands. I am not sure that is a good idea.

We ought to have a good discussion and a debate as to why that would be necessary and why the Secretary should ever waive competitive bidding when we are selling public lands.

Mr. Chairman, in addition, on page 7, for example, there is a distribution of the proceeds, which splits it half and half, 50 percent to the Federal Government, 50 percent to the local government and to the State in which the land is located. These are Federal lands and perhaps the money ought to be split up between the State and local governments and the Federal Government, but that is the kind of discussion that ought to be raised in the committee as this bill was addressed and as we debate for pros and cons of it.

I would urge the rejection of the amendment. At the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) in the committee, we included language on page 33 of the bill that requires the Secretary of the Interior to actually transmit with the list transmitted under subsection (a), a separate list of those lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary that have been identified in applicable land management plans as surplus and eligible for disposal as provided by law.

There are laws now covering the disposal of public lands and we dispose of public lands pursuant to those laws. We actually even update each list to be transmitted as land management plans are amended and revised. So we have added language at the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) to literally make sure that we have a list of disposal lands available.

I would simply urge that this bill be considered in the full committee where it belongs and all of these intricate provisions debated in full committee. This amendment should be rejected.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I really would simply just concur with what the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) has said. To set up the regime to do as the amendment suggested is something we may want to do, but I do not think that that is what the amendment does. In fact, it is much broader than those lands which are identified. I think that this legislation as it is currently written, the CARA bill, will, in fact, increase the inventory of those lands as we go through the process with the Secretary of the Interior, and then maybe at that point the gentleman could decide if the gentleman wants to auction those off according to how the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) has written his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I concur with the notion that I think the committee ought to direct some time, as I said to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) in his amendment, direct some time to see how to do this and get on with it, maybe even more so in a State like the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), which is growing so rapidly. We are seeing more and more proposals come for land transfers, exchanges and the rest of it, because the cities' needs, airports and all the rest of it, are growing so rapidly that this may be absolutely worthy of our consideration in the committee to develop it, because some of our western States are starting to fill up and the land base that was there at one time may not serve the best needs of this State or even of this country.

I know sometimes it is harassing to say that we would reconsider the land bases that exist today, because it should always be that way. The fact is no, we should, we should reconsider it in light of what is taking place in the western United States, but I would hope that we would reject this amendment. I would hope that the committee might use this as a way to initiate some of the questions that have been avoided for many, many years about lands that may have little value to the Federal Government, that may have great value to localities in terms of their needs.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would only suggest to those Members in the audience here today, colleagues, to look at this picture, because it clearly shows the State of Nevada has almost no room for the people who live there today. With almost nearly 90 percent of the State owned by the Federal Government, acquisitions of more land, if you are

going to spend a billion dollars a year in land acquisition, this amendment is clearly the correct amendment to add to a bill that is acquiring land to put the other side of the coin in it for disposal.

Indeed, the amendment does specify very clearly which land can be used for disposal, and that is at the Secretary's discretion. It is under public law, under public land in their plans, maintained under section 202 of FLPMA.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a good amendment to the bill of CARA. It certainly brings, I think, a common sense, fair and balanced approach to this. It sets up a process of procedure whereby we can have an orderly disposal of land that the Federal Government has already identified that it wants to dispose of but does not have a clear means of disposal, and whenever there is an exchange process, that is the discretion given to the Secretary to make those determinations of whether or not a competitive bidding process should be set aside in order for an exchange process to take place. That is why we have to have that discretion for the Secretary under this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is one which clearly identifies a needed revision to this bill. I would urge all of my colleagues at this time to support this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25, printed in House Report 106-612.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. OSE

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 25 offered by Mr. OSE:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE —RESTRICTIONS ON FEDERAL USES OF FUNDS

SEC. 01. ELIMINATION OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FROM LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

Notwithstanding section 5 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended by this Act, or any other provision of that Act—

(1) all of the amounts made available for each fiscal year to carry out that Act shall be available only for grants to States in accordance with that Act; and

(2) amounts provided to a State under that Act may be used only to provide assistance in accordance with that Act to—

(A) entities that are incorporated cities under the laws of the State; and

(B) counties having a population of 1,000,000 or more.

SEC. 02. LIMITATION ON EXPENDITURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Amounts otherwise available under this Act for a fiscal year may not be obligated or expended and shall be returned to the general fund of the Treasury unless by the beginning of such fiscal year—

(1) sufficient amounts are available to make all payments authorized for the fiscal year under—

(A) chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code (relating to payments in lieu of taxes); and

(B) section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383; 16 U.S.C. 715s) (relating to refuge revenue sharing);

(2) all payments authorized for prior fiscal years under the laws referred to in paragraph (1) have been made; and

(3) each of the Committees on Appropriations, Resources, and Agriculture of the House of Representatives and each of the Committees on Appropriations, Energy and Natural Resources, and Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate certifies that all backlogged maintenance and repair has been completed at each National Park, National Monument, and National Forest, and on all lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—Subsection (a) does not prohibit payments under the laws referred to in subsection (a)(1) (relating to payments in lieu of taxes and refuge revenue sharing).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. OSE

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified on page 1, line 19 by deleting the number 1 million and inserting in its place the number 100,000.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 25 offered by Mr. OSE:

Line 19, strike out "1,000,000" and insert "100,000".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the modification offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE)?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) for 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment. The eight counties in my district are quite diverse. Some are highly urbanized, such as Sacramento County. Some are decidedly rural, such as Sutter County and Colusa County. There are obvious challenges in the urban counties to provide an appropriate amount of parks and open space. Fortunately, the economy

is booming in urban counties. Retail sales are rising, home prices are rising, jobs are plentiful, business is good.

Conversely, many of my rural counties are suffering from and must confront the challenge that comes from the loss of revenue resulting from Federal ownership of land. In addition, these same counties are suffering from low commodity prices, static or falling retail sales. Frankly, Main Street in some instances is dying, and unemployment remains high.

My challenge is to find a way to help the urban counties and their cities with the difficult task of urban park development and maintenance. My challenge with the rural counties is to prevent a further erosion in the revenue stream that is used to support local schools, law enforcement, and road maintenance, to name a few of the services provided by local government that contribute so much to the quality of life in rural America.

This amendment accomplishes that task by setting up standards that provide urban areas the opportunity to participate in this program that CARA represents while keeping rural counties from being subjected to the adverse consequences of further expansion of government-owned land. This is a real issue affecting real people.

I know that the distinguished gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) is familiar with this problem because he actually grew up in my district as a youngster, and his two brothers and their families actually live in my district today.

Absent full payment of PILT on current Federal landholdings, absent a requirement of first taking care of that which the Federal Government already owns before adding more to it, we consign rural America to a repeat of the slow strangulation we witnessed throughout many of America's rural areas during certain periods of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s.

This is a good amendment that improves the bill. I ask my colleagues for their support.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there a Member who claims the time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, and I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 2½ minutes.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, first of all, strips away all funding for the National Parks and the National Wildlife Refuges and the National Forests

from the bill. Keep that in mind. It is all gone.

The amendment also allows only incorporated cities and counties with more than I think 100,000 people to qualify, especially when one has to be incorporated to qualify. I do not know about my colleagues, but I have got a lot of unincorporated communities that are quite urban.

I have got a community near New Orleans called Metairie, which is as urban as any community in the country, certainly not rural America. It is located between New Orleans and the airport. If one ever comes to New Orleans and drives through Metairie, one knows one is not driving through the country. One is driving through a very urban area, but it is unincorporated. I think it is one of the big unincorporated areas of America. It would not qualify under this bill.

So I think my colleagues have got to look at what this amendment does if it were adopted and realize that it has two main purposes; and that is to limit the support in this bill to incorporated communities only. That is going to leave out some very important places in America that are just as qualified for assistance as any other place, such as Metairie, Louisiana.

Secondly, it does strip away all the national funding for the National Parks, the Wildlife Refuges and the National Forests.

So I urge that this amendment be rejected.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) has clearly read the amendment. I would appreciate the opportunity to correct one misinterpretation. In terms of the incorporated cities, there is an effort to put the impetus of urban park development on those; and the modification that we just added, reducing the population threshold in the unincorporated areas to 100,000, is designed to provide counties such as the one the gentleman described and from which I come from, that being Sacramento, to have the opportunity to participate.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSE. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, the problem is that the amendment specifies entities that are incorporated and counties having a population of 100,000 or more. So I think the problem is we have got a situation where one has got to be incorporated and be a county of 100,000 or more.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I read that differently. It is designed to be either.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

□ 1300

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Ose amendment,

which ensures that the Federal Government makes good on its obligation to our rural communities.

Lands owned by the Federal Government cannot be taxed by local governments. In some counties in Northern California, the congressional district I represent, the Federal Government owns up to 75 percent of the available land. In other areas of California, the State and Federal Government ownership reaches 90 percent.

These counties already struggle to fund critically important public services, public education, law enforcement, search and rescue operations, waste disposal, and a variety of other public health and safety programs. Yet this bill proposes almost \$1 billion per year for 15 years for even more Federal land acquisition, imposing even greater hardships on the citizens of these counties.

Mr. Chairman, where does it stop? PILT is intended to compensate counties for this lost revenue, but each year it is desperately underfunded. Nationally, it receives only 41 cents on the dollar. H.R. 701 would provide only a portion of the total that is needed to fully fund the Federal commitment, and it would take even more land from the American citizens and the county tax rolls, further limiting their ability to meet their needs.

This amendment seeks to correct that inequity by ensuring that the Federal Government fulfills its obligation before it takes even more away from the families of rural America. I urge the Members to support this Ose amendment.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong opposition to this amendment for its elimination of the Federal Land and Water Conservation Act and for the straitjacket that it puts local communities in when exercising their own judgment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to this amendment because I think it is an amendment of unintended consequences.

I represent San Benito County, California. It is a county of about 40,000 people. Probably the greatest recreational asset in that county is a national monument governed by the National Park Service. The monument is trying to expand, and has, with willing sellers, if we appropriate the money.

The County Board of Supervisors, and there are only two towns in the entire county, they look at this asset as being one of the economic engines. Because what happens is that people come there and stay at hotels and pay the local hotel tax and pay the local sales tax. Because it is Federal land, as the gentleman knows, and I appreciate his efforts to try to make them even

increase more, it pays payment-in-lieu taxes.

So what the gentleman's amendment does is, it says a county like this cannot use any of these funds to further that economic engine, which frankly is an employment and tourism destination area. And where does it draw from? It draws from the Silicon Valley, which is not far from there. This is one of the main assets that the valley has to attract people to be there. So there are all kinds of unintended consequences by this amendment.

Also there is the problem of the maintenance backlog. This national park monument was hit by the El Nino floods. Got wiped out. Maintenance is all bringing that back together. Under the gentleman's amendment they could not use the money for that. So the unintended consequences here is that the gentleman hurts very rural counties where the Federal asset is an economic engine driver.

A lot of these amendments offered today would never be offered by colleagues if it was military land, which is also Federal land, which is also off the tax rolls. But somehow what we do in these amendments is we always attack the Land and Water Conservation Fund and say we are going to separate that fund out and do things and require things to be done to that land that we would never require for any other kind of Federal land.

So this amendment of unintended consequences hurts the very rural county that I represent. I do not think the gentleman intends to do that, but the only way to stop it is to reject the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 19 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT); amendment No. 22 offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE); amendment No. 23 offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL); amendment No. 24 offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS); and amendment No. 25 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

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

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 261, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

AYES—158

Aderholt Goodlatte Peterson (PA)
Archer Goodling Petri
Army Graham Pickering
Baca Granger Pitts
Ballenger Green (WI) Pombo
Barcia Gutknecht Pryce (OH)
Barr Hall (TX) Radanovich
Barrett (NE) Hansen Regula
Bartlett Hastings (WA) Reynolds
Barton Hayworth Riley
Berry Hefley Rogers
Bliley Herger Rohrabacher
Blunt Hill (MT) Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner Roukema
Bonilla Hobson Royce
Bono Hoekstra Ryan (WI)
Brady (TX) Horn Ryan (KS)
Bryant Hostettler Salmon
Burton Hulshof Sandlin
Buyer Hunter Sanford
Calvert Istook Schaffer
Camp Jenkins Sensenbrenner
Cannon Johnson, Sam Sessions
Chabot Jones (NC) Shadegg
Chambliss Kasich Shimkus
Chenoweth-Hage Kingston Shows
Coburn Knollenberg Shuster
Collins Kolbe Simpson
Condit LaHood Skeen
Cook Largent Smith (MI)
Cox Latham Smith (TX)
Crowley Lewis (CA) Spence
Cubin Lewis (KY) Stearns
Cunningham Linder Stenholm
Danner Manzullo Stump
DeLay Martinez Sununu
DeMint McHugh Sweeney
Diaz-Balart McClinnis Talent
Dickey McKeon Tancredo
Doolittle Metcalf Tanner
Dreier Mica Taylor (NC)
Duncan Miller, Gary Terry
Dunn Moran (KS) Thomas
Ehrlich Myrick Thornberry
Emerson Nethercutt Tiahrt
Everett Ney Toomey
Ewing Norwood Walden
Fossella Nussle Wamp
Gallegly Ose Watkins
Gekas Oxley Weldon (FL)
Gibbons Packard Wilson
Gillmor Paul Young (FL)
Goode Peterson (MN)

NOES—261

Abercrombie Berman Burr
Ackerman Berry Callahan
Allen Biggart Camp
Andrews Bilbray Canady
Armed Bilirakis Capps
Bachus Bishop Capuano
Baird Blagojevich Cardin
Baker Blumenauer Carson
Baldacci Boehlert Castle
Baldwin Bonior Clay
Barrett (WI) Borski Clayton
Bass Boswell Clement
Bateman Boucher Clyburn
Becerra Boyd Conyers
Bentsen Brady (PA) Cooksey
Bereuter Brown (FL) Costello
Berkley Brown (OH) Coyne

Cramer Kelly
Crane Kennedy
Cummings Kildee
Davis (FL) Kilpatrick
Davis (IL) Kind (WI)
Davis (VA) King (NY)
Deal Kleczka
DeFazio Klink
Delahunt Kucinich
DeLauro Kuykendall
Deutsch LaFalce
Dicks Lampson
Dingell Lantos
Dixon Larson
Doggett LaTourette
Dooley Lazio
Edwards Leach
Ehlers Lee
Engel Levin
English Lewis (GA)
Eshoo Lipinski
Etheridge LoBiondo
Farr Lowey
Fattah Lucas (KY)
Filner Luther
Fletcher Maloney (CT)
Foley Maloney (NY)
Forbes Markey
Ford Mascara
Fowler Matsui
Frank (MA) McCarthy (NY)
Franks (NJ) McCollum
Frelinghuysen McCrery
Frost McDermott
Ganske McGovern
Gejdenson McIntyre
Gephardt McKinney
Gilchrist McNulty
Gilman Meehan
Gonzalez Meek (FL)
Gordon Meeks (NY)
Goss Menendez
Green (TX) Millender-
Greenwood McDonald
Gutierrez Miller (FL)
Hall (OH) Miller, George
Hastings (FL) Minge
Hayes Mink
Hill (IN) Moakley
Hilliard Mollohan
Hinchev Moore
Hinojosa Moran (VA)
Hoefel Morella
Holden Murtha
Holt Nadler
Hooley Napolitano
Houghton Neal
Hoyer Northup
Hutchinson Oberstar
Hyde Obey
Inslee Olver
Isakson Ortiz
Jackson (IL) Owens
Jackson-Lee Pallone
(TX) Pascrell
Jefferson Pastor
John Payne
Johnson (CT) Pease
Johnson, E. B. Pelosi
Jones (OH) Phelp
Kanjorski Pickett
Kaptur Pomeroy

NOT VOTING—15

Campbell Evans Sherwood
Coble Lofgren Watts (OK)
Combust Lucas (OK) Weller
DeGette McCarthy (MO) Wicker
Doyle McIntosh Wise

□ 1327

Mr. HOLDEN and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. MICA changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 172, I inadvertently pressed the "nay" button. I meant to vote "aye."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each remaining amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MRS. CHENOWETH-HAGE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 22 offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been ordered.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 317, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

AYES—107

Aderholt Granger Rohrabacher
Archer Gutknecht Royce
Baker Hall (TX) Ryan (WI)
Ballenger Hastings (WA) Ryan (KS)
Barr Hayworth Salmon
Barrett (NE) Herger Sanford
Bartlett Hill (MT) Schaffer
Barton Hilleary Sensenbrenner
Bliley Hoekstra Sessions
Blunt Hostettler Shadegg
Boehner Hulshof Shimkus
Bonilla Hunter Simpson
Bono Hyde Skeen
Brady (TX) Istook Skelton
Burton Johnson, Sam Smith (MI)
Buyer Kingston Smith (TX)
Calvert Knollenberg Spence
Cannon Kolbe Stearns
Chabot Largent Stump
Coburn Latham Sununu
Combust Lewis (CA) Sweeney
Cook Manzullo Talent
Cubin McHugh Taylor (NC)
Danner McKeon Terry
DeLay Metcalf Thomas
DeMint Miller, Gary Thornberry
Doolittle Nethercutt Tiahrt
Duncan Norwood Toomey
Emerson Nussle Traffcant
Everett Paul Walden
Fowler Peterson (PA) Watkins
Gibbons Pickering Watts (OK)
Goode Pombo Weldon (FL)
Goodlatte Radanovich Wicker
Goodling Reynolds Young (FL)
Graham Riley

NOES—317

Abercrombie Berman Burr
Ackerman Berry Callahan
Allen Biggart Camp
Andrews Bilbray Canady
Armed Bilirakis Capps
Bachus Bishop Capuano
Baird Blagojevich Cardin
Baldacci Boehlert Castle
Baldwin Bonior Chambliss
Barcia Borski Clay
Barrett (WI) Boswell Clayton
Bass Boucher Clement
Bateman Boyd Clyburn
Becerra Brady (PA) Collins
Bentsen Brown (FL) Condit
Bereuter Brown (OH) Conyers
Berkley Bryant Cooksey

Costello Johnson, E. B.
 Cox Jones (NC)
 Coyne Jones (OH)
 Cramer Kanjorski
 Crane Kaptur
 Crowley Kasich
 Cummings Kelly
 Cunningham Kennedy
 Davis (FL) Kildee
 Davis (IL) Kilpatrick
 Davis (VA) Kind (WI)
 Deal King (NY)
 DeFazio Kleczka
 Delahunt Klink
 DeLauro Kucinich
 Deutsch Kuykendall
 Diaz-Balce LaFalce
 Dickey LaHood
 Dicks Lampson
 Dingell Lantos
 Dixon Larson
 Doggett LaTourrette
 Dooley Lazio
 Doyle Leach
 Dreier Lee
 Dunn Levin
 Edwards Lewis (GA)
 Ehlers Lewis (KY)
 Ehrlich Linder
 Engel Lipinski
 English LoBiondo
 Eshoo Lowey
 Etheridge Lucas (KY)
 Evans Luther
 Ewing Maloney (CT)
 Farr Maloney (NY)
 Fattah Markey
 Filner Martinez
 Fletcher Mascara
 Foley Matsui
 Forbes McCarthy (NY)
 Ford McCollum
 Fossella McCrery
 Frank (MA) McDermott
 Franks (NJ) McGovern
 Frelinghuysen McInnis
 Frost McIntyre
 Gallegly McKinney
 Ganske McNulty
 Gejdenson Meehan
 Gekas Meek (FL)
 Gephardt Meeks (NY)
 Gilchrist Menendez
 Gillmor Mica
 Gilman Millender-
 Gonzalez McDonald
 Gordon Miller (FL)
 Goss Miller, George
 Green (TX) Minge
 Green (WI) Mink
 Greenwood Moakley
 Gutierrez Mollohan
 Hall (OH) Moore
 Hansen Moran (KS)
 Hastings (FL) Moran (VA)
 Hayes Morella
 Hefley Murtha
 Hill (IN) Myrick
 Hilliard Nadler
 Hinchey Napolitano
 Hinojosa Neal
 Hobson Ney
 Hoeffel Northrup
 Holden Oberstar
 Holt Obey
 Hooley Olver
 Horn Ortiz
 Houghton Ose
 Hoyer Owens
 Hutchinson Oxley
 Inslee Packard
 Isakson Wilson
 Jackson (IL) Pascrell
 Jackson-Lee Pastor
 (TX) Payne
 Jefferson Pease
 Jenkins Pelosi
 John Peterson (MN)
 Johnson (CT) Petri

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell Lofgren Sherwood
 Chenoweth-Hage Lucas (OK) Wise
 Coble McCarthy (MO)
 DeGette McIntosh

□ 1335

Mr. JONES of North Carolina changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 Stated for:
 Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 173 I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY UDALL OF COLORADO

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 306, noes 116, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

AYES—306

Abercrombie Crane
 Ackerman Crowley
 Allen Cummings
 Andrews Danner
 Baca Davis (IL)
 Baird Davis (VA)
 Baker DeFazio
 Baldacci Delahunt
 Baldwin DeLauro
 Barcia Deutsch
 Barr Diaz-Balart
 Barrett (WI) Dickey
 Bartlett Dicks
 Barton Dingell
 Bass Dixon
 Bateman Doggett
 Becerra Dooley
 Bentsen Doyle
 Berkeley Duncan
 Biggert Edwards
 Bilirakis Ehlers
 Bishop Ehrlich
 Engel Blagojevich
 Bilely English
 Blumenauer Eshoo
 Boehlert Etheridge
 Bonior Evans
 Bono Farr
 Borski Fattah
 Boswell Filner
 Boucher Fletcher
 Boyd Forbes
 Brady (PA) Ford
 Brown (FL) Fossella
 Brown (OH) Frank (MA)
 Bryant Kuykendall
 Callahan Frost
 Camp Gallegly
 Cannon Ganske
 Capps Gejdenson
 Capuano Gekas
 Cardin Gephardt
 Carson Gonzalez
 Clay Gordon
 Clayton Goss
 Clement Green (TX)
 Clyburn Greenwood
 Collins Gutierrez
 Condit Gutknecht
 Conyers Hall (OH)
 Cook Hall (TX)
 Cooksey Hastings (FL)
 Costello Hayes
 Cox Hefley
 Coyne Hill (IN)
 Cramer Hilleary

Markey Martinez
 Mascara
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McCrery
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McInnis
 McIntyre
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Menendez
 Metcalf
 Mica
 Millender-
 McDonald
 Miller (FL)
 Miller, George
 Minge
 Mink
 Moakley
 Mollohan
 Moore
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Morella
 Murtha
 Myrick
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Ney
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Ose
 Owens
 Oxley
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor

Payne
 Pease
 Pelosi
 Peterson (MN)
 Phelps
 Pickett
 Pomeroy
 Porter
 Portman
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Regula
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Rivers
 Rodriguez
 Rogers
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Rush
 Sabo
 Sanchez
 Sanders
 Sandlin
 Sawyer
 Saxton
 Scarborough
 Schakowsky
 Scott
 Serrano
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherman
 Shows
 Shuster
 Sisisky
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Spratt
 Stabenow
 Stark
 Stearns
 Stenholm
 Strickland
 Stupak
 Tancredo
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Tauzin
 Taylor (MS)
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thune
 Thurman
 Tierney
 Towns
 Traficant
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Velazquez
 Vento
 Visclosky
 Vitter
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Waters
 Watt (NC)
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Wexler
 Weygand
 Whitfield
 Wilson
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

NOES—116

Aderholt Gilchrist
 Archer Gillmor
 Army Gilman
 Bachus Goode
 Ballenger Goodlatte
 Barrett (NE) Goodling
 Bereuter Graham
 Berry Granger
 Bilbray Green (WI)
 Blunt Hansen
 Boehner Hastings (WA)
 Bonilla Hayworth
 Brady (TX) Herger
 Burr Hill (MT)
 Burton Hoekstra
 Buyer Hostettler
 Calvert Houghton
 Canady Hunter
 Castle Istook
 Chabot Jenkins
 Chambliss Johnson, Sam
 Chenoweth-Hage King (NY)
 Coburn Kingston
 Combust Knollenberg
 Cubin Largent
 Cunningham Latham
 Davis (FL) Lee
 Deal Manzullo
 DeLay McHugh
 DeMint McKeon
 Doolittle Miller, Gary
 Dreier Nethercutt
 Dunn Northrup
 Emerson Norwood
 Everett Nussle
 Ewing Packard
 Fowler Paul
 Franks (NJ) Peterson (PA)
 Gibbons Petri

NOT VOTING—12

Berman Foley
 Campbell Hobson
 Coble Lofgren
 DeGette Lucas (OK)

□ 1344

Mr. PITTS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. FOSSELLA changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 174, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote No. 174, the amendment offered by my colleagues Mr. UDALL and Ms. CLAYTON, I inadvertently voted "no."

I intended to vote "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. GIBBONS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 250, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]

AYES—170

Aderholt	Everett	Metcalf
Archer	Fletcher	Mica
Armey	Fossella	Miller (FL)
Baker	Galleghy	Miller, Gary
Ballenger	Ganske	Moran (KS)
Barr	Gekas	Myrick
Barrett (NE)	Gibbons	Nethercutt
Bartlett	Gillmor	Ney
Barton	Goode	Northup
Bateman	Goodlatte	Norwood
Berkley	Goss	Nussle
Berry	Graham	Ose
Bilirakis	Granger	Oxley
Bliley	Green (WI)	Paul
Blunt	Gutknecht	Peterson (PA)
Boehner	Hall (TX)	Petri
Bonilla	Hansen	Pickering
Boswell	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Hayworth	Pombo
Bryant	Hefley	Portman
Burr	Herger	Pryce (OH)
Burton	Hill (MT)	Radanovich
Buyer	Hilleary	Regula
Calvert	Hobson	Reynolds
Canady	Hoekstra	Riley
Cannon	Hostettler	Rogan
Chabot	Hulshof	Rogers
Chambliss	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Chenoweth-Hage	Hutchinson	Royce
Coburn	Hyde	Ryan (WI)
Collins	Istook	Ryun (KS)
Combest	Jenkins	Salmon
Cook	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
Cooksey	Jones (NC)	Schaffer
Cox	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Crane	Knollenberg	Sessions
Cubin	Kolbe	Shadegg
Cunningham	LaHood	Shaw
Davis (VA)	Largent	Shimkus
Deal	Latham	Shows
DeLay	Lazio	Shuster
DeMint	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Skeen
Dickey	Linder	Smith (MI)
Doolittle	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Dreier	Marquez	Spence
Duncan	McCollum	Stearns
Dunn	McHugh	Stenholm
Ehrlich	McInnis	Stump
Emerson	McKeon	Sununu

Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry

Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Walden
Wamp
Watkins

Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Young (FL)

Matsui
McCarthy (MO)

McIntosh
Sanchez

Sherwood
Wise

□ 1350

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. OSE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 25 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE), as modified, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 56, noes 365, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 176]

AYES—56

Armey	Herger	Rohrabacher
Barton	Hilleary	Royce
Boehner	Hobson	Ryun (KS)
Burton	Hoekstra	Salmon
Buyer	Hostettler	Sensenbrenner
Calvert	Hunter	Sessions
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Chenoweth-Hage	Largent	Shimkus
Cook	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Cubin	Linder	Skeen
DeLay	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Dickey	McKeon	Stump
Doolittle	Nethercutt	Thomas
Dreier	Norwood	Thornberry
Gibbons	Ose	Tiahrt
Goodling	Pombo	Traficant
Granger	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (FL)
Hastings (WA)	Radanovich	Wilson
Hayworth	Regula	

NOES—365

Abercrombie	Boucher	Deal
Ackerman	Boyd	DeFazio
Aderholt	Brady (PA)	Delahunt
Allen	Brady (TX)	DeLauro
Andrews	Brown (FL)	DeMint
Baca	Brown (OH)	Deutsch
Bachus	Bryant	Diaz-Balart
Baird	Burr	Dicks
Baker	Callahan	Dingell
Baldacci	Camp	Dixon
Baldwin	Canady	Doggett
Berkley	Capps	Dooley
Ballenger	Capuano	Doyle
Barcia	Cardin	Duncan
Barr	Carson	Dunn
Barrett (NE)	Castle	Edwards
Barrett (WI)	Chabot	Ehlers
Bartlett	Chambless	Ehrlich
Bass	Chambless	Emerson
Bateman	Clay	Engel
Becerra	Clayton	English
Bentsen	Clement	Eshoo
Bereuter	Clyburn	Etheridge
Berkley	Coburn	Evans
Berman	Collins	Everett
Berry	Combest	Farr
Biggart	Condit	Fattah
Bilbray	Conyers	Frost
Bilirakis	Cooksey	Filner
Bishop	Costello	Fletcher
Blagojevich	Cox	Foley
Bliley	Coyne	Forbes
Blumenauer	Crane	Ford
Blunt	Crowley	Fossella
Boehrlert	Cummings	Fowler
Bonilla	Cunningham	Frank (MA)
Bonior	Danner	Frank (NJ)
Bono	Davis (FL)	Franks (NJ)
Borski	Davis (IL)	Frelinghuysen
Boswell	Davis (VA)	Frost

NOES—250

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Biggart
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehrlert
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Callahan
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Lee
Levin
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dillon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frank (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gedjenson
Geppard
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez

Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleckza
Klink
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar

Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Townes
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Boucher
Campbell
Coble

DeGette
Goodling
Hinchev

Lofgren
Lucas (OK)

Galleghy	Lucas (KY)	Roukema
Ganske	Luther	Roybal-Allard
Gejdenson	Maloney (CT)	Rush
Gekas	Maloney (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Gephardt	Markey	Sabo
Gilchrest	Martinez	Sanchez
Gillmor	Mascara	Sanders
Gilman	Matsui	Sandlin
Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)	Sanford
Goode	McCollum	Sawyer
Goodlatte	McCrery	Scarborough
Gordon	McDermott	Schaffer
Goss	McGovern	Schakowsky
Graham	McHugh	Scott
Green (TX)	McInnis	Serrano
Green (WI)	McIntyre	Shaw
Greenwood	McKinney	Shays
Gutierrez	McNulty	Sherman
Gutknecht	Meehan	Shows
Hall (OH)	Meek (FL)	Shuster
Hall (TX)	Meeks (NY)	Sisisky
Hansen	Menendez	Skelton
Hastings (FL)	Metcalfe	Slaughter
Hayes	Mica	Smith (MI)
Hefley	Millender-	Smith (NJ)
Hill (IN)	McDonald	Smith (WA)
Hill (MT)	Miller (FL)	Snyder
Hilliard	Miller, Gary	Souder
Hinchey	Miller, George	Spence
Hinojosa	Minge	Spratt
Hoeffel	Mink	Stabenow
Holden	Moakley	Stark
Holt	Mollohan	Stearns
Hooley	Moore	Stenholm
Horn	Moran (KS)	Strickland
Houghton	Moran (VA)	Stupak
Hoyer	Morella	Sununu
Hulshof	Murtha	Sweeney
Hutchinson	Myrick	Talent
Hyde	Nadler	Tancredo
Inslie	Napolitano	Tanner
Isakson	Neal	Tauscher
Istook	Ney	Tauzin
Jackson (IL)	Northup	Taylor (MS)
Jackson-Lee	Nussle	Taylor (NC)
(TX)	Oberstar	Terry
Jefferson	Obey	Thompson (CA)
Jenkins	Olver	Thompson (MS)
John	Ortiz	Thune
Johnson (CT)	Owens	Thurman
Johnson, E. B.	Oxley	Tierney
Jones (NC)	Packard	Toomey
Jones (OH)	Pallone	Towns
Kanjorski	Pascrell	Turner
Kaptur	Pastor	Udall (CO)
Kasich	Paul	Udall (NM)
Kelly	Payne	Upton
Kennedy	Pease	Velazquez
Kildee	Pelosi	Vento
Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Kind (WI)	Peterson (PA)	Vitter
King (NY)	Petri	Walden
Kingston	Phelps	Walsh
Kleczyka	Pickering	Wamp
Klink	Pickett	Waters
Knollenberg	Pitts	Watkins
Kolbe	Pomeroy	Watt (NC)
Kucinich	Porter	Watts (OK)
Kuykendall	Portman	Waxman
LaFalce	Price (NC)	Weiner
LaHood	Quinn	Weldon (PA)
Lampson	Rahall	Weller
Lantos	Ramstad	Wexler
Larson	Rangel	Weygand
Latham	Reyes	Whitfield
Lazio	Reynolds	Wicker
Leach	Riley	Wolf
Lee	Rivers	Woolsey
Levin	Rodriguez	Wu
Lewis (GA)	Roemer	Wynn
Lewis (KY)	Rogan	Young (AK)
Lipinski	Rogers	Young (FL)
LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	
Lowe	Rothman	

NOT VOTING—13

Archer	LaTourette	Saxton
Campbell	Lofgren	Sherwood
Coble	Lucas (OK)	Wise
Cramer	McCarthy (MO)	
DeGette	McIntosh	

□ 1359

Mr. OXLEY changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1400

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 106-612.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. THORNBERRY

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 26 offered by Mr. THORNBERRY:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title.
- Sec. 2. Table of contents.
- Sec. 3. Definitions.
- Sec. 4. Annual reports.
- Sec. 5. Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.
- Sec. 6. Limitation on use of available amounts for administration.
- Sec. 7. Recordkeeping requirements.
- Sec. 8. Maintenance of effort and matching funding.
- Sec. 9. Sunset.
- Sec. 10. Protection of private property rights.
- Sec. 11. Signs.

TITLE I—IMPACT ASSISTANCE AND COASTAL CONSERVATION

- Sec. 101. Impact assistance formula and payments.
- Sec. 102. Coastal State conservation and impact assistance plans.

TITLE II—LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND REVITALIZATION

- Sec. 201. Amendment of Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.
- Sec. 202. Extension of fund; treatment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.
- Sec. 203. Availability of amounts.
- Sec. 204. Allocation of Fund.
- Sec. 205. Use of Federal portion.
- Sec. 206. Allocation of amounts available for State purposes.
- Sec. 207. State planning.
- Sec. 208. Assistance to States for other projects.
- Sec. 209. Conversion of property to other use.
- Sec. 210. Water rights.

TITLE III—WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION

- Sec. 301. Purposes.
- Sec. 302. Definitions.
- Sec. 303. Treatment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.
- Sec. 304. Apportionment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.

- Sec. 305. Education.
- Sec. 306. Prohibition against diversion.

TITLE IV—URBAN PARK AND RECREATION RECOVERY PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

- Sec. 401. Amendment of Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978.

- Sec. 402. Purpose.
- Sec. 403. Treatment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.
- Sec. 404. Definitions.
- Sec. 405. Eligibility.
- Sec. 406. Grants.
- Sec. 407. Recovery action programs.
- Sec. 408. State action incentives.
- Sec. 409. Conversion of recreation property.
- Sec. 410. Repeal.

TITLE V—HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

- Sec. 501. Treatment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.
- Sec. 502. State use of historic preservation assistance for national heritage areas and corridors.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL AND INDIAN LANDS RESTORATION

- Sec. 601. Purpose.
- Sec. 602. Treatment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund; allocation.
- Sec. 603. Authorized uses of transferred amounts.
- Sec. 604. Indian tribe defined.

TITLE VII—FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM AND ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES RECOVERY

SUBTITLE A—FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM

- Sec. 701. Additional funding and additional authorities under farmland protection program.
- Sec. 702. Funding.

SUBTITLE B—Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery

- Sec. 711. Purposes.
- Sec. 712. Treatment of amounts transferred from Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.
- Sec. 713. Endangered and threatened species recovery assistance.
- Sec. 714. Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Agreements.
- Sec. 715. Definitions.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "coastal population" means the population of all political subdivisions, as determined by the most recent official data of the Census Bureau, contained in whole or in part within the designated coastal boundary of a State as defined in a State's coastal zone management program under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 and following).

(2) The term "coastal political subdivision" means a political subdivision of a coastal State all or part of which political subdivision is within the coastal zone (as defined in section 304 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453)).

(3) The term "coastal State" has the same meaning as provided by section 304 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453).

(4) The term "coastline" has the same meaning that it has in the Submerged Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1301 and following).

(5) The term "distance" means minimum great circle distance, measured in statute miles.

(6) The term "fiscal year" means the Federal Government's accounting period which begins on October 1st and ends on September 30th, and is designated by the calendar year in which it ends.

(7) The term "Governor" means the highest elected official of a State or of any other political entity that is defined as, or treated as, a State under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-4

and following), the Act of September 2, 1937 (16 U.S.C. 669 and following), commonly referred to as the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act or the Pittman-Robertson Act, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 and following), the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470h and following), or the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-127; 16 U.S.C. 3830 note).

(8) The term "leased tract" means a tract, leased under section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) for the purpose of drilling for, developing, and producing oil and natural gas resources, which is a unit consisting of either a block, a portion of a block, a combination of blocks or portions of blocks, or a combination of portions of blocks, as specified in the lease, and as depicted on an Outer Continental Shelf Official Protraction Diagram.

(9) The term "Outer Continental Shelf" means all submerged lands lying seaward and outside of the area of "lands beneath navigable waters" as defined in section 2(a) of the Submerged Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1301(a)), and of which the subsoil and seabed appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction and control.

(10) The term "political subdivision" means the local political jurisdiction immediately below the level of State government, including counties, parishes, and boroughs. If State law recognizes an entity of general government that functions in lieu of, and is not within, a county, parish, or borough, the Secretary may recognize an area under the jurisdiction of such other entities of general government as a political subdivision for purposes of this title.

(11) The term "producing State" means a State with a coastal seaward boundary within 200 miles from the geographic center of a leased tract other than a leased tract or portion of a leased tract that is located in a geographic area subject to a leasing moratorium on January 1, 1999 (unless the lease was issued prior to the establishment of the moratorium and was in production on January 1, 1999).

(12) The term "qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues" means (except as otherwise provided in this paragraph) all moneys received by the United States from each leased tract or portion of a leased tract lying seaward of the zone defined and governed by section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g)), or lying within such zone but to which section 8(g) does not apply, the geographic center of which lies within a distance of 200 miles from any part of the coastline of any coastal State, including bonus bids, rents, royalties (including payments for royalty taken in kind and sold), net profit share payments, and related late-payment interest from natural gas and oil leases issued pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. Such term does not include any revenues from a leased tract or portion of a leased tract that is located in a geographic area subject to a leasing moratorium on January 1, 1999, unless the lease was issued prior to the establishment of the moratorium and was in production on January 1, 1999.

(13) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary's designee, except as otherwise specifically provided.

(14) The term "Fund" means the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund established under section 5.

SEC. 4. ANNUAL REPORTS.

(a) STATE REPORTS.—On June 15 of each year, each Governor receiving moneys from the Fund shall account for all moneys so received for the previous fiscal year in a writ-

ten report to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, as appropriate. The report shall include, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretaries, a description of all projects and activities receiving funds under this Act. In order to avoid duplication, such report may incorporate by reference any other reports required to be submitted under other provisions of law to the Secretary concerned by the Governor regarding any portion of such moneys.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—On January 1 of each year the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit an annual report to the Congress documenting all moneys expended by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from the Fund during the previous fiscal year and summarizing the contents of the Governors' reports submitted to the Secretaries under subsection (a).

SEC. 5. CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund which shall be known as the "Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund". In each fiscal year after the fiscal year 2000, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit into the Fund the following amounts:

(1) OCS REVENUES.—An amount in each such fiscal year from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues equal to the difference between \$2,825,000,000 and the amounts deposited in the Fund under paragraph (2), notwithstanding section 9 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1338).

(2) AMOUNTS NOT DISBURSED.—All allocated but undistributed amounts returned to the Fund under section 101(a)(2).

(3) INTEREST.—All interest earned under subsection (d) that is not made available under paragraph (2) or (4) of that subsection.

(b) TRANSFER FOR EXPENDITURE.—In each fiscal year after the fiscal year 2001, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer amounts deposited into the Fund as follows:

(1) \$1,000,000,000 to the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of making payments to coastal States under title I of this Act.

(2) To the Land and Water Conservation Fund for expenditure as provided in section 3(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-6(a)) such amounts as are necessary to make the income of the fund \$900,000,000 in each such fiscal year.

(3) \$350,000,000 to the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund established under section 3 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669b).

(4) \$125,000,000 to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 and following).

(5) \$100,000,000 to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 and following).

(6) \$200,000,000 to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out title VI of this Act.

(7) \$100,000,000 to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the farmland protection program under section 388 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-127; 16 U.S.C. 3830 note) and the Forest Legacy Program under section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103c).

(8) \$50,000,000 to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out subtitle B of title VII of this Act.

(c) SHORTFALL.—If amounts deposited into the Fund in any fiscal year after the fiscal year 2000 are less than \$2,825,000,000, the amounts transferred under paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (b) for that fiscal year shall each be reduced proportionately.

(d) INTEREST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest moneys in the Fund in public debt securities with maturities suitable to the needs of the Fund, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, and bearing interest at rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity.

(2) USE OF INTEREST.—Except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (4), interest earned on such moneys shall be available, subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, for obligation or expenditure under—

(A) chapter 69 of title 31 of the United States Code (relating to payment in lieu of taxes), and

(B) section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383; 16 U.S.C. 715s) (relating to refuge revenue sharing).

In each fiscal year such interest shall be allocated between the programs referred to in subparagraph (A) and (B) in proportion to the amounts authorized and appropriated for that fiscal year under other provisions of law for purposes of such programs.

(3) CEILING ON EXPENDITURES OF INTEREST.—Amounts made available under paragraph (2) in each fiscal year shall not exceed \$200,000,000.

(4) TITLE III INTEREST.—All interest attributable to amounts transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of title III of this Act (and the amendments made by such title III) shall be available, subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, for obligation or expenditure for purposes of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act of 1989 (16 U.S.C. 4401 and following)

(e) REFUNDS.—In those instances where through judicial decision, administrative review, arbitration, or other means there are royalty refunds owed to entities generating revenues under this title, such refunds shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from amounts available in the Fund.

SEC. 6. LIMITATION ON USE OF AVAILABLE AMOUNTS FOR ADMINISTRATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of amounts made available by this Act (including the amendments made by this Act) for a particular activity, not more than 2 percent may be used for administrative expenses of that activity. Nothing in this section shall affect the prohibition contained in section 4(c)(3) of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (as amended by this Act).

SEC. 7. RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS.

The Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish such rules regarding recordkeeping by State and local governments and the auditing of expenditures made by State and local governments from funds made available under this Act as may be necessary. Such rules shall be in addition to other requirements established regarding recordkeeping and the auditing of such expenditures under other authority of law.

SEC. 8. MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT AND MATCHING FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no State or local government shall receive any funds under this Act during any fiscal year when its expenditures of non-Federal funds for recurrent expenditures for programs for which funding is provided

under this Act will be less than its expenditures were for such programs during the preceding fiscal year. No State or local government shall receive any funding under this Act with respect to a program unless the Secretary is satisfied that such a grant will be so used to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of State, local, or other non-Federal funds available for such program. In order for the Secretary to provide funding under this Act in a timely manner each fiscal year, the Secretary shall compare a State or local government's prospective expenditure level to that of its second preceding fiscal year.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may provide funding under this Act to a State or local government not meeting the requirements of subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that a reduction in expenditures is attributable to a non-selective reduction in the expenditures in the programs of all Executive branch agencies of the State or local government.

(c) USE OF FUND TO MEET MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.—All funds received by a State or local government under this Act shall be treated as Federal funds for purposes of compliance with any provision in effect under any other law requiring that non-Federal funds be used to provide a portion of the funding for any program or project.

SEC. 9. SUNSET.

This Act, including the amendments made by this Act, shall have no force or effect after September 30, 2020.

SEC. 10. PROTECTION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS.

(a) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in the Act shall authorize that private property be taken for public use, without just compensation—

(1) as provided by the Fifth and Fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution; and

(2) determined based on an independent appraisal of the property, that is—

(A) paid for by the Federal Government; and

(B) performed by an appraiser approved by the property owner and the head of the Federal agency taking the action that constitutes a taking of the property.

(b) REGULATION.—Federal agencies, using funds appropriated by this Act, may not apply any regulation on any lands until the lands or water, or an interest therein, is acquired, unless specifically authorized to do so by another Act of Congress.

(c) PROTECTION OF RIGHTS IN NON-FEDERAL PROPERTY FROM FEDERAL ACQUISITION OF NEARBY LANDS.—The right of an owner of non-Federal real property to use and enjoy that property shall not be diminished based on the property being—

(1) within the boundaries of a Federal unit as a consequence of the acquisition of lands for that unit with amounts made available by this Act; or

(2) adjacent to Federal lands acquired with amounts made available by this Act.

SEC. 11. SIGNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require, as a condition of any financial assistance provided with amounts made available by this Act, that the person that owns or administers any site that benefits from such assistance shall include on any sign otherwise installed at that site at or near an entrance or public use focal point, a statement that the existence or development of the site (or both), as appropriate, is a product of such assistance.

(b) STANDARDS.—The Secretary shall provide for the design of standardized signs for purposes of subsection (a), and shall prescribe standards and guidelines for such signs.

TITLE I—IMPACT ASSISTANCE AND COASTAL CONSERVATION

SEC. 101. IMPACT ASSISTANCE FORMULA AND PAYMENTS.

(a) IMPACT ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS TO STATES.—

(1) GRANT PROGRAM.—Amounts transferred to the Secretary of the Interior from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund under section 5(b)(1) of this Act for purposes of making payments to coastal States under this title in any fiscal year shall be allocated by the Secretary of the Interior among coastal States as provided in this section in each such fiscal year. In each such fiscal year, the Secretary of the Interior shall, subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, disburse such allocated funds to those coastal States for which the Secretary has approved a Coastal State Conservation and Impact Assistance Plan as required by this title. Payments for all projects shall be made by the Secretary to the Governor of the State or to the State official or agency designated by the Governor or by State law as having authority and responsibility to accept and to administer funds paid hereunder. No payment shall be made to any State until the State has agreed to provide such reports to the Secretary, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Secretary to perform his duties under this title, and provide such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement and accounting for Federal revenues paid to the State under this title.

(2) FAILURE TO HAVE PLAN APPROVED.—At the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall return to the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund any amount that the Secretary allocated, but did not disburse, in that fiscal year to a coastal State that does not have an approved plan under this title before the end of the fiscal year in which such grant is allocated, except that the Secretary shall hold in escrow until the final resolution of the appeal any amount allocated, but not disbursed, to a coastal State that has appealed the disapproval of a plan submitted under this title.

(b) ALLOCATION AMONG COASTAL STATES.—

(1) ALLOCABLE SHARE FOR EACH STATE.—For each coastal State, the Secretary shall determine the State's allocable share of the total amount of the revenues transferred from the Fund under section 5(b)(1) for each fiscal year using the following weighted formula:

(A) 50 percent of such revenues shall be allocated among the coastal States as provided in paragraph (2).

(B) 25 percent of such revenues shall be allocated to each coastal State based on the ratio of each State's shoreline miles to the shoreline miles of all coastal States.

(C) 25 percent of such revenues shall be allocated to each coastal State based on the ratio of each State's coastal population to the coastal population of all coastal States.

(2) OFFSHORE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF SHARE.—If any portion of a producing State lies within a distance of 200 miles from the geographic center of any leased tract, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine such State's allocable share under paragraph (1)(A) based on the formula set forth in this paragraph. Such State share shall be calculated as of the date of the enactment of this Act for the first 5-fiscal year period during which funds are disbursed under this title and recalculated on the anniversary of such date each fifth year thereafter for each succeeding 5-fiscal year period. Each such

State's allocable share of the revenues disbursed under paragraph (1)(A) shall be inversely proportional to the distance between the nearest point on the coastline of such State and the geographic center of each leased tract or portion of the leased tract (to the nearest whole mile) that is within 200 miles of that coastline, as determined by the Secretary for the 5-year period concerned. In applying this paragraph a leased tract or portion of a leased tract shall be excluded if the tract or portion is located in a geographic area subject to a leasing moratorium on January 1, 1999, unless the lease was issued prior to the establishment of the moratorium and was in production on January 1, 1999.

(3) MINIMUM STATE SHARE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The allocable share of revenues determined by the Secretary under this subsection for each coastal State with an approved coastal management program (as defined by the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451)), or which is making satisfactory progress toward one, shall not be less in any fiscal year than 0.50 percent of the total amount of the revenues transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of this title for that fiscal year under subsection (a). For any other coastal State the allocable share of such revenues shall not be less than 0.25 percent of such revenues.

(B) RECOMPUTATION.—Where one or more coastal States' allocable shares, as computed under paragraphs (1) and (2), are increased by any amount under this paragraph, the allocable share for all other coastal States shall be recomputed and reduced by the same amount so that not more than 100 percent of the amount transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of this title for that fiscal year under section 5(b)(1) is allocated to all coastal States. The reduction shall be divided pro rata among such other coastal States.

(c) PAYMENTS TO POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—In the case of a producing State, the Governor of the State shall pay 50 percent of the State's allocable share, as determined and disbursed under subsection (b), to the coastal political subdivisions in such State. Such payments shall be allocated among such coastal political subdivisions of the State according to an allocation formula analogous to the allocation formula used in subsection (b) to allocate revenues among the coastal States, except that a coastal political subdivision in the State of California that has a coastal shoreline, that is not within 200 miles of the geographic center of a leased tract or portion of a leased tract, and in which there is located one or more oil refineries shall be eligible for that portion of the allocation described in subsection (b)(1)(A) and (b)(2) in the same manner as if that political subdivision were located within a distance of 50 miles from the geographic center of any leased tract.

(d) TIME OF PAYMENT.—Payments to coastal States and coastal political subdivisions under this section shall be made not later than December 31 of each year from revenues received during the immediately preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 102. COASTAL STATE CONSERVATION AND IMPACT ASSISTANCE PLANS.

(a) DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION OF STATE PLANS.—Each coastal State seeking to receive grants under this title shall prepare, and submit to the Secretary, a Statewide Coastal State Conservation and Impact Assistance Plan. In the case of a producing State, the Governor shall incorporate the plans of the coastal political subdivisions into the Statewide plan for transmittal to the Secretary. The Governor shall solicit

local input and shall provide for public participation in the development of the Statewide plan. The plan shall be submitted to the Secretary by April 1 of the calendar year after the calendar year in which this Act is enacted.

(b) **APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Approval of a Statewide plan under subsection (a) is required prior to disbursement of funds under this title by the Secretary. The Secretary shall approve the Statewide plan if the Secretary determines, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, that the plan is consistent with the uses set forth in subsection (c) and if the plan contains each of the following:

(A) The name of the State agency that will have the authority to represent and act for the State in dealing with the Secretary for purposes of this title.

(B) A program for the implementation of the plan which, for producing States, includes a description of how funds will be used to address the impacts of oil and gas production from the Outer Continental Shelf.

(C) Certification by the Governor that ample opportunity has been accorded for public participation in the development and revision of the plan.

(D) Measures for taking into account other relevant Federal resources and programs. The plan shall be correlated so far as practicable with other State, regional, and local plans.

(2) **PROCEDURE AND TIMING; REVISIONS.**—The Secretary shall approve or disapprove each plan submitted in accordance with this section. If a State first submits a plan by not later than 90 days before the beginning of the first fiscal year to which the plan applies, the Secretary shall approve or disapprove the plan by not later than 30 days before the beginning of that fiscal year.

(3) **AMENDMENT OR REVISION.**—Any amendment to or revision of the plan shall be prepared in accordance with the requirements of this subsection and shall be submitted to the Secretary for approval or disapproval. Any such amendment or revision shall take effect only for fiscal years after the fiscal year in which the amendment or revision is approved by the Secretary.

(c) **AUTHORIZED USES OF STATE GRANT FUNDING.**—The funds provided under this title to a coastal State and for coastal political subdivisions are authorized to be used only for one or more of the following purposes:

(1) Data collection, including but not limited to fishery or marine mammal stock surveys in State waters or both, cooperative State, interstate, and Federal fishery or marine mammal stock surveys or both, cooperative initiatives with universities and private entities for fishery and marine mammal surveys, activities related to marine mammal and fishery interactions, and other coastal living marine resources surveys.

(2) The conservation, restoration, enhancement, or creation of coastal habitats.

(3) Cooperative Federal or State enforcement of marine resources management statutes.

(4) Fishery observer coverage programs in State or Federal waters.

(5) Invasive, exotic, and nonindigenous species identification and control.

(6) Coordination and preparation of cooperative fishery conservation and management plans between States including the development and implementation of population surveys, assessments and monitoring plans, and the preparation and implementation of State fishery management plans developed by interstate marine fishery commissions.

(7) Preparation and implementation of State fishery or marine mammal management plans that comply with bilateral or

multilateral international fishery or marine mammal conservation and management agreements or both.

(8) Coastal and ocean observations necessary to develop and implement real time tide and current measurement systems.

(9) Implementation of federally approved marine, coastal, or comprehensive conservation and management plans.

(10) Mitigating marine and coastal impacts of Outer Continental Shelf activities including impacts on onshore infrastructure.

(11) Projects that promote research, education, training, and advisory services in fields related to ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources.

(d) **COMPLIANCE WITH AUTHORIZED USES.**—Based on the annual reports submitted under section 4 of this Act and on audits conducted by the Secretary under section 7, the Secretary shall review the expenditures made by each State and coastal political subdivision from funds made available under this title. If the Secretary determines that any expenditure made by a State or coastal political subdivision of a State from such funds is not consistent with the authorized uses set forth in subsection (c), the Secretary shall not make any further grants under this title to that State until the funds used for such expenditure have been repaid to the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund.

**TITLE II—LAND AND WATER
CONSERVATION FUND REVITALIZATION**

**SEC. 201. AMENDMENT OF LAND AND WATER
CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1965.**

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-4 and following).

**SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF FUND; TREATMENT OF
AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM
CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT
ACT FUND.**

Section 2(c) is amended to read as follows:“(c) **AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.**—In addition to the sum of the revenues and collections estimated by the Secretary of the Interior to be covered into the fund pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section, there shall be covered into the fund all amounts transferred to the fund under section 5(b)(2) of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 2000.”

SEC. 203. AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.

Section 3 (16 U.S.C. 4601-6) is amended to read as follows:

“**APPROPRIATIONS**

“**SEC. 3. (a) IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary from the fund to carry out this Act not more than \$900,000,000 in any fiscal year after the fiscal year 2001. Amounts transferred to the fund from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund and amounts covered into the fund under subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 shall be available to the Secretary in fiscal years after the fiscal year 2001, subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, to carry out this Act.

“(b) **OBLIGATION AND EXPENDITURE OF AVAILABLE AMOUNTS.**—Amounts available for obligation or expenditure from the fund or from the special account established under section 4(i)(1) may be obligated or expended only as provided in this Act.”

SEC. 204. ALLOCATION OF FUND.

Section 5 (16 U.S.C. 4601-7) is amended to read as follows:

“**ALLOCATION OF FUNDS**

“**SEC. 5.** Of the amounts made available for each fiscal year to carry out this Act—

“(1) 50 percent shall be available for Federal purposes (in this Act referred to as the ‘Federal portion’); and

“(2) 50 percent shall be available for grants to States.”

SEC. 205. USE OF FEDERAL PORTION.

Section 7 (16 U.S.C. 4601-9) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **USE OF FEDERAL PORTION.**—

“(1) **APPROVAL BY CONGRESS REQUIRED.**—The Federal portion (as that term is defined in section 5(1)) may not be obligated or expended by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture for any acquisition except those specifically referred to, and approved by the Congress, in an Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture, respectively.

“(2) **WILLING SELLER REQUIREMENT.**—The Federal portion may not be used to acquire any property unless—

“(A) the owner of the property concurs in the acquisition; and

“(B) acquisition of that property is specifically approved by an Act of Congress.

“(3) **CERTIFICATION BY GAO REQUIRED.**—Of the amounts in the Federal portion that are transferred from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund and available for a fiscal year to the Secretary of the Interior or to the Secretary of Agriculture, respectively, 25 percent may not be obligated or expended and shall be returned to the general fund of the Treasury unless, before the commencement of the fiscal year, the Comptroller General of the United States submits to the President and the Congress a finding that the operational maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior or the United States Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture (as applicable) as of the beginning of the preceding fiscal year has been reduced by at least 5 percent.

“(e) **LIST OF PROPOSED FEDERAL ACQUISITIONS.**—

“(1) **RESTRICTION ON USE.**—The Federal portion for a fiscal year may not be obligated or expended to acquire any interest in lands or water unless the lands or water were included in a list of acquisitions that is approved by the Congress. This list shall include an inventory of surplus lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture for which there is no demonstrated compelling program need.

“(2) **TRANSMISSION OF LIST.**—(A) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly transmit to the appropriate authorizing and appropriations committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate for each fiscal year, by no later than the submission of the budget for the fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, a list of the acquisitions of interests in lands and water proposed to be made with the Federal portion for the fiscal year.

“(B) In preparing each list, the Secretary shall—

“(i) seek to consolidate Federal landholdings in States with checkerboard Federal land ownership patterns;

“(ii) use equal value land exchanges, where feasible and suitable, as an alternative means of land acquisition;

“(iii) use permanent conservation easements, where feasible and suitable, as an alternative means of acquisition;

“(iv) identify those properties that are proposed to be acquired from willing sellers, and not use adverse condemnation; and

“(v) establish priorities based on such factors as important or special resource attributes, threats to resource integrity, timely availability, owner hardship, cost escalation, public recreation use values, and similar considerations.

“(3) INFORMATION REGARDING PROPOSED ACQUISITIONS.—Each list shall include, for each proposed acquisition included in the list—

“(A) citation of the statutory authority for the acquisition, if such authority exists; and

“(B) an explanation of why the particular interest proposed to be acquired was selected, including an explanation of the priorities under paragraph (2)(B)(iv) that were applied in making the selection.

“(f) NOTIFICATION TO AFFECTED AREAS REQUIRED.—The Federal portion for a fiscal year may not be used to acquire any interest in land unless the Secretary administering the acquisition, by not later than 30 days after the date the Secretaries submit the list under subsection (e) for the fiscal year, provides notice of the proposed acquisition—

“(1) in writing to each Member of and each Delegate and Resident Commissioner to the Congress elected to represent any area in which is located—

“(A) the land; or

“(B) any part of any federally designated unit that includes the land;

“(2) in writing to the Governor of the State in which the land is located;

“(3) in writing to each State political subdivision having jurisdiction over the land; and

“(4) by publication of a notice in a newspaper that is widely distributed in the area under the jurisdiction of each such State political subdivision, that includes a clear statement that the Federal Government intends to acquire an interest in land.

“(g) COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS UNDER FEDERAL LAWS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal portion for a fiscal year may not be used to acquire any interest in land or water unless the following have occurred:

“(A) All actions required under Federal law with respect to the acquisition have been complied with.

“(B) A copy of each final environmental impact statement or environmental assessment required by law, and a summary of all public comments regarding the acquisition that have been received by the agency making the acquisition, are submitted to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

“(C) A notice of the availability of such statement or assessment and of such summary is provided to—

“(i) each Member of and each Delegate and Resident Commissioner to the Congress elected to represent the area in which the land is located;

“(ii) the Governor of the State in which the land is located; and

“(iii) each State political subdivision having jurisdiction over the land.

“(2) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any acquisition that is specifically authorized by a Federal law.”.

SEC. 206. ALLOCATION OF AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR STATE PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(b) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) DISTRIBUTION AMONG THE STATES.—(1) Sums in the fund available each fiscal year for State purposes shall be apportioned among the several States by the Secretary,

in accordance with this subsection. The determination of the apportionment by the Secretary shall be final.

“(2) Subject to paragraph (3), of sums in the fund available each fiscal year for State purposes—

“(A) 30 percent shall be apportioned equally among the several States; and

“(B) 70 percent shall be apportioned so that the ratio that the amount apportioned to each State under this subparagraph bears to the total amount apportioned under this subparagraph for the fiscal year is equal to the ratio that the population of the State bears to the total population of all States.

“(3) The total allocation to an individual State for a fiscal year under paragraph (2) shall not exceed 10 percent of the total amount allocated to the several States under paragraph (2) for that fiscal year.

“(4) The Secretary shall notify each State of its apportionment, and the amounts thereof shall be available thereafter to the State for planning, acquisition, or development projects as hereafter described. Any amount of any apportionment under this subsection that has not been paid or obligated by the Secretary during the fiscal year in which such notification is given and the two fiscal years thereafter shall be reapportioned by the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (2), but without regard to the 10 percent limitation to an individual State specified in paragraph (3).

“(5)(A) For the purposes of paragraph (2)(A)—

“(i) the District of Columbia shall be treated as a State; and

“(ii) Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa—

“(I) shall be treated collectively as one State; and

“(II) shall each be allocated an equal share of any amount distributed to them pursuant to clause (i).

“(B) Each of the areas referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be treated as a State for all other purposes of this Act.”.

(b) TRIBES AND ALASKA NATIVE CORPORATIONS.—Section 6(b)(5) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(b)(5)) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) For the purposes of paragraph (1), all federally recognized Indian tribes and Native Corporations (as defined in section 3 of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1602)), shall be eligible to receive shares of the apportionment under paragraph (1) in accordance with a competitive grant program established by the Secretary by rule. The total apportionment available to such tribes and Native Corporations shall be equivalent to the amount available to a single State. No single tribe or Native Corporation shall receive a grant that constitutes more than 10 percent of the total amount made available to all tribes and Native Corporations pursuant to the apportionment under paragraph (1). Funds received by a tribe or Native Corporation under this subparagraph may be expended only for the purposes specified in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (a).”.

(c) LOCAL ALLOCATION.—Section 6(b) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) Absent some compelling and annually documented reason to the contrary acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior, each State (other than an area treated as a State under paragraph (5)) shall make available as grants to local governments, at least 50 percent of the annual State apportionment, or an equivalent amount made available from other sources.”.

SEC. 207. STATE PLANNING.

(a) STATE ACTION AGENDA REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(d) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) STATE ACTION AGENDA REQUIRED.—(1) Each State may define its own priorities and criteria for selection of outdoor conservation and recreation acquisition and development projects eligible for grants under this Act so long as it provides for public involvement in this process and publishes an accurate and current State Action Agenda for Community Conservation and Recreation (in this Act referred to as the ‘State Action Agenda’) indicating the needs it has identified and the priorities and criteria it has established. In order to assess its needs and establish its overall priorities, each State, in partnership with its local governments and in consultation with its citizens, shall develop, within 5 years after the enactment of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 2000, a State Action Agenda that meets the following requirements:

“(A) The agenda must be strategic, originating in broad-based and long-term needs, but focused on actions that can be funded over the next 4 years.

“(B) The agenda must be updated at least once every 4 years and certified by the Governor that the State Action Agenda conclusions and proposed actions have been considered in an active public involvement process.

“(2) State Action Agendas shall take into account all providers of conservation and recreation lands within each State, including Federal, regional, and local government resources, and shall be correlated whenever possible with other State, regional, and local plans for parks, recreation, open space, and wetlands conservation. Recovery action programs developed by urban localities under section 1007 of the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 may be used by a State as a guide to the conclusions, priorities, and action schedules contained in State Action Agenda. Each State shall assure that any requirements for local outdoor conservation and recreation planning, promulgated as conditions for grants, minimize redundancy of local efforts by allowing, wherever possible, use of the findings, priorities, and implementation schedules of recovery action programs to meet such requirements.”.

(2) EXISTING STATE PLANS.—Comprehensive State Plans developed by any State under section 6(d) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 before the date that is 5 years after the enactment of this Act shall remain in effect in that State until a State Action Agenda has been adopted pursuant to the amendment made by this subsection, but no later than 5 years after the enactment of this Act.

(b) MISCELLANEOUS.—Section 6(e) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(e)) is amended as follows:

(1) In the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “State comprehensive plan” and inserting “State Action Agenda”.

(2) In paragraph (1) by striking “comprehensive plan” and inserting “State Action Agenda”.

SEC. 208. ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR OTHER PROJECTS.

Section 6(e)(2) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(e)(2)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “or to enhance public safety within a designated park or recreation area”.

SEC. 209. CONVERSION OF PROPERTY TO OTHER USE.

Section 6(f)(3) (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(f)(3)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” before “No property”; and

(2) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following:

“(B) Prior to each such conversion, the Governor of the State shall demonstrate that—

“(i) no prudent or feasible alternative exists with the exception of those properties that no longer meet the criteria within the State Plan or Agenda as an outdoor conservation and recreation facility due to changes in demographics or that must be abandoned because of environmental contamination which endangers public health and safety; and

“(ii) the conversion will assure the substitution of other conservation and recreation properties of at least equal fair market value and reasonably equivalent usefulness and location and that are consistent with the existing State Plan or Agenda.”.

SEC. 210. WATER RIGHTS.

Title I is amended by adding at the end the following:

“WATER RIGHTS

“SEC. 14. Nothing in this title—

“(1) invalidates or preempts State or Federal water law or an interstate compact governing water;

“(2) alters the rights of any State to any appropriated share of the waters of any body of surface or ground water, whether determined by past or future interstate compacts or by past or future legislative or final judicial allocations;

“(3) preempts or modifies any Federal or State law, or interstate compact, dealing with water quality or disposal; or

“(4) confers on any non-Federal entity the ability to exercise any Federal right to the waters of any stream or to any ground water resource.”.

TITLE III—WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION

SEC. 301. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are—

(1) to extend financial and technical assistance to the States under the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act for the benefit of a diverse array of wildlife and associated habitats, including species that are not hunted or fished, to fulfill unmet needs of wildlife within the States in recognition of the primary role of the States to conserve all wildlife;

(2) to assure sound conservation policies through the development, revision, and implementation of a comprehensive wildlife conservation and restoration plan;

(3) to encourage State fish and wildlife agencies to participate with the Federal Government, other State agencies, wildlife conservation organizations, and outdoor recreation and conservation interests through cooperative planning and implementation of this title; and

(4) to encourage State fish and wildlife agencies to provide for public involvement in the process of development and implementation of a wildlife conservation and restoration program.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

(a) REFERENCE TO LAW.—In this title, the term “Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act” means the Act of September 2, 1937 (16 U.S.C. 669 and following), commonly referred to as the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act or the Pittman-Robertson Act.

(b) WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION PROGRAM.—Section 2 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669a) is amended by inserting after “shall be construed” the first place it appears the following: “to include the wildlife conservation and restoration program and”.

(c) STATE AGENCIES.—Section 2 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669a) is amended by inserting “or State fish and wildlife department” after “State fish and game department”.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C.

669a) is amended by striking the period at the end thereof, substituting a semicolon, and adding the following: “the term ‘conservation’ shall be construed to mean the use of methods and procedures necessary or desirable to sustain healthy populations of wildlife including all activities associated with scientific resources management such as research, census, monitoring of populations, acquisition, improvement and management of habitat, live trapping and translocation, wildlife damage management, and periodic or total protection of a species or population as well as the taking of individuals within wildlife stock or population if permitted by applicable State and Federal law; the term ‘wildlife conservation and restoration program’ means a program developed by a State fish and wildlife department and approved by the Secretary under section 4(d), the projects that constitute such a program, which may be implemented in whole or part through grants and contracts by a State to other State, Federal, or local agencies (including those that gather, evaluate, and disseminate information on wildlife and their habitats) wildlife conservation organizations, and outdoor recreation and conservation education entities from funds apportioned under this title, and maintenance of such projects; the term ‘wildlife’ shall be construed to mean any species of wild, free-ranging fauna including fish, and also fauna in captive breeding programs the object of which is to reintroduce individuals of a depleted indigenous species into previously occupied range; the term ‘wildlife-associated recreation’ shall be construed to mean projects intended to meet the demand for outdoor activities associated with wildlife including, but not limited to, hunting and fishing, wildlife observation and photography, such projects as construction or restoration of wildlife viewing areas, observation towers, blinds, platforms, land and water trails, water access, trail heads, and access for such projects; and the term ‘wildlife conservation education’ shall be construed to mean projects, including public outreach, intended to foster responsible natural resource stewardship.”.

SEC. 303. TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.

Section 3 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by inserting “(1)” after “(a)”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(2) There is established in the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund a subaccount to be known as the ‘wildlife conservation and restoration account’. Amounts transferred to the fund for a fiscal year under section 5(b)(3) of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 2000 shall be deposited in the subaccount and shall be available, subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, for apportionment in accordance with this Act to carry out State wildlife conservation and restoration programs.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) Amounts transferred to the fund from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund and apportioned under subsection (a)(2) shall supplement, but not replace, existing funds available to the States from the sport fish restoration account and wildlife restoration account and shall be used for the development, revision, and implementation of wildlife conservation and restoration programs and should be used to address the unmet needs for a diverse array of wildlife and associated habitats, including species that are not hunted or fished, for wildlife conservation, wildlife conservation edu-

cation, and wildlife-associated recreation projects. Such funds may be used for new programs and projects as well as to enhance existing programs and projects.

“(d) (1) Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of this section, with respect to amounts transferred to the fund from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund so much of such amounts as is apportioned to any State for any fiscal year and as remains unexpended at the close thereof shall remain available for expenditure in that State until the close of—

“(A) the fourth succeeding fiscal year, in the case of amounts transferred in any of the first 10 fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 2000; or

“(B) the second succeeding fiscal year, in the case of amounts transferred in a fiscal year beginning after the 10-fiscal-year period referred to in subparagraph (A).

“(2) Any amount apportioned to a State under this subsection that is unexpended or unobligated at the end of the period during which it is available under paragraph (1) shall be reapportioned to all States during the succeeding fiscal year.”.

SEC. 304. APPORTIONMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669c) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior shall, subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, make the following apportionment from the amount transferred to the fund from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund for each fiscal year:

“(A) To the District of Columbia and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, each a sum equal to not more than ½ of 1 percent thereof.

“(B) To Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, each a sum equal to not more than ¼ of 1 percent thereof.

“(2) (A) The Secretary of the Interior, after making the apportionment under paragraph (1), shall apportion the remainder of the amount transferred to the fund from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund for each fiscal year among the States in the following manner:

“(i) ⅓ of which is based on the ratio to which the land area of such State bears to the total land area of all such States.

“(ii) ⅔ of which is based on the ratio to which the population of such State bears to the total population of all such States.

“(B) The amounts apportioned under this paragraph shall be adjusted equitably so that no such State shall be apportioned a sum which is less than ½ of 1 percent of the amount available for apportionment under this paragraph for any fiscal year or more than 5 percent of such amount.

“(3) Amounts transferred to the fund from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund shall not be available for any expenses incurred in the administration and execution of programs carried out with such amounts.

“(d) WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION PROGRAMS.—(1) Any State, through its fish and wildlife department, may apply to the Secretary of the Interior for approval of a wildlife conservation and restoration program, or for funds to develop a program. To apply, a State shall submit a comprehensive plan that includes—

“(A) provisions vesting in the fish and wildlife department of the State overall responsibility and accountability for the program;

“(B) provisions for the development and implementation of—

“(i) wildlife conservation projects that expand and support existing wildlife programs, giving appropriate consideration to all wildlife;

“(ii) wildlife-associated recreation projects; and

“(iii) wildlife conservation education projects pursuant to programs under section 8(a); and

“(C) provisions to ensure public participation in the development, revision, and implementation of projects and programs required under this paragraph.

“(2) A State shall provide an opportunity for public participation in the development of the comprehensive plan required under paragraph (1).

“(3) If the Secretary finds that the comprehensive plan submitted by a State complies with paragraph (1), the Secretary shall approve the wildlife conservation and restoration program of the State and set aside from the apportionment to the State made pursuant to subsection (c) an amount that shall not exceed 75 percent of the estimated cost of developing and implementing the program.

“(4)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), after the Secretary approves a State's wildlife conservation and restoration program, the Secretary may make payments on a project that is a segment of the State's wildlife conservation and restoration program as the project progresses. Such payments, including previous payments on the project, if any, shall not be more than the United States pro rata share of such project. The Secretary, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may advance funds representing the United States pro rata share of a project that is a segment of a wildlife conservation and restoration program, including funds to develop such program.

“(B) Not more than 10 percent of the amounts apportioned to each State under this section for a State's wildlife conservation and restoration program may be used for wildlife-associated recreation.

“(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘State’ shall include the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.”

(b) **FACA.**—Coordination with State fish and wildlife agency personnel or with personnel of other State agencies pursuant to the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act or the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.). Except for the preceding sentence, the provisions of this title relate solely to wildlife conservation and restoration programs and shall not be construed to affect the provisions of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act relating to wildlife restoration projects or the provisions of the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act relating to fish restoration and management projects.

SEC. 305. EDUCATION.

Section 8(a) of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669g(a)) is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: “Funds available from the amount transferred to the fund from the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Fund may be used for a wildlife conservation education program, except that no such funds may be used for education efforts, projects, or programs that promote or encourage opposition to the regulated taking of wildlife.”

SEC. 306. PROHIBITION AGAINST DIVERSION.

No designated State agency shall be eligible to receive matching funds under this title if sources of revenue available to it after January 1, 1999, for conservation of wildlife are diverted for any purpose other than the administration of the designated State agency, it being the intention of Congress that funds available to States under this title be added to revenues from existing State sources and not serve as a substitute for revenues from such sources. Such revenues shall include interest, dividends, or other income earned on the forgoing.

TITLE IV—URBAN PARK AND RECREATION RECOVERY PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

SEC. 401. AMENDMENT OF URBAN PARK AND RECREATION RECOVERY ACT OF 1978.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 and following).

SEC. 402. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to provide a dedicated source of funding to assist local governments in improving their park and recreation systems.

SEC. 403. TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.

Section 1013 (16 U.S.C. 2512) is amended to read as follows:

“TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND

“SEC. 1013. (a) **IN GENERAL.**—Amounts transferred to the Secretary of the Interior under section 5(b)(4) of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 2000 in a fiscal year shall be available to the Secretary, subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, to carry out this title. Any amount that has not been paid or obligated by the Secretary before the end of the second fiscal year beginning after the first fiscal year in which the amount is available shall be reapportioned by the Secretary among grantees under this title.

“(b) **LIMITATIONS ON ANNUAL GRANTS.**—Of the amounts available in a fiscal year under subsection (a)—

“(1) not more than 3 percent may be used for grants for the development of local park and recreation recovery action programs pursuant to sections 1007(a) and 1007(c);

“(2) not more than 10 percent may be used for innovation grants pursuant to section 1006; and

“(3) not more than 15 percent may be provided as grants (in the aggregate) for projects in any one State.

“(c) **LIMITATION ON USE FOR GRANT ADMINISTRATION.**—The Secretary shall establish a limit on the portion of any grant under this title that may be used for grant and program administration.”

SEC. 404. DEFINITIONS.

Section 1004 (16 U.S.C. 2503) is amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (j) by striking “and” after the semicolon.

(2) In paragraph (k) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon.

(3) By adding at the end the following:

“(1) ‘development grants’—

“(1) subject to subparagraph (2) means matching capital grants to units of local government to cover costs of development and construction on existing or new neighborhood recreation sites, including indoor

and outdoor recreational areas and facilities, support facilities, and landscaping; and

“(2) does not include routine maintenance, and upkeep activities; and

“(m) ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of the Interior.”

SEC. 405. ELIGIBILITY.

Section 1005(a) (16 U.S.C. 2504(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) Eligibility of general purpose local governments to compete for assistance under this title shall be based upon need as determined by the Secretary. Generally, eligible general purpose local governments shall include the following:

“(1) All political subdivisions of Metropolitan, Primary, or Consolidated Statistical Areas, as determined by the most recent Census.

“(2) Any other city, town, or group of cities or towns (or both) within such a Metropolitan Statistical Area, that has a total population of 50,000 or more as determined by the most recent Census.

“(3) Any other county, parish, or township with a total population of 250,000 or more as determined by the most recent Census.”

SEC. 406. GRANTS.

Section 1006 (16 U.S.C. 2505) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by striking so much as precedes subsection (a)(4) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

“GRANTS

“SEC. 1006. (a)(1) The Secretary may provide 70 percent matching grants for rehabilitation, development, and innovation purposes to any eligible general purpose local government upon approval by the Secretary of an application submitted by the chief executive of such government.

“(2) At the discretion of such an applicant, a grant under this section may be transferred in whole or part to independent special purpose local governments, private nonprofit agencies, or county or regional park authorities, if—

“(A) such transfer is consistent with the approved application for the grant; and

“(B) the applicant provides assurance to the Secretary that the applicant will maintain public recreation opportunities at assisted areas and facilities owned or managed by the applicant in accordance with section 1010.

“(3) Payments may be made only for those rehabilitation, development, or innovation projects that have been approved by the Secretary. Such payments may be made from time to time in keeping with the rate of progress toward completion of a project, on a reimbursable basis.”

SEC. 407. RECOVERY ACTION PROGRAMS.

Section 1007(a) (16 U.S.C. 2506(a)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the first sentence by inserting “development,” after “commitments to ongoing planning,”; and

(2) in subsection (a)(2) by inserting “development and” after “adequate planning for”.

SEC. 408. STATE ACTION INCENTIVES.

Section 1008 (16 U.S.C. 2507) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) **IN GENERAL.**—” before the first sentence; and

(2) by striking the last sentence of subsection (a) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this section) and inserting the following:

“(b) **COORDINATION WITH LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACTIVITIES.**—(1) The Secretary and general purpose local governments are encouraged to coordinate preparation of recovery action programs required by this title with State Plans or Agendas required under section 6 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, including by

allowing flexibility in preparation of recovery action programs so they may be used to meet State and local qualifications for local receipt of Land and Water Conservation Fund grants or State grants for similar purposes or for other conservation or recreation purposes.

“(2) The Secretary shall encourage States to consider the findings, priorities, strategies, and schedules included in the recovery action programs of their urban localities in preparation and updating of State plans in accordance with the public coordination and citizen consultation requirements of subsection 6(d) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.”

SEC. 409. CONVERSION OF RECREATION PROPERTY.

Section 1010 (16 U.S.C. 2509) is amended to read as follows:

“CONVERSION OF RECREATION PROPERTY

“SEC. 1010. (a) Before converting any property developed, acquired, or rehabilitated with amounts provided under this title to any purpose other than public recreation purposes, a grantee, through the designated State official, shall notify the Secretary that no prudent or feasible alternative exists.

“(b) Subsection (a) shall apply also to the park, recreation, or conservation area of which the property is a part.”

SEC. 410. REPEAL.

Section 1015 (16 U.S.C. 2514) is repealed.

TITLE V—HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

SEC. 501. TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.

Section 108 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470h) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a)” before the first sentence;

(2) in subsection (a) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this section) by striking all after the first sentence; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) Amounts transferred to the Secretary under section 5(b)(5) of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 2000 in a fiscal year shall be deposited into the Fund and shall be available, subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, to carry out this Act.

“(c) At least ½ of the funds obligated or expended each fiscal year under this Act shall be used in accordance with this Act for preservation projects on historic properties. In making such funds available, the Secretary shall give priority to the preservation of endangered historic properties.”

SEC. 502. STATE USE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION ASSISTANCE FOR NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS AND CORRIDORS.

Title I of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470a and following) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 114. STATE USE OF ASSISTANCE FOR NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS AND CORRIDORS.

“In addition to other uses authorized by this Act, amounts provided to a State under this title may be used by the State to provide financial assistance to the management entity for any national heritage area or national heritage corridor established under the laws of the United States, to support cooperative historic preservation planning and development.”

TITLE VI—FEDERAL AND INDIAN LANDS RESTORATION

SEC. 601. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to provide a dedicated source of funding for a coordinated program on Federal and Indian lands to re-

store degraded lands, protect resources that are threatened with degradation, and protect public health and safety.

SEC. 602. TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND; ALLOCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Amounts transferred to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture under section 5(b)(5) of this Act in a fiscal year shall be available in that fiscal year, subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, to carry out this title.

(b) ALLOCATION.—Amounts referred to in subsection (a) year shall be allocated and available as follows:

(1) DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.—80 percent shall be allocated and available to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the purpose of this title on lands within the National Park System, lands within the National Wildlife Refuge System, and public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—10 percent shall be allocated and available to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purpose of this title on lands within the National Forest System.

(3) INDIAN TRIBES.—10 percent shall be allocated and available to the Secretary of the Interior for competitive grants to qualified Indian tribes under section 603(b).

SEC. 603. AUTHORIZED USES OF TRANSFERRED AMOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds made available to carry out this title shall be used solely for maintenance activities related to resource protection, or protection of public health or safety.

(b) COMPETITIVE GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBES.—

(1) GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall administer a competitive grant program for Indian tribes, giving priority to projects based upon the protection of significant resources, the severity of damages or threats to resources, and the protection of public health or safety.

(2) LIMITATION.—The amount received for a fiscal year by a single Indian tribe in the form of grants under this subsection may not exceed 10 percent of the total amount available for that fiscal year for grants under this subsection.

(c) PRIORITY LIST.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall each establish priority lists for the use of funds available under this title. Each list shall give priority to projects based upon the protection of significant resources, the severity of damages or threats to resources, and the protection of public health or safety.

(d) COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE PLANS.—Any project carried out on Federal lands with amounts provided under this title shall be carried out in accordance with all management plans that apply under Federal law to the lands.

(e) TRACKING RESULTS.—Not later than the end of the first full fiscal year for which funds are available under this title, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly establish a coordinated program for—

(1) tracking the progress of activities carried out with amounts made available by this title; and

(2) determining the extent to which demonstrable results are being achieved by those activities.

SEC. 604. INDIAN TRIBE DEFINED.

In this title, the term “Indian tribe” means an Indian or Alaska Native tribe,

band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that the Secretary of the Interior recognizes as an Indian tribe under section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a-1).

TITLE VII—FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM AND ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES RECOVERY

Subtitle A—Farmland Protection Program

SEC. 701. ADDITIONAL FUNDING AND ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES UNDER FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

Section 388 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-127; 16 U.S.C. 3830 note) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 388. FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out a farmland protection program for the purpose of protecting farm, ranch, and forest lands with prime, unique, or other productive uses by limiting the nonagricultural uses of the lands. Under the program, the Secretary may provide matching grants to eligible entities described in subsection (d) to facilitate their purchase of—

“(1) permanent conservation easements in such lands; or

“(2) conservation easements or other interests in such lands when the lands are subject to a pending offer from a State or local government.

“(b) CONSERVATION PLAN.—Any highly erodible land for which a conservation easement or other interest is purchased using funds made available under this section shall be subject to the requirements of a conservation plan that requires, at the option of the Secretary of Agriculture, the conversion of the cropland to less intensive uses.

“(c) MAXIMUM FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of purchasing a conservation easement described in subsection (a)(1) may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of purchasing the easement.

“(d) ELIGIBLE ENTITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘eligible entity’ means any of the following:

“(1) An agency of a State or local government.

“(2) A federally recognized Indian tribe.

“(3) Any organization that is organized for, and at all times since its formation has been operated principally for, one or more of the conservation purposes specified in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of section 170(h)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and—

“(A) is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Code;

“(B) is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Code; and

“(C) is described in paragraph (2) of section 509(a) of the Code, or paragraph (3) of such section, but is controlled by an organization described in paragraph (2) of such section.

“(e) TITLE; ENFORCEMENT.—Any eligible entity may hold title to a conservation easement purchased using grant funds provided under subsection (a)(1) and enforce the conservation requirements of the easement.

“(f) STATE CERTIFICATION.—As a condition of the receipt by an eligible entity of a grant under subsection (a)(1), the attorney general of the State in which the conservation easement is to be purchased using the grant funds shall certify that the conservation easement to be purchased is in a form that is sufficient, under the laws of the State, to achieve the purposes of the farmland protection program and the terms and conditions of the grant.

“(g) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—To provide technical assistance to carry out this section, the Secretary of Agriculture may not use more than 10 percent of the amount made available for any fiscal year under section 702 of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 2000.”

SEC. 702. FUNDING.

(a) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture under section 5(b)(7) of this Act in a fiscal year shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture, subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, to carry out—

(1) the farmland protection program under section 388 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-127; 16 U.S.C. 3830 note), and

(2) the Forest Legacy Program under section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103c).

(b) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—Not less than 10 percent of the amounts transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture under section 5(b)(7) of this Act in a fiscal year shall be used for each of the programs referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

Subtitle B—Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery

SEC. 711. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this subtitle are the following:

(1) To provide a dedicated source of funding to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service for the purpose of implementing an incentives program to promote the recovery of endangered species and threatened species and the habitat upon which they depend.

(2) To promote greater involvement by non-Federal entities in the recovery of the Nation's endangered species and threatened species and the habitat upon which they depend.

SEC. 712. TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS TRANSFERRED FROM CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT FUND.

Amounts transferred to the Secretary of the Interior under section 5(b)(8) of this Act in a fiscal year shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior, subject to appropriations for fiscal years before fiscal year 2006 and without further appropriation for fiscal year 2006 and each fiscal year thereafter, to carry out this subtitle.

SEC. 713. ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES RECOVERY ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may use amounts made available under section 712 to provide financial assistance to any person for development and implementation of Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Agreements entered into by the Secretary under section 714.

(b) PRIORITY.—In providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to the development and implementation of species recovery agreements that—

(1) implement actions identified under recovery plans approved by the Secretary under section 4(f) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(f));

(2) have the greatest potential for contributing to the recovery of an endangered or threatened species; and

(3) to the extent practicable, require use of the assistance on land owned by a small landowner.

(c) PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE FOR REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may not provide financial assistance under this section for any action that is required by a permit issued under section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1539(a)(1)(B)) or an incidental take statement issued under section 7 of that Act (16 U.S.C. 1536), or that is otherwise required under that Act or any other Federal law.

(d) PAYMENTS UNDER OTHER PROGRAMS.—

(1) OTHER PAYMENTS NOT AFFECTED.—Financial assistance provided to a person under this section shall be in addition to,

and shall not affect, the total amount of payments that the person is otherwise eligible to receive under the conservation reserve program established under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 and following), the wetlands reserve program established under subchapter C of that chapter (16 U.S.C. 3837 and following), or the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program established under section 387 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 3836a).

(2) LIMITATION.—A person may not receive financial assistance under this section to carry out activities under a species recovery agreement in addition to payments under the programs referred to in paragraph (1) made for the same activities, if the terms of the species recovery agreement do not require financial or management obligations by the person in addition to any such obligations of the person under such programs.

SEC. 714. ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES RECOVERY AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Agreements for purposes of this subtitle in accordance with this section.

(b) REQUIRED TERMS.—The Secretary shall include in each species recovery agreement provisions that—

(1) require the person—

(A) to carry out on real property owned or leased by the person activities not otherwise required by law that contribute to the recovery of an endangered or threatened species;

(B) to refrain from carrying out on real property owned or leased by the person otherwise lawful activities that would inhibit the recovery of an endangered or threatened species; or

(C) to do any combination of subparagraphs (A) and (B);

(2) describe the real property referred to in paragraph (1)(A) and (B) (as applicable);

(3) specify species recovery goals for the agreement, and measures for attaining such goals;

(4) require the person to make measurable progress each year in achieving those goals, including a schedule for implementation of the agreement;

(5) specify actions to be taken by the Secretary or the person (or both) to monitor the effectiveness of the agreement in attaining those recovery goals;

(6) require the person to notify the Secretary if—

(A) any right or obligation of the person under the agreement is assigned to any other person; or

(B) any term of the agreement is breached by the person or any other person to whom is assigned a right or obligation of the person under the agreement;

(7) specify the date on which the agreement takes effect and the period of time during which the agreement shall remain in effect;

(8) provide that the agreement shall not be in effect on and after any date on which the Secretary publishes a certification by the Secretary that the person has not complied with the agreement; and

(9) allocate financial assistance provided under this subtitle for implementation of the agreement, on an annual or other basis during the period the agreement is in effect based on the schedule for implementation required under paragraph (4).

(c) REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AGREEMENTS.—Upon submission by any person of a proposed species recovery agreement under this section, the Secretary—

(1) shall review the proposed agreement and determine whether it complies with the requirements of this section and will con-

tribute to the recovery of endangered or threatened species that are the subject of the proposed agreement;

(2) propose to the person any additional provisions necessary for the agreement to comply with this section; and

(3) if the Secretary determines that the agreement complies with the requirements of this section, shall approve and enter with the person into the agreement.

(d) MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary shall—

(1) periodically monitor the implementation of each species recovery agreement entered into by the Secretary under this section; and

(2) based on the information obtained from that monitoring, annually or otherwise disburse financial assistance under this subtitle to implement the agreement as the Secretary determines is appropriate under the terms of the agreement.

SEC. 715. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) ENDANGERED OR THREATENED SPECIES.—The term “endangered or threatened species” means any species that is listed as an endangered species or threatened species under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce, in accordance with section 3 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1532).

(3) SMALL LANDOWNER.—The term “small landowner” means an individual who owns 50 acres or fewer of land.

(4) SPECIES RECOVERY AGREEMENT.—The term “species recovery agreement” means an Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Agreement entered into by the Secretary under section 714.

H. RES. 497

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 701) to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 4377. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall

be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend my chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and the others who have worked with him on this bill for trying to meet a very real need in this country. There is obviously a great deal of interest in this House to have a dedicated funding stream to help us take better care of coastal areas and to fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for the other purposes identified in this bill.

This bill is certainly a major departure from the way we have handled those issues in the past, and it gives us an opportunity to take better care of these resources.

But I also believe that the Chairman's bill can be made better. It can be made more fiscally responsible. It can be made better so we take better care of the property we already have under our control, because, Mr. Chairman, there are consequences to our actions. There are severe consequences if this bill is allowed to pass in the form it is now.

My substitute which I have offered is very similar in most respects to CARA. It differs from the Chairman's bill in four primary areas: It is more fiscally responsible, it ensures that we take better care of the property the Federal government already has, it ensures that communities affected by Federal action will be compensated, and it strengthens private property rights.

Mr. Chairman, my substitute is much more fiscally responsible. Yesterday,

the committee passed the Shadegg amendment, which requires a certification on social security, Medicare, and debt. That is a good start, but they are not the only priorities we have to worry about in this budget. There are a number of other priorities.

I would refer my colleagues to today's Washington Post, a publication I am not used to citing. The Washington Post today, in one of their editorials, says, "Our objection to this bill is not the purposes but the automatic spending with regard to the competing claims on the Federal dollars."

The spending would be automatic. This program would go to the head of the line, ahead of national defense, ahead of education, ahead of tax collection, ahead of biomedical research, you name it. So we cannot automatically put this ahead of everything else without looking at the consequences.

What I do, Mr. Chairman, is say we need time to prepare the budget. We just passed a 5-year budget. We need to take time before we move it to mandatory spending to take these new priorities into account.

Secondly, we have to address the maintenance backlog that we have heard discussed in this debate. The Department of the Interior can tell us it is somewhere around \$8 billion to \$14 billion of backlog that we already have. It is big, it is getting worse, and if the Federal government takes in a lot more land under this bill, it is going to get far worse than it is now. My substitute has a dedicated fund for maintenance, and it can only be used for maintenance.

Also, it requires that the maintenance backlog go down by 5 percent a year. If it does not go down to meet those targets, then the acquisition funds are reduced, so we have a guarantee that we deal with this maintenance problem which has plagued us.

Third, my substitute makes the PILT payments mandatory. My substitute makes the PILT payments mandatory. We cannot ignore the consequences of our actions when the Federal government takes land off the private property rolls. That is going to grow under this bill.

To say that PILT should be a matching program so if in Congress's discretion we happen to fund it that year I think is wrong. It needs to be mandatory like the rest of it, to ensure that these communities are compensated for the lack of the tax roll.

Finally, my bill strengthens property rights. We have heard some of these property issues previously in the debate. I also add an appraiser. The Federal government has to pay for an appraiser to get an independent appraisal when the Federal government is taking over property. I require that there be a willing seller and that land acquisitions be approved by Congress. There are other provisions here as well.

I take, in this substitute, the structure of CARA, I leave it essentially as it is, but I address those concerns that

Members have addressed throughout this debate.

I think this substitute is much more responsible. It helps us to deal with the consequences of this action. I hope my colleagues will agree and vote for it.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time to refute the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 20 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) to control, and I will claim 10 minutes in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this substitute, which in effect would kill CARA. We are getting to the end of this marathon debate now, and thanks to the hard work of the sponsors and the chairman and the ranking member, CARA has emerged relatively unscathed. We cannot lose strength now that we are nearing the finish line.

Here is some information that should make it easy to reject this substitute. Over the past day and a half, the House has already decisively defeated every significant change to CARA that is included in the Thornberry substitute. All the Thornberry amendment does is package all the proposals that the House has already discarded.

The substitute amendment would put off CARA spending for 5 years, make it difficult to undertake any Federal land purchases, and hamstring government efforts to protect existing parks and forests. We do not want to do any of the above.

Again, the House has already wisely rejected all of these ideas. I do not know why pulling all of these defeated proposals into one substitute would make them more appealing. They certainly do not do those of us who are following the details of this very important legislation.

This is legacy legislation. This is legislation for future generations. This is legislation that deals responsibly with our stewardship. This is legislation that has brought together in this Chamber, the people's House, diverse elements of this body geographically, New York, Alaska, California. Republican, Democrat, conservative, liberal, moderate, we are all together on this for all the right reasons.

What we are doing today is investing in the future and leaving a legacy to

generations that will make us all proud.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment for all of the reasons set forth by my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT). I rise in strong support of the underlying bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bipartisan compromise plan is a historic opportunity to preserve America's natural resources for future generations. It will protect endangered wildlife and improve coastal habitats. It will help towns build new ballfields and help States preserve scenic hiking trails. It encourages urban parks and protects rural farmland.

CARA does all this without creating new taxes or fees. Instead, it simply re-dedicating offshore oil and gas revenues to the conservation programs they were intended to fund.

In this time of budget surpluses, there is no reason that these fees should be diverted from their original purpose. This commonsense idea enjoys unprecedented support, with the backing of all 50 Governors and communities across the Nation.

In my home State of Maine, a coalition of more than 230 business, conservation groups, municipalities, and sportsmen's groups has rallied behind this bill. These unusual allies recognize that when we invest in our natural resources, we improve our communities, our health, and our quality of life.

In Maine, CARA funding will be used to supplement the \$50 million Land Conservation Fund that Maine voters approved with overwhelming support. It will allow us to realize once in a lifetime opportunities to protect tracts of the northern forest that have been targeted for development. CARA will help us preserve those pristine areas for traditional outdoor recreation that we in Maine have enjoyed for generations.

Mr. Chairman, this landmark bill is perhaps the most important piece of environmental legislation we shall see in the 106th Congress. By passing this measure, we can ensure that Congress meets its commitment to help States and communities preserve their natural resources for generations to come.

I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment and support the underlying bill.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleagues that the substitute retains all of the basic purposes in the underlying CARA bill. I do not change the allocations at all.

I would also remind the gentleman that whatever one could argue the original purposes of the OCS revenue was, the fact is, it has been going into the general Treasury. We cannot just jerk it out and assume we have no im-

pact on defense, education, on trying to have prescription drug benefits, on Medicare, biomedical research, or whatever else we care about. We have to prepare for the consequences of this action.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and commend him for this excellent substitute.

Mr. Chairman, many Members of this Chamber feel like I do. They support many of the conservation and resource management programs and objectives of this bill, yet they are concerned about the way the bill treats such things as property rights, land acquisition, and important budget priorities like social security, Medicare, and debt reduction.

I agree with the gentleman from New York, that this legislation has the potential for being a great legacy piece of legislation, but we have to make sure that that legacy is not a mountain of debt.

The Thornberry substitute is designed to give these Members a place to go. Simply put, this amendment provides some essential fixes to CARA. First, it defers spending on CARA to 2006, thus reducing the competition between the spending in this bill and other more important priorities, like preserving social security, strengthening Medicare, reducing the debt, and improving education.

Second, it improves and strengthens funding for PILT, payments in lieu of taxes, something vitally important for the Members of this House who represent districts, as I do, where there is already a very substantial ownership of land by the Federal government. In my district, one-third of all the land in my district, more than 1 million acres, is owned by the Federal government.

The localities in my district do not receive adequate compensation for the loss of the use of that land which could be used for a whole host of purposes that generate revenue for schools, for roads, for other local needs. Funding PILT is a very high priority, and that is a good improvement in this substitute.

Third, the substitute improves the protection of private property by protecting inholders and maintaining current property protection laws.

Finally, it ties a portion of the Federal land acquisition money to a demonstrable reduction in the \$13 billion operations and maintenance backlog in our national forests, parks, and rangelands.

To wrap up quickly, this backlog in much needed work on our currently owned Federal land is vitally important. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Forestry of the Committee on Agriculture, I can tell the

Members the pressing need we have to take care of the land we own now, and this substitute will do just that. The Thornberry amendment will move this bill in the right direction and bring us much closer to supporting conservation and resource management without jeopardizing our budget priorities, the protection of private property, and the appropriate balance between land acquisition and land maintenance.

I urge my colleagues to support this substitute.

□ 1415

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Thornberry amendment for a number of reasons, but one of the primary reasons is that my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) would delay the funding provided through CARA for 5 years. Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to delay this program any longer.

Mr. Chairman, this program is not for us; this program is for our children and our grandchildren and their children. This program is to provide a quality of life, like the quality of life we have or the quality of life that we would like to restore for future generations.

Mr. Chairman, delaying this 5 years in States like the one I represent means that hundreds of thousands of more acres of land disappear under parking lots, under housing developments, thousands and thousands and thousands of acres going to development that this bill, that this process will permit us to save.

It is for our children. It is for their environment. It is for their quality of life. To arrive at the point that we have today, the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) in one fell swoop would short-circuit this process. This process has been ongoing for years; the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), and the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), all of us have had input over a long period of time.

We have taken care to provide for resources for every State. Yes, coastal States with lots of coastal areas in high populations get a little more, and that is because the problems that I described are enhanced in those kinds of States.

If Members could all come home with me and ride from the northern part of the State I represent, New Jersey, to the southern part of the State, and if Members could have done that 30 years ago, and then do it again today, they would see the results of development pressure.

This bill will provide for enhancement of wildlife, enhancement of quality of life and be a good, a very good

thing for our children, our grandchildren and their children.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I think the last couple of days has been an extraordinary debate about a profound issue about the future of conservation for this country. This legislation, in my judgment, is as profound and may be more so than the concept of national parks and national forests to preserve the heritage of a Nation and, certainly, the world.

There has been some discussion about maintenance backlog in our national parks and our national forest, and those are legitimate questions, but I would like to pose this thought, how were they managed before Columbus came? There is a certain amount of natural processes that go into place the mechanics of creation have created.

This legislation creates the potential, if we take advantage of the opportunity, for disparate interests to collectively collaborate on land use issues. There is a lot of money coming directed towards certain States. In my district, we are, and have been for about a year, in anticipation of this legislation, bringing farmers together, real estate agents together, developers together, nonprofit people together, local government folks together. You name it, and we are beginning to understand the nature of what our region should look like to preserve those natural resources, to preserve the agricultural heritage of our districts in future years.

We did a study and looked at three things: We looked at the contribution of taxes from housing developments, the contribution of taxes from industry, and the contribution of taxes from agriculture.

For every dollar that a housing project gave to local government, local government had to give them nearly a \$1.50 back for services. In agriculture for every dollar, the farm gave to the local community, the local government only had to give 35 cents back. The argument that we need more development and more construction is just not there.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind my friend and colleague from New Jersey who argues that we cannot afford to delay 5 minutes, I would like to get all of my needs met right now, right away. I would like to fully fund the Federal obligation to special education right now. I would like to keep our promise to military retirees on their healthcare right now. The fact is, we have a budget framework we have to deal with. We have to prepare for these things.

The gentleman said that the chairman has been working on this for several years; he has. But the budget has not been prepared for several years. If we take this money out of the general fund, then something has to suffer. The budget law says that mandatory spending has to be offset in some way. What are those offsets?

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORNBERRY. No, I do not yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman I am from Maryland.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I was referring to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) who spoke earlier.

Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) talked about the maintenance backlog, which, of course, is there and is a serious problem, but my substitute addresses it far better, because under the underlying bill, there are three purposes under title VI how that money could be spent. I eliminate two of them. It can only be spent for maintenance, and I require a demonstrable reduction in maintenance backlog. It takes care of the backlog better.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO).

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of CARA, and I want to applaud the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) and members of the committee for crafting this historic piece of legislation which is on budget and fiscally responsible.

Mr. Chairman, today I stand with my two young daughters in mind. As a result of our vote today, they and thousands like them will be able to enjoy the great American outdoors long into the future. Thanks to this bill, people will be able to go clamming on Long Island in restored shellfish beds, and many other parts of the country.

They can expect to enroll their children in Little League and find a field available. They can expect to take their kids for a walk in the woods, and see the joy on their faces as they spot one of nature's creatures.

Mr. Chairman, I find it fitting that 100 years after my fellow Long Islander, Teddy Roosevelt, put in place the basic elements of our Nation's conservation program, today we are continuing that fine tradition. In TR's time, we declared the frontier closed. Today, we declare it open and available

for the enjoyment of future generations.

My district provides compelling examples of the dire environmental problems that this funding is intended to address. I represent a coastal district. With the funding afforded in title I, we look forward to working with New York State to clean up the South Shore Estuary, which enjoys widespread support on Long Island. Cleaning this body of water would be a fitting tribute to the conservation goals of this bill.

But, Mr. Chairman, for us to realize our goals, we need to respect the delicate balance of the issues that this bill addresses. As we consider this legislation, I urge my colleagues to do three things.

First, let us overcome the temptation to destroy the good in the name of perfection.

Second, let us look objectively at the protections and the opportunities that are included in this historic bill.

And, finally and most importantly, let us keep in mind this is about our children. Let us leave them something for which we can be proud. Let us demonstrate that the spirit of Teddy Roosevelt lives on in this body today. Let us support CARA and let us not support this substitute, which will undercut this important legislation.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska, the chairman of the Committee on Resources, for bringing this monumental bill forward for consideration.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN).

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time. I also applaud the gentleman from the panhandle of Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) for coming up with a pretty good substitute. I think it falls a little short in several areas.

First and foremost, it delays this program. We addressed that issue in this House decided overwhelmingly to defeat that proposal. But more than that, it delays and asks people in the communities that are most needy as far as coastlines to wait 5 years. I beg the gentleman from Texas, Louisiana cannot wait 5 years.

If my colleagues see the map beside me, the red is what we will lose over the next few short years. Five years is too much. We are losing 25 square miles a year. Times five, that is 125 square miles of Louisiana will be gone before this bill is enacted, before we can get to that point. My district may be gone by that time, because I represent 250 miles of coastline.

Second of all, a difference that the gentleman has is that he says he has \$200 million for maintenance. Well, I fall back on my first argument. If he does say that we want \$200 million, he says but let us wait 5 years before we get \$200 million. That puts us a billion dollars in backlog and also payment in lieu of taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I have a parish in the southwestern corner of my district, Cameron Parish, that is mostly owned by the Federal Government. I have worked very hard in trying to get a dedicated stream of funding to pay this poor parish so they could have the services they need.

I beg my colleagues not to adopt the substitute, it has all of the provisions that have been defeated over the last 2 nights and days in this body, but pass this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this will be the last amendment, so I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), ranking member of my committee, and also the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the committee, for their diligent effort in putting together, I think, what is the most historic piece of legislation that deals with our conservation needs in the history of this country.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would respond to the gentleman from Louisiana that the gentleman has a remedy now. He can come to this House and get more money through the regular budget process to deal with the coastal problems that he is suffering. Nothing prevents him from doing that. But I know that he also wants to be fiscally responsible, because his constituents have other needs such as education and defense and high taxes. We need to bring all of that together to sort out those priorities.

I would also remind the gentleman that my substitute requires a 5 percent a year decrease in the backlog. That begins now. And so we have to move towards where CARA will ultimately take us by putting more money towards those efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE).

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) for yielding me this time. I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that at this time there is a raging fire on the public land in New Mexico. One hundred homes have been destroyed. The fire is now around the Los Alamos National Laboratories and Los Alamos, New Mexico, is preparing evacuation.

This is because we do not have good management on our federally controlled lands. And here, this original bill without the substitute, the original bill would allow for us to acquire a lot more private land, and put it into the hands of the government. The substitute amendment is a great amendment because it gives more private property rights protections.

It is very interesting, in the beginning, in the founding of this country, our forefathers tried having property in commons and it did not work, and that is why they moved to the private property rights.

□ 1430

In fact, John Adams said the moment that the idea is admitted into society that if property is not as sacred as the laws of God and there is not a force of law and public justice to protect it, anarchy and tyranny commence. Property must be sacred or liberty cannot exist.

That is why it is so important that we vote and support this amendment because our fight is for more than property. Property must be sacred, or liberty cannot exist.

Daniel Webster understood that, and he said it very well. This body, in fact, historically has upheld private property rights until recently. In 1995, in fact, this body voted with the majority of 277 votes to extend a moratorium against any more acquisition of Federal land. Now look at us today.

We have moved in a counter position from that position, that very proud and good position, a traditional position that is emblazoned on the wall above my head, above the Speaker's head. It quotes Daniel Webster. It talks about what this Nation has been and what can be done. It challenges by saying, "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, let me rise in opposition to this substitute and recognize that the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) basically restates the Chambliss amendment, which would delay this bill for 5 years.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN) has showed us what 5 years in Louisiana means, 125 more square miles of Louisiana loss we cannot ever recover. The answer, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) said one can come to the legislature and get some money, because the other budget priorities are too important for this bill. But he has not offered, as many

other States have not offered, to sacrifice their revenue sharing from Federal lands inside the State while we do other budget priorities. Those go forward.

States like Wyoming, which have collected \$7.4 billion in revenue sharing from Federal lands inside their State, or New Mexico which has collected \$5.3 billion, those programs have not been asked to wait until other budget priorities are matched.

This substitute needs to be defeated, as was the Chambliss amendment defeated by 281 votes. But let me tell my colleagues why this bill needs to be passed when we defeat this substitute. Now, there is a reason why the National Lands Rights Alliance is against this bill. They are the ultimate property rights organization out west. They are against it because the Federal Government owns much too much of the land out west, and they know it, and one has a right to be offended by that.

There is a reason why Green Peace and Sierra and the Defenders of Wildlife and the Environmental Defense Group oppose this bill, too. They oppose this bill because we have got property rights built into this bill.

See, this has been very much of a very difficult but well-negotiated, balanced project. It is a great environmental bill that finally includes some property rights for landowners, great environmental protection for this country, but finally some property rights for landowners. Willing sellers only. A commandment to the agencies that the first priority ought to be land swaps and easements rather than acquisitions, provisions to make sure no land is regulated until it is bought. It is about time. This is a great compromise.

Let us defeat this substitute.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand the position that our colleagues from Louisiana are in. They have a problem, and they are looking for a solution. Obviously, the coast of Texas is right there next to the coast of Louisiana. We do not have exactly the same problems, but I sympathize with their position.

But there are a number of other problems around the country. I am not saying the other problems are more important than this, but I am saying that we should not automatically put this problem at the head of the line. As the Washington Post said this morning, we should not put this on automatic pilot, put it ahead of education, ahead of defense, ahead of medical research and all of the other priorities that are there.

We need to come together as a Congress and sort through those budgetary priorities. I would also add that the very valid interest that this bill tries to promote are promoted better in this substitute, because I take much better care because I have dedicated funds to go to deal with the maintenance problem. I have greatly improved private

property rights so that the League of Private Property Voters supports my substitute. I think this does a better job of accomplishing their aim.

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

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I think the House of Representatives can be very proud of itself over these last 2 days of debate. I think our constituents are going to be very proud of us because, as the beginning of our summer vacation season starts, as millions of Americans will travel to its National Parks to its wilderness areas, to its forests, to its wildlife refuges and to its beaches, they will know that the House of Representatives once again restored a promise that the Congress made to them 36 years ago and then broke; that this House of Representatives had the courage to put the money back that it had borrowed from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, almost \$13 billion, just as we have had the courage to put money back into the Social Security Trust Fund and into the Highway Trust Fund, because that is what we told the people we were going to do with their money. I hope all Members feel very proud about their work product as we defeat this substitute and pass the bill.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) for all of his effort and for his courage in working with this legislation; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) for all of the work, all of the talent, all of the history that he brought to our considerations; the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN); the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN), who made it possible for us to understand the needs, the needs of what was happening in the Gulf Coast, as was witnessed here in their closing arguments, and with the threat to wildlife, the threat to their cities, the threat to their economy; to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), who sat there during negotiations and was terribly, terribly helpful; and even the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), who I disagree with on many, many issues, but kept after us, kept after us and kept after us and wanted a set of language here on behalf of property rights that is not in existing law that strengthens the hands of individual property owners. I want to thank him for his participation.

I want to give special thanks to a person in this body that probably knows more about public land than anyone else and anyone else I have ever served with, and that is the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO). The gentleman from Minnesota is going through very difficult times now. But he has been here for every vote. He was there for all of the negotiations. His retirement from Congress is going to be a great loss on public lands.

I am very, very proud to be associated with this bill. This will be a historic bill. This will be a landmark bill. We will be addressing one of the very highest priorities of the American people. We are going to do it on a bipartisan basis. We are going to send it over to the Senate. The Senate leadership has met. They are waiting for this legislation. The Senate Majority Leader is a cosponsor of similar legislation, along with many Democratic Senators. The White House has pledged its effort to get this bill passed and get it enacted into law.

At the end of the year, Charles Kuralt, before he died, used to have at the end of his Saturday morning shows during the holiday season, he had what he called "the gifts we gave to ourselves." The camera would go out in silence for 2 or 3 minutes and visit a wildlife refuge in Louisiana or the North Slope, and we just panned the vistas. It would pan the vistas of the Grand Canyon and of the Everglades.

This is about a continuation of the gift that this Congress gives the people of the United States in perpetuity and to the people of the rest of the world who come here to see these grand, grand environmental assets.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of the substitute. Although I do not think it is the perfect document, I think it is certainly better than what we have here.

What we have here is a bill, CARA, that does three fundamentally wrong things. Number one, it abdicates the right, the constitutional obligations and responsibility of Congress, gives it to the State legislatures, gives it to the governors, gives it to unelected officials.

We hear from the proponents of CARA that 50 governors support it. Well, I would be disturbed if the governors did not support a largess of several million dollars of tax dollars given to them. Hello. What is remarkable about that? The fact is it is Federal money, and it should be spent by the Federal Government.

The other part is here we are in the Federal Government \$5.4 trillion in debt, and we are going to give this money to States that have a surplus of \$70 billion. Indeed, the State of California alone has a \$3 billion surplus. But the big underlying question is how much land should the Federal Government own?

Now, this is a map of the United States of America. We can see, okay, this is land that is up for grabs for business, for families, for development. But do my colleagues know what? One-third of this land has already been purchased by the Federal Government, and that does not include military bases. That is the equivalent of just lopping off one-third.

Now, I have asked the proponents of CARA, how much land should the Federal Government own? Should it be 25 percent? Should it be 32 percent? Should it be 50 percent? Not one person can answer that question. They will not even support a study saying how much land should be owned by the Federal Government.

The substitute measure puts some common sense into the CARA law. It tries to bridge their passion for buying land with some fiscal responsibility, saying put maintenance first, and think about the other formulas. Do not abdicate one's responsibility as a Federal Government. Do not let the United States get continued to be gobbled up by political bureaucrats.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) has 2½ minutes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard several times during the debate that we need to put these revenues towards the purpose that they were originally intended. The fact of the matter is 96 percent of the money that comes from revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf come into the general treasury. This is a different situation than the Highway Trust Fund. It is not a user fee where these funds are dedicated to help the people who pay the taxes. This is the sale of assets owned by the whole people, all of the people of the United States. They come into the general treasury.

Now, this bill is going to take them out of the general treasury and leave a big hole. My point is we need to plan on how we are going to fill that hole. Where is it going to come from? Is it going to come from education, biomedical research, defense, tax relief? We need to plan.

So my amendment delays moving this to mandatory spending. We can continue to fund the purposes of the bill, but it prevents it from being an entitlement until we can have a chance to take it into account.

Now, what my substitute also does is make CARA better. It helps improve it so it can do a better job of accomplishing the purposes that it was written to accomplish. No one has questioned that I do a better job of making sure we deal with this maintenance backlog, that we make PILT payments mandatory so they do not have to be questioned, and that we have common-sense private property rights, including an appraiser that the government pays for to make sure that people are getting treated fairly.

Mr. Chairman, there are consequences to our action. My substitute basically takes CARA and says we have to think about those consequences. We have to prepare for them. We have to prepare the budget. We have to prepare

for the taking care of these new lands that we are going to buy. We have to prepare for compensating communities that are going to lose this tax base. We have to prepare in the way of keeping private property rights sacred.

I think that is a common sense approach, and it improves the purposes of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO).

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute. I think that it was a well-written, well-thought-out, and I think well-intentioned amendment substitute to this legislation.

What the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) is attempting to do is to try to bring us back into a little bit of reality, reality of budget, reality of what our constitutional responsibilities are, a little bit of reality as to what we really should be doing with this legislation.

I can tell my colleagues I grew up in a small town, a small farming town in the Central Valley of California that is not so small anymore. It has grown. It has become somewhat of a suburb of the Bay Area. We are going through a lot of the problems that this bill is intended to address: the problem of loss of farmland, the problem with interaction with wildlife of endangered species, the problem with funding urban parks.

□ 1445

A lot of the problems that this bill is intended to go after will impact my district. It is as if it was written to directly go after the problems that I have in my district. But I have to, at the same time, tell my colleagues that I strongly oppose this legislation. The reason is that the underlying laws that this bill intends to force money toward, the underlying laws that this bill force-feeds money into, are broken.

Our Federal land management system is a shambles. We are doing a horrible job of managing the Federal lands that we currently have. There is no one in this body that can say that we are doing a good job because we are not. We are doing a terrible job. Yet we are going to put \$1 billion a year more into buying land. A billion dollars a year more into buying public lands.

The Federal Government owns a third of this country already. They own half of the State of California that I come from. And yet that is not enough. We are going to force-feed more money into it because they are doing such a terrible job of managing the lands they currently have.

The Endangered Species Act is a shambles. It is a complete and utter failure. We have been trying for the last 8 years to reauthorize the Endangered Species Act. And what is our answer to that? We force-feed another \$100 million a year into it. The Urban

Parks Program has been controversial, and many would argue it has been a failure. Our response to that is not to fix it but to force-feed more money into it. Everything that we are doing with this bill may be of a higher cause, it may be something we think is great, it may be mom and apple pie, but the truth of the matter is those programs are all broken. And we cannot just force more money into broken programs and expect that to solve the problem.

We had an amendment earlier in the debate that put more money into those programs and it was defeated. I cannot for the life of me understand how people can say they are in favor of all of these programs and then vote against giving more money to them, but that is what is happening.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the substitute and I urge defeat of the final bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Congress of the United States. This has been 2 days of very interesting debate. Everybody had their time to speak and to offer amendments. I want to congratulate those that stood with me and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER). Those that oppose me, I admire their enthusiasm and hope they will see the wisdom of supporting this legislation.

Before I go into my last closing statement, though, I want to thank Mike Henry, who has worked very hard on this bill for 2 years; as well as Liz Megginson, Lisa Pittman, Lloyd Jones, and all my staff on this side of the aisle; and, of course, the staff on the other side of the aisle, John Lawrence and Jeff Petrich.

I would suggest respectfully that the amendment that is offered as a substitute destroys everything we have done in the last 2 days. I know the gentleman does not intend to do that, but he does that. He waits for 5 years, puts everything back with the appropriators, which I think have not done an adequate job.

We have allowed this bill to go on budget. We will have the process of the budget, we will fund this program, and we will do what we should do for the future of this Nation.

For those that oppose the bill on private property rights, again I will tell them that this bill improves private property rights. It helps those people; it does not hurt them.

But more than that, may I suggest the bill, not the substitute, takes care of a problem that should have been taken care of beginning in 1964. The money put in the general budget are nonrenewable monies. They come from oil offshore, primarily Louisiana, Texas, and Alabama. They have carried

this burden to fund programs very frankly that may have merit but not what the intent was. The intent was to protect our land, our water, and to conserve, not preserve, our wildlife. Our land is for people to enjoy. This bill will do that.

This bill will heal some scars that this government created in reclamation. I believe this bill recognizes that wildlife is necessary. And for money being spent in Endangered Species, I will tell my colleagues that I have tried to amend the Endangered Species Act, and I hope to do that with the next administration, but this bill will help species from becoming endangered.

This bill will establish an area of land where the American people, the future, the young ones, can go and hunt and fish, and be alone and think, to meditate, to be away from the television and the computer. This bill will, in fact, give us an opportunity to be free. Because we have gone from a rural area to an urbanized area. We have to face this. As much as I reject it, we have to face that. If we do not take and allow room for our people, we will have a society that is not stable.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the substitute and the passage of this bill for the future generations.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 291, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

AYES—126

Aderholt	Gibbons	Metcalf
Archer	Gilman	Mica
Armey	Goode	Miller (FL)
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Moran (KS)
Barr	Gooding	Myrick
Barrett (NE)	Graham	Nethercutt
Bartlett	Granger	Ney
Barton	Hall (TX)	Northup
Berry	Hastings (WA)	Norwood
Blunt	Hayworth	Nussle
Bonilla	Hefley	Ose
Brady (TX)	Herger	Oxley
Bryant	Hill (MT)	Packard
Burton	Hilleary	Paul
Buyer	Hobson	Peterson (PA)
Calvert	Hoekstra	Petri
Cannon	Hostettler	Pickering
Chabot	Hulshof	Pitts
Chenoweth-Hage	Hunter	Pombo
Coburn	Hutchinson	Pryce (OH)
Collins	Istook	Radanovich
Combest	Johnson, Sam	Regula
Cook	Kasich	Rohrabacher
Cox	Kingston	Royce
Cubin	Knollenberg	Ryan (WI)
DeLay	Kolbe	Ryan (KS)
DeMint	Largent	Salmon
Dickey	Latham	Sandlin
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Sanford
Duncan	Linder	Schaffer
Emerson	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Everett	Martinez	Sessions
Fowler	McKeon	Shadegg

Shimkus	Stenholm	Toomey
Shows	Stump	Walden
Shuster	Sununu	Wamp
Simpson	Talent	Watkins
Skeen	Tancred	Watts (OK)
Smith (MI)	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (FL)
Smith (TX)	Terry	Wicker
Spence	Thornberry	Wolf
Stearns	Tiahrt	Young (FL)

NOES—291

Abercrombie	Foley	McDermott
Ackerman	Forbes	McGovern
Allen	Ford	McHugh
Baca	Fossella	McIntyre
Bachus	Frank (MA)	McKinney
Baird	Franks (NJ)	McNulty
Baker	Frelinghuysen	Meek (FL)
Baldacci	Frost	Meeks (NY)
Baldwin	Gallegly	Menendez
Barcia	Ganske	Millender-Gekas
Barrett (WI)	Gejdenson	McDonald
Bass	Gekas	Miller, Gary
Bateman	Gephardt	Miller, George
Becerra	Gilchrest	Minge
Bentsen	Gillmor	Mink
Bereuter	Gonzalez	Moakley
Berkley	Gordon	Mollohan
Berman	Goss	Moore
Biggart	Green (TX)	Moran (VA)
Bilbray	Green (WI)	Morella
Bilirakis	Greenwood	Murtha
Bishop	Gutierrez	Nadler
Blagojevich	Gutknecht	Hall (OH)
Blumenauer	Hall (OH)	Napolitano
Boehler	Hansen	Neal
Bonior	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Bono	Hayes	Obey
Borski	Hill (IN)	Olver
Boswell	Hilliard	Ortiz
Boucher	Hinchee	Owens
Boyd	Hinojosa	Pallone
Brady (PA)	Hoeffel	Pascarell
Brown (FL)	Holden	Pastor
Brown (OH)	Holt	Payne
Burr	Hooley	Pease
Callahan	Horn	Pelosi
Camp	Houghton	Peterson (MN)
Canady	Hoyer	Phelps
Capps	Hyde	Pickett
Capuano	Inslee	Pomeroy
Cardin	Isakson	Porter
Carson	Jackson (IL)	Portman
Castle	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Chambliss	(TX)	Quinn
Clay	Jefferson	Rahall
Clayton	Jenkins	Ramstad
Clement	John	Rangel
Clyburn	Johnson (CT)	Reyes
Condit	Johnson, E. B.	Reynolds
Conyers	Jones (NC)	Riley
Cooksey	Jones (OH)	Rivers
Costello	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Coyne	Kaptur	Roemer
Cramer	Kelly	Rogan
Crane	Kennedy	Rogers
Crowley	Kildee	Ros-Lehtinen
Cummings	Kilpatrick	Rothman
Cunningham	Kind (WI)	Roukema
Danner	King (NY)	Roybal-Allard
Davis (FL)	Klecicka	Rush
Davis (IL)	Klink	Sabo
Davis (VA)	Kucinich	Sanchez
Deal	Kuykendall	Sanders
DeFazio	LaFalce	Sawyer
Delahunt	LaHood	Saxton
DeLauro	Lampson	Scarborough
Deutsch	Lantos	Schakowsky
Diaz-Balart	Larson	Scott
Dicks	LaTourette	Serrano
Dixon	Lazio	Shaw
Doggett	Leach	Shays
Dooley	Lee	Sherman
Doyle	Levin	Sisisky
Dreier	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Dunn	Lewis (KY)	Slaughter
Edwards	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Ehlers	LoBiondo	Smith (WA)
Ehrlich	Lowey	Snyder
Engel	Lucas (KY)	Souder
English	Luther	Spratt
Eshoo	Maloney (CT)	Stabenow
Etheridge	Maloney (NY)	Stark
Evans	Markey	Strickland
Ewing	Mascara	Stupak
Farr	Matsui	Sweeney
Fattah	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Filner	McCollum	Tauscher
Fletcher	McCrery	Tauzin

Taylor (MS)	Udall (NM)	Weller
Thompson (CA)	Upton	Wexler
Thompson (MS)	Velazquez	Weygand
Thune	Visclosky	Whitfield
Vitter	Vitter	Wilson
Tierney	Waters	Woolsey
Towns	Watt (NC)	Wu
Traficant	Waxman	Wynn
Turner	Weiner	Young (AK)
Udall (CO)	Weldon (PA)	

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	Dingell	Sherwood
Bliley	Lofgren	Thomas
Boehner	Lucas (OK)	Vento
Campbell	McCarthy (MO)	Walsh
Coble	McInnis	Wise
DeGette	McIntosh	

□ 1515

Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. LEWIS of California and Mr. BONILLA changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I will vote against H.R. 701, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA).

CARA violates the Budget Act. The legislation creates a new entitlement and is inconsistent with the budget resolution passed by the House and Senate. It would and should be subject to a Point of Order. The Rules Committee, however, passed a rule that waives the Point of Order objection.

By creating a new entitlement program, the legislation reduces the power of Congress to prioritize spending. When push comes to shove, environment interests should still compete for funds with other spending priorities such as education, Social Security and Medicare. Entitlement status for this program impedes sensible prioritization of this program. As a result, it is poor public policy to expand our entitlement spending as provided in CARA.

Mr. Chairman, as a further explanation of why this bill is not good public policy, I submit the following article from today's Washington Post entitled, "A Green Bill in the House."

The House is to vote today on a bill that will pass for precisely the reason it should fail. The measure is doubly green: The purpose is environmental, and the votes have been bought. A new entitlement would be created, in part by people who in other contexts are wont to declaim against entitlements as poor fiscal and social policy alike.

About \$3 billion a year would be distributed to buy and thereby protect environmentally valuable land and for other conservation purposes. Enough members think, with cause, that their districts would benefit that the bill has 315 cosponsors. What better tribute could there be to the williness of those who cooked the measure up?

The money would come from the proceeds of offshore oil and gas leases. The spending would be automatic. The program would go to the head of the line—ahead of national defense, education, tax collection, biomedical research, you name it. The annual appropriations process in which less-favored programs

compete for funds would be waived. About a third of the money would be split between the federal and state governments for land acquisition. Another third would be reserved for coastal states, as supposed compensation for the environmental costs of offshore drilling. The rest would be artfully scattered across other purposes and districts—for wildlife conservation, urban parks, historic preservation.

Our objection is not to the purposes but to the automatic spending without regard to competing claims on the federal dollar. It's as wrong to create this carve-out as it was to yield to the highway and aviation lobbies and create similar, larger carve-outs for them in the past few years. The sponsors say that they had no choice—that the only way to ensure a steady funding stream for conservation was to bypass appropriations and spread the wealth. So which worthy programs do they do it for next? Why this and not those? That's the question this bill begs.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, and in support of the substitute amendment offered by my friend from Texas, Mr. THORNBERY.

I grew up along the Tippecanoe River in Indiana. I explored the great outdoors and learned to appreciate the value of our natural resources. This appreciation led me to realize the necessary balance required between wildlife, nature, and humans.

Growing up in a rural community, I also know that private landowners take pride in their land. They are wise stewards of their lands, seeking to pass them on to their children and their children's children.

It disturbs me, therefore, that we are considering legislation of which the major purpose is the purchase of private property by government. It provides dedicated mandatory funding for land acquisition. Proponents of CARA seem to believe that the goal of conservation can be reached if only the federal government controlled more land. But the federal government already owns 670 million acres of land—that's one-third of the land in the U.S.—and it can't take care of it. Currently our national parks, recreation areas, wildlife areas and other federally owned properties have a multi-billion dollar backlog of maintenance needs. Maintenance of trails, park benches, roads, camping sites, bathrooms, water and sewage infrastructure and housing for administrative and management employees are among the unmet needs. GAO estimates the maintenance backlog at over \$12 billion. Yet this bill provides little money to address this backlog, compared to the funds for land acquisition. It is irresponsible that while the government can not take care of what it already owns, we are adding mandatory funds to purchase even more land.

I am also concerned that payments made to local governments by the federal government to offset the loss to the local tax base of federal property is given a lower priority than land acquisition. Local governments with large federal holdings are struggling to provide adequately for their school systems because the federal government does not adequately address its obligations to local communities. While the bill provides PILT funding from interest payments to the fund, land acquisition gets guaranteed funding. Funding for PILT should be given at least the same or even higher priority than land acquisition. Urban communities—which will receive guaranteed funding

under the bill—have other tax base supporters on which to draw to make up shortfalls for publicly-held lands, while rural areas—where the bulk of the land acquisition is likely to take place—have far fewer revenue streams to rely upon.

Finally, while I hear the argument of the bill's supporters, who say that private property rights are increased and that Congress must approve acquisition from unwilling sellers; the fact remains that half the funds for land acquisitions flow to the States, whose property rights protections we are limited in our ability to influence.

Mr. Chairman, farming is one of the major occupations in my district. Farmers truly love the land, it's their life's blood. Farmers are a crucial ingredient in preserving our open spaces and wildlife habitat. Yet the farm community, including the American Farm Bureau, opposes this bill because it does not truly address the needs and concerns of farmers.

The CARA bill, as currently written, falls short of what is needed to address our conservation and preservation needs in a comprehensive fashion. That's why I urge my House colleagues to support the Thornberry substitute which establishes a dedicated fund for maintenance, makes PILT funding mandatory, and strengthens private property rights.

Mr. Chairman, there is a better way for us to get to our shared goal of environmental preservation and conservation than the CARA bill. For the best interests of farmers, ranchers, landowners, and for those who love nature, we should take this alternate route.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 701, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA), legislation which I cosponsored. This is landmark legislation indeed and an exceptional example of bipartisan cooperation creating comprehensive legislation to conserve our nation's natural treasures and preserve the environment as a legacy for generations to come.

I believe that we do not inherit the earth from our parents, but instead we are stewards of the earth who must preserve it for our children and our children's children. CARA enables the federal government, in partnership with states and local governments, to fund a wide variety of conservation activities. This legislation fully funds the Land and Water Conservation Fund, increases funding for state fish and wildlife programs, increases incentives for voluntary actions to conserve endangered species by private landowners, and increases support for coastal conservation programs and conservation easements.

As we experience record growth in my home state of Colorado, the ability to enjoy open space has become more important, and the need to preserve the unique natural beauty that brought many to the state has become more apparent. The public looks to the government for help conserving land, water and open space. This legislation strikes an important balance to fully fund these worthwhile efforts. As a result, it has garnered the support of all 50 governors and over 4500 organizations, businesses, elected officials and government entities. It is high time for the Congress to make a strong commitment to the environment by investing in wildlife conservation, open space, farmland and historic preservation, recreation, parks, and endangered species recovery.

I am proud to lend my strong support to this legislation.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, as I walk through the neighborhoods and communities throughout Macomb and St. Clair Counties, among the top issues raised with me is the need to have more parks and open spaces, and the need to protect farmland.

While our local communities need to make smart decisions about growth and open space preservation, there is a federal role to play.

That's what this bill is all about.

Our bill will provide a reliable funding source so that communities like Roseville can improve their Veterans Memorial Park.

Or so that Port Huron can link up to a statewide network of bike and hike trails.

Or so that apple, dairy and sugarbeet farmers in Macomb and St. Clair Counties can afford to keep their land for agricultural purposes.

Or so that Shelby Township can preserve a historic stop on the underground railroad.

These are quality of life improvements with which our communities could use some assistance, and that's why I support this bill.

There are, however, a few things we can still do to make a good bill better.

We can make sure that states develop concrete plans to prioritize and target how money from the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Fund will be spent in order to effectively conserve our wildlife heritage.

We need to be sure that, in our efforts to provide full and secure funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, we do, in fact, use the money to conserve, protect and purchase our precious and special places.

And we should make it clear that this bill does not encourage oil drilling off the Coast of Alaska or any other state—including preventing the use of these funds for environmentally damaging infrastructure.

As we move forward, I am willing to work with my colleagues in the House and Senate, and with the Administration, to try to further improve this important bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a landmark bill—one that defines bipartisanship in the most extreme form. If you can imagine GEORGE MILLER and DON YOUNG reaching agreement on a measure to spend billions in federal funding to protect the environment. Now, that is a landmark.

I commend my colleagues, Mr. MILLER and Mr. YOUNG, for their ingenuity, tenacity and civility in bringing this legislation to the floor.

H.R. 701 represents a major first step in bringing funding in line with our federal priorities to protect natural resources and open spaces across the country. This bill is supported by 75 percent of the House membership.

The investment H.R. 701 makes in our natural resources will have a lasting effect. From acquiring lands for areas of national significance to developing programs for inner-city youth, its impact will resonate throughout future generations who will enjoy new sources of recreation.

H.R. 701 brings certainty to the protection of our natural resources by putting in place permanent funding for land acquisition for conservation purposes by setting aside OCS oil royalties in the Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA) Fund. Adequate funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund is long overdue. After years of patiently waiting for OCS revenues to be used for their intended purpose—land acquisition—Mr. MILLER

and Mr. YOUNG have resorted to this unique alliance to deliver what has long been promised.

Under the CARA Fund, \$2.8 billion each year would be allotted for programs receiving mandatory funding to include the following: \$1 billion for coastal conservation; \$900 million for the Land and Water Conservation Fund; \$350 million for wildlife conservation; \$125 million for urban parks and recreation; \$100 million for historic preservation; \$200 million for federal and Indian land restoration; \$100 million for farmland protection and \$50 million for endangered species recovery.

Again, I commend Mr. MILLER and Mr. YOUNG for their work on this bill and for their efforts to protect our nation's natural resources. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 701.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 701, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA) brought forth by Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member MILLER of the House Resources Committee. H.R. 701 is the product of a historic, truly bipartisan effort to bring to the House floor landmark environmental legislation that would go far to protect our nation's resources for future generations.

The Conservation and Reinvestment Act is based on a vision that began in 1964 with the creation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). The LWCF provided for a dedicated source of revenue to be devoted from offshore oil production towards preserving our natural resources. However, during the past 15 years, over \$11 billion of that supposedly guaranteed source of revenue has been diverted to other programs.

H.R. 701 is a balanced measure that addresses urgent public resource needs while at the same time respecting legitimate concerns related to private property. Over three-quarters of the House support the bill, which would set aside nearly \$3 billion annually for various conservation, resource protection, and recreation initiatives. These include: the allocation of \$900 million for LWCF, \$1 billion for coastal conservation, \$350 million for wildlife conservation, \$200 million for Federal and Indian land restoration, \$125 million for urban parks and recreation, \$100 million for historic preservation, and \$50 million for endangered species. These funds would be made available automatically, without having to be appropriated.

In my State of Massachusetts, the passage of CARA will result in an additional \$50 million that will go far toward preserving land that will benefit the State for years to come. This includes nearly \$8 million to the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery Program, which provides 70 percent matching grants to local governments toward the revitalization and maintenance of open space that could be used for the development of recreation programs.

Now is the time for Congress to provide significant new resources to support State and community efforts to protect wildlife and local green spaces, reinforce Federal efforts to save national and historic treasures and expand efforts at all levels to protect ocean and coastal resources. Passage of CARA will represent one of the most important environmental issues that Congress passes this year as the measure would restore the government's promise of protecting lands and resources nationwide and would eliminate the inclusion of incentives for additional offshore drilling.

With this in mind, I urge each of my colleagues to give H.R. 701, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, and the manager's amendment their strongest support.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 701, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA). This legislation offers a historic opportunity to invest in our natural legacy by ensuring adequate funding for open space, recreation, and land and water conservation.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) was established by Congress in 1965 as the primary vehicle for funding land conservation efforts in the United States. The Federal Government uses LWCF funds for acquisition of our national parks, forests, beaches, and wildlife refuges.

Since coming to Congress in 1993, I have consistently supported the principle behind LWCF—reinvest the revenues earned from the depletion of offshore oil and gas resources in the conservation of other lasting natural resources. Unfortunately, the promise of LWCF has never been fully realized. As a result, many opportunities to conserve precious lands and work with our State and local partners in conservation efforts have been lost.

As a member of the House Budget Committee, I have strongly opposed the raid on the LWCF to pay for other programs unrelated to land and water conservation.

Representing the most densely populated State in the Nation, New Jersey is in urgent need of all available Federal funds in order to protect our State's limited amount of open space.

If enacted, CARA would ensure that the LWCF is fully and permanently funded. In addition, CARA will provide New Jersey with additional funds to invest in open space, coastal restoration, historic preservation, urban parks, wildlife conservation, and outdoor recreations.

New Jersey citizens have already resoundingly endorsed conservation efforts by passing various local ballot initiatives and by supporting the Garden State Preservation Trust Act of 1999. CARA would ensure that New Jersey reaches our million-acre preservation goal by creating a stable source of funding.

CARA will provide unprecedented and permanent support for America's natural resources. I look forward to seeing the many benefits that New Jersey will reap if this important piece of conservation legislation is signed into law.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this important environmental legislation, which creates a permanent stream of federal matching funds, so that states can expand efforts to preserve open space, investing in conservation and recreation projects, and restoring and preserving our natural resources. This bill will achieve, among other things, the following goals: Full and permanent funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF); increased incentives for state fish and wildlife programs; increased incentives for voluntary actions by private landowners to conserve threatened and endangered species; increased support for coastal conservation programs; and increased support for conservation easements which enable private landowners to achieve conservation objectives.

This landmark bill is strongly backed by a remarkably diverse coalition of support in my San Diego district. These include landowners,

homebuilders, and realtors, police and fire departments, environmental and recreation groups, hunting and fishing clubs, public service clubs, local government officials, and even little leagues and soccer leagues. These constituents have expressed to me their overwhelming support for the conservation and recreation programs that will be provided under H.R. 701.

CARA will play a particular critical role in the future of southern California, and particularly in San Diego County. Our region, with its booming economy and exceptional biological diversity, has endured more than its share of land use conflicts. In San Diego, we have taken visionary steps to move beyond these conflicts by coming together in a partnership with local and Federal Government, the building industry, landowners, and developers, and the environmental community, in order to address the problems and balance continued economic growth with sound environmental protections. The habitat conservation plans which have been established in San Diego County have proven to be "blueprints" for similar efforts both in California and nationwide. Our experience has shown that cooperation is more efficient and effective than continued pointless confrontation.

However, these complex partnerships can only succeed if sufficiently funded to provide for lasting and comprehensive conservation of our important natural resources. It is not simply enough to "care" about the environment; we need to put our money where our mouth is. San Diego's future-oriented habitat conservation plans need adequate Federal funding in order to remain viable, and this bill will help to provide that. H.R. 701 also will, at long last, provide for complete funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), which is integral to maintaining our existing and future conservation efforts, along with urban park needs, forestry and agricultural easement programs, historic preservation, and other important initiatives.

I also want to emphasize to my colleagues and to my constituents a provision of this bill which is very important to me and to my coastal district—H.R. 701 does not provide any incentives for additional offshore oil exploration or production, or affect current moratoriums on offshore oil or gas leasing.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will provide critical assistance to conservation programs currently underway in critical backcountry habitat areas, and outdoor recreation programs in urban regions. It provides the funding necessary to benefit both the retired birdwatcher and the 10-year-old inner-city child who needs a safe open field on which to play soccer or football with his friends. I strongly support H.R. 701, and ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 701, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, and I would like to commend Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member MILLER for working together to craft this truly historic piece of environmental legislation.

Let me be clear, this bill is by no means perfect. For example, the funding formula for all seven titles of this bill could have been crafted in a more equitable manner to allow smaller States with important environmental needs like the State of Vermont to either receive more money or at least have the ability to apply for more money.

Legislation pending in the Senate, includes provisions to help smaller states like Vermont

gain access to more environmental funding, and I am hopeful as this process moves along we can find a way to include these provisions in the final piece of legislation.

Having said that, we must not allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good. For the first time in 25 years, we have the opportunity to provide a permanent and reliable source of funding to protect our environment. This legislation is indeed one of the few bright spots of the 106th Congress, and we must do everything possible to ensure that a final version of this bill is passed and signed into law this year.

H.R. 701 would enable communities all across the country to expand parks and recreation, preserve open space farmland, protect wildlife and endangered species, and preserve historic buildings—more than three times the amount currently spent on those purposes. Funding for the measure would come from the more than \$4 billion generated annually from royalties paid to the Federal Government from offshore oil and gas drilling on Federal lands.

One of the most important pieces of this legislation is full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). From parks to playgrounds, wilderness to wetlands, open trails to open spaces, the LWCF has been an American success story at the national, state and local levels. In its 35-year history, LWCF has been responsible for nearly 7 million acres of parkland, refuges, and open spaces and the development of more than 37,000 State parks and recreation projects.

Since 1968, my State of Vermont has received more than \$27 million in LWCF funds. Practically every town in the State has benefited from LWCF money. Examples of LWCF projects include State treasures such as Camel's Hump State Park and the Mount Hunger hiking trail. Many other LWCF projects are far less high-profile, but make a significant contribution to local communities. From the repair of a sewage system in a town park, to the creation of a school sports field, hundreds of these projects have enriched Vermonters' lives at the local level. In addition, these projects have assisted local authorities in funding the ever-increasing demand for recreation facilities.

It is truly amazing that LWCF has been as successful as it has been, given the fact that with the exception of one year LWCF has never been fully funded. By passing this legislation we would redeem a promise Congress made 36 years ago to dedicate a portion of the revenue stream from offshore oil production into preserving our nation's natural resources. Rarely has Congress had such an opportunity to redeem a promise that it made to the American people. We can do that today by passing this legislation.

H.R. 701 will dramatically increase federal spending on outdoor-recreation facilities and, most importantly, it will safeguard the environment. All 50 Governors have endorsed this bill, and the majority of both House Republicans and House Democrats have signed on as cosponsors.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this important piece of legislation.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 701, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999.

I support Federal funding for protecting lands that are critically important for wildlife habitat and recreation needs. But, this vote is

not a vote in support of this laudable goal. It is a vote for inequity and fiscal irresponsibility.

To start with, I cannot support a bill that literally takes money away from Arizona and funnels it into the coastal and Great Lakes states coffers. This bill is a cash cow for a few states, while the rest of us—like Arizona—fight for a few leftover scraps in an attempt to keep us happy. Under this bill, Arizona loses access to \$1 billion in Federal money. The states that have access to this \$1 billion are “coastal states,” which you may mistakenly think are states along the coast. No, coastal states are defined in this bill to include states bordering the Great Lakes, as well as Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa. Under this bill, the coastal states do quite well—Louisiana would get \$285 million, Texas takes home \$132 million, Alaska \$87 million, and California \$67 million. This is money that is guaranteed to go to these states each year. Even Puerto Rico would get \$8.5 million from this new \$1 billion entitlement program, while Arizona would receive nothing—and be barred from ever competing for any of these dollars.

It's not as if these “coastal states” aren't receiving money now from the Federal Government. The Federal Government currently shares revenue with the coastal states for some offshore drilling. In addition, these states receive offshore royalties from drilling that occurs in waters that are within three miles of their shores, which is within the state's jurisdiction.

But, this bill isn't just about inequities to my part of the country. It is also about bad fiscal policy. We have a multi-billion dollar backlog in maintenance needs on our national lands. We are struggling to maintain what we already own. This bill makes this problem worse by providing more than twice the amount of money for land acquisitions as for restoration. Under this premise, we continue to buy lands, which compound future operating and maintenance costs. This policy decision inevitably drives up maintenance costs by increasing the backlog even more.

I also oppose the budgeting aspects of this bill. We simply cannot govern a nation by compartmentalizing our budget through a myriad of dedicated funding streams. Revenues must be spent on the nation's priorities as a whole. You can't run a business by restricting cash flows to expenses directly attributable to their related sales. Could GM effectively compete in the marketplace if revenues from the sale of shock absorbers couldn't be used for maintenance of brake manufacturing equipment? No. GM can't, and neither can the Federal Government.

We need to take a step back and understand where this road leads us. I understand the supporters of this measure are gleeful at the prospect of guaranteed money every year. Wouldn't it be nice if everyone with a claim on Federal spending had a guaranteed stream of cash flowing into their pockets? But, that is not the way to run a fiscally responsible government.

Finally, I am leery of adding Federal mandatory programs like this one. By making this a mandatory spending program, by guaranteeing that all of this money must be spent each year on this one program, we are saying land acquisition is more important than dollars for our school children, that funds for species recov-

ery is more pressing than prescription drug coverage for senior citizens. I doubt anyone here today intends to make that statement, but that is exactly what we are doing.

For all these reasons—that it inequitably distributes funds among the states, that it worsens the maintenance backlog in our system of federal lands, that it furthers the fragmentation of our budget process, and that it mandates spending for one worthy purpose to the detriment of other equally important priorities—this legislation should be defeated.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to lend my voice in support of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA), H.R. 701.

My district is one of the most beautiful places in the Nation. In fact, protecting the beauty of Wisconsin and the nation is what prompted former Wisconsin Senator Gaylord Nelson to come up with the concept of Earth Day 30 years ago.

My district also has some of the most productive farmland in the Nation. But this fertile soil, and the family farms that are the backbone of Wisconsin's rural economy, are being overrun by development and sprawl. CARA will provide needed funding to protect these valuable and beautiful areas. Protection of these lands is paramount, for once the land is lost to development, it is very difficult to restore to its natural state.

But this bipartisan bill does more than just protect open spaces and farmland. It is a wide ranging measure that will help states improve and maintain parks and recreational areas. It will provide much needed funding for historic preservation and it will help keep plant and animal species from becoming endangered. This bill will provide Wisconsin with over \$25 million every year until the year 2015 for these and other vital conservation efforts. The time is now to protect our natural resources for future generations.

I understand there are concerns from some that this bill may inadvertently increase exploration and drilling offshore for more oil and gas. I share these concerns, and I agree that this is not a perfect bill. However, this bill does go a long way in protecting, preserving and securing a wide range of public lands and addresses many vital conservation needs. Today, we can seize the opportunity to save America's amazing beauty for generations to come by passing this bill. I hope we will do so.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. QUINN, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 701) to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 497, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DEFAZIO. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DEFAZIO moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Resources with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE VIII—PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE BENEFITS

No funds shall be expended under this Act if such expenditure diminishes benefit obligations of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, or the Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Is there a Member opposed to the motion to recommit?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I am opposed to the motion to recommit, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this is an important improvement to the bill and I believe it is something that every Member of the body, no matter which side of the aisle they come from, will want to vote for. This is a motion to recommit, which would immediately report the bill back as amended with this language added. This amendment is quite simple. It assures with no estimates, no nothing else, it assures absolutely 100 percent that the benefits under Social Security, and all of the Medicare trust funds and programs will not be diminished under this legislation. That is certainly the objective of all the supporters of this legislation, and I urge support for this amendment so that there will be no question about the commitment of every single Member of this House of Representatives to our senior citizens and other beneficiaries of these vital programs.

Last night, the Committee of the Whole accepted an amendment which

purported to give assurances that CARA would not be funded unless the Congressional Budget Office could certify that we would eliminate the national debt by 2013, among others. Of course the Congressional Budget Office has already testified that they cannot project what is going to happen in 2013 and that raised some questions on the floor. A number of Members on those grounds voted against that amendment as mischievous. But they also want to be certain the bill protects Social Security. So I am removing them from that dilemma.

I suspect that the vote last night was a vote against ordering a government agency to make a finding it has already declared it cannot make. But again, we want to be absolutely clear here today. The House should speak strongly in passing legislation like CARA, which does mandate spending on high priority programs, but we will not allow this initiative to diminish the benefits to millions of Americans provided by Social Security and all the Medicare programs by one penny.

The amendment I am offering, therefore, adds a new title to the bill that makes it crystal clear that expenditures under H.R. 701 will not occur if they would diminish benefit obligations under the Social Security or Medicare programs. I would note, and Members should listen, this is a stronger pro-Social Security and stronger pro-Medicare statement than that adopted last night. It is more accurate. The amendment last night did not include the supplementary medical insurance trust fund, part B of Medicare, which therefore would remain outside the protections of H.R. 701 unless my amendment is adopted.

This amendment offers Members the opportunity to be for Social Security and Medicare and CARA. Members do not have to choose. They can be for Social Security 100 percent protected out of the trust funds and Medicare, all of its trust funds 100 percent protected, and they can be for CARA. This is absolutely dispositive language. I do not believe that anyone should have any concern with adopting this stronger language.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think it is a strange turn of events that we end up with CARA discussing these trust funds, but it is very clear that to all Members of this House on both sides of the aisle, as we have evolved in the Social Security-Medicare debate in this Congress over the last decade, we have made it very clear to ourselves, I hope, and to our constituents that we would not once again go back to an old habit of invading Social Security trust funds and the Medicare program as we had in the past.

What the DeFazio motion to recommit does is make an absolute prohibi-

tion against that, so that we cannot gimmick up estimates, we cannot gimmick up certifications. We have all been there before. We have all had these estimates. If Members remember, 8 years ago we were going to have \$300 billion deficits for as far as the eye could see. Now we are telling people we have \$300 billion surpluses as far as the eye can see. The bottom line is whether or not you have invaded the trust funds. This assures that CARA goes forward, it goes forward with permanent funding, but it will not, under the prohibitions in the DeFazio amendment, invade those trust funds.

I think this serves the best interests of all Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. I thank the gentleman for offering his amendment and I would hope that it would have strong bipartisan support because it does, in fact, speak to the issues that all of us have addressed throughout our careers in the Congress of the United States while affording us the opportunity to meet one of the very, very important concerns that the American public has, and, that is, about the conservation of America's great natural resources and assets.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this does not rely on estimates. It does not rely on estimates that can be phoned up on certifications like the annual certification we see sometimes on trade issues and others. This is hard and fast dollars and cents protection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate all the work he has done on this legislation. What we have before us is a purely political move by our colleagues on the other side to cover exactly what has happened here yesterday.

Let us make a point, first on substance. The language of the motion to recommit, which we have in front of us, does not protect the trust fund. It does not protect the Medicare trust fund or the Social Security trust fund. What it says is that we will not diminish the benefit obligations. You tell me what "benefit obligations" means.

The reality is the language we offered last night and that this House voted on last night protected the trust fund for Social Security, it protected paying down the debt, it protected Medicare, and it made sure that we did not raid Medicare over time. There were four certifications. This motion today is simply an effort by the other side to join us. I am glad that they are willing to join us. I am glad that they are not stripping this language, because the language they have offered does not go nearly far enough to protect the trust fund. Indeed, on its face it does not even claim to protect the Social Security trust fund.

Last night in a vote on this floor, the vast majority of my colleagues on the other side voted not to protect the Social Security trust fund. They voted not to protect the Medicare program. They voted not to ensure that we were paying down the debt, and therefore they were willing to put at risk America's seniors and America's grandchildren.

Today The Washington Post pointed out exactly what was wrong with their position, and that is, that it puts their bill, it puts conservation and buying more Federal land ahead of every other program. If they were genuine about this, why is there not additional language in here to protect, for example, education ahead of buying more Federal land? The answer is, this is a protect-your-backside vote on Social Security and Social Security only. And if it stripped the language of the Shadegg amendment last night, then it should, indeed, be defeated. But it does not do that.

To their credit, they do not strip the critically important language that we put into the measure. They do not strip the language that Republicans adopted last night to protect Social Security, to protect Medicare and to pay down the debt by 2013 as this Congress has agreed.

□ 1530

If it were not so, if this were not just simply to protect themselves, then, in fact, they would agree to allow this to pass on a voice vote, but I assure my colleagues they will not allow it to pass on a voice vote.

Last night, we took the right steps, and I am glad that having read The Washington Post editorial which pointed out that the automatic spending in this bill was irresponsible, particularly irresponsible since we were going to have a downturn in the economy at some point in time, I am glad they have woken up and decided to protect themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues that because this is a Pyrrhic and empty amendment simply for political purposes, I urge that we adopt the motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

I want to end this 2 days on a good note. You will find out whether it is impossible or not, a good note in the sense that let us not get fighting amongst one another on this bill. If my colleagues do not believe in the merits, vote "no." If my colleagues believe in the merits, vote "yes."

I told the gentleman yesterday when this amendment was adopted and I voted against the amendment, I would not attempt to strip it, and I did not do so. I cannot control what is offered in

recommittal. It may be protecting their back side or my back side, but that is the process.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in this House and in this process which we follow. I ask my colleagues respectfully to understand each person's belief in what he stands for and vote our consciences. That is all I ask of my colleagues. That is fair, that is the way of this House of the people. That is what is right. That is what we must do.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 413, noes 3, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

AYES—413

Abercrombie Burr
Ackerman Burton
Aderholt Buyer
Allen Callahan
Andrews Calvert
Archer Camp
Armey Canady
Baca Cannon
Bachus Capps
Baird Capuano
Baker Cardin
Baldacci Carson
Baldwin Castle
Ballenger Chabot
Barcia Chambliss
Barr Chenoweth-Hage
Barrett (NE) Clay
Barrett (WI) Clayton
Bartlett Clement
Bass Clyburn
Bateman Coburn
Becerra Collins
Bentsen Condit
Bereuter Conyers
Berkley Cook
Berman Cooksey
Berry Costello
Biggert Cox
Billbray Coyne
Bilirakis Cramer
Bishop Crane
Blagojevich Crowley
Bliley Cubin
Blumenauer Cummings
Blunt Cunningham
Boehlert Danner
Boehner Davis (FL)
Bonilla Davis (IL)
Bonior Davis (VA)
Bono Deal
Borski DeFazio
Boswell Delahunt
Boucher DeLauro
Boyd DeLay
Brady (PA) Deutsch
Brady (TX) Diaz-Balart
Brown (FL) Dickey
Brown (OH) Dicks
Bryant Dingell

Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutiérrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchee
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
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
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

NOES—3

Goodling
Barton
Campbell
Coble
Combest

NOT VOTING—18

DeGette
DeMint
Kaptur
Lewis (GA)
Metcalf
Smith (MI)
Lofgren
Lucas (OK)
McCarthy (MO)
McInnis

McIntosh
Meek (FL)
Sherwood
Vento
Walsh
Wise

□ 1549

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House on the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 701, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE VIII—PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE BENEFITS

No funds shall be expended under this Act if such expenditure diminishes benefit obligations of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, or the Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 315, noes 102, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

AYES—315

Abercrombie Boswell
Ackerman Boucher
Allen Boyd
Andrews Brady (PA)
Baca Brady (TX)
Bachus Brown (FL)
Baird Brown (OH)
Baker Burr
Baldacci Callahan
Baldwin Camp
Ballenger Canady
Barcia Capps
Barr Capuano
Barrett (WI) Cardin
Bass Carson
Bateman Castle
Becerra Chambliss
Bentsen Clay
Bereuter Clayton
Berkley Clement
Berman Clyburn
Biggert Collins
Billbray Combest
Bilirakis Condit
Bishop Conyers
Blagojevich Cooksey
Blumenauer Costello
Boehlert Coyne
Bonior Cramer
Bono Crane
Borski Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner

Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gardner
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinche
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hyde
Inlee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee

Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowe
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley

Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Trafigant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

Peterson (PA)
Pombo
Radanovich
Regula
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner

Shadegg
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas

Thornberry
Tiahrt
Toomey
Visclosky
Walden
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Barton
Campbell
Coble
DeGette
DeMint
Ford
Graham
Lofgren
Lucas (OK)
McCarthy (MO)
McInnis
McIntosh
Meek (FL)
Sherwood
Vento
Walsh
Wise

□ 1601

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, today I missed rollcall Vote No. 178 and rollcall Vote No. 179 due to my son's graduation. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the motion to commit with instructions and voted "no" on final passage of H.R. 701.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote Nos. 172, 173, 175, 176, and 177, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote Nos. 174, 178, and 179 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

REMOVAL OF NAME AS
COSPONSOR OF H.R. 396

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 396.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR PERMANENT SE-
LECT COMMITTEE ON INTEL-
LIGENCE TO HAVE UNTIL MID-
NIGHT, FRIDAY, MAY 12, 2000, TO
FILE REPORT ON H.R. 4392, IN-
TELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION
BILL

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence have until midnight on Friday, May 12, 2000, to file the report on H.R. 4392, the Intelligence Authorization Bill.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON
APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE
UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, MAY
12, 2000, TO FILE PRIVILEGED RE-
PORT ON LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Friday, May 12, 2000, to file a privileged report on the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H.R. 4425, MILITARY
CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2001

Mr. HOBSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-614) on the bill (H.R. 4425) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to unofficial business at the White House, I was unable to record my vote on rollcall 154 raising a point of order against consideration of H.R. 3709, an unfunded mandate. Had I been present, I would have voted nay against the consideration of H.R. 3709.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purposes of asking the distinguished Majority Leader the schedule for the week and the remainder of the week and next week. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY).

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed its legislative business for the week. There will be no votes in the House tomorrow.

On Monday, May 15, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour, and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices tomorrow.

On Monday, no recorded votes are expected before 6 p.m.

NOES—102

Aderholt
Archer
Army
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Berry
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Cannon
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage
Coburn
Cook
Cox
Cubin
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Duncan
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Manzullo
McKeon
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Nethercutt
Obey
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul

On Tuesday, May 16 and the balance of the week, the House will consider the following measures:

H.R. 1291, the Internet Access Charge Prohibition Act of 1999;

Military Construction Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001;

H.R. 863, the Comprehensive Budget Process Reform Act;

H.R. 4205, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001;

H.R. 4392, Intelligence Reauthorization; and,

Agriculture Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001.

As we can see by the schedule, Mr. Speaker, next week will be a very busy week in the House, and Members should expect to work late nights on Tuesday through Thursday. We do, however, expect to wrap up our work for the week no later than 2 p.m. on Friday, so that Members will be able to catch flights that afternoon back to their district.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Just a couple of quick questions. On Tuesday next, might we begin the week after the suspension bills with the Budget Process Act? Is that what the gentleman from Texas and the leadership have in mind?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would continue to yield, again, I thank the gentleman for the inquiry. As we are contemplating the schedule, we are planning to take up the Internet Access Charge first, then Military Construction and then move on and, hopefully, complete the Comprehensive Budget Reform Act.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. And the other question I have to the gentleman from Texas is regarding the Older Americans Act. As the gentleman knows, we had a discharge petition filed today to bring that bill to the floor. It is an important bill. It deals with very key programs for our seniors, including the Meals on Wheels. And I would ask the gentleman from Texas when he would expect to bring the Older Americans Act to the floor?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for the inquiry. If the gentleman would continue to yield, the committee of jurisdiction is working on it. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) has advised me they continue to work on it. We recognize the importance of the bill and we would like to get it to us as soon as possible. I will advise the gentleman as progress proceeds.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and wish him a good weekend.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 15, 2000

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MAY 16, 2000

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, May 16, 2000, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Wednesday, May 17, 2000, for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 17, 2000, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday, May 17, 2000, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday Rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute requests.

INTERNATIONAL ABDUCTION

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell the story of Rayma and Rasheed El-Saleh, two children who were abducted from Cincinnati, Ohio, to Saudi Arabia in 1992 by their non-custodial father.

After an investigation led by the mother, Mary El-Saleh, the father's brother, was contacted in Lebanon and eventually the abductor called Mary and the children were able to speak to her. Rayma and Rasheed expressed how much they missed their mother and sounded depressed.

The children's father, Saleh Chenade El-Saleh, who was formerly trained as a Palestinian terrorist, is very controlling and may be abusive toward the children. He has tried to force Rasheed to testify against his mother and Rayma is apparently showing a great deal of mental stress and is threatening suicide.

Mr. Speaker, Rayma and Rasheed have been wrongfully taken from their mother and placed in a possibly dangerous situation. This House must do something to bring them and the other 10,000 American children who have been abducted to foreign countries back home.

EQUAL PAY DAY

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize today, May 11, as Equal Pay Day. Gender equity is an ongoing struggle that seeps into many facets of all of our lives. We have made a lot of progress and I hope that we will eventually see the end of Equal Pay Day, because the goal will have been achieved. Until then, we know that women do not receive a 27 percent discount on milk when they buy groceries, and they do not pay 27 percent less than men for rent or day care.

The gap between women's and men's wages has narrowed since 1963, but women still bring home only about 73 cents for every man's dollar. And equally disheartening is that the gender-based pay gap with African-American women earning 63 cents and Latino women earning 53 cents on each dollar a man earns.

Achieving equality takes not only awareness of a problem, but a coalition of those dedicated to solving the problem of eliminating the wage gap. The National Committee on Pay Equity, Business and Professional Women, the labor unions and the EEOC, have all helped lead the fight for pay equity. I thank them for representing so many women in the struggles, challenges and victories that they have faced, and I urge this body to do all on our behalf to make sure that we have the legislation in order so that every day is Equal Pay Day.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MARV SATHER, "TEACHER OF THE YEAR" FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted today to make a comment in support of a gentleman by the name of Marv Sather who is from my district, the Fifth District of Washington, who has been given the great award of Teacher of the Year for the State of Washington.

He is a high school teacher at Riverside High School and he teaches English. I had a chance to talk with him today about the future of education and about his commitment to children. The thing that impressed me most about Marv is that he has a passion for education, but he also acknowledges freely that the way he has impressed his students and become, obviously, the Teacher of the Year for our State, is to address them respectfully and deal with them on a person-to-person basis and give them the confidence that he cares deeply about their education.

Mr. Speaker, Marv Sather is a great tribute to education. He is an innovator. He is one example of the many millions of teachers who serve this country and serve our youth so well. So I say wholeheartedly, a sincere congratulations to Marv Sather for his great work in representing education nationally and representing education so well out of eastern Washington. We are proud of you.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

□ 1615

END THE EXPLOITATION OF WORKERS BEFORE CONSIDERING PERMANENT MFN

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, let me just start by commending the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for all their leadership and work on the pay equity issue. It is a very important issue, not only for women, but for families in this country, and I applaud their leadership.

Having said that, I want to tell my colleagues about another person who works. She is a 16-year-old girl. I want my colleagues to meet her. She is not a criminal. She spends her days locked up behind a 15-foot wall topped with barbed wire.

At the end of the day, she must leave in a single file from her work site like a prisoner. During the day, she assembled sneakers, applying toxic glue with her bare hands. She is not in school to make her life better. Despite all the evidence, my colleagues can see her, she is not in prison.

She works in a shoe factory in China that ships its sneakers to our department stores and our malls. She toils for \$70 a month. She could work for a month and barely afford to buy one

pair of the shoes that she makes. She works with 1,800 other young women. Ninety percent of them are between the ages of 16 and 25. By the age of 25, most of them are exhausted. In some factories, they are forced to retire.

This scene is played out over and over again throughout China's thousands of American-owned factories. Handbags made for the American market are stitched together by thousands of workers under conditions of indentured servitude, with only 1 day off a month. They work 30 days out of 31 days.

The workers earn an average, listen to this, 3 cents an hour. They are fed two dismal meals a day and are housed in a dormitory, 16 people to one very small room, crammed into this room.

When the workers protested for being forced to work from 7:30 in the morning to 11 p.m. in the evening, 7 days a week for literally pennies, pennies an hour, when they protested, 800 workers were fired.

Now, this is what American companies are doing in China. Instead of trying to create a consumer market for American goods in China, these companies are looking for cheap labor by exploiting Chinese workers.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, we want to expand market for American goods in China, but that is not what this trade deal is all about, and that is not what these companies are doing. These companies are moving jobs to China, exploiting Chinese workers, and shipping these products back here into the United States of America.

China is an export platform. American companies operating in China have an obligation to abide by internationally-recognized standards on wages and working conditions and the right to organize, so they can have a say that they do not have to work 14 hours a day, 16 hours a day for 3 cents an hour, 30 out of 31 days a month.

Regrettably, a new report was issued by Charlie Canahan on sweat shops in China. This new report shows that these companies, who are also lobbying, they are here all over Capitol Hill, lobbying for permanent MFN for China, they consistently deny human and worker rights.

But the WTO excludes labor rights from consideration and so does the bilateral deal reached with China last year. It does nothing to ensure that Chinese workers will be free from this exploitation by American companies, much less than the oppressive regime in Beijing.

If this Congress, Mr. Speaker, passes permanent MFN for China without giving workers the same protection that the WTO calls for software, compact discs, tapes, we will lose our leverage to do anything at all.

We should insist that China and American companies in China abide by internationally recognized worker rights before we even consider permanent MFN for China.

In conclusion, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that if one raises one's voice for

worker rights, for human rights, for religious liberties in China, one will end up in prison, where are thousands and thousands and tens of thousands of people are languishing in gulags today because they dare to try to create an atmosphere where they can worship their God, where they can have a decent working condition with decent wages for themselves and their families, and where they can politically participate in a government to change the way of life that is so oppressive for them and their families.

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

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

OPPOSE PNTR FOR CHINA

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, another veterans or military organization comes out against PNTR today for China. The Fleet Reserve Association, representing 10,000 members of the Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard opposes PNTR.

The Naval Reserve Association, representing 37,000 officers and enlisted members, is opposed to PNTR. The Warrant Officers Association, representing 20,000 warrant officers, is opposed to PNTR. The Reserve Officers Association, representing 80,000 officers said, "Now is not the time to grant PNTR to China."

Today, the American Legion, God bless them, representing 2.8 million veterans, came out opposed to PNTR for China.

This vote is scheduled just a few days before Memorial Day, a day in which we honor our armed forces personnel for giving their lives for our freedom. We should heed the voices of these men and women who served for us to give us this freedom, this dignity.

When we are given the opportunity, we should vote no on PNTR for China until they improve their human rights, respect religious freedom, and stop being a threat to our men and women in uniform.

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

PASSING PNTR WILL ONLY CONFIRM THAT CHINA'S BEHAVIOR WILL CONTINUE AND WORSEN

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. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is built upon a common desire to promote democratic ideals throughout the world. But as we strive to encourage democracy in developing nations, something is sorely amiss in our China policy.

When the CEOs of multinational corporations lobby for increased trade with China, they talk about access to 1.2 billion Chinese consumers. What they do not say is that their real interest is 1.2 billion Chinese workers, workers whom they pay 10 cents, 20 cents, 30 cents, 40 cents an hour.

These CEOs will tell us that increasing trade with China will force China to improve, that engagement with China will bring democracy to that Communist dictatorship. But as we engage with developing countries in trade and investment, democratic counties in the developing world are losing ground to more authoritarian countries. Democratic nations such as India are losing out to more totalitarian governments such as China where the people are not free and the workers do as they are told.

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. Corporate America wants to do business with countries with docile work forces that earn below poverty wages and are not allowed to organize to bargain collectively.

In manufacturing goods, developing democracies' share of developing country exports fell 21 percent, from 56 percent to 35 percent. Corporations are relocating their manufacturing to more authoritarian regimes where the workers do not talk back for fear of being punished.

Western corporations want to invest in countries that have below poverty wages, that have nonexistent environmental standards, that have no worker safety standards, that have no opportunities to bargain collectively. As developing nations make progress toward democracy, as they increase worker rights, as they create regulation to protect the environment, American business punishes them by pulling its trade and pulling its investment in favor of other totalitarian governments.

Decisions about the Chinese economy are made by three groups: the Chinese Communist Party, the People's Liberation Army, which controls a significant number of the business that export to the United States, and, third, Western investors. Do any of these three want to empower workers? Does the Chinese Communist Party want the Chinese people to enjoy human rights? No. Does the People's Liberation Army want to close the labor camps? I do not think so. Do Western investors want Chinese workers to bargain collectively? Obviously no. None of these groups, I repeat, none of these groups, the Chinese Communist Party, the People's Liberation Army, and Western investors,

none of these groups have any interest in changing the current situation in China. All three profit too much from the status quo to want to see human rights and labor rights improve in China.

The People's Republic of China ignores the United Nations High Commission on Human Rights. The People's Republic of China ignores the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. They ignore the State Department's country reports, and the People's Republic of China has broken almost every agreement they have made with the United States. Why would the Chinese government pay any attention to the congressional task force? Passing PNTR, passing permanent Most Favored Nation status trading privileges for China, will only confirm that China's behavior will continue and worsen.

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.)

WOMEN'S ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I spoke earlier on equal pay day, May 11, which is today, which indicates that women have had to work 4½ months longer than men to achieve equal pay. I wanted to comment a little further on that with some statistics, and then I want to go into an invitation to women as well as men to join all of us on Sunday, Mother's Day at the Million Mom March for common-sense gun legislation.

But, first of all, let me mention, women have made great strides in education and in the work force. When one looks at the statistics, the majority of undergraduate and master's degrees are awarded to women. Forty percent of all doctorates are earned by women. More than 7.7 million businesses in the United States are owned and operated by women. These businesses employ 15.5 million people, which is about 35 percent more than the Fortune 500 companies worldwide.

Women are running for elected office in record numbers. When I was first elected to the House in 1987, there were 26 women in the House and two in the Senate. In 2000, we now have 58 women serving in the House and nine in the Senate. It sounds like quite an addition. Not enough. Not enough, but certainly we can see there has been an increase.

While many doors to employment and educational opportunity have opened for women, they still get paid less than men for the same work.

Women who work full time earn less than men employed for the full time. The average college graduate woman earns a little more than the average male high school graduate. Full-time working women earn only about 73 cents for every dollar that a man earns.

That number, as I mentioned before, African American women earn only 63 cents for every dollar. Hispanic women earn only 53 cents for every dollar. We need to remember the struggle for equality is not over. Although women are and continue to be the majority of new entrants into the workplace, they continue to be clustered in low-skilled, low-paying jobs. Part-time and temporary workers, the majority of whom are women, are among the most vulnerable of all workers. They receive lower pay, fewer or no benefits, and little, if any, job security.

Women account for more than 45 percent of the work force and, yet, they are underrepresented and face barriers in the fields of science, engineering, and technology, especially.

Recently, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the most prestigious science and engineering university in the country issued a report revealing that female professors at the school suffer from pervasive discrimination.

For all of those reasons, that is why I introduced the Commission on the Advancement of Women in Science, Engineering and Technology Development Act. That was passed in the previous 105th Congress and signed into law. This Commission has met many times during this past year, and we will release their report in June of this year.

The Commission's report will help us find out what is keeping women and minorities and persons with disabilities out of technological fields at this critical time. In addition, we will have ascertained what are effective and productive policies that can address the underrepresentation of women in the sciences and could help alleviate the increasing shortage of information technology workers and engineers.

I see this as the first step in encountering the roadblocks to women in our rapidly evolving high-tech society, and it is going to help women finally help to breakthrough that glass ceiling and the silicone ceiling in the fields of science, engineering and technology.

Let me also point out that, as women retire, we are understanding the economic problems of the elderly. Women are affected in disproportionate numbers because we tend to have lower pension benefits than men. Pension policies have not accommodated women in their traditional role as family care givers.

□ 1630

Women move in and out of the workforce more frequently when family needs arise, making it more difficult for them to accrue retirement credits.

Consequently, Social Security is especially important for women. Women are heavily reliant on Social Security, and since its inception, Social Security has often been the only income source keeping women from living out their days in poverty.

As elderly women continue to outlive their male counterparts and as medical care costs for the elderly continue to rise, fundamental reform to the Social Security System will have important implications for today's female Baby Boomers and Generation Xers and for women of future generations. It is generally daughters who bear much of the responsibility for their aging parents. In this way, women of all generations will be deeply impacted if the current system is not fundamentally reformed.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge May 11 as Equal Pay Day to mark the wage disparity between genders.

Women have made great strides in education and in the work force. The majority of undergraduate and master's degrees are awarded to women, and 40 percent of all doctorates are earned by women. More than 7.7 million businesses in the United States are owned and operated by women. These businesses employ 15.5 million people, about 35 percent more than the Fortune 500 companies worldwide. And women are running for elected offices in record numbers. When I first came to the House in 1987, three were 26 women in the House and two in the Senate. In 2000, there are 58 women serving in the House, and 9 in the Senate.

While many doors to employment and educational opportunity have opened for women, they still get paid less than men for the same work. Women who work full-time earn less than men who are employed full-time. The average woman college graduate earns little more than the average male high school graduate. Full-time working women earn only about 73 cents for each dollar a man earns. That number for African-American women is 63 cents to every dollar and 53 cents for Hispanic women. We need to remember that the struggle for equity is not over.

Although women are and continue to be the majority of new entrants into the workplace, they continue to be clustered in low-skilled, low-paying jobs. Part-time and temporary workers, the majority of whom are women, are among the most vulnerable of all workers. They receive lower pay, fewer or no benefits, and little if any job security.

Women account for more than 45 percent of the work force, yet they are under-represented and face barriers in the fields of science, engineering, and technology. Recently, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), the most prestigious science and engineering university in the country, issued a report revealing that female professors at the school suffer from pervasive discrimination. That is why I introduced the Commission on the Advancement of Women in Science, Engineering and Technology Development Act. My legislation passed in the 105th Congress and was signed into law.

This commission has met several times in the past year and will release their report in June. The commission's report will help us find out what is keeping women out of technological fields at this critical time. In addition,

we will have ascertained what are effective and productive policies that can address the under-representation of women in the sciences and could help alleviate the increasing shortage of information technology workers and engineers. This legislation is a first step in countering the roadblocks for women in our rapidly evolving high-tech society, and will help women break through the "Glass Ceiling" and the "Silicon Ceiling" in the fields of science, engineering, and technology.

As women retire, we are understanding the economic problems of the elderly. Women are affected in disproportionate numbers because we tend to have lower pensions benefits than men. Pension policies have not accommodated women in their traditional role as family care givers. Women move in and out of the work force more frequently when family needs arise making it more difficult for them to accrue pension credit.

Consequently, Social Security is especially important for women. Women are heavily reliant on Social Security, and since its inception, Social Security has often been the only income source keeping women from living out their days in poverty.

As elderly women continue to outlive their male counterparts and as medical care costs for the elderly continue to rise, fundamental reform to the Social Security system will have important implications for today's female Baby Boomers and Generation Xers, and for women of future generations. It is generally daughters who bear much of the responsibility for their aging parents. In this way, women of all generations will be deeply impacted if the current system is not fundamentally reformed.

For this reason we have passed the Long Term Care Security Act. Women are the most likely care-givers when older relatives or spouses become frail or ill and need care. As more women are employed full time, it becomes more difficult for them to fill the requirements of caring for aging parents and relatives. A recent survey found that 41 percent of women who have been in care-giver roles were forced to quit their jobs or take a leave of absence, and 50 percent had to cut back their working hours to assist loved ones needing care.

Gender Equity is an ongoing struggle that seeps into many facets of all of our lives. We've made a lot of progress, and I hope that we'll work together with our partners to see the end of Equal Pay Day, because the goal will have been achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I also, for Mother's Day, invite all of the mothers, and those who care for common sense gun legislation, to meet on Sunday at the Mall to march together.

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

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

MATTERS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to briefly discuss two unrelated but very important matters of national importance.

Last year, we spent billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars bombing Kosovo. As the Scripps-Howard Newspapers said a few weeks ago, "the outcome certainly has not been a happy one." As the Scripps-Howard chain noted, "many innocent civilians killed."

How cavalierly we brush over that, "many innocent civilians killed." Hundreds of innocent civilians killed and we are not ashamed of that for some reason. Hundreds of thousands made homeless by our actions. We wasted billions of hard-earned tax dollars to make a situation many times worse than it would have been if we had simply stayed out. We bombed people who would like to have been our friends, and we bombed in a situation, and bombed repeatedly, where there was no threat whatsoever to our national security and no vital U.S. interest at stake.

To make things even worse, Newsweek Magazine this week has a major story entitled The Kosovo Coverup. Listen to what part of this article says. "An antiseptic war, fought by pilots flying safely three miles high. It seems almost too good to be true, and it was. In fact, as some critics suspected at the time, the air campaign against the Serb military in Kosovo was largely ineffective. NATO bombs plowed up some fields, blew up hundreds of cars, trucks, and decoys, and barely dented Serb artillery and armor. According to a suppressed Air Force report obtained by Newsweek, the number of targets verifiably destroyed was a tiny fraction of those claimed: 14 tanks, not 120, as claimed; 18 armored personnel carriers, not 220; 20 artillery pieces, not 450. Out of the 744 'confirmed strikes' by NATO pilots during the war, the Air Force investigators who spent weeks combing Kosovo by helicopter and by foot found evidence of just 58."

About 5 years ago, I remember reading on the front page of The Washington Post one day that we had our troops in Haiti picking up garbage and settling domestic disputes. A couple of years ago, I remember another Member on this floor saying we had our troops in Bosnia giving rabies shots to dogs. Well, I have nothing whatsoever against the Haitians, but they should pick up their own garbage. And I have nothing whatsoever against the Bosnians, but they should give their own rabies shots.

We should stop sending our troops into situations where there is no vital U.S. interest at stake and no threats to national security and turning our military into international social workers and spending billions and billions of hard-earned tax dollars in the process.

This administration has committed troops to other countries 36 times more than the six previous administrations

put together. Mr. Speaker, it is time for this type of thing to stop.

Mr. Speaker, the other unrelated topic I wanted to discuss was this pre-dawn raid of the home where Elian Gonzalez lived in Miami.

All of the polls showed that most of the people thought that this young man should have been with his father. And as a father myself, I certainly can understand that. But regardless of what people thought about the custody, everyone should have been shocked and saddened by that picture of that INS border agent in full riot gear pointing that submachinegun at that little boy. Anyone who was not shocked or saddened by that, I think, does not really appreciate freedom.

I want my colleagues to listen to what three very liberal left-wing people have said about this just recently. A.M. Rosenthal, the very liberal former Executive Editor of The New York Times said "The armed invasion of the home of Elian's relatives in Miami by federal officers combat-ready with the deadliest of military rifles, the shocking abduction of the boy seen around the world, are so unconstitutional and cruel that they keep the hope alive that this time the courts and Congress will not allow the White House to get away with it."

Laurence H. Tribe, the very liberal law professor from Harvard, writing in The New York Times said, "Ms. Reno's decision to take the law as well as the child into her own hands seems worse than a political blunder. Even if well intended, her decision strikes at the heart of constitutional government and shakes the safeguards of liberty."

And the very left wing, Alan Dershowitz, another Harvard law professor writing in the Los Angeles Times said this, "By enforcing its own order, without the judicial imprimatur of a court mandate, the Justice Department has reinforced a precedent that endangers the rights of all American citizens."

Mr. Speaker, I was a Circuit Court judge in Tennessee for 7½ years before coming to Congress, and I believe that the Justice Department has grown so arrogant, abusive, and out of control that, unless we greatly downsize this department and decrease its funding, the freedom of all Americans is in jeopardy.

NAMING OF ORLANDO POST OFFICE AFTER ARTHUR "PAPPY" KENNEDY

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to offer legislation designating the post office located at 440 South Orange Blossom Trail in Orlando as the Arthur "Pappy" Kennedy Post Office Building.

This bill, H.R. 4399, was introduced last Tuesday night. Mr. Kennedy was

Orlando's first African American city commissioner. He was a tireless advocate for the dispossessed and the poor. He died on March 28 and is survived by his children, Arthur Kennedy and Shirley Waters, six granddaughters and three grandsons, 21 great grandchildren, and numerous cousins, close relatives and friends.

Mr. Kennedy was a public servant who worked with many organizations, including the Meals on Wheels, the United Negro College Fund and the NAACP. He was never one to talk about his accomplishments, so I would like to take the opportunity to do so.

As an elected official, his negotiating skills were integral in the building of Hankins Park, and the landscaping of Parramore Street. He organized the Orlando Negro Chamber of Commerce and served on the Jones High School Parent-Teacher Association.

In 1992, the Southwest Orlando Jaycees honored Mr. Kennedy with the Lifetime Achievement Award and named the Prayer Breakfast in his honor. He dedicated his life to serving others, as evidenced by the Preserve African American Society honoring him as their Trailblazer Award.

Mr. Speaker, Orlando has lost a fine public servant as a result of the passing of Mr. Kennedy. Born in River Junction, Florida, in 1913, Pappy Kennedy moved to Orlando at age 10. He was a graduate of Bethune Cookman College and an impressive public servant whose decency will long be remembered by his friends and family.

It is with great pride that I urge my colleagues to help me designate the aforementioned post office in Orlando as the Arthur "Pappy" Kennedy Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a special note that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) will be making comments and submitting a statement for the RECORD. I also want to encourage others to join me on Sunday, Mother's Day, to participate in the Mother's Day March. There is no better way to honor mothers than a salute to mothers in support of pending legislation before this body for gun safety and to protect our children.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to offer legislation designating the Post Office located at 440 South Orange Blossom Trail in Orlando as the "Arthur 'Pappy' Kennedy Post Office Building."

This bill, H.R. 4399, was introduced last Tuesday night. Mr. Arthur 'Pappy' Kennedy was Orlando's first African American City Commissioner and he was a tireless advocate for the dispossessed and the poor. He died on March 28 and is survived by his children Arthur Kennedy and Shirley Waters; six granddaughters and three grandsons; twenty-one great grandchildren and numerous cousins, close relatives, friends and acquaintances.

Mr. Kennedy was a public servant who worked with many organizations including Meals on Wheels, the United Negro College Fund, and the NAACP. He was never one to talk about his accomplishments, so I would like to take the opportunity to do so. As an

elected official, his negotiating skills were integral in the building of Hankins Park, and the landscaping of Parramore Street. He organized the Orlando Negro Chamber of Commerce and served on the Jones High School Parents-Teachers Association.

In 1992, the Southwest Orlando Jaycees honored "Pappy" with the Lifetime Achievement Award and named the Prayer Breakfast in his honor. He dedicated his life to serving others as evidenced by the Preserve African American Society (PAST) honoring him with their Trailblazer Award.

Mr. Speaker, Orlando has lost a fine public servant as a result of the passing of Arthur 'Pappy' Kennedy. Born in River Junction, Florida in 1913, Pappy Kennedy moved to Orlando at age ten. He was a graduate of Bethune Cookman College and an impressive public servant whose decency will long be remembered by his friends and family.

It is with a great deal of pride that I urge my colleagues to help me designate the aforementioned Post Office in Orlando as the "Arthur 'Pappy' Kennedy Post Office Building." Thank you and with that I would like to yield the remainder of the time to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Congressman HASTINGS.

SAVE OUR SURPLUS FOR DEBT REDUCTION AND TAX REBATE RESOLUTION

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. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced House Resolution 490, the Save Our Surplus for Debt Reduction and Tax Rebate Resolution of 2000. I am proud of this bill in that it does something that no other bill has ever done, it provides a mid-year tax rebate to the hard-working American people.

This resolution says that Congress will direct any additional on-budget non-Social Security surplus that may be announced as early as this week or next by the Office of Management and Budget be used only for rebates to taxpayers and paying down the national debt.

Specifically, when the President introduced his budget in January, he projected a non-Social Security surplus of \$19 billion for the current year. My bill does not address what should be done with that surplus. In fact, at this time, it is unclear whether that \$19 billion will be used in a supplemental appropriations bill or for debt reduction. What my resolution deals with is any surplus in excess of that \$19 billion.

Specifically, if the OMB announces that the additional non-Social Security surplus is between \$19 billion and \$35 billion, my resolution would dedicate the entire amount over \$19 billion to debt reduction. However, if OMB projects a budget surplus of more than \$35 billion, my resolution would direct \$16 billion be equally divided and returned to the American taxpayers, with the remaining amount being used for debt reduction.

The latest speculation is that the on-budget, non-Social Security surplus will far exceed \$35 billion, meaning that this tax rebate can happen this year. And I urge my colleagues to join me in this pursuit. My plan would result in a rebate of between \$150 and \$200 to each American household. Now, some of my colleagues may not think \$150 is too much money or worth the effort. When dealing with the Federal budget and billions of dollars it might not seem like much money, but I can tell my colleagues that when it comes to the family budget, \$150 is a lot of money.

This is a prudent time to introduce and pass this common sense tax resolution. As the economy continues to grow and expand, and revenues into the U.S. Treasury have increased, we are in a time of legitimate on-budget surplus. There is a constant temptation by legislators to spend the money that comes to Washington. All of our current programs now are paid for. The big question is what to do with the left-over money.

As Ronald Reagan said, "Government does not tax to get the money it needs. Government always finds a need for the money it gets." Mr. Speaker, the money that comes to the U.S. Treasury from the American people is not the government's money. It is still the taxpayers' money, and their change should be returned.

Democrat President Grover Cleveland talked about this in his second inaugural address to the Congress in 1886. President Cleveland said, "When more of the people's substance is exacted through the form of taxation than is necessary to meet the just obligations of the government and the expense of its economical administration, such exaction becomes ruthless extortion and a violation of the fundamental principles of a free government."

In short, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers have paid the bills in full this year. We have balanced the budget, we have locked up the Social Security surplus, we have strengthened Medicare and, yes, we are paying down the national debt. Now, let us provide the American taxpayer with their needed rebate. Let us give them their change back.

I urge my colleagues to join me along with the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), and the majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and several other colleagues as cosponsors of this bill and move it forward this legislative session.

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about the decision this Congress must make regarding extending Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) to China. Over the

last several months I worked the 29th district and talked to people who have varying opinions both for and against granting PNTR to China. These many conversations have reinforced my existing belief that there is no easy way to decide whether a vote in favor or in opposition of expanding trade with China is correct.

Having been to China, I have great respect for the Chinese people, their culture, and their impressive history. The vitality is there, we should encourage it to expand. While I understand that you cannot move 1.2 billion people from communism to a free democracy overnight it appears that China has been moving backwards. Recent actions by China to prohibit the free expression of religion and their unwillingness to open their domestic markets to foreign products is very troubling.

During my tenure in Congress, I have tried to closely examine the various trade measures that the House of Representatives considered. I voted against the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), but supported the annual extension of Most Favored Nation (MFN) trading status, now called Normal Trade Relations (NTR), to China. The differences in my voting record reflects my concerns about blanket trade agreements that, once signed, will disadvantage the American producer.

As the vote on granting China PNTR looms in two weeks, I want to discuss the criteria used to develop my position on this trade agreement. There were three main components that I felt had to be met before I could support the measure: First, we must safeguard American security against a potential adversary. Second, the legislation should encourage policies allowing greater individual liberty, the rule of law, and religious freedom. And finally, American economic interests should not be harmed.

When I considered China's recent actions toward Taiwan and the possibility of a direct Chinese attack if Taiwan had decided to declare independence, I wondered how granting annual NTR to China in recent years had tempered their belligerent attitudes. This latest bluster by Beijing is comparable to the 1996 Chinese "missile test" over the Taiwan Straits during Taiwan's first democratic elections. Beijing's attempt to intimidate Taiwanese voters failed to deter them from electing President Lee Teng-hui. (Chen)

Taiwan is a vibrant democracy and its people should have every right to elect their leaders. Has granting NTR to China stopped them from taking such an aggressive posture towards Taiwan? I do not believe it has. So, when taken in the context of preserving the security of the United States, the past decisions to grant China greater trading access has not increased our national security. The United States must remain on constant alert and ready to defend Taiwan if China decides to attack. In addition, the willingness of the Chinese government to allow the stoning of our embassy last year after we mistakenly bombed their embassy in Belgrade was of great concern to me. I find it very unsettling when a nation with nuclear weapons uses such tactics to try and intimidate our government. Because of these incidents, I feel China has failed to meet the first criteria of safeguarding American security.

China's continuing problem with religious freedom has frequently caused concern in my district. China's record on religious and work-

ers' rights continues to be disappointing. Take for instance the recent imprisonment of several thousand members of the Falun-Gong spiritual movement. This peaceful organization uses meditation and exercise to promote inner strength and healing. The Chinese government has responded to this movement by systematically imprisoning the leaders of this peaceful group on charges they are attempting to undermine the Communist Party.

I find this continuing lack of tolerance by the Chinese government very disturbing because it simply reinforces the bloody images of the Tiananmen Square massacre in 1989. Cracking down on the Falun-Gong indicates to me that granting NTR, and now possibly PNTR, will have absolutely no effect on improving religious freedom. China wants Permanent Normal Trade Relations with no strings attached. Granting NTR on an annual basis allows us to retain some ability to impact the Chinese government and monitor their international conduct. Unfortunately, in light of recent incidents I now have concerns that granting PNTR will allow China to completely ignore their responsibilities to promote religious and individual freedom. Because of this belief, I feel China has failed to meet the second portion of my criteria dealing with improving religious freedoms and human rights.

Finally, I am concerned that China has yet established a judicial system where the impartial "rule of law" principle is applied. Access to an impartial court system is critical for economic development and individual freedom. Unfortunately, this principle has yet to develop in China. Companies doing business in China have little recourse if their permits to enter the domestic Chinese markets are withheld because of resistance from within the governmental bureaucracy. The Chinese judicial system is still a political tool of the Communist Party. It is not unusual for verdicts to be decided before cases even go to trial. In addition, the Chinese judicial system is responsible for maintaining social order by imprisoning political dissidents.

When I visited China two years ago, I saw a Kodak factory that was built to serve the domestic and foreign markets. During the visit I asked a Kodak representative if they had received permission to market their products in China. They had received permission by contract, but still could not serve the domestic market. Had this situation occurred in this country Kodak could have gone to court to enforce their access rights. Unfortunately, they were in China where access to a fair court hearing is questionable at best.

Mr. Speaker, China wants the foreign investment to build new production facilities that can employ the millions of Chinese workers throughout their country. However, it is becoming quite clear that any new facilities will be strictly for export purposes. The U.S. trade deficit with China has grown from \$6 billion in 1989 to \$70 billion in 1999. This staggering figure does not even include the estimated losses due to piracy of U.S. intellectual property, which in 1998 was \$2.6 billion and totaled \$10 billion from 1995 to 1998, according to the International Intellectual Property Alliance.

By granting China PNTR, we surrender the only effective economic and political voice to effect positive change in China, the annual vote to renew NTR. Growth in this new economy is very important to me, but it is because of freedom and individual initiative, not control.

There are too many protesters in prison. There are too many religious persecutions. There are too many military threats. Granting China PNTR now might be economically rewarding, but it would be morally wrong. Last year, I supported and spoke in favor of granting a one-year extension of normal trade relations (NTR) with China. I support a comprehensive engagement with China that includes free and fair trade, but only after China has demonstrated a willingness to become a responsible member of the world community. China should move toward more individual freedom not less. More negotiation with Taiwan and not military threats. China historically is a great nation and can and should be part of this global economic success, but it's not accomplished by persecution and threats. I cannot support granting PNTR to China until the government gives up its reliance on threats and intimidation to achieve their international policy goals.

MILLION MOM MARCH

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it should not take a million moms to do anything, but that is what we are going to get this coming Sunday, Mother's Day. Actually, it should not have taken the moms whose children died at the Columbine High School youth massacre.

□ 1645

It should not take the moms who are still feeling the reverberations of the Jonesboro, Arkansas, shooting. And it should not have taken what the moms at the Granada Hills Jewish Community Center in Los Angeles went through just last August.

But what has happened with the killing of youth over the past year, and it has been more than a year since Columbine, has caused the mothers of America to take the matter into their own hands, and well they might because this Congress has not taken it into its hands, to do something about it.

These mothers are coming. I do not know if there will be a million, but I know there will be a lot. And this is what they say to us, "We are putting our elected officials on notice that we, the mothers, will not tolerate them putting the gun lobby before the safety of our children any longer. We expect results, and we will hold our elected officials accountable if they do not deliver."

Mr. Speaker, these are some serious women and their families. These are some moms who wanted to test us to see whether if they come they can get the attention that the killings of children throughout the United States have failed to attract.

The moms do not doubt that every Member of this body and of the other body are seriously concerned about the deaths of these and the 80,000 children

who have died from gunfire, accidental, suicidal, and homicidal since 1979. They know we care. They do not know that we have the political will to do what is necessary to stop these killings.

I am grateful that two Members of this body, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), have introduced a Congressional resolution praising the Million Mom March. They know that this body is full of Members who support gun safety legislation and certainly the gun legislation that is pending before the House at the moment in conference committee. Because that is, by any standards, very modest legislation.

The million moms, of course, are way out in front of us on legislation. Their crusade, and it has taken on the appearance of a mother's crusade, began with a single mother, not with any special interest organization, not with any group of lobbyists sitting around trying to get our attention, but with a single mother who, following the North Valley Jewish Community Center shooting last August, simply could not take it anymore.

One mom started. And if ever there is a meaning to grassroots movement, that is what has happened ever since. It has been 9 months. There must be some symbolic importance of that time since she started this crusade. And it has grown like wildfire in every State of the Union.

It started with suburban, middle class moms. And that is very interesting as far as this Member, who represents a large city, is concerned. Because until the Columbine youth massacre, the real focus had been on the one-on-one shootings, and that is what they mostly were and mostly are, that occur in large cities because kids so easily get ahold of guns.

What has made this a national priority is that mothers and families now see that these guns know no borders and that suburban children are at least as fascinated with guns as anywhere.

So we are going to see hundreds of buses come into this town from Texas and California, to Maine and Michigan. In April they said Pennsylvania was leading in buses. By now I do not know if some other State has overtaken Maine.

Rosie O'Donnell, the television celebrity, who everybody knows is a big opponent of the proliferation of guns, is going to be the MC.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we will not find many Members of this body speaking because the moms want to speak for themselves. There will be an occasional public official speaking. But, apparently, to qualify to speak, if they happen to be a public official, they have to have been a public official who has suffered gun violence in her own family.

I love it that the march will be open not, as is the usual case, by our mayor, after all, he is not a mom, but by the woman we call Nana Williams, the

mother of the mayor. And then the moms will step forward to tell their stories and to let us know what they want.

Look, everybody else has tried. We begin in quite civil debates on the subject. The media delight in airing the subject. None of that talk has gotten us anywhere on the most modest legislation, the bill pending before us, where we literally are almost at the point of absolute agreement literally with about an inch to go and cannot get that inch accomplished.

That inch, of course, has largely to do with closing the gun show loophole, with most of us agreeing that instant checks would do it but not wanting to let the most dangerous potential owners get through because they will require at least 24 hours.

We hear about the dozen children every day who die from gunshot wounds. These do not always occur in the way, of course, that the terrible tragedy occurred at Columbine. These happen with accidents. They happen with kids playing with guns. These happen with suicides. What they all have in common is the easy availability of guns to kid.

Well, the moms, in all of their literature, insist upon speaking for themselves. Here again is what they say. "Now we moms are mad, and we mean business. We want Congress to create a meaningful gun policy in this country that treats guns like cars."

I have to tell my colleagues that I would save some time if I did not have to get my car checked or the registration renewed. But most of us understand that a car is seen as a dangerous weapon. If that is true about a car that is used normally in a quite benign fashion, I guess the moms have a point when they say they do not understand why guns cannot be treated like cars.

As I contemplated Columbine, which has weighed on my mind for the full year since it took place, I was jolted when a big-city version of the suburban tragedy in Colorado came right here to the Nation's capital at the National Zoo that the House and the Senate established long ago essentially for children.

Seven children were wounded when gunfire broke out on Easter Monday. Thank God none of them were killed. But, Mr. Speaker, one of them lies still gravely wounded in Children's Hospital here.

I, of course, have visited that family. It is a very brave family. They have stayed away from the press. They are very dignified. The family has devoted its energy to prayer and to this 11-year-old child who is fighting for his life.

They call him Pappy because when he was born he looked like a papoose. They delight in talking about him. Because this 11-year-old is no man-child. He is still a child and is still acting like a child, jumping up in his mama's bed, playing with his video games, loving his mom and his dad, and is part of

a big, extended family. So they feel a real hole in their hearts with this youngster lying in the bed.

It is interesting. His mother, in talking to me, brought up the Million Mom March. She said, you know Congresswoman, I go to all these marches. So I intended to go to the Million Mom March, but I am certainly going to go this time.

And so, she will be with me. Mrs. Bates, the mother of Harris Pappy Bates, will be marching with me and with mothers from Maryland, Virginia, and the District on Sunday.

On Sunday, we are going to start out from Freedom Plaza at 11 o'clock and we are going to march together as a region to drive home the point that we know that these borders are porous. The moms in Virginia and Maryland say they know that the guns come from their States and from other States.

We in the District have done our job in banning guns altogether. We are not asking for other jurisdictions to do exactly as we are doing, but we do think that our Government has an obligation to protect us all in the national union of which we are a part by enacting legislation to protect our kids.

So there is going to be a Metro Moms March from Freedom Plaza to the march simply to show solidarity in the region for our kids, to put aside all the rhetoric, to put aside all of the jingoism about where we are from and to stand together with our kids on Sunday and to make our own regional statement.

And just as we will be making our own regional statement, we know that mothers from every State in the Union will be carrying the flag of their State to talk about their experience and to speak directly to us, mom to Congress, about our job, our part of the job in eliminating these guns.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that one of our distinguished Members, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), has come to the floor. I yield to the gentlewoman.

□ 1700

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for her leadership and her passion on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support today's special order and to thank again the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for bringing attention to this serious problem in our Nation. It is a serious issue that is really plaguing the families and the children of our mothers. As a mother and a grandmother, I am moved by the efforts and commitment of mothers across this Nation to draw attention to the thousands of children who have been killed by gunfire. As a legislator, however, I am disturbed that we here in Congress have not heard the pleas for common sense gun legislation. Throughout this session, we have

struggled to keep the focus of Congress on gun safety, one of the most vital issues facing our country today. This Congress has sat idle for some 9 months, refusing to pass common sense legislation or to hold a simple meeting while an alarming number of America's children are gunned down every day.

Mr. Speaker, the question we must ask ourselves is why so many of our American children must die, for God sake, before this Congress takes action to end the epidemic of violence that plagues our communities and especially our families, but, most importantly, our children. In the United States today, a child dies from gunfire every 100 minutes, 12 times the rate of the next 25 industrialized nations combined. That means, Mr. Speaker, that 12 children die from gunfire each day, a classroom full every 2 days. Not one of our congressional districts is immune from gunfire which has taken the lives of children. In my district, Joe and Gerald Hawkins are but two of the victims in this cycle. The names of America's children continue to toll. George Camacho, Armondo Garcia, Yuridia Balbuena, Olivia Munguia, Jessica Yvette Zavala have all been killed by gunfire in California. What do we tell mothers when we in Congress cannot even meet to discuss common sense gun legislation that would have saved the lives of these children and save the lives of many more?

Mr. Speaker, I represent the 37th Congressional District of California, which includes the areas of Watts, Compton and Wilmington, some of the most impoverished areas in the Nation. These areas, like many in the inner city, have been riddled with gun violence. We cannot allow another child from our communities to die while this Congress refuses to move forward with common sense gun legislation.

It is quite simple. While Congress sits on the sideline, more of our Nation's children are dying each day from gun violence. Our Nation's mothers have spoken and will speak again on Sunday. The message is clear. Gun safety is about saving lives. Regrettably, the mothers of this Nation are marching on Washington and in cities across this country not to celebrate sensible gun legislation but to protest an ineptitude which has infiltrated the halls of Congress. A delegation of mothers from my district will participate in one of the two marches in the Los Angeles community. I hope and pray that our message will finally move Congress to address this issue before another day passes and more of our children are lost to gunfire.

It is unfortunate that we have let special interests and political differences interfere with a common sense approach to protecting the lives of America's greatest asset, our children. I have introduced a bill both in the 105th Congress and the 106th Congress that would prohibit any person from transferring or selling a firearm in the United States unless it is sold with a

child safety lock. Common sense gun safety measures that prevent felons, fugitives and stalkers from obtaining firearms and children from having access to guns are the types of items that we want enacted into law in this Congress.

My dear colleagues, wherever you are, we have been entrusted by the people of this Nation to be leaders and visionaries. We have a moral obligation to the people of our Nation to enact legislation before more of our children are sacrificed. Again, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, and I urge my colleagues to stand up for children and support the Million Mom March this Sunday. Happy Mother's Day to all mothers and to those mothers who will be marching on behalf of our children.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman from California for her very good intervention and for her work in this Congress on behalf of children and her work in promoting the use of Mother's Day in a particularly meaningful way this year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for all of her work on behalf of meaningful gun control legislation, and I want to thank her for allowing me the opportunity to come before this body to discuss gun control legislation and to discuss the Million Moms March. Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Million Moms March organizers for inviting me to share my thoughts on the need for gun control in this country at the Million Moms March on Mother's Day 2000 this upcoming Sunday. This is an issue which has been dear to me for quite some time.

It is with great sorrow that I come to the floor to remember the more than 80,000 children who have fallen victim to gun violence since 1979, great sorrow that is followed with great conviction, great conviction that I rise to advocate for the 13 children who statistics say die today, died yesterday, and therein will die tomorrow from gun violence.

Also on yesterday, the National Education Association held a press conference to draw attention in part to the fact that gun violence robs children of the opportunity to learn and to grow. And on the eve of the Million Mom March, we must remember that at its core the gun control issue is about opportunity. It is about the opportunity for our children to go to school and to learn without fearing for their lives. The gun control issue is about opportunity, the opportunity for our children to enjoy the wonderful innocence of youth. This is an opportunity that they all deserve.

As adults, we make life choices which may be risky or may be dangerous. For example, millions of police officers and other public safety officers go to work each and every day and willingly put their lives on the line to protect and

serve the public. But it is one thing for an adult to die in the course of performing a chosen duty. It is one thing for the parents, the family of that adult to have an element of uncertainty in their lives as their father, spouse, mother go off to perform a chosen duty. But it is another thing for a parent, for any parent, to fear for the life of a young child who goes off to school, a birthday party or even to the local grocery store.

Too often, it is a common occurrence in our Nation for these parents, these siblings, these loved ones, to engage in moments of uncertainty as our young people go off to perform in routine matters, go off to do those normal things that children do, including going to school, going to a birthday party or just going to the local grocery store. These are the routine events of a young life which should never ever be threatening.

So today, on the eve of the Million Moms March, I want every mother in my district in Chicago, every mother in Chicago, every mother across this Nation, to know that I for one stand firmly with them arm in arm, hand in hand, shoulder to shoulder. I am ready to do all that I can to bring this senseless violence to an end. The time has come. This time is now. The time has come for the Congress to listen finally to the impassioned voices of mothers and fathers from all across this Nation. It is high time that we do all that we can to give our children the most important opportunity of all, and that is the opportunity to lead a meaningful life, the opportunity to just live.

Again, I want to thank the organizers of the Million Moms March, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for organizing this special order.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for coming to the floor this evening. The gentleman from Illinois will be speaking at the march because of his own tragic loss, and I honor the moms for understanding that what public officials should speak are those public officials who indeed have a tragedy that bespeaks why the moms are here. I honor the gentleman for his participation and our prayers continue to be with him in his loss.

It is my great pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership in so many very, very important issues. Again, the issue that we address today is probably one of the most important. As I reflected on my statement this evening about the upcoming Million Moms March to be held on such an important day, Mother's Day, and focus on such a pressing issue, common sense gun safety legislation, I knew that this momentous occasion deserved profound but heartfelt words.

As I searched my soul for those words, I realized that they had already been written over two centuries ago

and could be found within one of the documents that is sitting right on my desk, the Constitution of the United States of America, for the Constitution's preamble states, "We the people of the United States in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Let me repeat the key phrase that is critical to this issue: "We the people of the United States in order to ensure domestic tranquility . . . do ordain and establish this Constitution."

Many of the opponents of common sense gun safety legislation would interpret this phrase along with the second amendment to mean that our Constitution provides for unregulated access and use of guns by individual citizens in order to protect themselves, their families and their communities. And may I add for recreational use.

On Sunday, Mother's Day, our Nation's mothers will respectfully disagree. In 1999 in one single year, 4,025 children and teens were killed by gunfire, one every 2 hours, nearly 12 every day. 1,262 children committed suicide using a firearm, more than three every day. 306 died from an accidental shooting. I ask the opponents of gun safety legislation, is this domestic tranquility? Nearly three times as many children under 10 died last year from gunfire as the number of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. Is this domestic tranquility? And American children under 15 are 12 times more likely to die from gunfire than children in 25 other industrialized countries combined.

□ 1715

I ask the question is this domestic tranquility? Sadly, many of our neighborhoods and schoolgrounds have become war zones where our children will soon be forced to wear protective gear to protect them from the piercing sting of a bullet, and, ultimately, death.

Again, I ask the opponents of gun safety, is this domestic tranquility? Is this what our Constitution allows? I submit that the framers of the Constitution created a document that serves as the foundation of our democratic society, yes, lending certain freedoms. However, it is also meant to guarantee certain protections, including domestic tranquility.

As lawmakers, it is our duty to pass legislation that breathes life into this constitutional ideal. This means that our Nation's mothers should be guaranteed the right to raise their children in a tranquil environment free from the fear that their child could be killed by gunfire in their own home, in a friend's home, or on the school playground or simply walking to a neighborhood store.

This means common sense gun safety legislation that would make guns

childproof and theftproof and would require increased background checks in order to close loopholes through which criminals gain access to guns.

And so, this evening, the profound heartfelt words that I leave with you, Mr. Speaker, are as such, on Sunday, our Nation's mothers will send us a signal that we have an obligation to uphold the ideals of the Constitution of the United States of America by ensuring that their children are afforded a world of domestic tranquility.

Mr. Speaker, it is our duty to breathe life into these words and protect the lives of our children, for our children are the living messages we send to a future we will never see. Let us rid their lives of gun war zones and replace them with tranquil homes, schools and communities by passing common-sense gun safety legislation.

Our time is running out, one child dead in the past 2 hours, 12 dead today.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), my good friend, for those very moving remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to another distinguished friend, the gentleman from Manhattan, New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my support for the Million Mom March. I am looking forward to participating in the march this weekend which welcomes concerned mothers, fathers and their children to join in the call for reasonable gun safety measures.

This House should certainly pass reasonable gun safety measures, and we should call upon the leadership to convene the conference committee that has sat for over a year without meeting because they do not want to deal with these issues.

One of the main goals of the march is to urge Congress not to pass merely some of the very mild gun safety legislation that has been considered here, which is apparently too much for the Republican leadership, but to pass, in addition handgun licensing and registration legislation. In the spirit of this effort, I strongly urge my colleagues to cosponsor the handgun licensing and registration bills, H.R. 2916 and H.R. 2917, that I introduced in September of last year.

Senator FEINSTEIN has just introduced very similar legislation in the Senate. Handgun Control, Inc. has endorsed these bills which would require States to establish handgun licensing and registration systems.

H.R. 2916 would require individuals to pass a Brady background check, take a gun safety course and obtain a photo license from their States in order to receive a license to purchase a handgun.

H.R. 2917 would require States to implement handgun registration programs.

These common sense measures are supported by about 70 percent of Americans according to the recent CNN-USA

Today-Gallup polls, if you want to own and operate an automobile, which, used improperly, can be a deadly weapon. Every State in the union requires that the automobile be registered and that you obtain a license to drive.

With respect to guns, which are by definition deadly weapons, we should take similar precautions, and as the polls I mentioned shows, 70 percent of Americans agree with this commonsense assertion.

These bills have been awaiting action by the House Committee on the Judiciary since last September. In response to the huge outpouring of support for these ideas, I, again, urge the House Republican leadership to schedule hearings and markups on these two critically important bills.

The House Republican leadership is fond of embracing motherhood and apple pie; now they should listen to the moms and pass handgun licensing and registration legislation as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to thank the organizers of the march for their efforts, and I look forward to joining many New Yorkers and tens of thousands of people from all across the country in the Million Mom March this Sunday on Mother's Day.

Let me add, I also want to thank the delegate, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for arranging this special order.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I very much thank the gentleman from New York City for coming down to offer those important remarks and remind us of our own obligations there is much we can do right now in this House to respond to the mothers. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the need for national gun legislation is brought home by the virtual futility that many of us who have succeeded in getting strong gun legislation in our own jurisdictions now see to that effort.

Many large cities in the United States, including the District of Columbia, have gun bans. There are those with the audacity, some of them on this floor occasionally to say words to the effect the District of Columbia has a gun ban, so what good are gun control laws?

Well, that is a virtual concession to the proposition that we need national gun safety legislation in order to have truly effective local gun safety legislation, and that is all we are asking. That is all we are asking. We are not asking for uniformity, but we do think there should be a minimum standard that any decent civil society should have with respect to the most dangerous weapons in that society, guns. That is what these moms, I take it, are coming to say.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to identify myself, though, with those who have become so obsessed with the national obsession with guns that when it comes to gun violence, they focus solely on guns. I do not believe that guns

are the central source for the violence in American society. I think that their role is overwhelmingly clear, the role of guns in that violence is overwhelmingly clear.

Mr. Speaker, I am a student of history, I have a Master's in history, I read history, I love my country and I love its history, and I am profoundly impressed with the degree to which violence is simply a part of our national character. It was there before guns became the pervasive weapons of choice in the streets of the cities and in the homes of the suburbs.

Violence in the American character has expressed itself throughout American history. We continue to carry forward that sense of violence as simply a part of who we are. It may have to do with the fact that we came, at least those of us who were not African Americans, or American Indians, simply came as immigrants and fought our way, one way or the other, some violently, some nonviolently, into the fabric of this country, from the time that the first settlers fought the native Americans for territory until the time that the Wild West was settled. Whatever it is, we have to face who we are and who we are are folks who have had violence as a part of who we are from the time the country came into being. It is deep within us and guns is but one expression of it.

Indeed, most of the expressions are at least overtly non-lethal, but in my judgment, they probably are as primary in causing the violence as guns are. I am talking about our movies and our videos and our cable, and I am talking about Hollywood and the networks, and I am talking about computer games. I see this as one huge stew. Guns are a part of that stew, but it is a very dangerous mixture of things that we kind of take for granted because everybody has them, as we see the increasing violence in all of the portrayals from our literature to our video portrayals. It is there, it is all around us. It cannot be avoided. We have a love affair with violence and always have had one. We have had a long, deep romance with violence.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is not that guns are the source of the problems in our city, even the problems of guns; I am saying that guns are a part of a phalanx of sources and this if we are going at the sources, if we are going at Hollywood, if we are going where the guns begin, with the parents and the communities, if we are going at the networks, then who would leave out the guns? This is a big picture. All of the actors in this picture need to sit around the same table and come to some agreement about how to deal with all the causes of violence.

All I ask my colleagues to remember, or indeed, to ask themselves, is should guns be left out of this picture. Should we take them off the table, while saying to Hollywood and the networks and computer games and cable and literature, you come and see what should

be done. As a virtual first amendment absolutist, I certainly am not calling for censorship, but I do believe if we all sat around the table and frankly admitted that when a child of 5 gets acculturated to who he is in American society through gun and violent-impacted portrayals everywhere he looks, that one should not be surprised if he picks up a gun and tries it out one day himself. Therefore, if we understand how almost as if by osmosis the violence is picked up, then it seems to me putting all of the causes on the table, we can stop the finger pointing and begin where we must begin. All I am asking is that with a million mothers coming in on mothers day, we at least begin with modest gun control legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to sit with those who over and over again tell me that there is not enough enforcement. Right, let us have more enforcement; that we have to do something about the parents, I would begin there; that the communities are racked with violence, we have to draw the churches in, absolutely. Let us sit down and figure out a strategy for that, but let us not take guns off the table. Let us not have more than a year pass since Columbine and sit on our thumbs doing nothing about it. Let us start with guns. Let us start with that youngster with a bullet in his brain in Children's Hospital. Then, let us come to work next week and put everything on the table and sit down and figure out what to do.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) today to renew our call for gun safety legislation and to highlight the Million Mom March, which will take place this coming Sunday.

As my colleagues have indicated, the Million Mom March promises to be an amazing event. This weekend I, too, will be coming back to Washington from New Jersey. I will join families from across the Nation who will take time out of their lives to come to the Nation's capital to call for passage of commonsense gun safety legislation.

It takes a special kind of parent to spend Mother's Day on Interstate 95 on a bus heading for Washington. It will be moms, and in my case and in the case of others, granddads and dads and grandmothers, but these Americans feel so strongly about this issue that they are making this commitment.

I believe this will be a Mother's Day that few will forget. Mothers are trying to demonstrate to Congress the overwhelming desire of our Nation's families for commonsense gun safety legislation.

Just a few weeks ago our Nation was shaken by events at a Michigan elementary school classroom where a 6-year-old child, a child who had barely

learned to read, knew how to kill another child with a handgun. It is the latest in a long line of gun-related tragedies.

In Columbine we thought it was the last straw, but in West Paducah, in Jonesboro, and in dozens of other communities across America, in each case we thought, this is the straw. This is the last straw. It will break the camel's back. We will get gun safety legislation moving.

Since the murder of little Kayla Roland, citizens across New Jersey have called even louder for passage of strict gun safety laws. But despite the outcry, a few politicians in Congress have been standing in the doorway and blocking the halls and refusing to act.

The National Rifle Association may control a few of the hearing rooms around this Capitol, but we are here today to say that the NRA is going to recoil from the effect of the mom squad. The hundreds of busloads from across the Nation I think will show that they have more clout than Charlton Heston and the gun lobby.

Every school I visit, every PTA meeting I attend, every classroom I teach in, moms, kids, dads, nearly everyone I talk to in New Jersey tells me it is high time that Congress take action to keep guns out of the hands of kids and criminals. They are fed up reading the headlines, and so am I.

As a new Member of Congress, I find it particularly disturbing that Congress has refused to consider this legislation this year, particularly in light of the fact that nearly one child is killed every 2 hours by gunfire.

I am sure my colleague here knows, but it is worth repeating, that more people were killed by guns in New Jersey than in Australia and New Zealand and Korea and Singapore, Japan, Canada, Germany, and Great Britain combined last year. A child in America is more likely to die from gun violence than from all communicable diseases.

Congress has passed laws that allow water pistols to be regulated by the Consumer Product Safety Commission, but real pistols, the ones that kill people, are not regulated. That needs to change.

All of us were shocked last year when a deranged gunman opened fire at the Jewish Community Center in Los Angeles, wounding several people, children, later killing a randomly selected bystander. It was a hate crime that left us numb.

But many people do not realize an additional shocking fact in that story. The gun that was used was originally a police service firearm that had been resold legally by the law enforcement agency and put back on the street. It is an all too common problem that is only recently being recognized. It makes no sense for police to work to get guns off the street, and then to put them right back there where they can be used to harm officers or civilians.

I have introduced legislation to encourage States to mandate the destruc-

tion of surplus police guns when they are at the end of their lives. Furthermore, something I have called for, some say it is politically risky, but I think we should have registration of all handguns in the United States, and licensing of all handgun owners. I have legislation to do that.

As my colleague has said, you need a license to drive a car. You need a license to catch a fish. You need a license to give a haircut or even a pedicure. You ought to need a license to own a deadly firearm. It should not take tragedies like Columbine and the recent shootings in Seattle and Hawaii to get us to admit that.

It is time for Republicans and Democrats, Independents, to look the NRA in the eye and say, enough. It is time to pass gun safety legislation now.

I think the million moms, the moms squad, will help make that change. I am old enough to remember the effect of the Mothers March for Peace. I am sure my colleague remembers this. She was too young, perhaps. But in 1961, it was the outrage of millions of mothers across America that brought us the Atmospheric Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

The power unleashed from these million moms is something to behold, I guess is the way to put it. I think this will be a Mothers Day to remember. Let us just hope that there are enough Members of Congress who hear and heed the message that these mothers bring to Washington this coming Mothers Day.

I thank my colleague for arranging this special order and drawing attention to this important subject.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I very much thank the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. HOLT, for his salient remarks. I must say to the gentleman, when he spoke about the moms and the nuclear ban treaty and said he was old enough to remember it, he might have said, "When I was a child, the mothers insisted on such a ban."

I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), if I may say so, I found what the gentleman had to say about shootings in the gentleman's own State, New Jersey, comparing them to shootings in nations, huge nations across the world, that there were more shootings in this single State than in what looked like more than a half dozen nations, I found that to be itself profoundly informative.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentlewoman will yield, the point I wanted to make, it is not a particularly large number in New Jersey relative to the other States. New Jersey also has a crime rate that is falling.

It is just that in the United States, there are 30,000 gun deaths a year in the 50 States. Among the 9 million people in New Jersey, yes, we have some, too. And it is, by any international standard, astoundingly large.

Ms. NORTON. The gentleman does point out that crime is falling, and still we are way beyond other countries. Of course, the statistics the gentleman

gave us from New Jersey very frankly could probably have been given from every State in the Union. No State I think would be excluded.

As the gentleman says, it is because we now have pervasive gun violence. None of us is safe. Some thought they were safe if they did not live in big cities. The million moms, most of whom are going to be suburban moms, are leading the country to understand that these guns are everywhere.

I very much thank the gentleman from New Jersey, unless he has some more remarks to make.

Mr. HOLT. Just following on what the gentlewoman just said, no one in America is immune. We have a society where guns are prevalent, are available, are unlocked, and dangerous.

What I hear from so many people is not that Columbine High School is a school where our children might go. In fact, Columbine High School is a school where our children would like to go. It seems to have all of the advantages: An excellent curriculum, excellent facilities. Yet, that kind of tragedy could happen there. Yes, it could happen anywhere.

Ms. NORTON. Indeed so, because when children are acculturated to violence, they get it off the television, off the same CDs, off the same networks, they get it out of the same Hollywood, we really are one Nation. Nothing, ironically, proves that more than the way in which these guns have touched every part of our Nation.

I very much thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for his very cogent intervention.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put into the RECORD what the million moms want. They are way beyond our modest gun legislation where we are trying to close a gun loophole, and where we are trying to get gun safety locks. They think that any rational human being should be doing that and should do it quickly.

They are asking for licensing and registration. They say each would work very simply and without a new bureaucracy. They say that the licensing would mean that before one got a gun, one would complete a basic safety course. Would anybody want a gun without in fact making sure that she understood everything that was associated with that gun?

There would be a check to ensure that the person was not a criminal who committed a violent crime, or a mentally ill person. There would be a photo and a thumbprint, and of course, that like any license, it would have to be renewed periodically.

Then they say they also want gun registration. The nerve of them. We have to register for almost everything. I have to make sure my car is registered because the time for that is due this year. They said what would be involved there, if you fill out a form with the gun serial number, the government would make sure, the local government would make sure that the gun buyer is

in fact licensed. A copy of the registration would go to law enforcement authorities.

Of course, there would be renewal of the registration periodically. That way, of course, the tracing of guns would be a snap, and we would make sure that the only people who got guns in the first place were like the 90 percent of the people who pass the instant gun check, those who of course are like you and me and are buying guns not to kill other people.

I want to thank the President of the United States for going with me to our academy, our police academy, where he announced that there would be some funds available for the District to do another gun buyback on June 14.

I have national legislation that would allow localities to receive small amounts from the Federal government in order to do gun buy-backs. They have been enormously successful in the District, where we set something of a precedent, and we would hope that would be repeated and that our national government would take up this notion.

I do want to stress that the million moms stress that they do not advocate the banning of guns. They want particularly their Second Amendment sisters to know that, because they cannot see any part of what they want to do that any mothers would be truly in disagreement with.

As a lawyer, I do want to answer those who are concerned about the Second Amendment. My friends, if the Second Amendment kept the modest legislation we are advocating here from going through, then how could the gun bans, total gun bans, handgun bans that we have here in the District and in every large city, have passed constitutional muster?

We can in fact regulate guns the way we regulate cars. The Second Amendment does not say that there should be no regulation. We can even regulate the time and manner of speech, and that is a more salient constitutional right than the Second Amendment. Let us not keep throwing the Second Amendment up and confusing the matter.

In the recent gun violence, in 1997, of the children killed, 191 were under the age of 10 and 84 were under the age of 5. Most of these children are not shot in shoot-em-ups, in gang wars. Most of these are suicides. Imagine if a gun had not been available. The presence of the gun in the home triples the risk of homicide in the home. If a gun is not handy, then a suicide is less likely to occur, whether by a child or an adult.

Mr. Speaker, the gun safety legislation that we have here is the least that the mothers who are coming on Sunday are entitled to a year after the Columbine youth massacre. They want much more. I think it would be an insult and a show of disrespect if, at the very least, the modest gun legislation pending before us were not forthcoming after their visit here to Washington, where the national government sits.

I know that every Member of this body has the deepest respect for the mothers. The mothers do not represent themselves as a lobby or representative of every mother. They do say they are moms, and they ask as moms for their Congress, their House, and their Senate to hear them and to respond accordingly.

□ 1745

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS FOR CHINA

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time out to talk about a very important issue that we are going to be addressing later this month here in the Congress, but I of course would join in extending happy Mother's Day to all of the mothers all over this country and all around the world, for that matter.

Mr. Speaker, the issue that I am talking about is an issue that, according to several of my colleagues, will be the single most important vote that we will cast in our entire careers here in the Congress. The question has to do with whether or not we are going to pry open a market with 1.3 billion consumers in the People's Republic of China and force this very repressive society to live with a rules-based trading system, or are we going to say that the United States of America will have nothing whatsoever to do with that sort of effort.

It seems to me that it is the most important vote that we will cast possibly in this session of Congress at least, because it really says are we going to maintain our role as the paramount global leader, and are we going to maintain our economic prosperity, or are we going to turn our backs on it and cede that to other countries in the world.

Well, I think that we have a responsibility not only to the United States of America, but to the rest of the world. Why? Because the United States of America is the greatest symbol of political pluralism. This building in which I am standing right now is the symbol throughout the world of freedom and democracy. It says to me that we have a responsibility to continue to provide the inspiration and the promotion of those things. And that is a message which I am happy to say is moving widely throughout repressive societies like the People's Republic of China. It is a message which can be sent with even greater enthusiasm if we bring the People's Republic of China into the World Trade Organization and, as I said, force them to live with a rules-based trading system.

There are many people here who regularly talk about the fact that over the last 20 years we have provided one-way

access for China to the U.S. consumer market and they have said why do we not get into their market so that our first class workers and businesses can export goods and services to those 1.3 billion consumers? Well, in the week of May 22, we will have an opportunity right here to cast a vote in favor of opening up that market so that it can benefit our workers and businesses.

But there is an issue which in many way transcends this, and is one that is of great concern to me and I know to many of my colleagues here. That has to do with the question of our western values; the things that we hold here near and dear; the recognition of human rights; as I mentioned earlier, political pluralism, making sure that we have religious freedom. Those things need to expand throughout China.

But guess what, Mr. Speaker. Since we have seen the opening of China, since what was known as the Shanghai Communique in 1972 when Richard Nixon opened China, we have seen improvements take place. There is a great deal of room for improvement. I do not stand here as an apologist for the policies that exist in Beijing, but we do have to recognize that there have been very positive steps taken that move us closer to the kind of China that the world needs.

As was pointed out by President Ford in the event that was held at the White House earlier this week, maintaining stability in Asia is in our U.S. national interest, and this is a very important issue which will play a role in helping to maintain stability there.

I think it is important for us, Mr. Speaker, to take a few moments to look at some of the statements that have been made by outspoken dissidents in China. In this morning's Washington Post, there was an article which talked about three dissidents who actually believe that granting Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China will do more than almost anything to address the very important concerns of human rights and religious freedom and those other concerns that are out there.

Tong Bao, who is one of the most prominent dissidents, actually lays out a really key distinction that needs to be made here. He talks about the division. He said that there are some in China who believe that things must "get as bad as possible."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that that is wrong. I do not think that we should have things get as bad as possible, and neither does Tong Bao. He happens to believe that it is important for us to do everything that we can to improve that situation there, and in so doing, I believe that we will create an opportunity to get our western values through Permanent Normal Trade Relations.

So I will simply close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I believe that we have a wonderful chance for success. I hope that every single one of my colleagues,

Democrat and Republican alike, will join with the Republican leadership here and President Clinton in bringing about a positive vote on this.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SHERWOOD (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of attending his daughter's college graduation.

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 Ms. NORTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes each day, May 15 and May 16.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2412. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse at 1300 South Harrison Street in Fort Wayne, Indiana, as the "E. Ross Adair Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 15, 2000, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7552. A letter from the Under Secretary, Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting a report that includes a descriptive summary of appropriations requested for each project category under the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program element and the amounts obligated or expended or planned to be obligated or expended for each project; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7553. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the Report on the Status of Pending Requests for Contract Adjustments and the Department's Plan for Eliminating the Backlog; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7554. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs: Breast Cancer Research Program; Prostate Cancer Research Program; and Defense Health Research Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7555. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement involving export transactions to Mexico; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7556. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the OMB Cost Estimate as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended; to the Committee on the Budget.

7557. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting Abnormal occurrences at or associated with any facility licensed or regulated under the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 for Fiscal Year 1999, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5848; to the Committee on Commerce.

7558. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft bill entitled, "Community Access to Health Care Act of 2000"; to the Committee on Commerce.

7559. A letter from the Lieutenant General, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Taipei Economic and Cultural Representatives for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00-28), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

7560. A letter from the Lieutenant General, Director, Department of Defense, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (Transmittal No. 00-22), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

7561. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that effective March 12, 2000, the Department is extending the 15% danger pay allowance to the entire country of Uganda, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on International Relations.

7562. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the report required by the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 describing the current conditions in Hong Kong of interest to the United States; to the Committee on International Relations.

7563. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7564. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the Month in Review: February 2000 Reports, Testimony, Correspondence, and Other Publications; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7565. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting the Performance Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities for Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7566. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the legislative proposal entitled the "Omnibus Federal Human Resources Administrative Improvements Act of 2000"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7567. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft bill, "To allow for waiver and indemnification in mutual law enforcement agreements between the National Park Service and a state or political subdivision, when required by state law, and for other purposes."; to the Committee on Resources.

7568. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, OAR, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—National Marine Aquaculture Initiative: Request for Proposals for FY-2000 [Docket No. 00309067-0067-01] (RIN: 0648-ZA82) received March 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7569. A letter from the Regulatory Policy Officer, ATF, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Increase in Tax on Tobacco Products and Cigarette Papers and Tubes [99R-88P] [T.D. ATF-420] (RIN: 1512-AB88) received March 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7570. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a proposed bill, "To amend 49, United States Code, to require manufactures of motor vehicles and items of motor vehicle equipment to test or perform other engineering analyses that demonstrate compliance of their products with all applicable federal motor vehicle safety standards, and for other purposes"; jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure.

7571. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's annual report on the implementation of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 4173; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Government Reform.

7572. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Prison Industries, Inc, Department of Justice, transmitting the 1999 Annual Report of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc. (FPI), pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 4127; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Government Reform.

7573. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a draft bill entitled the "Medicare Modernization Act of 2000"; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Commerce, Rules, the Budget, and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOBSON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4425. A bill making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the

Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BARR of Georgia (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 4423. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the authority of probation officers and pretrial services officers to carry firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Ms. GRANGER):

H.R. 4424. A bill to provide a temporary alternative to fingerprint-based background checks, allowing the Federal Bureau of Investigation the time necessary to put in place a national fingerprint-based system accessible by youth serving organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself and Mr. COBURN):

H.R. 4426. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to testing pregnant women and newborn infants for infection with the human immunodeficiency virus; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 4427. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require the payment of interest on reserves maintained at Federal reserve banks by insured depository institutions that make affordable transaction accounts available to their customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 4428. A bill to ensure that schools develop and implement comprehensive school safety plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BARCIA (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 4429. A bill to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to assist small and medium-sized manufacturers and other such businesses to successfully integrate and utilize electronic commerce technologies and business practices; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland (for himself, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. GILCREST, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. REYES, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 4430. A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11831 Scaggsville Road in Fulton, Maryland, as the "Alfred Rascon Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. BORSKI):

H.R. 4431. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide support for the modernization and construction of bio-

medical and behavioral research facilities and laboratory instrumentation; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 4432. A bill to increase the legal age of smoking from 18 to 21; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey:

H.R. 4433. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the income inclusion on a distribution from an individual retirement account or a section 401(k) plan to the extent that the distribution is contributed to a charity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SWEENEY):

H.R. 4434. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that ancestors and lineal descendants of past or present members of the Armed Forces shall be taken into account in determining whether a veterans' organization is exempt from tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 4435. A bill to clarify certain boundaries on the map relating to Unit NC01 of the Coastal Barrier Resources System; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MASCARA:

H.R. 4436. A bill to authorize a study concerning the George C. Marshall Plaza in Uniontown, Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MCHUGH (for himself and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 4437. A bill to grant to the United States Postal Service the authority to issue semipostals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 4438. A bill to provide compensation for certain World War II veterans who survived the Bataan Death March and were held as prisoners of war by the Japanese; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. LARSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BACA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. CARSON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HORN, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. DREIER):

H.R. 4439. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program for the prevention of suicide among Latina adolescents; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 4440. A bill to authorize appropriations to expand and enhance United States international broadcasting operations around the world, specifically enhancing the depth and scope of programming throughout the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 4441. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide a mandatory fuel surcharge for transportation provided by certain motor carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 4442. A bill to establish a commission to promote awareness of the National Wildlife Refuge System among the American public as the System celebrates its centennial anniversary in 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. STRICKLAND:

H.R. 4443. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Correctional Health; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DELAY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. SANCHEZ):

H. Con. Res. 322. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding Vietnamese Americans and others who seek to improve social and political conditions in Vietnam; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Ms. MCKINNEY):

H. Con. Res. 323. Concurrent resolution supporting peace and democracy in the Republic of Sierra Leone; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HOEFFFEL (for himself, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. BERMAN):

H. Con. Res. 324. Concurrent resolution expressing support for United States participation in the Sixth Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. LARSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BACA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. CARSON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HORN, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. DREIER):

H. Con. Res. 325. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need to more appropriately address the health and well being of Hispanic adolescent girls and endorsing the findings and recommendations of the National Coalition of Hispanic Health and Human Services Organizations (COSSMHO) now known as The National Alliance for Hispanic Health; to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 175: Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 353: Mr. LEVIN Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. GEPHARDT.

H.R. 531: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 652: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 773: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 1178: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1187: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1304: Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 1322: Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mrs. CUBIN.
 H.R. 1388: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FARR of California, Mrs. BONO, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 1452: Mr. POMBO.
 H.R. 1621: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. GRAHAM.
 H.R. 1708: Mr. CALLAHAN.
 H.R. 1769: Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 1824: Mr. KING.
 H.R. 1841: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H.R. 1870: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 1872: Mr. GIBBONS.
 H.R. 1882: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 2308: Mr. WAMP.
 H.R. 2339: Mr. HILL of Indiana.
 H.R. 2420: Mr. OLVER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. SHUSTER.
 H.R. 2451: Mr. MINGE.
 H.R. 2457: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 2595: Ms. CARSON.
 H.R. 2635: Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
 H.R. 2641: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 2655: Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 2733: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 2816: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 2892: Mr. WICKER.
 H.R. 2907: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2916: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 2934: Mr. KIND, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. BALDIN.
 H.R. 2984: Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 3082: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MINGE, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 3125: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. MARTINEZ.
 H.R. 3192: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 3250: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. STRICKLAND.
 H.R. 3377: Mr. WU and Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 3593: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 3625: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 3669: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. MICA.
 H.R. 3677: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 3688: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. FILNER, Ms. DANNER, and Ms. DELAULO.
 H.R. 3700: Mr. DICKS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. ISAKSON.
 H.R. 3710: Mr. HORN, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. DOOLEY of California.
 H.R. 3823: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 3872: Mr. STUPAK, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.
 H.R. 3883: Ms. CARSON.
 H.R. 3896: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
 H.R. 3916: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 3928: Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 4003: Mrs. THURMAN.
 H.R. 4013: Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 4033: Mr. LUTHER and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 4064: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 4069: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. RAHAL, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. QUINN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.
 H.R. 4081: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
 H.R. 4094: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. DELAHUNT.
 H.R. 4132: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. POMBO, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 4168: Mr. CLAY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. KLINK, and Mr. ROEMER.
 H.R. 4214: Mr. MASCARA, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. BLUNT.
 H.R. 4232: Mr. HOYER.
 H.R. 4239: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. MCNULTY.
 H.R. 4245: Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. METCALF, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
 H.R. 4268: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. SHOWS, and Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 4274: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BACA, Mr. COBURN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. COOK, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. GILMAN.
 H.R. 4279: Mr. ENGLISH.
 H.R. 4290: Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 4292: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. WAMP and Mr. TIAHRT.
 H.R. 4308: Mrs. THURMAN.
 H.R. 4328: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. MASCARA.
 H.R. 4334: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 4346: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 4380: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, and Ms. RIVERS.
 H.R. 4390: Ms. CARSON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 4393: Mr. OSE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 4395: Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. RAHALL.
 H. Con. Res. 252: Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H. Con. Res. 266: Mrs. THURMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 318: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 388: Mr. FARR of California.
 H. Res. 458: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. PETRI.
 H. Res. 459: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. KINGSTON.
 H. Res. 494: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. WAMP.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. Res. 396: Mr. BONILLA.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 9, May 11, 2000, by Mr. MINGE on House Resolution 478, was signed by the following Members: David Minge, George Miller, Tom Udall, Gene Green, Michael R. McNulty, David E. Bonior, John W. Olver, Tammy Baldwin, Alcee L. Hastings, Jose E. Serrano, Michael E. Capuano, John D. Dingell, Fortney Pete Stark, Albert Russell Wynn, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Janice D. Schakowsky, Rush D. Holt, Marcy Kaptur, Bruce F. Vento, Ed Pastor, Solomon P. Ortiz, Rosa L. DeLauro, Steven R. Rothman, Dennis Moore, Robert A. Borski, Tim Holden, Martin T. Meehan, Ron Klink, Sherrod Brown, Carolyn McCarthy, Frank Mascara, Paul E. Kanjorski, Robert A. Brady, Joseph M. Hoeffel, Max Sandlin, Lynn C. Woolsey, Danny K. Davis, Thomas M. Barrett, Peter A. DeFazio, John F. Tierney, John Lewis, Nick Lampson, Bart Stupak, Ted Strickland, Darlene Hooley, Baron P. Hill, Robert A. Weygand, Patsy T. Mink, Earl F. Hilliard, Michael P. Forbes, Dale E. Kildee, Shelley Berkley, Ruben Hinojosa, Grace F. Napolitano, Nydia M. Velazquez, Mike Thompson, Henry A. Waxman, Eva M. Clayton, Juanita Millender-McDonald, Martin Frost, Rod R. Blagojevich, Charles A. Gonzalez, Anna G. Eshoo, Bill Luther, Robert E. Andrews, Bobby L. Rush, John B. Larson, Karen McCarthy, Lynn N. Rivers, Carrie P. Meek, Julia Carson, Robert Wexler, Leonard L. Boswell, Steny H. Hoyer, Martin Olav Sabo, Robert T. Matsui, Ron Kind, Bob Etheridge, John Elias Baldacci, Luis V. Gutierrez, Ciro D. Rodriguez, Frank Pallone, Jr., Mark Udall, Major R. Owens, Anthony D. Weiner, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Earl Pomeroy, Lois Capps, James L. Oberstar, Gerald D. Kleczka, Adam Smith, Sam Farr, Ralph M. Hall, Chaka Fattah, Michael F. Doyle, Jim Turner, Collin C. Peterson, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, James P. McGovern, Ronnie Shows, Karen L. Thurman, Sam Gejdenson, Vic Snyder, Marion Berry, Allen Boyd, Bennie G. Thompson, Harold E. Ford, Jr., Nancy Pelosi, Julian C. Dixon, Howard L. Berman, Tom Lantos, Barney Frank, Elijah E. Cummings, Pat Danner, Bernard Sanders, Loretta Sanchez, David R. Obey, Maurice D. Hinchey, Edward J. Markey, William D. Delahunt, Ike Skelton, James H. Maloney, Donald M. Payne, Gene Taylor, Lloyd Doggett, John M. Spratt, Jr., Xavier Becerra, James A. Barcia, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Chet Edwards, Barbara Lee, Tom Sawyer, Corrine Brown, Jerry F. Costello, William O. Lipinski, Carolyn B. Maloney, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Jim Davis, Ken Bentsen, Joe Baca, Debbie Stabenow, David E. Price, Bob Filner, Ellen O. Tauscher, Charles B. Rangel, Ken Lucas, Patrick J. Kennedy, Calvin M. Dooley, Jerrold Nadler, Owen B. Pickett, Norman D. Dicks, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., John Conyers, Jr., Jim McDermott, Cynthia A. McKinney, Eliot L. Engel, Sheila Jackson-Lee, David Wu, Nita M. Lowey, Mike McIntyre, Peter Deutsch, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Robert Menendez, William J. Coyne, Gary L. Ackerman, Joseph Crowley, Tony P. Hall, James E. Clyburn, Lane Evans, Dennis J. Kucinich, Jay Insee, Brad Sherman, Silvestre Reyes, Robert C. Scott, John J. LaFalce, Charles W. Stenholm, Edolphus Towns, William J. Jefferson, David D. Phelps, Gregory W. Meeks, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Norman Sisisky, Thomas H. Allen, Maxine Waters, William (Bill) Clay, and Richard A. Gephardt.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 11, 2000

No. 58

Senate

The Senate met at 9:32 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MICHAEL D. CRAPO, a Senator from the State of Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Edward Robinson, from the Central Union Church, Honolulu, HI.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, Dr. Edward Robinson, offered the following prayer:

Let us speak together in prayer.

Almighty God, our Creator and our Redeemer, there are those across the aisle or awaiting us in our office or in some other corner of the world whose might and power trouble us and may even make us afraid, but Your strength grants us courage. There are those whose intelligence and oratory make us feel humbled and vulnerable, but Your wisdom gives us grace to meet the challenge.

There are those whose laughter and jibes or the things they write about us sometimes hurt, ridicule, and demean us, but Your smile makes us welcome and tells us we are worthwhile. There are those whose schemes and dreams for humanity confuse, bewilder, and terrify us, but Your vision for our lives gives us joy and hope.

Lord, in this incredible arena of power and decisionmaking, in these incredible times as citizens of this land, surrounded by all these incredible people, teach us to use our God-given talents to serve as You have served us. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MICHAEL D. CRAPO led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2000.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule 1, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL D. CRAPO, a Senator from the State of Idaho, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I give the opening script for the leader, I would like to defer to the Senator from Hawaii for a few minutes.

Mr. AKAKA. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

GUEST CHAPLAIN, DR. EDWARD "TED" ROBINSON

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I am very pleased and extremely honored to welcome to the Senate our guest Chaplain today, Rev. Dr. Edward Merritt "Ted" Robinson of Central Union Church in Honolulu.

Dr. Robinson is senior minister at Central Union Church in Honolulu, the largest United Church of Christ in the West and 1 of the 10 largest in the United States. Central Union was founded over 150 years ago, and the "Church in the Garden" is renowned

for its commitment to community outreach as much as for its beautiful sanctuary. For over a century, the congregation has worked to put its faith into action in Hawaii, nationally, and throughout Asia and the Pacific.

Dr. Robinson has served as senior minister at Central Union for 15 years and has ministered in the United Church of Christ for over 30 years. He was born in Westwood, MA, and received his bachelor's degree from Yankton College and bachelor of theology degree from Yankton School of Theology. He holds a master's of divinity from United Seminary in St. Paul and master's of sacred theology from the Iliff School of Theology at the University of Denver. He earned his doctor of ministry degree at San Francisco Theological Seminary.

In addition to his work in the United Church of Christ, Dr. Robinson has served on a number of boards and commissions in Honolulu including the Salvation Army, Girl Scouts, Shriner's Hospital for Crippled Children, Hawaii Habitat for Humanity, and Honolulu Boy Choir.

Ted and Barbara Robinson are the proud parents of two children, Sarah and Jonathan, and one granddaughter.

When we are home in Hawaii, we frequently worship at Central Union. Ted Robinson is one of the finest preachers to grace Hawaii. He is a friend and source of comfort for me and my family and inspires his active and growing congregation to live their lives as courageous people of faith. By word and deed, he embraces the mission of Central Union inscribed in the sanctuary above the altar: "Love Never Faileth."

It is my pleasure and privilege to welcome my good friend and minister to the Senate.

Aloha.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We thank the Senator and join with him in his gracious welcome to Reverend Robinson.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we all thank Reverend Robinson for his

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3857

prayer this morning and for his leadership in the spiritual world.

SCHEDULE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, for the leader, I will announce today's business.

The Senate will resume debate on the conference report to accompany the African Growth and Opportunity Act. By previous consent, at 10 a.m. the Senate will proceed to a cloture vote on the conference report. If cloture is invoked, debate will resume with the anticipation of an early afternoon vote on final passage of the trade bill. Senators will be notified as further votes are scheduled.

Following the disposition of this important legislation, it is hoped the Senate can begin consideration of the military construction appropriations bill.

The leader thanks colleagues for their attention and cooperation.

MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR—H.R. 4386

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due its second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4386) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance for certain women screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer under a federally funded screening program, to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to surveillance and information concerning the relationship between cervical cancer and the human papillomavirus (HPV), and for other purposes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings on this matter at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000—CONFERENCE REPORT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now resume consideration of the conference report accompanying H.R. 434, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Conference report to accompany H.R. 434, an act to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 10 a.m. is equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I defer to the Senator from New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I do thank my colleague, who will be speaking momentarily. I want to simply recapitulate some of the statements made yesterday, of which the first and the most important is to say this is the first trade bill to come to the floor of the Senate in 6 years. It is not simply that there have not been matters to attend to, it is rather that we have not been able to attend to them.

Most important, we have been unable to provide the President with negotiating authority for future trade agreements in the manner that developed over the last half century, following the epochal decision and action in the first term of President Roosevelt under Cordell Hull to begin the reciprocal trade agreements program. Under that program, the United States negotiated with individual countries, and then after World War II with a group of countries gathered together under the umbrella of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 gave the President the authority to negotiate and proclaim tariff reductions and that procedure evolved, in 1974, into the trade agreements negotiating authority, whereby the Congress gave the President the opportunity to reach a common agreement with other countries and then send it to the Congress to be approved up or down, not to be negotiated item by item as we had done in the disastrous Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930. We have never had a tariff bill as such on the Senate floor in 70 years.

The administration was hesitant about asking the Congress to renew this authority. When finally it did, we were hesitant about giving it, and it looked for a while as if an enormous, a momentous event in the world economy and the American economy and in the political stability of the world was being lost. The role of trade has become so important. Many of the principal actors in the Second World War were at war with each other in very much trade-related matters. It would now be thought inconceivable for any such conflict to take place.

I say this because not only was this the first bill in six years, but yesterday we began our debate on an auspicious note with a resounding vote of 90-6 in support of the motion to proceed to the conference report, and now we will vote to invoke cloture. I trust we will do so with the same resounding vote.

This is a good bill. It is not perfect, nor will it solve all the economic problems of sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean, but it will help, as Senator GRASSLEY and others said yesterday. My esteemed colleague, the Senator from Iowa, is here representing Senator ROTH, the chairman of our committee, who is recovering from surgery and who will be back with us next week when on next Wednesday we will take up in the Finance Committee the prop-

osition of permanent normal trade relations with China, an epic decision we will have to make and which I think we will be able to make in the context of this legislation having succeeded.

I remind all who might be listening that 6 months ago, this legislation was dead. It was not going anywhere. The House had passed a measure limited to Africa and not very well received over here. They had not included anything for the Caribbean Basin and Central America, as we call it, a program begun under President Reagan, and the Finance Committee took it up. The Finance Committee worked for 6 months on this matter.

I know there are persons who feel it is unacceptable because it does not contain provisions that provide for assistance to sub-Saharan Africa with respect to HIV/AIDS.

I say to my friends, the Senate did have such a provision. We fought for it in conference. We were not able to succeed because on the House side it was thought the legislation was a trade measure and public health issues were not relevant.

But also, absent economic development, there will be no controlling this epidemic in Africa, anymore than in the subcontinent of Asia, and we will not have anything in which to begin an engagement on these matters—nothing. Anyone who comes to this body thinking that legislation which is not perfect is unacceptable will often be disappointed. I was disappointed with the extent to which persons spoke yesterday about rejecting this legislation because it was not perfect.

I note that the Foreign Relations Committee has reported out a measure, S. 2382, the Technical Assistance, Trade Promotion and Anti-Corruption Act of 2000, which includes some important provisions addressing this public health crisis. Other suggestions are under review. These include proposed tax incentives to promote vaccine development. These tax incentives will come to the Finance Committee.

I am sure my friend from Iowa will agree that Senators who accept what we have done today, even if not perfect, will find a much more receptive Finance Committee. We have worked very hard on this. We know perfectly well the facts, and we propose to address them in a context where we will have a tax bill. We will try to get a tax bill on the House side, and we will enact something of much greater consequence than anything now contemplated.

I offer a further thought, which is that on May 3, the Wall Street Journal reported, and I was advised of this in advance, that the Pfizer pharmaceutical company—one of the oldest, the one which developed penicillin during World War II, the British having discovered it and not having the capacity to produce it; a great firm with great successes—had offered to provide one of its drug therapies for HIV infection, called Diflucan, at no cost to

South Africans. There is a press announcement from Geneva this morning that five pharmaceutical companies—Merck, Bristol Myers Squibb, Glaxo Wellcome, Boehringer Ingelheim, and Roche—are participating in a collaborative initiative with the United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, which is termed UNAIDS to “explore ways to accelerate and improve the provision of HIV/AIDS-related care and treatment in developing countries.”

Does the Presiding Officer wish me to cease and desist?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The time allocated to the minority side has expired.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Fine.

I would simply close by saying, sir, as to the matter of worker rights, the amendment to the CBI legislation offered on this matter was offered by Senator LEVIN, which I cosponsored. It provided that the President must take into account the extent to which a prospective CBI beneficiary country protects internationally recognized worker rights. That is to say, the core labor standards established by the ILO. I report to the Senate that this was retained in the conference agreement, as were many other Senate amendments.

I thank the Chair and I regret having imposed upon my colleague's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, it is my intention to use 5 minutes and then give the remainder of the time to one of the opponents of the legislation, the Senator from Wisconsin. So I ask the Chair to please inform me when 5 minutes are up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so note.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the cloture motion. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this motion. I spoke yesterday, at length, about why this bill is such an important piece of legislation.

I guess the best proof of it is that it enjoys such bipartisan support, which does not happen too often on Capitol Hill. But I summed up, in yesterday's remarks, that this conference agreement is about opportunity—opportunity for 48 struggling nations of sub-Saharan Africa; and opportunity for the people of the Caribbean, many of whom are struggling to rebuild their lives following the devastation of their countries by natural disaster.

Most importantly, we in the Congress must be concerned about American jobs—our working men and women. This bill does much for the American economy and for America's consumers, as well. The enhanced Caribbean Basin Initiative textile provisions in this conference agreement may create up to \$8 billion in new sales and 120,000 new jobs over the next 5 years. Those are not my estimates. Those are not Senator MOYNIHAN's estimates. Those are the textile industry's own estimates.

In addition to the textile industry, this bill enjoys the support of many

other industries as well. This is because American exports follow American investment when that investment moves abroad, especially exports of capital equipment.

This conference agreement enjoys broad support among distinguished Members of both the majority and minority, who have worked together long and hard to fashion this agreement.

It also enjoys the support of a vast majority of political, civic, and religious leaders around the United States, and the support of each of the nations that would benefit from its passage.

I urge my colleagues to take a look at an advertisement in the Hill newspaper that was put out yesterday. It has a long list of prominent business leaders and organizations. It has a long list of American civic leaders who support this, including even organizations such as Empower America, which is headed by Republican Jack Kemp, and is supported by conservative leaders such as Bill Bennett.

Since it enjoys this broad, bipartisan support—both within and outside the political environment—I hope that it gets the support of our colleagues as well.

A vote for cloture is also a reaffirmation of America's historic leadership role in international trade. We have much to do in the international trade arena in the next year or two:

Restore confidence in American trade policy, and leadership in trade; rebuild confidence in the World Trade Organization; win the fight for permanent normal trade relations status for China; and show our trading partners in Geneva, where negotiations are underway right now, that we in the Senate are engaged with the world, and the world can look to us for that leadership.

I ask my colleagues to vote in support of the opportunity to continue America's leadership in the effort to reduce trade barriers. I ask my colleagues to vote in favor of this motion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that advertisement I mentioned in the Hill newspaper printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Hill, May 10, 2000]

TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

We Endorse Legislation That Provides Social and Economic Opportunity in Africa And We, the Undersigned, are Working Together to Achieve this Goal

All 48 African Nations

Angola
Benin
Botswana
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cameroon
Cape Verde
Central Africa Republic
Chad
Comoros
Congo (Brazzaville)

Congo, Democratic Republic
Côte d'Ivoire
Djibouti
Equatorial Guinea
Eritrea
Ethiopia
Gabon
The Gambia
Ghana
Guinea
Guinea-Bissau
Kenya
Lesotho
Liberia
Madagascar
Malawi
Mali
Mauritania
Mauritius
Mozambique
Namibia
Niger
Nigeria
Reunion
Rwanda
Sao Tome and Principe
Senegal
Seychelles
Sierra Leone
South Africa
Swaziland
Tanzania
Togo
Uganda
Zambia
Zimbabwe

Business Leaders

The Limited, Inc.
Gap Inc.
Ford Motor Company
Moving Water Industries
Chevron Corporation
Kmart Corporation
Cargill
BP Amoco Corporation
Bechtel
Exxon Corporation
Citigroup
Enron Corporation
Bank of America
Mobil Corporation
Boeing Company
Bristol-Myers Squibb Company
National Retail Federation
Caterpillar, Inc.
Leon Tempelman & Son
DaimlerChrysler
American International Group
Archer Daniels Midland Company
Foley, Hoag and Eliot
Eastman Kodak
Equator Bank HSBC
Edlow International
Eli Lilly and Company
Emerson Electric Co.
Texaco Inc.
Equitable Capital Mgmt.
Barden International
BET, Inc.
F.C. Schaffer
Fluor Corporation
WorldSpace, Inc.
General Electric
General Motors Corporation
Halliburton/Brown & Root
Harris Corporation
Holland & Knight
Iridium LLC
Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical
Lehman Brothers
Corporate Council on Africa
Louis Berger International
Manchester Trade
McDermott Incorporated
McDonald's Corporation
Modern Africa Fund Managers
Motorola Inc.

Moving Water Industries
 National Soft Drink Association
 New Africa Advisers
 Occidental International
 Ocean Energy
 Oracle
 Philip Morris
 PriceWaterhouseCoopers
 Pryor, McClendon, Counts & Co.
 Raytheon
 SBC Communications Inc.
 Seaboard
 Teledesic Corporation
 Tyco
 Westar Group Inc.
 International Mass Retail Association
 U.S. Chamber of Commerce
 Coalition for Employment Through Exports,
 Inc.

American Civic Leaders

Bishop Donald G.K. Ming, AME Church
 Bishop Garnett C. Henning, AME Church
 Bishop Vinton Anderson, AME Church
 The Honorable Leon Sullivan
 Mel Foote, CFA
 Ambassador Andrew Young
 Former Mayor David Dingins
 Mayor Wellington Webb
 The Honorable Kweisi Mfume
 Mrs. Coretta Scott King
 Mr. Martin Luther King III
 Mr. Robert Johnson, BET, Inc.
 Mr. C. Payne Lucas
 Constituency for Africa
 National Council of Churches
 Africare
 International Foundation for Education and
 Self-Help
 Education Africa
 Africa-America Institute
 African Development Foundation
 World Vision
 Service and Development Agency (SADA)
 African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church
 Corporate Council on Africa
 Organization Industrialization Council Inter-
 national
 NAACP
 Washington Law Society
 Foundation for Democracy in Africa
 National Association of Negro and Profes-
 sional Women's Club
 National Bar Association
 United States Conference of Mayors
 National Conference of Black Mayors
 National Council of Churches
 Africa Travel Association
 Black Professionals in International Affairs
 Southern Christian Leadership Conference
 National Association of State Legislatures
 National Association of Minority Contrac-
 tors
 National Black Chamber of Commerce
 National Black Media Coalition
 National Black Republican Council
 Council of 100 Black Republicans
 Nigerian American Alliance
 U.S. Business Council
 Ron Brown Foundation
 Goodworks International
 Empower America

President Clinton: "Our Administration strongly supports the African Growth and Opportunity Act, which I said in my State of the Union Address, we will work to pass in this session of Congress."

Majority leader Trent Lott: "I support legislation that is good for Americans and Africans."

The African Diplomatic Corps: "The House of Representatives should seize this opportunity to open a new, historic chapter in the relations between Africa and the United States. It will mark a true beginning for an independent Africa and this great nation."

Reverend Leon Sullivan, IFESH: "The African Growth and Opportunity Act will open

new markets for American products and will create additional jobs for Americans and Africans. For every \$1 billion in exports to Africa, 14,000 jobs are created or sustained in the United States."

We Urge Senate Conferees to Report the: African Growth and Opportunity Act!!—AGOA Coalition, Inc.

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

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, let me first thank the Senator from Iowa for his courtesy in giving me this time to speak in opposition.

Mr. President, I rise to take another opportunity to express my disappointment with the conference report on the African Growth and Opportunity Act. I have outlined my concerns about this bill time and again. I have explained how little opportunity it really offers to the countries of Africa. I have expressed my fears about transshipment. I have noted the bill's failure to address the environmental issues that are inextricably linked with trade and investment. And, most importantly, I have pointed out the rather obvious fact that unless we get serious about reducing Africa's debt burden and fighting the region's devastating HIV/AIDS crisis, any effort to stimulate trade and investment is simply an act of political theater.

By refusing to address the core obstacles prohibiting so much of that vast continent from achieving its potential as a region of prosperity and a valued trading partner, this Senate is once again ignoring the tough issues in favor of the ultimately futile quick fix. We are capable of better, and the people of Africa are certainly deserving of more.

I felt this way before learning the outcome of the conference—I felt this way last year, when I joined Congressman JESSE JACKSON, Jr., to introduce alternative legislation to the African Growth and Opportunity Act. But my disappointment was deepened, and my sense of outrage was provoked, and my resolve to fight for something better was strengthened when the outcome of the conference became apparent.

The fate of the Feinstein-Feingold amendment—a provision that was accepted into the manager's package when this bill was debated on the floor last fall but was stripped by the leadership in the final days of the conference—is appalling. Our modest amendment would have prevented the U.S. Government from pressuring African countries that use internationally legal means to make HIV/AIDS medications more accessible to their citizens. I stood on this floor yesterday and cited statistic after shocking statistic, trying to communicate the urgency of the situation and the scale of the crisis. The falling life expectancies, the overcrowded morgues, the millions of orphans, the declines in GDP—I have tried to convey the extent of the disease's reach. In light of these facts, passing legislation that prevents our Government from stopping legal efforts

to bring help and hope to the millions affected by the epidemic seemed like the least that this body could do. And yet we could not even accomplish that modest step. We could not even agree to do no harm.

And I want to remind my colleagues that this issue will not go away. Even those least inclined to give this issue the attention it deserves will not be able to ignore 5,500 deaths per day, and the social, economic, and political ramifications of those deaths. This issue will not go away as long as the HIV/AIDS crisis continues on its terrible course; this issue will not go away as long as the American public asks tough questions about why this Congress refuses to pass even modest measures like the Feinstein-Feingold amendment; and this issue will not go away as long as I am in this Senate.

Most Members didn't have to face up, publicly, to the pressure of the pharmaceutical industry and the far reaching implications of their choice to support or not support the Feinstein-Feingold amendment. But eventually we will all have to face the music, we will have to answer to our constituents and to our consciences.

The commitment of the major pharmaceutical companies to differential pricing is perhaps promising, but it raises as many questions as it answers. There is differential pricing today between the United States and Canada.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

There is differential pricing today between Canada and the United States when it comes to pharmaceuticals, and that is a bad deal. Differential pricing does not necessarily mean the affordable pricing of drugs.

But I appreciate the courtesy in being able to speak on this matter because I believe so strongly that the voices in opposition to this bill need to be heard. We did not do the job we needed to do to create a real Africa trade bill. I regret that and will vote in opposition to cloture. I ask my colleagues to vote against cloture.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 434, The African Growth and Opportunity Act:

Trent Lott, Jon Kyl, Pat Roberts, Craig Thomas, Bill Frist, Paul Coverdell, James Inhofe, Orrin Hatch, Don Nickles, Larry Craig, Slade Gorton, Mitch McConnell, Peter Fitzgerald, Chuck Grassley, Phil Gramm, and Mike Crapo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call is waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the conference report to accompanying H.R. 434, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 76, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 97 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Abraham	Gorton	McConnell
Akaka	Graham	Mikulski
Allard	Gramm	Moynihan
Ashcroft	Grams	Murkowski
Baucus	Grassley	Murray
Bayh	Gregg	Nickles
Bennett	Hagel	Reid
Biden	Harkin	Robb
Bond	Hatch	Roberts
Breaux	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Brownback	Hutchison	Roe
Burns	Inhofe	Santorum
Campbell	Inouye	Sarbanes
Chafee, L.	Jeffords	Schumer
Cochran	Johnson	Sessions
Coverdell	Kerrey	Shelby
Craig	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Crapo	Kohl	Specter
Daschle	Kyl	Stevens
DeWine	Lautenberg	Thomas
Dodd	Levin	Thompson
Durbin	Lieberman	Torricelli
Enzi	Lott	Voinovich
Feinstein	Lugar	Warner
Fitzgerald	Mack	Wyden
Frist	McCain	

NAYS—18

Boxer	Dorgan	Leahy
Bunning	Edwards	Reed
Byrd	Feingold	Smith (NH)
Cleland	Helms	Snowe
Collins	Hollings	Thurmond
Conrad	Kennedy	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—6

Bingaman	Domenici	Lincoln
Bryan	Landrieu	Roth

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 76, the nays are 18. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, now that we are considering the conference report on the free trade bill, which I support, I point out while this legislation is designed to improve economic conditions in sub-Saharan Africa, many of these sub-Saharan countries have struggled economically for years. As a result, that economic stagnation has also led to political unrest, civil wars, and bloody violence. Reducing violence should be a high priority all across the globe, not only on the African Continent but also a high priority in our country.

In this country, we are going to see this weekend hundreds of thousands of mothers and families in Washington marching against violence as part of the Million Mom March.

My resolution simply commends the participants of the Million Mom March this weekend for rallying their communities to ask for sensible gun safety legislation. It calls on the Congress to complete action on the juvenile justice bill, which will help promote safety and sensible legislation, and I hope to offer that resolution before the Memorial Day recess.

I will be on The Mall for the march this Sunday with, I am sure, many of my colleagues on Mother's Day, May 14, 2000, with Americans from all walks of life. In Washington and communities across the country, people will join together to call for meaningful, common-sense gun safety policies.

My resolution commends these families, citizens, members of religious congregations, schools, community-based organizations, businesses, political, and cultural groups for coming together as a local and national community to recognize the violence committed against our children from guns must cease.

I am going to continue to try my best to see if we can get action on the stalled gun safety provision that American families want us to pass.

It has now been more than a year since that terrible tragedy at Columbine High School on April 20, 1999. Students at that high school were attacked in the halls of their school, in their classrooms. The result everyone knows: 12 students dead, a teacher shot dead, another 23 students and teachers injured.

I have to ask, just as they are asking—I hear it; and I know colleagues of mine hear it—what has Congress done since that time, since that awful day 1 year ago? What have we done to help reduce this violence? As I see it, not much—virtually nothing. I think it is shameful.

It is shameful because shootings have not stopped. Columbine was the most deadly school shooting. But there have been many others. It is peculiar, you often think—at least I do; I speak for myself—that we have seen the ultimate outrage, one after another: Columbine; the children being led, hand in hand, by policemen out of the school in Los Angeles; young people at a prayer meeting in Texas—and still nothing happens.

In February of this year, a little first grader was shot and killed by a classmate—a 6-year-old killing a 6-year-old. The child, Kayla Rolland, a beautiful little girl, is taken from her family. There was no explanation except that this little boy got a gun and pulled the trigger. In December of last year, a seventh grader in Fort Gibson, OK, took a handgun to school and wounded four students. These are just the school shootings since the terrible tragedy at Columbine.

Since 1997, there have been school shootings in Pearl, MS, West Paducah, KY, Jonesboro, AR, Edinboro, PA, and Springfield, OR.

There have been many other outrages outside our schools. Recently, a racist in Pittsburgh killed six people, and not too far from where we are standing, seven children were shot at the National Zoo.

Some of us have tried to address this violence. During the debate on the juvenile justice bill, the Senate passed several gun safety measures, including my amendment to require criminal background checks at gun shows. It was a very close vote. The Vice President, in his role as President of the Senate, voted to break the 50-50 tie.

I remind my colleagues that the gun show amendment had bipartisan support. I did not get 50 votes without getting some of our colleagues on the Republican side. I was pleased to see that support from Senators DEWINE, FITZGERALD, LUGAR, VOINOVICH, WARNER, and Senator John Chafee, who is no longer with us. They all voted for the amendment.

The final juvenile justice bill passed by a vote of 73-25. There was strong bipartisan support for moving forward on juvenile crime and for trying to reduce gun violence.

But what has happened since then? The gun lobby, and its congressional allies, have stalled the bill. It has been held hostage in the conference committee for more than 9 months. We need to move forward on gun safety because stopping gun violence and keeping our kids safe is too important.

When you talk about a million women marching, while they would like it, they are not marching for equal pay; they are not marching for job opportunity; they are not talking about "glass ceilings;" they are not talking about an invasion of the rights as we conventionally see them. There is one issue that is more important than any other.

They say: Dear God, help us protect our children. When we send them to school in the morning, they are healthy and smiling. We want them to come back from school the same way at the end of the day—even though they now know that there are going to be metal detectors, there are going to be guards, and there are going to be additional measures to try to maintain security.

Violence has won over much of our attention, certainly much of our budget. But we have to work to help families, some of whom have already paid a terrible price for gun violence, and others who worry about it each and every day. Because the wounds that were received were not simply the wounds that came from the gun attack, as horrible as that was, but everybody in the vicinity, everybody in those schools, were wounded by those attacks, so was our Nation. It changed the tenure of things. It made us all apprehensive.

So the gun safety provisions in the juvenile justice bill are simply commonsense measures that Congress should have enacted a long time ago.

First, we have to close the gun show loophole. There is no question that closing the gun show loophole will help prevent guns from getting into the wrong hands, including the hands of schoolchildren.

The proof is in the testimony of Robyn Anderson before the Colorado Legislature. She is the young woman who went with Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold to the Tanner gun show in Adams County, CO. She bought two shotguns and a rifle for Klebold and Harris, three of the four guns that they later used in their massacre, their shooting rampage at Columbine High School.

She testified, saying very clearly:

Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold had gone to the Tanner gun show on Saturday and they took me back with them on Sunday. . . . While we were walking around, Eric and Dylan kept asking sellers if they were private or licensed. They wanted to buy their guns from someone who was private—and not licensed—because there would be no paperwork or background check.

She said:

It was too easy. I wish it had been more difficult. I wouldn't have helped them buy the guns if I had faced a background check.

More recently Patty Nielson, a teacher at Columbine High School, spoke about the need to close the gun show loophole. She said:

All we know for sure is that if they [Klebold and Harris] hadn't gotten these guns, they never would have killed those innocent people. And the shocking thing is that they got those guns so easily from the gun show.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator from New Jersey withhold? The leader is on the floor to make a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I certainly would agree to that provided that I regain the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I did not hear the request, but I understand that Senator LAUTENBERG will yield so that I can proceed to a unanimous consent request at this time.

Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. I believe that we are postcloture now, and the subject for debate should be the African and CBI trade bill; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, that is correct. In a postcloture situation, debate is supposed to be germane to the bill.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—S. 2521

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the military construction appropriations bill, S. 2521, immediately following the adoption of the African trade conference report; further, there be debate only relative to the bill, other than any amendments offered

and cleared by the two managers, which would continue until 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, May 16, 2000.

This has been cleared with the Democratic leadership. We are extending it until this time on Tuesday at the request of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I just want to make sure that those of us who want to speak about the Million Mom March that is coming this weekend, where we may see a quarter of a million or more moms here, and thousands more across the country, are not precluded under this UC from speaking on it in morning business. If it requires an amendment to the UC, I would hope we could work that out. Otherwise, I will object because we could talk about a lot of things, but there is no question the Million Mom March deserves to be discussed. Senator LAUTENBERG has a resolution praising the moms, and I think we should be able to discuss that.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I might say, this does not preclude that. But the rules of the Senate are that once you vote on cloture, and the fact that cloture was adopted, postcloture, the debate has to be on the cloture item.

If the Senators want to talk on this subject, we will be glad to talk with them about the appropriate time to do it. But under the rules, the regular order will be that we have debate on this measure.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. After a vote on final passage, this would be entirely in order, and if a resolution is to be offered, then you could deal with the resolution; but you could not deal with it now, is that right? I ask that question of the majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I may, I inquire of the Senator, what was the question?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. After we have a vote on final passage, then these matters would be entirely in order, correct?

Mr. LOTT. As a matter of fact, after the vote on the conference report, it would be debate relative to the pending bill only. But, again, we always work together to find time for Senators to have morning business and talk on subjects that they wish to talk about. But we are trying to set up a process to complete the African trade bill and then move to the military construction appropriations bill. We have it worked out. Again, we will be glad to talk to Senators who may be interested in a time when that could be done. But the rules do not allow that now.

Mrs. BOXER. I understand. I am going to have to object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. I want to see it. My understanding is we are going to MILCON and we will not necessarily have an opportunity to speak—maybe we can put in a quorum call until I see that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from California to withhold her objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. She has already objected. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I hope we can work this out in some amicable way. The regular order is that debate now is on the African trade and CBI conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I know the Senator from New Jersey has the floor. In an effort to resolve this, I wonder if the leader would consider, prior to going to the military construction bill, that there be a period of time for Senators to discuss this march.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, again, I think we can work out a time to do this. We have a problem in that the manager of the bill has a time problem—or one of the managers—and she has to leave later on this afternoon.

Mr. REID. Also, there is nothing to prevent Senators from talking while the bill is pending.

Mr. LOTT. The point is, it would take consent in order for that to happen. Generally speaking, as long as everybody is being considerate of each other—we haven't objected to Senator LAUTENBERG speaking. But he would not be able to speak on the subject if Senators objected. He actually has spoken on both. I think we are making a mountain out of a molehill here, and we ought to be able to work through this.

Mr. REID. We will continue to work on this.

Mr. LOTT. Should I renew the request at this time?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, let me say again, we worked very hard on both sides of the aisle to accommodate Senators on both sides of the aisle, including their desires to speak, but also the managers' desire to do some of their work and still be able to make other commitments. In this case, we are actually trying to protect the ranking member, Senator MURRAY, from Washington State. We ought to be able to work through that. I hope Senators will be understanding of the managers' desire to make some progress on the MILCON bill today. But at their request, which I think is reasonable, we will strike the "relative to the bill" part of the request and I will renew it.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the military construction appropriations bill, S. 2521,

immediately following the adoption of the African trade conference report, and further, there be debate only, other than any amendments offered and cleared by the two managers, which would continue until 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, May 16, 2000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator REID and all Members. Further, I assure the minority leader that I don't intend to file a cloture motion on this bill this week. I think we can make progress on military construction. It has broad support because of what is in the base bill and also because it has the emergency funding for Kosovo and fuel for the military. I believe we can complete this bill this week.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. If the majority leader will yield, when would he expect that the MILCON bill will come up and be available for debate?

Mr. LOTT. I believe we will be able to finish the debate remaining on the Africa trade bill, and sometime between 12 and 1 o'clock get a vote on that, and then we would go to MILCON. The managers would like to spend, obviously, some time on the substance of that, and then we will go forward from there.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Would there be any likelihood of a vote tomorrow on that?

Mr. LOTT. No. We will vote on the Africa trade bill today, but then we will go to debate only on MILCON, and that would go until 2:15 until Tuesday. There would be no votes on that until Tuesday.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield? We have a couple more speakers on this side. Senator HARKIN is one of them and he said he would be willing to speak after the vote.

Mr. HARKIN. I will speak after the vote.

Mr. REID. One of our members is tied up in judiciary, or we could be finished by noon. We will try to get him back here and speed this thing up.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the teacher, Patty Nielson, from Columbine is right in her statement. It is shocking that anyone can get a gun so easily at a gun show. The American people understand this issue. In every poll, more than 80 percent of the American people support background checks at gun shows. In fact, two-thirds of the gun owners—66 percent—support background checks on all gun sales at gun shows. Some of the other loopholes in our gun laws are also shocking. There is no reason why we should allow large-capacity ammunition clips to be imported. We banned them from being manufactured in this country, but they can still be brought in, imported.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like the Senator to respond to these questions. I want to put the importance of this resolution in context.

The Senator mentioned that it was April 10 of last year that we had the Columbine tragedy.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. April 20.

Mr. DURBIN. April 20, 1999. And if I am not mistaken, 12 or 13 high school students were killed, and more were injured during the course of that time. America was fixed on this event as no other event, despite all the gun violence, when we consider it could happen at a high school such as Columbine.

Is the Senator from New Jersey able to tell me what the response was of the Senate to that tragedy?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I call the Senate to order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The debate must be germane to the African trade conference report.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. It is regular order.

Mr. President, I have the right to establish the connection between the trade industry, and that is how I started my remarks. The fact is that one of the purposes of getting this trade matter into law is to make sure the countries we deal with that are having severe economic problems, where we see starving populations, where we see human rights ignored, corruption rampant—that is the mission of what we are doing this day. Frankly, I am not doing it exclusively so we can do more business. We would like to do more business.

The fact is that trade has another significant implication. It is a foreign policy implication. How do we deal with it? When we look through the television cameras today, we see people with malnutrition, disease, starving. We are hoping we can do something to try to alleviate those conditions.

Why is it out of order? I ask the Parliamentarian, why is it out of order to talk about the subjects that relate at home to the same things we are trying to do to help overseas? I don't understand it. I must say that I have to pose that to the Parliamentarian.

We are never so strict that you can't talk about matters that relate indirectly. Or are we going to measure it word by word what is being said here? I think it is an invasion, I must say, of the Senator's right to speak on an issue.

I am not finished with remarks on the trade commentary. I intend to close with the trade commentary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All debate must be germane to the conference report.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York, everybody's good friend here, wishes to ask a question of the majority leader. I would like Senator MOY-

NIHAN to ask him to respond with the assurance that I get the floor, if we abandon the debate now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, might I ask the distinguished and forbearing majority leader, if we have a vote on the African trade bill, if the Senator from New Jersey could speak to the matter he is discussing?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I believe under the unanimous consent request we agreed to that he would be able to do that.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. That I be able to recapture—we are asking the majority leader. He speaks very clearly. I have the assurance that I will be recognized immediately after to finish the comments that I was making.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, could I inquire?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask Senator LAUTENBERG if he can give us some idea about how long he thinks that might take. The reason I am inquiring again is that we do have managers of the bill who have a time problem. I would like to encourage the Senator to talk with them and get some time agreements so they can move forward with the military construction bill. I feel as if they will be able to work something out with you.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have two of our Senators who want to speak on the African free trade bill. One of the Senators wishes to speak after the vote. I placed a call and spoke to the other Senator. He is going to call me back in a few minutes as to whether he could do the same. If that is the case, the vote will take place as soon as the leader wants it on the Africa trade bill, and then they can speak after that.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am not managing the bill. I know there is at least one more Senator on the floor who wants to speak on the trade bill. I understand there may be one or two on this side. We have about four or five speakers.

Mr. REID. We have three on our side.

Mr. LOTT. And a couple on our side.

Mr. REID. One of the Senators wants to speak for 45 minutes on our side. That is why I was trying to see if we could work it out so she could speak after the vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. What is our status, Mr. President? I am going to ask for a vote on germaneness, if the interpretation stands.

I thought we had an accommodation with the majority leader—I was trying to be helpful—to give us a chance to finish the debate on the subjects as I described, and to make way for the vote to take place in an expeditious fashion but guaranteeing me by unanimous consent now to be able to get the floor after the vote on the trade bill has taken place. If that is the case, I will yield the floor so we can get on to the business.

I would like that representation to be made now and clearly understood.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, as I understand it, the debate now postcloture has to be on the African-CBI trade bill. After that vote occurs, which shouldn't be too long from now, we would go to the military construction appropriations bill. I assume that Senators who wish to speak on this subject will want to talk with the managers of that MILCON bill, including the Senator from Washington on the other side of the aisle, who has a time problem, and work something out. I assume you can get that worked out.

I didn't know there was a consent that had been asked for that would guarantee that or how long that would be. And I am not sure the Senator wants to do that until he talks to Senator MURRAY to see what her situation is.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, as the majority leader knows very well, there is some dispute on this issue. And I have the floor. I have tried to conduct myself as the rules provide.

What I am asking the majority leader now is, if I propound a unanimous consent request, I be recognized after the vote on the trade bill and that I be permitted to speak at that time, to regain the floor. I think it is a reasonable request based on the debate that is going on now. Otherwise, we are going to have more delays than we would like to see. I want to get the African trade bill out of the way.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I don't believe there has been a unanimous consent request propounded. If there is one propounded, will the Senator be willing to include in that a time period for how long it would take? If he takes a couple of hours, he has a major problem because of his own Member's schedule. If he needs 10 minutes, then I think we could do that.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I have a couple of requests. I would try to do it in 40 minutes, and work on even compressing that, I say to the leader—but 40 minutes maximum.

Mr. HARKIN. Reserving the right to object, if there is such a thing going on right now, some of us want to speak. If I may say, I happen to be in favor of the African trade bill. I am willing to speak after the vote. I just want to make sure we are allowed to speak on the African trade bill.

Mr. LOTT. The African trade bill? Why don't you speak now?

Mr. HARKIN. I would like to speak now. But I don't have the floor right now, and I can't get the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We can release the floor, if the leader will give me consent, and we can move on to the business.

Mr. REID. As I understand what the Senator from New Jersey said, he and the other two speakers would be willing to agree to a 40-minute time agreement today. Is that the correct way I understood the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I wish the Senators would at least talk to the Senator on their side of the aisle as to the time problem and see what Senator MURRAY has to say because I feel a little funny here. I am protecting Senator MURRAY's desire to do her part early. I think we could, if the Senator would agree to do this after Senator MURRAY speaks, and opening statements are made—I wish the Senator would talk to her we could agree to that. I presume it would be about 3:30 this afternoon, or so.

Mr. REID. I can't speak to this. Senator BOXER would be happy to talk to our friend. I think 40 minutes would probably do it.

Mr. LOTT. I would like to urge the Senator to talk to Senator MURRAY and see if that is agreeable with her, and to the managers of the bill.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We want to accommodate. I tell the leader that. Perhaps we can move it along by saying that after the opening statements by the managers—they introduce their managers' amendment—I then be able to regain the floor for the 40 minutes about which we are talking. I think that will allow us to move things along at a good pace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Is that propounded as a unanimous-consent request or simply the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was. It was a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CRAIG. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it was already agreed to. You already said it was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, the Senator has the right to reserve the right to object.

The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Senator LAUTENBERG be given 30 minutes after the opening statements and the managers' amendments are offered on the military construction bill, so we can speak on the subject about which he has been speaking this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise to, first of all, support enthusiastically the Trade and Development Act of 2000 known as the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

I thank Chairman ROTH, Senator MOYNIHAN, and the staffs for their hard work to retain the amendment I offered on child labor. This is an important piece of legislation not only for the trade benefits it promises to African and Caribbean countries, but for the benefits it promises to another important and often neglected group, the world's children.

This bill includes a provision I introduced last year in the form of an amendment when we first considered this trade measure. As many of you will recall, my amendment, cosponsored by Senators HELMS and WELLSTONE, sought to ensure that beneficiaries of U.S. trade preferences fulfill their commitments to eliminate the use of abusive and exploitative child labor.

My amendment passed the Senate by a resounding vote of 96-0. The provision contained in this conference report is very simple and straightforward.

It builds on the international consensus that came out of the ILO conference in Geneva last June in which the delegates unanimously adopted the Convention to Eliminate the Worst Forms of Child Labor.

This provision simply states that in order to be eligible for the trade benefits in this bill, the Generalized System of Preferences, the Caribbean Basin Initiatives, the African Trade Preferences, a country must implement its commitments to eliminate the worst forms of child labor as established by ILO Convention 182 for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor—it is that simple.

ILO Convention 182 defines the worst forms of child labor as all forms of slavery, debt bondage, forced or compulsory labor, the sale or trafficking of children, including forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict, child prostitution, children producing or trafficking in narcotic drugs, or any other work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety, or morals of the children.

This chart illustrates the ILO Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labor, including child slavery, bondage, prostitution, use of children in pornography, trafficking in children, forced recruitment in armed conflict, recruiting children in the production or sale of narcotics, and hazardous work. These are all the items that are covered in the bill before us.

For the first time in history, the world will speak with one voice in opposition to abusive and exploitative child labor. Countries from across the political, economic, and religious spectrum—from Jews to Muslims, from Buddhists to Christians—came together to proclaim unequivocally that

abusive and exploitative child labor is a practice that will not be tolerated and must be abolished. Those are the exact words from the convention.

So after ILO Convention 182 was adopted unanimously, gone is the argument that abusive and exploitative child labor is an acceptable practice because of a country's economic circumstances; gone is the argument that abusive and exploitative child labor is acceptable because of cultural traditions; and gone is the argument that this form of child labor is a necessary evil on the road to economic development.

When this convention was adopted and approved, the United States and the international community as a whole laid those arguments to rest and laid the groundwork to begin the process of ending the scourge of abusive and exploitative child labor.

Additionally, for the first time in history, the U.S. tripartite group of the ILO, which consists of representatives from government, business, and labor, unanimously agreed on the final version of the convention. This is the first time in history this has happened.

For the first time ever in our history, the legislation we have before us—the African trade bill—will codify in U.S. trade law a simple notion: If you want the trade benefits outlined in this bill, you must implement commitments on abusive and exploitative child labor into which your country has freely entered.

Let me be clear. What I mean by abusive and exploitative child labor is not a kid helping on the family farm. It is not a kid doing work after school. There is nothing wrong with that. I worked in my youth. I bet you probably did too, Mr. President, as all of us did. That is not what we are speaking about.

The Convention the ILO adopted last year deals with children chained to looms, who handle dangerous chemicals, ingest metal dust, are forced to sell illegal drugs, are forced into child prostitution, are forced into armed conflict, are forced to work in factories where furnace temperatures exceed 1,500 degrees. It deals with children who are forced to work to pay off their parents' debts in a form of bondage that deserves to be called what it is, outright slavery.

According to the ILO, Latin America and the Caribbean has about 17 million children doing this type of work, Africa has about 80 million children, Asia has about 153 million, and there are about a half million in Oceania. That totals about 250 million children worldwide who are working—most full time. Millions of these kids are under 10 years of age. Some are as young as 6 or 7.

Can you imagine your first-grade son or daughter, or your first-grade grandson or granddaughter, working 12 to 14 hours a day in horrific conditions making just pennies a day, if anything? Can anyone say this is acceptable for any child anywhere in the world?

These children are forced to work many times with no protective equipment. They endure long hours, as I said, for little or no pay. They simply work only for the economic gain of others. They are denied an education and the opportunity to grow and to develop.

Again, this is in sharp contrast to any kind of a part-time job after school for spending money or to buy the latest CD. That is not what we are talking about. We are talking about kids working in the worst conditions you can imagine. I am not talking about teenagers, I am talking about kids under the age of 10.

A lot of times, people will say: Well, that is just what you heard. But I have had firsthand experience and exposure to this.

About 2 years ago, Rosemary Gutierrez, of my staff, and I traveled to Pakistan, India, Nepal, and Bangladesh to investigate and look at the issue of abusive and exploitative child labor. We were in Katmandu, Nepal. We had previously been told of a young man who had worked as a child laborer for a number of years. He escaped, and through various and sundry means he became involved actively in working against child labor in his home country of Nepal.

Through various contacts, we contacted this young man and asked him if there was any way possible we could get in to see a carpet weaving facility where kids are working.

As others told us, the problem is, if you let a factory owner know you are coming to inspect, or to visit, they take all of the kids out the back door. They hide them. They disperse them around. When you get there, there are no kids. They do this all the time.

So the only way we could ever get a feel for what was going on was to surreptitiously and under cover try to enter one of these places. That is what my staff person, Rosemary Gutierrez, and I did with this young man from Nepal.

We got in an unmarked car. It was on a Sunday evening. He knew about this one plant on the outskirts of town where he knew one of the guards at the gate. He thought he had found out the owner of this factory was going to be gone. He knew the guard at the gate through I don't know what circumstances. He assured us, if he went out there, he would be able to sneak us in so we could see firsthand.

Imagine, we are in this unmarked car. My staff person, Rosemary Gutierrez, and another person, about five of us, I think, were cramped in this small, unmarked car. We drive out to this place on the edge of town, darkness has fallen. We walk up to this gate with an armed guard.

What is the first thing we see? A sign in both Nepalese and English. I took a picture of it. This is my picture. It says: Child labor under the age of 14 is strictly prohibited. Right there in front of the gate. It is in English and Nepalese.

Had we notified this plant owner we were coming, there would not have been one kid in this place. However, we came, the guard spoke with this young Nepalese man and let us through the gate. We walked down a back alley for about 15 yards, took a turn, and there was a building. We went in the door of the building that was all closed up. It is Sunday night about 7 o'clock in the evening. It is dark and wintertime.

We walk in the door and here is what we saw. This is only one picture, I have many others. This picture was taken by my staff person. That is me in the picture, I wanted to show proof positive of what was happening. Here are these kids. You cannot see them because the camera flash doesn't go back far. There are dozens of kids working at these looms. It is nighttime and kids are working the looms. Since I had this young Nepalese man with me who spoke Nepalese, they were talking. The kids were very nervous but I talked to this young child and the best we could determine he is 7 years old. We talked to this young girl shown in another picture and determined she was eight or nine years old. Remember, this is in the evening, they have been working all day in this closed building. I didn't know it at the time, but when you make these carpets, all the dust gets in the air; the place is dusty, anyone can see all the fine particles and the children have no protective gear whatever. We saw this firsthand.

To finish my story, it turned out the owner was not gone. After we had been there for about 10 minutes, the owner shows up and, of course, he is beside himself. I told him who we were and he asked us—not politely—to get out. Of course, we left—but not until we had the documented proof with photos. As I said, this is only one of many that I have. My staff person and a couple of other people were there to witness the kids, kids taken away from their countryside families. There was a barracks nearby where they live. They eat their meals there, they sleep there, they work here. This is maybe 50 or 100 feet away from the barracks in a compound which they cannot leave.

Tell me they are not slaves. They have no right to leave, they have no right to go home, they have no one protecting them. They are kept locked in a compound day and night, forced to work on these looms. Please, someone tell me that this ought to be tolerated in free trade.

This legislation before the Senate, the African trade bill, contains this provision that says from now on, no trade preferences to any country that doesn't implement what is already agreed to, implement the provisions of ILO 182.

Our goal is not to enact punitive sanctions on our trading partners. We are trying to use trade to help them emerge from poverty. Rather, it is to encourage and persuade them to build on the prosperity that comes with

trade and to lift their standards up. Exploitative child labor in other countries does a couple of things. First, it puts competing firms and workers at a disadvantage in the United States and other countries that do not allow child labor. This legislation before the Senate codifies for the first time ever in U.S. trade legislation the requirement that countries who wish to benefit from trade preferences must actually do what they have already committed to do, and that is to eliminate the worst forms of child labor.

Additionally, the Department of Labor will produce an annual report on what countries are doing in order to live up to their commitments to eliminate child labor. Furthermore, there will be a public hearing annually so that nongovernmental organizations, trade unions, and businesses will have an opportunity to comment. No longer will it be sufficient for a country to be merely "taking steps" to address one or more of the internationally recognized core labor standards to be deemed eligible for preferences under GSP or under the African Caribbean Trade Act.

Once the President signs this bill into law, a country's efforts to eliminate the worse forms of child labor will be a mandatory consideration for determining eligibility for trade benefits. This is, indeed, an important development. In the past, the U.S. Trade Representative, in its implementation and enforcement of the generalized system of preferences, I believe, has abused the language in the statute calling for taking steps to afford worker rights, including child labor. The USTR has interpreted that as any one gesture made by a country would be enough to satisfy the requirements of the generalized system of preferences.

In other words, there is a list of five internationally recognized workers' rights provisions: the right of association; the right to organize and bargain collectively; a prohibition on the use of any form of forced or compulsory labor; a minimum age for the employment of children; and acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health.

If a country previously had taken a step in any one of those areas, they would get GSP. If they had the right of association but still had children working they could get GSP. This is wrong.

Now, after 15 years, we have a universal standard. ILO Convention 182 is a well-defined and internationally accepted standard that will be the criterion used in granting any country U.S. trade benefits. ILO Convention 182 will hold everyone to one real and enforceable standard already agreed to by 174 countries.

I believe in free trade. But I also believe in a level playing field. U.S. workers, workers in other countries, cannot compete with slaves. Call it what you want, dress it up with all kinds of fancy words, but these kids

are working under slave-like conditions, and they do not have a choice. That is the definition of slavery.

When a child is exploited for the economic gain of others, that child loses, their family loses, their country loses, and the world loses. It is bad economics and bad development strategy. Nations that engage in abusive child labor make bad trading partners.

A nation cannot achieve prosperity on the backs of its children. There is simply no place in the new global economy for the slave labor of children.

Again, I point out, this is the kind of work we are talking about. This is 8-year-old Mohammad Ashraf Irfan, making surgical instruments in Sialkot, Pakistan. He is working with dangerous tools and he is making surgical equipment. If you are going to go into a hospital and have an operation, you are probably going to have one of these used on you, made by an 8-year-old kid with no hope for his future.

Here is a young Indian girl carrying construction material. This is the kind of abusive and exploitative child labor we are talking about.

Recently, I came across a startling statistic. According to the UNICEF report entitled "The State of the World's Children, 1999," nearly 1 billion people will begin this 21st century unable to read a book or sign their name because they are illiterate. This is a formula for instability, violence, and conflict.

Nearly one-sixth of all humanity, 3½ times the population of the United States, will be functionally illiterate on the eve of the new millennium. That is shocking. And the main reason for this appalling situation is that many of these people who are adults now were forced to work as children instead of attending school.

The children making pennies a day and denied an education will never buy a computer or the software for it. They will never purchase a CD or a VCR to play American movies. By allowing abusive and exploitative labor to continue, we not only doom the child to a future of poverty and destitution, we doom future markets for American goods and services.

The markets of tomorrow are taking shape today. If we want American goods to be purchased the world over, people not only have to be able to afford them, they have to be educated enough to be able to use them.

Some have said labor issues should not be dealt with in trade measures. I think this is wrongheaded thinking. We should be addressing these issues on trade measures. After all, we are ultimately talking about our trade policy.

Not long ago, agreements on intellectual property rights were not considered measures to be addressed by trade agreements. In the beginning, just a few years ago, only tariffs and quotas were addressed by GATT because they were the most visible trade-distorting practices. But over the years, GATT evolved to include intellectual property rights and services which have be-

come integral parts of our trade agreements.

Now I understand the WTO, the World Trade Organization, will consider rules dealing with foreign direct investment and competition policy to be part of trade agreements. If we can protect a song, if we can protect a CD, certainly we can protect children.

We cannot, as a nation, ignore this. In 1993, the Senate put itself on record in opposition to the exploitation of children by passing a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that I submitted. In 1994, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, I requested the Department of Labor to begin a series of reports on child labor. These reports now consist of five volumes with a sixth to be released in a few days. They represent the most comprehensive documentation ever assembled by the U.S. Government on this issue.

Last year, President Clinton issued an Executive Order prohibiting the U.S. Government from procuring items made by forced or indentured child labor. I congratulate President Clinton for taking that step.

I am also pleased to say that the United States was one of the very first countries to ratify ILO Convention 182. We did it in near record time, and President Clinton signed this. I was there in Seattle at the WTO conference last December. Again, I compliment and commend President Clinton for his bold action in signing this, the U.S. being one of the first countries to sign on to ILO Convention 182.

I also compliment and commend the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Chairman HELMS, for not only cosponsoring my amendment but also for his work in getting the ILO convention through his committee and through the Senate in record time last year. Chairman HELMS did a great service to this effort to eliminate these worst forms of child labor around the world. I commend Chairman HELMS for his leadership in this area.

I am not just talking about the ratification. I am talking about the standards that were established by this convention that were unanimously accepted in Geneva. There was not one vote against it. As I said, the Tripartite Advisory Panel on International Labor Standards says the United States already meets the standards set by this convention.

Last, some say this is a restraint of trade. Nonsense. We already have laws on our books that prohibit the importation of ivory. We have laws on our books that prohibit the importation of goods made with prison labor. We have laws on our books that prohibit the importation of counterfeit goods that don't respect intellectual property rights such as pirated CDs. Again, if we can protect ivory and pirated CDs, we can protect. I am pleased the United States has taken a major step forward with this trade bill. We are sending a strong message to our trading partners. There is no place in the global

economy for countries engaging in abusive and exploitative child labor.

I am hopeful my colleagues will support this conference report with an overwhelming vote. I believe this measure will give hundreds of thousands of children hope for a brighter future. As someone who has been working on this issue of abusive and exploitative child labor for over a decade, I cannot help but feel proud the United States has spoken in such a clear and unequivocal voice that engaging children in this type of slave labor will not be tolerated in our trade policy.

I yield the floor.

TEXTILES AND APPAREL PROVISIONS

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, sections 112 and 211 of the act will create new import programs for apparel produced in the Sub-Saharan and CBI countries which have been carefully crafted to bring significant benefits both to those regions and to the U.S. textile and apparel industry if the new programs are administered as intended. These programs could, however, fail to provide the intended benefits if they are not administered as intended.

Obviously, the intent of the Senate managers in crafting the textile and apparel provisions in sections 112 and 211 is very important, and is worth discussing in some detail as we consider the conference agreement today.

I would now ask my distinguished colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, if it is his understanding that the conference agreement adopted the operative provisions of the Senate bill commonly referred to as "807A" and "809" with respect to both Africa and the Caribbean Basin, provisions which afford duty-free and quota-free treatment to apparel articles made from American fabric.

Mr. GRASSLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COVERDELL. If the distinguished Senator from Iowa would indulge me further, with regard to the provisions popularly referred as "807A" and "809" in both the Caribbean Basin and Africa trade measures, do I understand correctly that the conference agreement adopted the operative language of these provisions as reported out of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COVERDELL. Is my understanding correct that those provisions, as reported out by the Finance Committee and passed by the Senate, required that all textile components of such apparel articles be made from American fabric?

Mr. GRASSLEY. The Senator is correct. The Finance Committee reported out the Africa and Caribbean Basin measures separately. The committee reports on each of those measure addresses this issue explicitly. The reports make clear that those provisions commonly referred to as "807A" and "809" are to be administered in a manner consistent with the then-current regulations regarding the "Special Ac-

cess Program" for textile and apparel articles from the Caribbean and Andean Trade Preference Act countries. The report, in fact, expressly cites the Federal Register notice dated April 3, 1998, that sets out the rules that the Committee intended would apply. The language of the reports then restates the language of the Federal Register notice, concluding that the requirements that products must be assembled from fabric formed in the United States applies to all textile components of the assembled products, including linings and pocketing.

Mr. COVERDELL. When the Act requires yarn to be "wholly formed" in the United States, am I correct that the intention of the managers is to require that all processes necessary to convert fibers into yarns—i.e., spinning, extruding—be performed in the United States?

Mr. GRASSLEY. That is correct. While the fibers need not be manufactured in the United States, let me be clear that it is the managers' intent that the man-made core of a wrapped yarn must originate in the United States and that all mechanical processes necessary to convey fibers into yarns must be performed in the United States.

Mr. COVERDELL. I understand that it is the managers' intent that under the Caribbean Basin portion of the Act, an apparel article containing elastomeric yarns, including elastomeric filament yarns, shall be eligible for the de minimis rule set forth in section 211 only if such yarns, whether covered or uncovered, are wholly formed in the United States.

Mr. GRASSLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COVERDELL. Now, with respect to the provisions of the Africa and Caribbean Basin programs that deal with fabric or yarn not widely available in commercial quantities, am I correct that it is the intent of the managers that these provisions should be administered in the same manner, as practicable, as the short supply procedures in the NAFTA?

Mr. GRASSLEY. That is the case.

Mr. COVERDELL. With respect to the so-called "809" benefits the Africa and CBI programs, is it the intent of managers that apparel articles remain eligible for duty-free and quota-free treatment when the fabric is cut both in the United States and the beneficiary countries?

Mr. GRASSLEY. That is correct, provided that all the other requirements of both the 807A and 809 provisions are satisfied. This includes the requirement that U.S. thread be used in the assembly of the apparel article.

Mr. COVERDELL. I have one final question regarding the so-called 809 provisions of both the Africa and Caribbean Basin measures. Am I correct that it is the managers' intent that these provisions do not permit dying or finishing of the fabrics to be performed in countries other than the United States or the beneficiary countries?

Mr. GRASSLEY. That is correct.

Mr. COVERDELL. I would like to thank my colleague for his time and attention to these important questions.

NON-ACCURAL EXPERIENCE METHOD OF ACCOUNTING

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I would like to join my distinguished colleague from Tennessee in a colloquy with the distinguished Managers of this legislation, the Trade and Development Act of 2000.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Virginia and I direct the distinguished Managers to a matter that relates to a revenue raising provision that was considered in the conference on the Trade and Development Act of 2000, but ultimately was not included in the final agreement. The revenue raising provision limited the non-accrual experience method of accounting.

The related matter is the application of the formula in the Treasury Regulations on the non-accrual experience method of accounting to qualified personal service providers.

The formula contained in Temp. Reg. Section 1.448-2T does not clearly reflect the amount of income that, based on experience, will not be collected by many qualified personal service providers, especially for those where significant time elapses between the rendering of the service and a final determination that the account will not be collected. Providers of qualified personal services should not be subject to a formula that requires the payment of taxes on receivables that will not be collected.

To this end, we believe the Treasury Secretary should amend the temporary regulations to provide a more accurate determination for such qualified personal service providers of the amount to be excluded from income that, based on the taxpayer's experience, will not be collected. In amending such regulations, the Secretary should consider providing flexibility with respect to the formula used to compute the amount of the exclusion to address the different factual situations of taxpayers.

Do the distinguished Managers agree with our view of the temporary regulations and the action the Treasury Secretary should take?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I agree with distinguished colleagues from Tennessee and Virginia that Temp. Reg. Section 1.448-2T presents problems for qualified service providers. Furthermore, the Treasury Secretary should consider amending these temporary regulations to provide a more accurate method.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I concur with my distinguished colleagues from Iowa.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, S. 434, the Trade and Development Act of 2000 Conference Report breaks important new ground in trade legislation. For the first time, in exchange for granting unilateral trade benefits to a country,

the President must give equal consideration to whether a country has met both trade criteria and labor standards.

For example, before the favorable trade benefits available in this legislation can be granted, the President must determine not only that a country has demonstrated a commitment to undertaking its WTO obligations on or ahead of schedule, and the extent to which a country provides protection of intellectual property rights, but also the extent to which the country provides internationally recognized worker rights.

Mr. President, I am pleased the Conference Report retained the Levin-Moynihan amendment requiring the President to take into consideration the extent to which a country provides internationally recognized worker rights, including child labor, collective bargaining, the use of forced or coerced labor, occupational health and safety and labor standards before the trade benefit can be granted to a Caribbean Basin beneficiary country.

The Levin-Moynihan provision sets an important precedent of promoting standards on such things as child labor, collective bargaining, use of forced or coerced labor, occupational health and safety and other worker rights as part of our trade relationships by considering progress toward those goals when unilaterally granting a trade benefit.

Most CBI countries are signatories of the International Labor Organization conventions. Considering the extent to which these countries abide by their own international obligations is the least we can do when considering whether they deserve to receive unilateral trade preferences from us.

The bill is further strengthened by another important precedent setting provision. The Conference Report also retained the Harkin amendment on Child Labor. As a result, this legislation, for first time, codifies in U.S. trade law ILO convention language on Child Labor by amending the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify that the ban on articles made with forced and/or indentured labor includes those articles made with forced and/or indentured child labor. It also, for the first time, conditions U.S. trade benefits on meeting child labor standards by adding a new eligibility criterion to the Generalized System of Preferences, which also apply to the eligibility criteria under the African Growth and Opportunity Act, to provide that the President shall not designate a country for benefits if it has not implemented its obligations to eliminate the worst forms of child labor.

I hope this legislation will help to bring about greater economic development and democracy to the important regions of Sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean. Because of this hope, and because of the provisions I have mentioned above, I will vote for this bill.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the conference report to H.R. 434, the Africa Growth

and Opportunity Act. I believe passage of this legislation is important to cement what has become the broad, bipartisan consensus of this body: trade is a key factor in raising living standards in developing countries, and is of primary importance in exporting to those countries key American values of human rights, democratization, peace and stability.

Mr. President, in supporting this legislation I do not suggest that trade alone is a panacea for the many difficulties in developing countries. Simply opening the door to trade with African countries will not enable many of these countries to enter the international community of developed nations. Many countries in Africa simply lack the basic health, education and economic infrastructures to take advantage of the benefits this legislation provides.

Trade and investment initiatives for Africa will not succeed without substantial investments in developing Africa's human resources.

For those sub-Saharan African countries who labor under a crippling debt burden, some measure must be taken to assist them to break free from reliance on debt provided by donor countries. Debt relief should be the highest priority of donor countries, including the United States, seeking to promote African economic development.

This legislation should therefore be hailed not as an end in itself, but as a good beginning to a longer-term policy which, under U.S. leadership, begins to draw Africa more closely into the global community. We need to begin now to ensure that U.S. policy will do more to promote regional economic cooperation and integration in Africa; U.S. Policymakers, including those in this body, should undertake broader and more regular consultation with Africa's governmental, non-governmental and private sector leadership, and we should ensure that the eligibility standards contained in this legislation carefully account for differing levels of development. To that end, we should be careful not to rely too closely on conditions such as those employed by the International Monetary Fund in applying eligibility standards under this legislation.

Mr. President, the importance of this legislation is both its historic significance as the first major piece of trade legislation in twelve years and its precedential significance in marking the importance of trade benefits as a "carrot" and not a "stick" to bring international social and living standards in developing standards more close to international norms.

Rather than holding this legislation hostage to concerns which can and must be addressed in the longer-term. I would urge my colleagues to take this first step on the road of a broader, more sensible policy toward the developing world, and pass this legislation.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, it is with mixed feelings that I will vote for pas-

sage of the Trade and Development Act of 2000.

No one can look upon the scenes of human suffering in Africa today without recognizing the need for action. Whether it is the AIDS epidemic or the violence in Sierra Leone, the floods in Mozambique or the unacceptably slow progress toward democratization, Africa challenges the conscience—and threatens the health and security—of the rest of the world.

We must respond.

The bill before us today offers an initial response to the many interconnected problems on the African continent. I agree with the basic premise of the bill, that promoting sustainable economic growth, led by more open access to American markets, must be a key element in any strategy for Africa.

And I must add here, Mr. President, that it is time for us to provide similar market openings to the nations of the Caribbean, who have faced a real disadvantage since the passage of NAFTA.

But I will focus my brief remarks today on Africa, because when the legislation before us today was initially proposed, it offered us the opportunity to formulate a comprehensive policy for Africa. At the end of the day, I am afraid that what remains is only a first step.

Mr. President, compared to the crushing problems facing the peoples of Africa, this bill is really very modest in terms of what it offers African countries in terms of duty free exports to the United States.

While opening our markets must be part of any program of economic assistance for Africa, we should not mistake this bill for a complete policy.

It may be that this bill has more symbolic value, as evidence of renewed interest in Africa, than any material impact on the many difficult and interconnected problems facing economic development there. Certainly, we should not let this bill become an excuse for self-congratulation or complacency.

Some provisions, however, I hope will enable the United States government to enhance its trade and investment relationship with countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. The conference report directs the Administration to convene an annual trade and economic forum with the trade ministers of African countries. The key here is that in order to expand trade and investment, there must be a climate within African countries which create investor confidence.

I believe that open, face to face dialogue with African Trade Ministers is vital if the United States is going to get its message across about issues such as the importance of transparency, and the guarantee of timely remedy to disputes through a judicial process that is open and fair.

In addition, the report increases the number of foreign commercial service officers. Currently, we have fewer than 10 such officers for the more than forty countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Clearly this is inadequate. These officers are

responsible for identifying opportunities for small to medium U.S. businesses to export their goods and services to African countries, as well as providing information on economic conditions and investment climate factors which enable them to make better decisions on where and when to invest.

One of the most glaring weaknesses of this legislation, Mr. President, is that it does not adequately address the HIV/AIDS crisis in Sub-Saharan Africa, so eloquently described by Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator FEINGOLD yesterday in their moving statements.

Some of my colleagues do not believe that a trade bill should attempt to speak to the issue of HIV/AIDS. I believe that we are talking about a disease that is so virulent, so deadly and so pernicious that any plan for economic development in Africa will inevitably fail if this epidemic is not contained.

If only because of the very real threat that this epidemic carries for our own health and security, Congress must take any and all opportunity we have to provide help to this region in fighting this dreaded disease.

That is why, Mr. President, I was extremely disappointed that the Feinstein-Feingold amendment to the Senate bill was dropped without any provision put in its place which would offer effective assistance to Africans as they fight this deadly disease.

In March, the Foreign Relations Committee unanimously passed an authorization bill which provided \$300 million dollars for a program—based on work by Senators FRIST and KERRY—of vaccines to fight the spread of HIV/AIDS.

Although the conference on the bill before us today was conducted under the jurisdiction of the Finance and Ways and Means Committees, it declined to take action on the tax credits for vaccine research, production, and distribution that would have complemented those steps we took in the Foreign Relations Committee.

That was another opportunity lost, Mr. President, and another reason why the celebration over passage of this bill should be muted, at best.

I see some hope in today's Wall Street Journal, which reports that several major drug companies have announced plans to cut the cost of AIDS drugs in the developing world. I hope we will see some real results following from this announcement. Voluntary action of this sort can and should be part of any comprehensive plan to address this crisis of historic proportions.

This conference report also states that it is the sense of the Congress that the nations of Sub-Saharan Africa should receive substantial debt relief.

I must point out that the Foreign Relations Committee has passed authorizations for the use of the proceeds of gold revaluations at the IMF as well as the U.S. share of the trust fund that will be set up for the new, enhanced debt relief program for the poorest na-

tions of the world. The nations of Sub-Saharan Africa will be among the chief beneficiaries of that program.

I am glad to see that, with passage of this legislation, that Congress stands behind this debt relief program. I hope that the Appropriations Committee will soon provide the funds for us to put some money behind those sentiments, and that the Banking Committee will quickly conclude its work on the remaining authorization needed to put the debt relief program into motion.

In the end, while I understand and sympathize with some of the complaints raised by those who will vote against the bill, I prefer to see this glass as half full. But this is still a pretty small glass, Mr. President.

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, in my absence I would like to submit this statement for the RECORD. As you know, I make every effort not to miss votes in the Senate, and would not do so but for the fact that there is currently a massive wildfire that is raging out of control in my state. At this time a substantial number of homes have been destroyed or damaged, with more surely to follow. And there is no end in sight. Thousands of New Mexicans have had to leave their homes in Los Alamos and White Rock, and if the conditions stay the same there, many more will be leaving in other communities. This is a uniquely catastrophic situation, and I apologize for not being able to cast my vote.

But since I cannot be here today, I want to submit for the record that if I was here I would have voted in the affirmative for the Africa/Caribbean Basin Initiative Trade Bill. There has been considerable debate over this bill, and I have carefully considered the issues involved. I agree with my colleagues that this is not a perfect bill—questions concerning labor rights, human rights, corporate investment, the environment, transshipments, and so on linger, and they will do so until the provisions of the bill are implemented over time. But I am convinced that over the long run it begins a process that offers real hope for Africa, the Caribbean Basin, and the people who live in those regions. So while I am not present today, I state for the RECORD that I feel this is the right step to take. An initial step to be sure, but definitely the right one. •

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, more than 6 months ago I signified my support for the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Caribbean Basin Initiative when it came to the Senate floor for a vote. Today, I stand again with a bipartisan collection of my colleagues, a broad base of industry, faith-based and religious groups, a variety of free trade advocates, and supporters from the sub-Saharan African nations and the Caribbean to advocate for swift passage of this legislation.

To begin, Senators ROTH and MOYNIHAN should be applauded for producing and delivering this legislation

after more than three years of deliberation and negotiation. The long and arduous task of attaining agreements between U.S. industry and their counterparts in Africa and the Caribbean, as well as assuring that the various trade interests from all sides were accommodated, is a task that should be commended.

As we continue to prosper and advance in this expanding and ever changing world economy, it is essential that the United States reach out to all regions of the globe. By unilaterally expanding access to U.S. markets, sub-Saharan nations and the Caribbean will be afforded new trade and investment policies that will propel these regions into 21st Century trade practices.

Trade with the United States does imply that certain practices be instituted and embraced by participating nations. This bill promotes the establishment and development of free-market economies, insists on human rights standards, and champions democratic and economic principles, the U.S. expects from our trading partners.

From textiles and apparel, to agriculture and specialty goods, not only does the United States stand to prosper from this trade agreement, but, so too do the sub-Saharan and Caribbean nations. While some have argued that U.S. companies could be harmed by expanded trade with these regions, stringent requirements regarding the transshipment of goods have been incorporated into the legislation. In addition, the bill includes a provision that enables the U.S. Customs Service to assist these countries with illegal transshipments.

While I am somewhat disappointed that the bill no longer includes the reauthorization of Trade Adjustment Assistance and the Generalized System of Preferences, the crux of the bill, its intent, and its long-term impact on trade with sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean make it well worthy of passage. In addition, my home State of Washington, the most trade dependent state in the nation, naturally stands to gain from increased trade.

Again, I reiterate my support for the legislation and its far-reaching intent. With such a broad base of advocates vying for its passage, not to mention the partnerships in trade this legislation creates for the United States, this measure deserves our support and swift approval.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to express my concerns with the legislation before us.

While I support the intent of this legislation, increasing trade between Africa and the U.S., I will not be able to lend it my support.

This is in no way a comment on either Chairman ROTH or Senator MOYNIHAN. They have done yeoman's work on this legislation, which has been a longtime priority for them both.

Mr. President, my objection to this legislation is what it includes, and what it excludes.

The legislation includes provisions which are a less than comprehensive approach to establishing mutually beneficial trade relations with Africa. In addition, I have heard from Rhode Island textile manufacturers who remain concerned with the textile provisions in this legislation, specifically the less than perfect transshipment elements. Lastly, the legislation only includes a study of the effectiveness of Trade Adjustment Assistance, even though the Senate bill reauthorized and strengthened TAA for workers and businesses adversely affected by international trade.

On the other hand, the conference report excludes an amendment which is important to our country's jewelry manufacturers as well as Senator FEINGOLD's and Senator FEINSTEIN's amendment on HIV/AIDS treatment in African nations.

Last year, with the support of Chairman ROTH and Senator MOYNIHAN, the Senate adopted a common sense amendment to the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act to improve country of origin marking requirements for certain types of imported jewelry.

Now, improving the country of origin marking requirements for jewelry may seem like a modest proposal, but it took many years to develop a compromise on this issue that would pass the Senate.

To give a sense of how long it took, I first introduced this legislation in 1996 as a member of the other chamber, when members of our struggling domestic jewelry manufacturing industry came to me with a desire to see permanent country of origin markings on imports.

These small businesses told me that all too often the stickers or tags meant to inform consumers where a product was made, fell off, were obscured by price tags, or in some cases were simply removed. Customs officials in Rhode Island also acknowledged that there was a problem with the marking regime on imported jewelry.

Most importantly, I found that the same concern on the part of domestic makers of Native American style jewelry had been addressed as part of the 1988 trade bill. It is upon this common sense law that I based my legislation.

Mr. President, as a general rule, the United States requires all imported products to display in the most permanent manner possible the nation where they were made. One only has to look at a watch, clothing, computers, televisions, scissors, books, toys, and almost every other product to see that its country of origin is conspicuously and permanently marked so consumers know where a product was manufactured.

The existence of these marking requirements is not due to some nefarious protectionist urge, rather it is simply a tool to provide consumers with information and help Customs officials easily recognize imports for the purposes of tariff classification. I

would add that most of our trading partners have similar standards.

It was with the above in mind that I was pleased to work with the Chairman and Senator MOYNIHAN to develop a sensible amendment to increase the amount of imported jewelry that had to be permanently marked. However, I would point out that this language was also consistent with all trade laws and created no bar to the flow of imported jewelry. Moreover, the amendment did no more than establish marking requirement parity between non-precious jewelry and Native American style jewelry. And, lastly I am hard pressed to see how changing the method by which a product is marked leads to any increased costs for foreign manufacturers, since under the current country of origin system all products are legally required to be marked in some fashion.

Unfortunately, the House cavalierly dismissed the concerns of Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, and California jewelry makers for reasons of either ignorance or animosity to change.

I want to stress that I appreciate and recognize the time that the Chairman, Senator MOYNIHAN and their staffs put into this seemingly non-controversial provision.

While the legislation before us does not contain this common-sense amendment, I want to assure my colleagues here and in the other body, as well as the thousands of hard-working men and women of the domestic jewelry industry, that I will continue to pursue this issue and utilize all of the Senate's prerogatives to enact this legislation. Thank you.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the conference report to the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act. This legislation contains important measures that not only will help spur the economies of developing nations in Sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean Basin, but also will strengthen our ability to retaliate against countries who refuse to comply with WTO trade decisions won by the United States.

Sub-Saharan Africa is enmeshed in great economic, human, and political turmoil. The countries of this region are among the poorest in the world. The per capita income averages less than \$500 annually, and the average life expectancy is the world's shortest. We have all seen pictures of the desperate conditions—images of starving babies, homeless families, and needless bloodshed seem to be everywhere. And, just today, news stories about the situation in Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe remind us of how truly bleak life in Africa can be.

But, Mr. President, despite the killings, despite the political unrest, despite the poverty—the future offers the people of Africa great opportunities for increased trade and investment—opportunities that can restore hope and bring about positive change on the Continent.

With a population of more than 700 million, Sub-Saharan Africa represents

one of the largest economic markets in the world. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, my own home state of Ohio was the tenth largest exporting state to the region, with \$148 million in exports in 1998. Although U.S. exports to Africa are more than 45 percent greater than U.S. exports to all the countries of the former Soviet Union, this export market still represents only about one percent of our nation's total trade.

It is time that we establish a new economic framework on which we can build increased trade with Africa. The Africa Growth and Opportunity Act establishes just such a framework by encouraging increased trade and investment by reducing trade barriers.

Mr. President, as I said earlier, the legislation before us today, not only affects African nations, but also those within our own hemisphere through the Caribbean Basin Initiative.

Over the last decade, the United States has played a vital role in the spread of democracy and the growth of free enterprise throughout the Western Hemisphere. Today, every nation in our hemisphere—except Cuba—has moved toward establishing a democratic government and is opening their economies to free trade. Democratic elections have become the norm—not the exception—and hemispheric trade integration is a common goal.

To further consolidate democracies and economic gains in the region, we must move forward to integrate economically with our neighboring countries. The Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act is part of our effort to consolidate democracy and economic stability in our hemisphere. This Act would bring tremendous benefits to the United States and to the Caribbean Basin. It would enhance our economic security, both by opening new markets for American products and by strengthening the economies of our closest neighbors. And, it would create new hope for those left jobless by Hurricanes Mitch and George.

The CBI enhancement legislation would extend duty-free treatment to apparel assembled in the Caribbean Basin (or assembled and cut in the region) using U.S. fabric made from U.S. yarn. This would help strengthen existing U.S.-CBI partnerships in the apparel industry, because the duty-free treatment will help U.S. apparel manufacturers maintain their competitiveness with the Asian market.

The CBI enhancement also would take steps toward creating a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), by promoting the anti-corruption and protection of intellectual property, as well as other forms of cooperation with matters such as counter-narcotics programs. Specifically, the legislation would link CBI benefits more explicitly to the fulfillment of specific obligations in beneficiary countries in such areas as WTO compliance, intellectual property rights, investment protection,

market access, worker rights, narcotics enforcement, corruption, government procurement, customs valuation and comparable tariff treatment.

Mr. President, trade integration will occur in this hemisphere, whether or not we are a part of it. So, it is in our national interest to shape that integration process by bringing more countries into bilateral and multilateral trade agreements with the United States. If we fail to seize trade opportunities in Africa and within our own hemisphere, others will take our place of leadership. No country is waiting for us to act first. In the end, the longer we wait, the more we stand to lose.

And speaking of losing, currently, our nation continues to be injured by the refusal of the European Union (EU) to comply with WTO rulings in the beef and banana trade disputes. In addition to denying American farmers access to the European market, the EU's actions are undermining the entire WTO Dispute Settlement process. If they are successful in ignoring such decisions, how can we expect other countries to follow trade dispute settlement rulings? How can we expect anyone in the United States to have faith in the WTO?

Repeatedly, I have come to the floor to raise my concerns about the EU's flagrant disregard for dispute settlement rulings in the beef and banana cases, which have clearly shown the "Fortress Europe" mentality against free and fair trade. Last Fall, during the Senate floor debate on the Africa trade bill, I successfully amended the legislation to create a powerful mechanism—tariff retaliation—to fight "fortress" mentalities and to protect our nation from illegal foreign trade practices. Today, I am pleased to say that the conference report before us now still contains my provision to strengthen the one and only weapon in our arsenal to fight WTO noncompliance.

The purpose of the provision is simple—to make our retaliation more effective and to compel compliance with the WTO rulings. The measure would specifically require the U.S. Trade Representative to periodically "carousel"—or rotate—the list of goods subject to retaliation when a foreign country or countries have failed to comply with a WTO ruling. The retaliation list would be carouselled to affect other goods 120 days from the date the list is made and every 180 days, thereafter. The U.S. Trade Representative would retain ample discretion and authority to ensure that retaliation implemented by the United States remains within the levels authorized by the WTO. Also, the provision makes it clear that our Trade Representative is to structure the retaliation lists to maximize the likelihood of compliance by the losing side in trade disputes.

Mr. President, the WTO is one of the most important means for American businesses and producers to open foreign markets, liberalize commerce, resolve disputes, and ensure more open

and fair trade. American farmers and agribusiness, for example, are major net exporters, posting exports of more than \$57 billion in 1997. Of the nearly 50 complaints filed by the United States in the WTO, almost 30 percent involved agriculture. If a country or countries fail to comply with WTO rulings, American agriculture and other U.S. sectors in need of trade relief will suffer greatly.

It's time to fight back. While carousel retaliation is tough, it is the right response to chronic non-compliance with WTO rulings. It is the kind of response that will do more to encourage compliance with WTO rules, giving Ohio's farmers and businesses the level-playing field they deserve.

Overall, Mr. President, the trade bill before us is a good bill—it is good for Sub-Saharan Africa; it is good for the Caribbean Basin; and it is good for agriculture and business right here at home in the United States. In the end, this bill just makes good sense.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I support passage of H.R. 434, the Trade and Development Act of 2000. This legislation includes the African Growth and Opportunity Act, legislation to grant Caribbean countries tariff parity with the North American Free Trade Agreement, and other legislation that will use trade incentives to promote U.S. global economic interests.

I have been a longtime supporter of many components of this legislation, especially the African Growth and Opportunity Act and legislation giving NAFTA parity to our Caribbean allies. This legislation sets an important precedent for future U.S. foreign policy by emphasizing trade incentives over foreign aid. It makes clear that a developing African or Caribbean country must pursue democratic and market-oriented reforms in order to receive benefits. This incentive-based approach will promote democratic government and economic reforms among nations home to more than one billion people. Recent developments in both Zimbabwe and Sierra Leone show that there is much work that still has to be done in Africa to establish stable and effective political and economic institutions. My hope is that this legislation will encourage these developing countries to continue to make progress toward this important goal.

This legislation has been improved since it passed the Senate last year. The conference report gives greater incentive to the development of local African and Caribbean industry by allowing conditional duty-free treatment of apparel made from regional fabrics. While I hope that a future Congress will remove the restrictive conditions on this tariff treatment in order to more fully assist the development of regional industry, I believe that this liberalized tariff-rate quota will promote economic growth and stability in the affected regions. This legislation urges the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) and Export-Import

Bank to promote investment in Africa. Greater American investment in Africa creates greater exposure to American political, economic, labor and environmental principles. Provisions of this legislation also welcome the people of Albania and Kyrgyzstan into the international economy, which I believe is beneficial to American interests. Finally, I am glad that this legislation includes a provision to prohibit the importation of products made from child labor into the United States. This barbaric practice is a relic of earlier, less enlightened times that should be extinguished.

It is unconscionable that the conference dropped a provision that would have made HIV/AIDS medicine more available to the African people. The AIDS epidemic throughout Africa is a crisis, which impedes political reform and economic development in that region. We have a moral obligation to help relieve this health epidemic. I am a strong advocate of free trade and private enterprise. However, as a practical matter, there is little profit to be made or lost in assisting with a health crisis in poor undeveloped countries. Therefore, I believe that we should have included the Senate provision in order to ensure greater distribution of HIV/AIDS drugs to Africa. Since it is no longer included in this legislation, I urge the Congress to enact legislation that will establish a comprehensive solution to the HIV/AIDS problem in Africa that includes the greater distribution of American drugs and medical practices to combat HIV/AIDS. The AIDS crisis in Africa must be solved if we are to achieve any lasting development in the region.

I also have concerns that this legislation will establish some poor precedents. It is my understanding that there is not yet a formal estimate by the Congressional Budget Office for this legislation, so we do not know its cost. I am very disturbed that whatever the costs of the legislation, it will be paid for out of the federal budget surplus. This is not wise policy. The Constitution clearly gives the Congress the "power of the purse" and we must use this power judiciously. I remain dedicated to the principle that the Senate should only consider legislation that has both a known cost and specific provisions paying for it. The version of this legislation that we considered in the Senate in November included provisions to pay for it. The Congress should close tax shelters and loopholes and cut wasteful government spending in order to pay for new programs. As fiscal conservatives, we know that this surplus exists only because we have made careful choices. We must now use this surplus to shore up Social Security and Medicare, pay down the national debt, and cut taxes—not spend it on more government programs.

I am also concerned by some of the provisions in this legislation. While I understand that the current tariff

structure puts American suit manufacturers at an unfair advantage, remedying this inequity deserves more study by the Senate. I do not favor the tariff rebate provisions. No compelling argument has been made to support a Wool Research, Development and Promotion Trust Fund that costs \$2.25 million each year. I am also concerned by provisions included in the conference report that allow Oregon nuclear power plant workers to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance benefits after their eligibility has expired, and allow a company with operations in Connecticut and Missouri to obtain a refund on duties it paid on imports of nuclear fuel assemblies. In addition, I have reservations about using "budgetary gimmicks" to change the schedule of payments of rum excise taxes to Puerto Rico. These revisions are unrelated to trade opportunities for Africa and the Caribbean. All of these measures should be examined in the usual authorization process to ensure that they are considered on merit, and not foisted on the taxpayers by special interests.

In conclusion, although I disagree with some of the inadvisable provisions in this bill, I support this legislation. I believe that, on balance, it is an important milestone in American policy with the developing world, which I hope will encourage the spread of American political and economic values. I will not allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good. However, Congress should ensure that we are more fiscally responsible in funding legislation. It is important that we write responsible legislation that will help promote the American principles of democracy, the rule of law, and a market-oriented economic system.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this is an exceptionally difficult decision.

But after weighing the pros and cons of this legislation, I rise to support the Trade and Development Act.

It is high time that we address economic growth in Africa and the Caribbean. Africa, in particular, has been ignored for far too long. I would like to support this effort to encourage economic growth, investment and trade in the region while recognizing that this effort alone is not enough. It should only be a small piece of our policy in Africa. Much more must be done.

I have considered the impact this measure will have on American workers. I am a blue-collar Senator. My heart and soul lies with blue-collar America. I spent most of my life in a blue-collar neighborhood. My career in public service is one of deep commitment to working-class people. I have fought and continue to fight for economic growth, jobs and opportunities in America—in particular—in my own State of Maryland. And in the last decade, working people have faced the loss of jobs, lower wages and a reduced standard of living, and a shrinking manufacturing base—everything that the critics say. But voting against the

Trade and Development Act will not save those jobs or bring those jobs back.

I also care about working-class people all over the world. I applaud my colleagues for uniting to pass Senator HARKIN's amendment to meet and enforce internationally recognized standards that eliminate the worst forms of child labor. Countries can only enjoy the benefits granted under this Act if they take action to eliminate work that harms the health, safety or morals of children. Benefits will not be given to sub-Saharan or Caribbean countries that carry out hazardous child labor practices, such as slavery, debt bondage, forced or compulsory labor, child prostitution or drug trafficking. This effort is especially relevant to this trade legislation because out of the 250 million children between the ages of 5 and 14 who are working in the developing world—one-third are in Africa.

This Act could have been further strengthened. I supported other amendments toward that aim, which were not incorporated into this legislation. I see several yellow flashing lights that we cannot ignore and we must address with our trading partners in sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean.

Even though the worst forms of child labor were addressed in this legislation, additional efforts still need to be undertaken to protect the rights, welfare, health and safety of all workers. I supported amendments offered by my colleagues to ensure the enforcement of internationally recognized core labor standards and to establish a labor side agreement before this legislation could go into effect. Neither amendment was adopted.

Furthermore, much more needs to be done to protect our environment. Dangerous or haphazard practices that damage the environment in sub-Saharan Africa or the Caribbean not only harm territory within these regions—it affects all of us. We cannot continue to ignore the environment in trade agreements. We must find a way to ensure that economic growth does not come at the expense of the environment.

In addition, much more must be done to provide debt relief to Africa and to prevent and address the HIV/AIDS crisis plaguing the region.

Taking into account these considerations, I still believe that we have a unique opportunity to support legislation that works toward free trade and fair trade. This Act strives to create economic growth, jobs and opportunities in sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean. It encourages African nations to compete and to institute market-oriented economic reforms. It also works to strengthen America's economy and to create American jobs by increasing US exports and investment to these regions.

I agree that the Trade and Development Act as it stands does not encompass numerous other measures that America needs to undertake with re-

spect to Africa and the Caribbean. But it is a courageous first-step and it merits our support.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Conference Report on H.R. 434, the Trade and Development Act of 2000. I oppose this bill because, as a result of this legislation, many Americans will lose their jobs, a significant number of whom will be South Carolinians. Our domestic textile industry will be particularly damaged. I remind my colleagues that in the past five years over 454,000 American textile industry workers already have lost their jobs.

At best, this bill further erodes the system of protective quotas that the Administration promised the U.S. textile industry as a condition of U.S. entry into the World Trade Organization. This quota system was to remain in effect for ten years from 1995 until 2005, to provide the U.S. textile industry with time to adjust to competition from foreign government-subsidized and sweat-shop made textile imports.

The textile industry has been strong in the United States because it encompasses fiber, fabric, and apparel production. The textile industry, in the aggregate, forms the second largest industrial sector of the U.S. economy. Certain segments of the industry, such as yarn and fabric production, have benefited from technology and increased capital investment while apparel production has tended to opt for cheaper labor rather than invest in modern production facilities.

I fear this bill will further encourage U.S. textile firms to move their production off-shore. It signals capital markets that the U.S. textile industry is at risk, thus reducing its ability to borrow the capital to make those improvements necessary for domestic production. With the denial of capital to automate and modernize, the rush toward cheaper and cheaper labor will lead to a continuing exodus of U.S.-based manufacturing. This will result in a further loss of employment in the domestic textile industry and its supporting industries.

A decline in the domestic textile industry will also impact American farmers. Cotton producers in the United States have profited from a strong and vibrant domestic textile industry. However, as the textile industry becomes locked in a downward spiral of chasing ever lower costs, it will look for other ways to reduce expenditures. A likely result will be to encourage cotton production closer to its foreign manufacturing facilities. While U.S. cotton exports may initially increase under this legislation, the long-term impact will not be so favorable to domestic cotton producers.

The countries of Sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean do need to develop economically. There can be no doubt that these countries require help. However, providing assistance by decimating the U.S. textile industry is not the answer. Furthermore, there is no

assurance that this bill will improve the textile industry of these Nations or provide jobs to their citizens. It is clear that government-subsidized Asian textile interests are positioning themselves to dominate the world textile trade. One only has to look at the situation in the Northern Mariana Islands to see the model for the future. Moreover, transshipment to evade the quota arrangements of this bill and other existing quotas will likely continue until the quotas finally end in 2005.

Mr. President, H.R. 434 is a bad bill that critically injures the U.S. textile industry, puts Americans out of work, and, in the end, benefits only Asian textile interests. Therefore, I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, due to a scheduling conflict I was unable to cast my vote today on the cloture motion for the conference report accompanying H.R. 434, the Trade and Development Act of 2000. For the record, I would have voted "aye" in favor of cloture on the bill.

I am very supportive of expanding our trading opportunities with the Caribbean countries and Africa and I am delighted that all parties involved have come to agreement and we have passed this vital legislation. Our distinguished ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator MOYNIHAN, focused our attention on the significance of the passage of this bill earlier today when he highlighted the fact that this is the first trade bill to pass Congress in six years. In my view, that is simply too long.

I'm not here to focus on missed opportunities today, however. I'm here to praise the members of both the House and Senate who were on the conference committee for their tireless efforts on this bill's behalf. To all involved in the passage of this legislation I say "thank you."

This legislation means a great deal to the Caribbean and Africa, but it means a lot to Arkansas, too. This bill will generate an increase in demand for cotton, which is sorely needed. Our cotton farmers at home have experienced several years of bad weather and prices, and I know they are pleased to have access to new markets. It's planting season in Arkansas but that hasn't stopped my constituents from staying in touch. I've heard from many of them this week who took time from their busy schedules to voice their support for this bill. They realize, as I do, that the world is increasingly becoming a "global marketplace" and we must do all we can to expand our trading opportunities. I applaud the Senate's vote on the "Trade and Opportunity Act" today and hope that it will not be another six years before the next trade bill comes to the Senate floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the trade bill before us represents a milestone in U.S. trade policy. This bill, and especially the African Growth and Opportunity Act found at Title I, acknowl-

edges the social, health, and political problems as well as the economic challenges facing a group of states, most of which are developing nations.

It is not that our trade policies have not concerned themselves with developing countries before—that commitment is evident in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), the Caribbean Basin Initiative, and many other trade initiatives. However, this bill is unique in many ways.

First, we are acknowledging that the mere existence of a trade agreement does not produce immediate results. The strength of a society and its polity profoundly affect the development of the capabilities that allow for globalization. Developing countries, for example, need investment, but prudent companies do not commit their resources unless some very fundamental conditions exist, conditions that exceed those addressed in the Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMS) Agreement of the World Trade Organization.

The bill before us does that. We underscore the importance of political stability; we provide opportunities for technical assistance that can create a banking and legal structure to repatriate profits and to protect the sanctity of the contract.

Second, we acknowledge that there are regionally specific social and health issues that are preconditions to real economic development—what I refer to as "trade enablement." Most Sub-Sahara African (SSA) states have been left behind. Their colonial and post-colonial societies have not, for the most part, melded into a modern, unified state. Nor have these societies produced the type of workforce that trade demands—educated, technically skilled, and healthy workers.

The bill before us deals this reality, too, and in several ways.

Like many of my colleagues, I believe we should do what we can to help restore our African partners to the world baseline standard of good health. With 20-30 percent HIV/AIDS infection among the adult populations in some states, few firms will risk hiring a workforce in which one-in-three to one-in-five workers may not be alive, let alone working in five years. I agree with President Clinton's comments that Africa, too, needs to do more to control this problem. But this bill provides incentives.

Not only are these efforts to improve health in this region good economics and good politics, but they are also simply the right thing to do. We are the richest nation in the world. It has always been a part of the American character to help those who are suffering and to improve conditions where we can.

Worker education also faces immense challenges. Literacy rates have risen to 59 percent, but that level lags comparable literacy rates in East Asia (84 percent), Latin America (83 percent) and the Caribbean (83 percent). Once

more, the incentives provided by this bill to create an investment climate, will awaken African governments to the need for programed improvements in literacy and technical training. And, through the newly created economic forum under this bill, conditions can be put in place for technical assistance.

Mr. President, it is undeniable that this bill is a hybrid. It is not a conventional trade bill, because Africa, with the exception of a few states like South Africa, Gabon, and Mauritius, is not positioned to gain immediate or even mid-term benefits unless, and I repeat, unless, trade is coupled with the forms of assistance and incentives that this bill provides.

But it is no less deniable that great benefits will be potentially available to both the U.S. and Sub-Saharan Africa if the underlying concept in this bill materializes.

For the United States, Africa is a warehouse of badly needed strategic materials which will open new sources of supply for U.S. producers. Moreover, if properly developed, this market will benefit the entire population of an African state, rather than a few, often corrupt elites.

It is a fundamental axiom of every trade theory that the economic evolution of trading partners produces rolling prosperity—which is another way of saying that prosperity raises all boats. Not only does this phenomenon promise future markets for U.S. goods, services, and agricultural products, but also a more prosperous, politically stable African continent, which, in turn, produces other foreign policy and national security benefits for the U.S. It creates international partners in this region that have a stake in world peace, disease controls, as well as other initiatives to combat terrorism, international crime, labor force abuses, and environmental degradation.

I believe that this Africa Trade bill will have a broad range of benefits for America, and I will support this legislation. I want to compliment Senator ROTH, Senator GRASSLEY, and other Senators who worked so diligently on this legislation.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last year I reluctantly cast my vote against the Trade and Development Act of 1999, a modest package of trade bills which included the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act.

I have long supported expanding trade opportunities for Vermonters and all Americans, as well as for people in developing countries. And I have felt for some time that our relationship with Africa cannot continue to be based almost exclusively on aid, when the real engine of development, as we have seen both at home and abroad, is investment and trade.

However, I voted against that bill because I felt that in developing a trade policy toward Africa—where poverty is deeply rooted and protections for the environment and the rights of workers

are non-existent—precautions must be taken to ensure that it is a sound policy that responds to Africa's unique and urgent needs. I was disappointed that given the rare opportunity to examine and redefine our relationship with Africa, the approach was so limited and flawed.

There are many aspects of this conference report which I strongly support. Provisions which open new markets for American exports, while providing trade benefits that will help a number of countries compete more effectively in the global economy. Provisions which encourage countries to eliminate the worst forms of child labor, and raise the profile of U.S. agricultural interests in trade negotiations.

I remain disappointed, however, by the act's approach toward Africa.

It is astonishing that aside from Sense of Congress language about the need to strengthen efforts to combat desertification, the act in no way addresses environmental concerns. This is an unfortunate step backward from NAFTA, which—while they did not go far enough—contained side agreements on both environmental and labor issues.

Multinational corporations, especially mining and timber companies, have a long history of exploiting Africa's weak environmental laws and causing pollution, deforestation and the uprooting of people. There is a direct link between environmental degradation and civil unrest. If barriers to foreign investment are lowered or eliminated—as the act calls for—and meaningful, enforceable environmental protections are not put in place, these problems will only get worse.

The act's provision on workers' rights, most of which have been included in other trade legislation, have routinely allowed countries notorious for abuses to escape without penalty. Unions have rightly criticized them for being vague and unenforceable.

As the wealthiest nation, we have a responsibility to do what we can to ensure that the benefits of the global economy are enjoyed by people from all walks of life, here and abroad. However, the workers' rights provision in this act are an invitation for the continued exploitation of cheap African labor.

Mr. President, some have claimed that this legislation is an historic first step toward integrating Africa into the global economy. Others have called it a devastating blow that will force African countries to cut spending on education and health care, and to submit to strict International Monetary Fund conditions. It is neither.

The Trade and Development Act of 2000 is not going to cause the great economic boon some have predicted, and it may cause harm. But it is the wrong approach if we truly want to redefine our relationship with the region from one of dependency to one of actively promoting economic growth and self-reliance.

Like last year, I reluctantly cast my vote against the bill.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we have now reached the final stage of the legislative process with regard to the Trade and Development Act of 2000. The moment has come to vote on final passage. Once again, I urge my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for opportunity, to vote to reaffirm America's historic leadership in international trade. What we do here, what we say here, reverberates all around the world. So I say to my distinguished colleagues, let's send a resounding message, a clear message, a strong message, that America is engaged with the world. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Trade and Development Act of 2000.

I hope we will have speakers now on the African trade bill so we can move ahead to get a vote on that. I think I have not had any requests for speakers in support of the legislation because those of us who support the legislation would like to move it to immediate passage. I hope those who would still like to speak in opposition to it and express those points of view will please do that at this particular time.

In the meantime, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding we are going to go to a vote immediately. All speakers on this side have evaporated. They will present statements.

We do have one speaker, Senator FEINGOLD of Wisconsin, who wants to speak for 45 minutes. I ask unanimous consent he be allowed to speak on this bill on which we are going to be voting following the vote, and prior to military construction, for up to 45 minutes.

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

Mr. REID. I thank the Chair.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICCI) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 98 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Abraham	Gorton	Mack
Akaka	Graham	McCain
Allard	Gramm	McConnell
Ashcroft	Grams	Mikulski
Baucus	Grassley	Moynihan
Bayh	Gregg	Murkowski
Bennett	Hagel	Murray
Biden	Harkin	Nickles
Bond	Hatch	Robb
Breaux	Hutchinson	Roberts
Brownback	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Burns	Inhofe	Santorum
Campbell	Inouye	Sarbanes
Chafee, L.	Jeffords	Schumer
Cochran	Johnson	Sessions
Coverdell	Kerrey	Shelby
Craig	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Crapo	Kohl	Specter
Daschle	Kyl	Stevens
DeWine	Landrieu	Thomas
Dodd	Lautenberg	Thompson
Durbin	Levin	Torricelli
Enzi	Lieberman	Voinovich
Feinstein	Lincoln	Warner
Fitzgerald	Lott	Wyden
Frist	Lugar	

NAYS—19

Boxer	Edwards	Reid
Bunning	Feingold	Smith (NH)
Byrd	Helms	Snowe
Cleland	Hollings	Thurmond
Collins	Kennedy	Wellstone
Conrad	Leahy	
Dorgan	Reed	

NOT VOTING—4

Bingaman	Domenicci
Bryan	Roth

The conference report was agreed to. Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, this was a momentous moment for the Senate, for the Nation, and for the world. We have passed the first trade bill in 6 years, having rejected others and having come about in the aftermath of very dim expectations. From no chance whatever, we have come to the point where this bill passed by 77 votes. It could not have happened without the majority leader, who personally convened meetings in his office day after day. There were mind-numbing details about thread, yarn, square meter equivalents, hundreds, millions—but it came about.

Senator ROTH, our chairman, who could not be here today, will be back next week. He put this matter through the Finance Committee nearly unanimously. I would like to take the opportunity to thank the staff who not only did this, but did it until dawn, day after day—or should I say night after night. They are, on the majority staff: Frank Polk, Grant Aldonas, Faryar Shirzad, Tim Keeler, and Carrie Clark. On the majority leader's staff: Dave Hoppe and Jim Hecht. On our minority staff: David Podoff, Debbie Lamb, Linda Menghetti, and Timothy Hogan. Plus majority and minority tax staffs because tariffs are taxes, we had: Mark Prater, Ed McClellan, Russ Sullivan,

Cary Pugh, Anita Horn, and Mitchell Kent. And a very special word of thanks to Polly CRAIGHILL, Senate Legislative Counsel, who labored with the committee staff long into the night.

Once again, I say to my dear colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, who carried the matter so brilliantly on the other side, not every day do we pass a trade bill 4-1. Thank you. And I again thank the majority leader. The Nation is in his debt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, following up on what Senator MOYNIHAN just said, and associating myself with those remarks, as important as the bill we passed is for the continent of Africa and the Caribbean Basin Initiative, and as important as it is for the consumers of America and the 120,000 new jobs it is going to create for American working men and women, this bill is far more significant, from my point of view, because it is the first major piece of trade legislation passing the Congress in years, as Senator MOYNIHAN said.

In the meantime, I think the United States has been seen by other nations as giving up some of our traditional leadership around the world in negotiations and tearing down trade barriers, which has been our role as a world leader since 1947. I hope that this legislation is the start of America, once again, leading the world in reducing barriers to trade, the promotion of international trade, and seeing trade as more important than aid as an instrument to helping depressed economies around the world.

I look forward to the continuation of our leadership in setting the agenda for the World Trade Organization agenda and regional trade agreements, as well.

Besides all the staff members Senator MOYNIHAN mentioned, I also compliment my international trade counsel, Richard Chriss, on his outstanding contribution to the passage of the Africa Trade and CBI bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I also thank the majority leader. I am not a member of the committee, but I wanted to commend the Senator from New York once again for his tremendous leadership on this issue, and Senator GRASSLEY who is filling in for Senator ROTH, who will be back next week. I commend the majority leader and minority leader. This is an example of what this body can do on issues that usually provoke the most bitter debates. Trade policy and some other issues can be tremendously acrimonious. The fact that the leadership on both sides of the aisle worked as diligently and as hard as they did to try to come up with some understandings as to how to recognize legitimate interests speaks volumes about what this body can do on something as significant and as important as this bill.

I didn't want the moment to pass without commending, obviously, the floor managers and the Finance Committee for their work, but also the leadership for their support of this measure. The administration, as well, should be mentioned in this context. While it has been 6 years, we are going to be dealing with a couple of these issues now in sequence that will be very important and, obviously, their backing and support is worthwhile.

Regarding the last point our colleague from Iowa made, my hope is that passage will also serve as a springboard for us to deal with other foreign policy matters that serve the interests of our country. We have entered a global economy. We all know the lingo about the kind of world of which we are now a part. It is going to be critically important that the Senate of the United States is fulfilling its historic role—the unique aspect of the legislative part of Government—to be engaged in the foreign policy interests of our Nation.

This agreement certainly serves the interests of Africa and the Caribbean Basin very well. But more importantly, it serves the interests of our Nation very well. So I commend the staff and others who were involved. This is a great start. The leadership deserves commendation for their support and their willingness to put a shoulder behind this effort. I also thank the minority leader, TOM DASCHLE, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator MOYNIHAN, Senator DODD, and Senator GRASSLEY, for their comments. They are absolutely right. This is the way we can do things when we make up our minds that we are going to. Keep in mind that just a year ago, most people thought this had no chance. The House passed a bill that was only applicable to Africa. But then Senator ROTH and Senator MOYNIHAN said we should go forward on this. They made the point that we had not had a major trade bill in—I thought 5 years, but in fact it was 6 years. I yielded to the distinguished Senator from New York because he pays such close attention to this. The chairman and ranking member said we should go forward with this and we should add the CBI region and Central America to the package. We did that.

We worked together across the aisle between the two parties. The administration did express its interest in this legislation. The President personally called at least twice—maybe three times—and talked about his hope that we could get this done. But I remember a critical moment a month or so ago, late at night, and we were trying to make the last decision that would close the package up. Dave Hoppe, my chief of staff, was there, and Jim Hecht on my staff, who worked so hard on this legislation, who knew the substance better than I would ever know it. It is mind-boggling in its detail and all the pieces that were in this package. But when I had to basically help make the

final decision, as a matter of fact, I was looking at Senator MOYNIHAN's staff and said, "What do you think? Can we make this work?" They said, "Yes."

That is the way it was. It wasn't partisan at all. To reach this point now and have a vote in the House last week of 309-110, and then 77-19 in the Senate, in an area where we have acrimony, regional division, and one sector of the economy pulling against the other, I think this is something we should take a moment and relish and take credit for and be proud of. It represents a significant step forward in our trade policy and a victory for the cause of free trade. Like Senator DODD, I have been to Central America and met with the Presidents and Ambassadors from Central America and the Caribbean. They pleaded for this and said, "Give us an opportunity." This is the way to help. This is the way to help their people and give them an opportunity to get jobs. It will help you, and it will help us.

I suspect there will be a celebration today and tonight in Central America, in the Caribbean, and in Africa.

I want to make this point. While that is important, we want free trade and this is good for America. I worked a great deal with CHARLIE RANGEL, the Congressman from New York, who really wanted this. I remember a fateful meeting we had outside an elevator in the Cannon Office Building at which I said, basically, if you do Africa, we will do CBI, and we will get together. And we did. He said in some of our meetings: I don't want a bill that is going to cost America jobs. I believe we can have a bill that helps America, creates more American jobs and more opportunity for Americans, and that will be good for the sub-Saharan region and for Central America. I believe we achieved that.

This bill retains the basic structure and approach of the original Senate bill. I want to emphasize that because we made a commitment to Senators who had reservations about this bill that we would do everything possible to retain the basic structure of the Senate bill. We fought for it, and I think we were successful in that area.

The approach makes economic sense, allowing workers and businesses in this country and in our trading partners' to specialize in the activities to which they are most suited. The vast majority of the trade benefits under this bill will involve the use of U.S.-made components. They need it in those other regions. They need our yarn. They need our cotton. So we will benefit, and they will benefit.

I am acutely aware of the concerns and challenges facing our domestic textile industry. Faced with vast amounts of unfair trade and blatant cheating in past textile agreements, our industry has seen a flood of foreign imports that have caused job losses.

The U.S. textile industry will within a few years face the removal of quotas under WTO. At a time of such uncertainty, it is imperative that our trade

measures be carefully geared to sustain and enhance the economic opportunities available to our textile industry and workers. I believe this measure before us today does that. It has some of the most stringent transshipment measures ever enacted, increasing resources for the Customs Service and ensuring that countries receiving benefits under the bill provide full cooperation with our authorities.

That was one of the concerns—that other countries would use Africa, or the CBI, the back door, to transship, to violate the agreements and get in our country in an unfair way.

Will this be perfect? Nothing in this area is perfect. But it will do the best job I believe we have ever done. We are going to watch it to make sure it is effective in that regard.

I was pleased to see comments from members of the domestic textile industry as a result of this conference agreement. The president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute has noted projections that the demand for U.S. fabric will double over the next 8 years under this bill. It is estimated that this will translate into more than 60,000 new U.S. textile jobs in America. This legislation will have real benefits, immediate benefits—for American consumers, for the retail industry, for the yarn industry, for cotton, and for textiles. All the other components in this area of job creation in America will benefit. So will Africa. So will the CBI.

I am pleased we have come to this agreement. Actually, it is a little anticlimactic. In the end, the vote was so overwhelming that you wonder why all the huffing and puffing. But I believe it is because of the good work done by our staffs and by the leadership in the House and in the Senate. It would have not been achievable if Chairman ARCHER and subcommittee chairman CRANE had not been willing to be flexible and agree to some of the things that were important to the Senate.

I want to say a special word about our staffs that worked so hard, and through so many nights, to secure the successful conclusion we have seen today. I want to recognize in particular Senator ROTH's staff, including Frank Polk, J.T. Young, Grant Aldonas, Faryar Shirzad, Tim Keeler, and Carrie Clark; and from Senator MOYNIHAN's staff, David Podoff, Debbie Lamb, Linda Menghetti, and Tim Hogan; from Senator GRASSLEY's staff, Richard Chriss; and from the Congressional Budget Office, Hester Grippando. And finally, with a bill of this detail and technicality, the diligent work of legislative counsel is especially critical. I would like to thank Polly Craighill, Sandy Strokoff and Mark Synnes for their extraordinary efforts.

So, Mr. President, I do not want us to complete this effort without saying I am proud of it. I believe it will be positive for all concerned. I began the debate that way, and I end it that way.

I extend my congratulations to all involved.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I compliment the majority leader for his statement and for the effort he has put forward in bringing us to this point.

I agree with virtually every word he has just spoken about the importance of this matter and about the extraordinary influence it will have on trade policy to important parts of the world today. This is not only good trade policy, it is good economic policy, and it is good diplomatic policy. It is extremely important that people realize the diplomatic, economic, and trade ramifications of this legislation.

I have watched with great admiration as this legislation has been produced. I must say it is one of the many reasons I have come to admire our ranking member on the Finance Committee and his extraordinary effort in getting us to this point. I don't know that I have talked to him about any matter as often as I have talked to him about this in recent months. This is one he has lived and breathed. We are very grateful to him for his leadership and for all of the work he did to get us to this point.

I have already expressed myself in regard to the importance of the legislation and the extraordinary amount of effort that has gone into the work today. This would not have happened were it not for the involvement of a number of our colleagues. Its importance cannot be overemphasized. This is good for this country, and as I noted, it is important we recognize the new opportunities that it presents, not only for the Caribbean countries and Africa but for this country especially.

I would be remiss if I were not to mention the tremendous leadership demonstrated by the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD. On every issue involving Central and Latin America, our caucus depends upon him to a remarkable degree. He is, without a doubt, our expert on South America, on Central America, and on international issues. I personally find myself required, in many cases, to turn to him as the person in whom I have the greatest trust and for whom I have the greatest admiration when it comes to his knowledge of these issues. I thank Senator DODD for all of his efforts in getting us to this point.

I also thank Senator GRAHAM from Florida who has put a great deal of effort into the vote we were able to get this morning, and I am grateful to him.

Finally, Senator BAUCUS also has worked diligently with all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and is also extraordinarily knowledgeable on trade matters.

We have a number of our colleagues who, because they worked as hard as they did, because they showed the leadership they did, because they were as committed as they were to resolving

outstanding differences and working through these many issues in a way that allowed us this success, we ought to pause and thank today. It is not often we see legislation, and trade legislation in particular, of this import with the kind of vote we just cast. It is a great day for this country. I again publicly express my appreciation for their diligence and for their work in getting us to this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator FEINGOLD is recognized for up to 45 minutes.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President.

We just completed our work on the African Growth and Opportunity Act. I had the opportunity on a number of occasions during the debate to express my concerns about the bill and, in particular, the way in which it did not address one of the greatest crises in Africa—the HIV/AIDS problem. But I have asked for this opportunity to speak about another enormous problem in Africa that I think needs to be closely associated with the debate we just had and our thinking with regard to Africa; that is, the problems with armed conflicts in Africa.

Anyone who has been reading the newspapers or watching television in the last few days—whatever the medium—could not help but have a natural reaction to the news from Africa that would suggest an impression of chaos, and even feelings of hopelessness. I am sure this is especially true in the last few days when it comes to the events that are transpiring in Sierra Leone with some United Nations troops being killed, others apparently captured, some missing, protesters being killed, and the absurdity of the United Nations troops protecting Foday Sankoh, the leader of the Revolutionary United Front, the group that has been responsible for some of the most heinous crimes against people we have seen in many years—a group that has been responsible for repeated acts of murder, maiming, and rape. People see this on the television, read about it in the newspaper, and they wonder if there is anything that can be done to help make things different in Africa.

Then they read about Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and they have this sense, understandably, that is a place of endless conflict. They read about Ethiopia and the starvation and famine in a border dispute between Ethiopia and Eritrea that seems to be, at least to many of us, unnecessary and terribly harmful to the people of both countries. They turn on the television, and they see Zimbabwe and what must appear to be a form of chaos with people occupying the land of other people and farmers and farm workers being murdered in a place that a lot of people thought was a success and that now begins to look awfully tense, violent, and undemocratic.

Add to that what we have been talking about in the last few days with this enormous AIDS crisis. Then, if you

mention the AIDS crisis to somebody from Africa, they say: By the way, do you know there is a terrible new strain of malaria that has become extremely problematic and dangerous for people in many parts of Africa? So it is easy for anyone to react with resignation.

I think this is a compassionate country. I think our elected representatives wish to help. When all of this is viewed, I fear that people believe it is hopeless. I think that is understandable. But it is too easy to give up or to use well-worn phrases to dismiss the situation in the African countries as hopeless.

We hear that a lot of records are thrown away. We hear people say, for example, that is just "tribalism" and that is what happens when these tribes strike out at one another.

Another word used is, well, it is just "barbarism." That is what goes on in Africa, people seem to say, and there is nothing you can do about it.

Others point out quite clearly that there are problems with corruption in many of these countries. One very thoughtful Senator actually said to me the other day as we talked about what might be done to try to resolve the problem in the Democratic Republic of the Congo: Well, I am afraid we are just going to throw away money to make ourselves feel better.

That is what some people fear we do when we try to solve or help solve the problem in Africa.

I don't think anyone can entirely dismiss any of this. As one who has on occasion shared at least the emotional reaction to these phrases and terms, I am afraid these terms and attitudes reflect a generalization about all of Africa, about the entire continent, that does not hold true. In fact, they are generalizations that even with regard to some of the specific examples do not have a connection to reality. I think these generalizations sometimes suggest, and these phrases sometimes suggest, an unwillingness to explore and understand the differences that actually exist as between these African countries and situations, and in fact the differences between easy assumptions and the facts on the ground in any one of these individual places.

I understand how easy it is for someone to slip into a feeling of hopelessness about Africa. I fight it myself in my own experience. Having been in Africa in December for 2 weeks and having traveled to 10 different countries, I have had some moments such as this. Since I have been there, in the countries I actually had a chance to visit, the situation certainly has not vastly improved, as in the Congo—although I will be talking about that shortly.

In Rwanda, there has been some political instability, a change of power in the Presidency, and other disturbing events. Namibia, just below Angola, has been drawn, to a greater extent than they had been in the past, into the Angolan conflict that has been going on for about 25 years. This has been only since last December, with

refugees crossing border lines in significant numbers. In Angola itself, this brutal civil war continues. You may have seen tragedy in some of these other countries on the television. One of the most horrifying things you could ever see is the incredible tragedy of war and the refugee children in Angola.

Then, of course, Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe certainly seemed tense in December. I was concerned. President Mugabe seemed quite tense to me at the time, but I had no idea there would be this collapse of a commitment to democracy on the part of the President of Zimbabwe, and all the violence and fear that has resulted.

Add to that places I did not go this time. There was a coup d'etat in Cote d'Ivoire. Some say it was for the better in the long run, but a coup d'etat it was. And we have also seen the terrifying and tragic consequences of flooding in Mozambique.

Even in Nigeria, which I would cite as a place where we have some greater hope than we used to have, even there where a fledgling democracy is trying to take root, there are repeated examples of religious and geographically based violence that make it difficult to believe the future is going to automatically be a bright one.

So I feel all these concerns about these problems, having just been there and traveled to some of these countries. Oddly enough, though, I believe we have to struggle to simultaneously do two things. First, we have to see each of these situations as different instead of just generalizing. Second, at the same time, we have to see the interrelationships between the different situations in Africa and the different countries in Africa. Because if we do not see how these situations relate to each other, we will not be able to help to make stability and peace possible, and we will not be able to help with fighting disease and establishing democracy and fighting corruption.

I do not pretend to come close to understanding all of these interrelationships, but I am trying to assist our own analysis of what American foreign policy toward African nations should be.

Let me suggest, at the risk of oversimplification, a few distinctions between three different important situations in Africa that we have been reading about right now: Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Zimbabwe. They are very different. First, Sierra Leone is obviously a very small country compared to the others, apparently about twice the size of the State of Maryland. The situation in Sierra Leone is certainly more confined than the situation in the Congo, but it does involve other elements. A lot of the refugees from Sierra Leone have gone to Cote d'Ivoire, which has led to some destabilization there.

The leader of Liberia, Charles Taylor, has been heavily involved in backing Mr. Sankoh in Sierra Leone, and has caused problems backing the RUF organization that committed so many of

these crimes. Unlike so many other African countries, Sierra Leone recently, in the last few years, had their first real democratic election. The President was thrown out in a coup, then the ECOMOG, the Nigerian-led force, came in and put him back in power. But the country descended into this, one of the most brutal civil wars we have witnessed in many years. So the Sierra Leone situation is a very tenuous governmental situation. There is no long, continuous period of rule, either democratic or otherwise, by one particular power or entity or person.

Contrast that with the situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Congo is, obviously, a huge country. To give you an idea of the size, it is basically the size of all of the United States, from the Mississippi River all the way over including the entire east coast. It is that big in area. But it has not suffered so much from instability, except for in the last few years, as from a brutal rule of Mr. Mobutu who, for maybe 35 years, was the autocratic ruler of what was then called Zaire and who, in fact, some regarded as one of the greatest thieves of all time, in terms of all the resources and riches he spirited out of his nation of Zaire which is now called Congo.

Finally, Mr. Mobutu had to flee and a group of powers from around Africa, some of whom are fighting each other now, together helped establish President Laurent Kabila in power a few years ago.

So it is a terribly difficult situation, but it is not the same as Sierra Leone. Sierra Leone is a frightening situation. There are great crimes being committed. But what is happening in the Congo quite a few people have referred to as a world war, or Africa's first world war. It is that significant and that problematic.

In fact, many people do not realize it but there are so many countries that now have their troops fighting in Congo that it really does look like a world war. There are alliances. For example, one side of combatants that are supposedly allies—although they have been fighting amongst themselves some—are Uganda, Rwanda, and Burundi. They are backing the rebels trying to fight the Kabila government. On the other side, you find groups from Angola, Namibia, and Zimbabwe trying to support and keep in power Mr. Kabila.

In addition to that, we fear there are economic incentives for some of these countries to want to stay in Congo. It is a country rich with incredible resources, including diamonds. Some suggest some of these countries may not want to leave the conflict because of the economic opportunities that exist. So, I would have to say Congo is already like the ultimate Rubik's Cube in foreign policy; it is so complicated and difficult, in terms of understanding what is going on and what could be done. It is like a world war.

Now, contrast that with the third example, Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe is in a

very different position. Zimbabwe actually had what, fortunately, became about 20 years ago, majority rule. Although I obviously believe that the previous Rhodesian Government was a terrible government, some of the institutions from that era have continued into the current era and suggest at least a significant commitment in the past to reasonable governance and the rule of law.

Unfortunately, that promise and that hope that Mr. Mugabe originally brought have fallen apart. Many people think what is happening in Zimbabwe is a race war; that is not the case. It is not a war of black against white. Some think it is about land reform. Although certainly there should be some land reform, that is not what is happening in what used to be a country that some thought was moving in the right direction.

What is happening in this country—that basically was on a better path than Congo, and certainly a better path than Sierra Leone—is President Mugabe is not moving his country forward in a democratic way, in the way that the great Nelson Mandela did. Nelson Mandela, one of the greatest persons of the 20th century, after all those years of imprisonment, became the President of South Africa. What did he do after his first term was up? He believed it was important that democracy work, and he stepped aside and let someone else be elected President. This is just the opposite of what Mr. Mugabe is doing in Zimbabwe, which is threatening to destroy, in my view, a country that has great promise.

I am trying to illustrate how different these situations are. Why do I do this? We must consider our responses to each of these crises individually, as well as in the context of Africa as a whole. When we look at each one, as well as any other situation in Africa, I can understand the hesitation on the part of the American people and our elected Representatives. Hesitation is not only understandable, but it makes some sense.

I understand the need to be hesitant. Hesitation should not be born of oversimplification or incorrect generalization. I know why we are hesitant to get involved in too many places. I have personally said many times we are overcommitted around the world. We have over 250,000 American troops stationed abroad in this post-cold-war era. We have gotten ourselves in situations in Bosnia and Kosovo and in East Timor and even in Colombia, potentially, that some people would regard as open-ended. I am more optimistic about the East Timor situation. However, I am fearful that in Bosnia and Kosovo we got into a situation very heavily. It is open ended. We may find it difficult to extricate ourselves. That is a reason for hesitation.

There are reasons for being hesitant specifically with regard to the record of the efforts made in Africa in the past. Certainly, the failure of the U.N.

mission in Congo in the early 1960s is an example often cited as an attempt that failed that makes people hesitant. Without any doubt, the miserable failure of our Somalia mission in north-east Africa in 1993 and 1994 is another example of where the American people would have some reason to pause before wanting to get involved in helping to resolve some of the conflicts in Africa.

I think this hesitation begs the question with regard to Africa. I think the question is, Why do we act decisively in other parts of the world, and seem to be disproportionately hesitant to act when it comes to problems in Africa? There are a lot of reasons that might be given for treating Africa differently. Let me suggest I don't think these reasons hold up. I want to mention a few of the reasons that have been given or might be given.

First, our not acting in Africa cannot be because of a lack of tragedy, brutality, and even genocide in Africa. Despite the cries of "never again" that were legitimately raised with respect to Bosnia and Kosovo and even East Timor, how can anyone now use that kind of phrase with regard to what happens in Africa? I don't need to cite chapter and verse from my colleagues, although maybe I should, about the tragedies and brutality and human suffering in Africa as a result of conflict, be it Angola, Burundi, or, of course, Rwanda.

I don't think the reason we don't act in Africa is because the African countries should try to help themselves. The fact is, the African countries are doing a pretty good job with very limited resources to try to shoulder their share of the burden. In fact, they compare favorably to our European allies when it comes to stepping up to the plate in their own region.

One of my criticisms of the Bosnia and Kosovo situation is I don't think the European allies did as much as they could and asked us to do more than we should in those situations. There are examples, in Africa, of a better record. Nigeria, a country I have often criticized on this floor, under their previous military regime actually has a good record of trying to resolve conflicts in their region. The ECOMOG forces, led by Nigeria, were involved in trying to change the situation for the better in Liberia, and the Nigerians in the past have taken aggressive steps to try to solve the problem in Sierra Leone, and some hope they will be asked to do this again.

When I was in Mali in December, one of the poorest countries in the world, they told me how some of their people were part of the ECOMOG force that went into Sierra Leone, and how they lost eight lives in that mission. They are taking the loss of lives of their own citizens in the name of trying to have peace and stability in their region. I am impressed by that.

I am impressed by the comments of President Chiluba of Zambia this week-

end who, after a couple hundred of his troops were missing in Sierra Leone, said he regretted it. He was concerned for their safety, but peace was worth this kind of effort.

For anyone who thinks the African nations and the African Presidents are asking us to do everything, that is not what the record shows. I don't think it can be a fair objection to our acting and a reason for hesitance to say they are asking for American troops to do this. That is not true. I am not hearing demands for American troops. In fact, I talked to ten different African Presidents about the Congo situation in December, and I don't remember any of them asking for American troops to be involved in this situation. In fact, some did specifically seem to indicate they prefer that there not be American troops involved for whatever reason. This is not a question of whether American ground troops will be asked to resolve these situations.

I don't think our hesitance can be explained by suggesting that African situations are somehow too complex—though, as I indicated they often are complex—to try and unravel. Some of the situations are horrible but are relatively straightforward, such as Angola. And as I said, although Congo is complex, so, certainly, are the situations in Bosnia with the ethnic divisions and borders that show no particular relationship to the ethnic identity of the people. There are little enclaves throughout the area. We are talking in this Congress about getting more involved in the situation in Colombia with real money and real resources. That is an enormously complex situation which is related to the situation in other Latin American countries. So it can't simply be that these are tough nuts to crack; they are, but they are not the only ones. We have acted in some incredibly difficult and complex situations in parts of the world that are not in Africa.

Can it be because somehow Africa doesn't involve our national security? I don't think it can be that these situations are not dangerous, not only for Africa but for us and the rest of the world. The situation in the Congo is often called Africa's first world war, as I have said. That means not just tragedy for Congo and the nations directly adjacent, but it means it has the potential for enormous disruption throughout the entire continent, and I suggest a destabilizing influence throughout the world when it comes to political borders, when it comes to the spread of AIDS, when it comes to millions of children who are orphans, when it comes to child soldiers marauding around the countries, and, yes, national security because this kind of situation, if left unchecked, opens the door to other countries and other entities that are not our friends, trying to exploit the tragedy in Africa, whether it might be attempted by Libya, North Korea, or perhaps China. It cannot be that we hesitate because this continent

is not in our national interest and is not a question of our national security.

Finally, perhaps most important, our hesitance cannot be because the United States and the West have no responsibility to act. Consider the colonial legacy. After my trip, I had a chance to read one of the best and most powerful books I have read in a long time called "King Leopold's Ghost" by Adam Hochschild. This is basically the story of the brutal exploitation of the Belgian Congo by Belgium's King Leopold and others in the previous century. Colonialism essentially marauded the social structure of a peaceful people.

When that period finally came to an end in 1960, I believe, they had a democratic election. I am sure it was not perfect, but a man named Patrice Lumumba, a hero to the Congolese people, was elected President. A few months later, he was brutally murdered, without a doubt at the instruction of our CIA and our country. That is what we did to the people of Congo, and we installed Mr. Mobutu who proceeded to have one of the most brutal rules in history for the next 30 to 35 years.

To suggest we do not have a responsibility, that we did not have anything to do with this is just plain wrong. The same thing goes for Angola. This is not about the colonial era only. Angola was used for many years as a playground for the cold war. The Soviet Union and the United States decided to have it out here, and they planted more landmines in the fields, the rich farm fields of Angola, than any other place in the entire world. As a result, there are more amputees in Angola than anywhere else in the world and in any other time in human history. Walk down a street in Angola and look at the number of people who have lost a limb to landmines—not that lives, of course, were not taken. It is appalling. That was our war. I understand the stakes that were involved, but to suggest we do not have a responsibility when we were that involved in the situation and to fail to help the people from Angola to have a decent life is simply wrong.

I have just given six reasons that I do not think can really be the reasons for our not acting in some of these situations. I will now suggest three reasons I think might genuinely explain our extreme hesitance and reluctance to help stop these conflicts in Africa, as compared to our willingness to do it in other parts of the world.

First, I believe there is a genuine fear that we will get stuck in one of these situations. Some might call it the Vietnam syndrome, and I understand that, having been a young opponent of the Vietnam war myself in my college years. I remember the song entitled "Knee Deep in the Big Muddy." That was a symbol for our generation of how we were stuck in Vietnam. I am sure many people worry about that.

I submit we are already stuck in Bosnia and Kosovo, and I believe we be-

came stuck in those places because we went headlong into those conflicts with no good plan about how to finish it or what resources we would commit to it or what steps would allow us to finish the job or decide that we cannot finish the job. I do think that our hesitance is part of our very recent memory of the enormous tragedy in Africa in Somalia when we lost 18 of our brave soldiers in the helicopter disaster that led to our withdrawal. There is no question in my mind that Americans and American foreign policymakers worry that if we try to help in one of these situations, we will get stuck and cannot get out. When I say "we," I mean the international community, not necessarily just the United States.

Second, I think we do not act perhaps when we should because we have a tendency in this country to think in terms of having to do all or nothing in one of these situations; that we have to do the whole thing, and if we do not do the whole thing, somehow we have not lived up to an American obligation to do absolutely everything to solve the problem.

Some say do not do it at all unless you are going to go in and get the job done. I have heard that many times with regard to military intervention; why don't we just go in there and finish the job? It is an attitude which, on occasion, is appropriate but I think sometimes leads to mistakes.

When it comes to the African situation, this notion that we should do everything or nothing leads to real problems. In Somalia, we tried to do too much when we did not know what we were doing, and then we did nothing when it came to Rwanda. It does not have to be everything or nothing. In fact, there is a recent example I am relatively pleased about, and that is what we are doing in East Timor. We are not leading the charge there. Australia is leading the charge and Asian countries are leading the charge. We are helping in a measured, reasonable way because the countries in that region, as I suggest some of the countries in Africa, are trying to do the same thing.

I believe that is a reason people are afraid of doing some things because they want to do everything or nothing.

A third reason we do not act, and a genuine reason—and I fear it is the most important reason and I wish I did not have to come to this conclusion—but I do think there is somehow, unbelievably, a double standard when it comes to Africa. This is very bad for Africa, and I submit it is just as bad for the United States.

When I see President Mbeki of South Africa and the President of the People's Republic of China, Jiang Zemin, get together at a news conference and comment about how they are tired of having one country calling all the shots in the world, I see fertile ground for resentment against the United States that can hurt us today and can especially hurt America and our children and grandchildren in the future.

This is a sad thing to let happen because we do not have a lot of the colonial baggage and some of the resentment that Africans feel toward countries such as Belgium because we were not deeply involved in many of those situations. We have a positive opportunity, when it comes to much of Africa, to get it right.

It is this idea of getting it right that brings me to the specific purpose of these comments, and that is that we should not summarily retreat from the pursuit of peace and self-determination in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. I fear there will be some kind of a knee-jerk reaction because of the very disturbing news and film coming from Sierra Leone. The United Nations there obviously has not yet got it right. I may well be interested in seeing and helping that United Nations effort become stronger and tougher to deal with the brutality that is going on, and we cannot abandon that situation, but I believe there is a way to get it right in Congo. One of the main reasons is the leadership of a man from whom I stole the phrase "Get It Right," and that is our Ambassador to the United Nations, Richard Holbrooke, whom I had the chance to accompany on a trip to Africa in December. It was an honor to be on that trip, and we had a chance together to meet with virtually every one of the African Presidents who are directly interested in this conflict.

I want my colleagues to know that, although we were extremely moved and troubled by the AIDS crisis in Africa, and that overtook us emotionally on the trip, the core reason for the trip was to see if the Ambassador and I and others could get an understanding of the complexity of what is going on in the Congo and what we could do about it.

I want my colleagues to know—and I heard him do it—that at each stop, Ambassador Holbrooke said: We want to help, but there are no blank checks and we must get it right or we cannot help.

He was very measured and showed due caution. Of course, the situation in the Congo is incredibly difficult, but I see some reason to see it as progressing in the right direction, slowly but surely. I understand that our support may not necessarily work, that there could be a failure, but I think that serious logical steps can be taken.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Twelve minutes.

MR. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I would like to, just very briefly, indicate some of the steps that have been taken in the Congo pursuant to what is called the Lusaka agreement that suggests to me this is a situation worth supporting if at all possible.

The countries involved, including the Congo itself, and some of the rebel groups, have signed this Lusaka agreement that set up something called a

joint military commission. This joint military commission is committed to doing the job of actually enforcing the peace and making sure the parties withdraw from the other countries.

In order to get to phase 2 of this operation that is now contemplated, a number of things had to happen. The joint military commission had to be created, and an initial 90 observers from the U.N. had to be deployed. That was done. But before the next phase goes forward—the one that involves some 5,500 U.N. troops and personnel—a number of other things had to happen as well.

There had to be a functioning cease-fire. Although it has not worked at all times—and at the moment is in a little bit of trouble because of the conflict between Uganda and Rwanda—on the whole, it has succeeded in the last month. Second, it was essential that all these parties come together and pick one person as a facilitator of the process of national dialogue. After a number of efforts, they did so, by appointing President Masire, the former President of Botswana.

They had to create an operational arrangement of the U.N. MONUC group and the JMC to coordinate, and they did it. They had to have a signed commitment by the parties of the conflict guaranteeing security and freedom of movement and access for the U.N. team. And they did it.

So now we come to the point of where additional steps, hopefully, can be taken. We are now looking at getting into the second phase of this peace operation, including developing plans to disengage and withdraw the troops from the various countries and parties that have signed this agreement, and the conducting of an inter-Congolese dialog that could lead to a genuine democratic country, and to develop these plans with the JMC.

If that is accomplished, and only if these steps are accomplished, would we go forward to the final steps, phase 3, which involves verifying the withdrawal of foreign forces, normalizing border security, and, yes, finally, again, after all these years, the conducting of a democratic election.

So what I am seeing here, although it is certainly not perfect, is a measured step-by-step approach—not an all-or-nothing approach—but a step-by-step approach, led by the African countries. That is something I think we should encourage and even admire because it is so very difficult to do in this situation.

For me, there is a sufficient record to say, we must try to do something—not send U.S. troops, not send a huge United Nations force of 30,000 or 40,000 people, as some have wondered about.

It may not work, and we may ultimately have to say no to doing more, as tragic as failure would be—but based on the facts that I have witnessed and learned about, I think we must try.

We must not wash our hands of this or just say that it would be an example

of throwing money in the Congo to make ourselves feel better. I believe we should support financially—and in other ways—the efforts for peace in the Congo. We must try.

Again, why must we try? I think because this is a test—it is a very tough test—but it is a test of whether the United States really does have a double standard vis-a-vis Africa. To abandon the Congo without an effort would be a strong signal that we intend to abandon all of Africa.

We must try, even though we have tried in other situations with great difficulty—such as Kosovo and Bosnia and Haiti. Let me again suggest I think we went too headlong into those situations. I do not think we were careful to take the measured steps that are being done in this case. And that led to our complete, abject failure to act with regard to Rwanda. As I have said, even with regard to Somalia, mistakes were made. But I think that is because it was, again, an example of an all-or-nothing approach, with no clear mission, and no exit strategy.

I think this is different. I think this has the potential to work, although it is difficult, because it is measured and it is an African-dominated approach.

I think we have to try because at this time in human history the crimes against Africa have to be halted. I do not have time to talk about the slave trade, the gap between the rich and the poor, the use of these countries as a playing field for colonial powers during the cold war. But we cannot extol this new global economy and trade around the world and have these African nations treated forever as hopeless and fundamentally different.

We must try, in fact, because the lofty rhetoric of U.S.-Africa trade becomes something of a cruel hoax on the people of Africa if we are not going to confront the brutality, the chaos, and even the genocide in the very nations with whom we claim we want to have improved trade.

We must try because I think it truly hurts America in the world's eyes, at a critical time in our role as a world leader, if we are perceived as being unwilling to help African nations when they desperately need that help.

Finally, to return to my initial theme—because each situation in Africa is different, and yet interrelated—if we help move this process forward, this Lusaka agreement, involving cooperation between the U.N. and the joint military commission, it cannot only give Congo what it has always deserved and never had—real peace, self-determination and hope—but it can help its neighbors.

Rwanda is greatly destabilized and threatened because of this conflict in the Congo. Uganda has a very problematic border with the Congo, and other countries, and is now in conflict with Rwanda because they are in the Congo together. That would help alleviate that situation. Burundi has enormous problems of its own, which President

Mandela is trying to help with. None of these countries should be involved in the Congo conflict. They have problems of their own.

Angola, which I have described as one of the most horrifying situations in Africa, should not be having troops up in this area for whatever reason, perhaps because of their conflict within their own country. We can cause this to be a more localized problem that perhaps we could deal with.

Namibia certainly should not have troops up in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, nor should the other countries, when all it does is drain their resources and causes problems over their borders.

And, of course, Zimbabwe. Talk about any country in the world that should not be using its resources right now to fight a war in the Congo, when it has such desperate economic and political problems at this time. Even South Africa suffers in its tremendous struggle to become one of the great nations of the world as long as this Congo conflict continues.

Let us be realistic, but let us also be open to the possibility of trying in the Congo. Let us not have a double standard where we act with great rhetoric and words of “never again” in so many places in the world, but when it comes to Africa, we seem to be unable to act.

Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 2521, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2521) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring before the Senate the military construction appropriations bill and report for fiscal year 2001. This bill reflects the bipartisan approach that the ranking member, Senator MURRAY of Washington, and I have tried to maintain regarding military construction on this subcommittee. It has been a pleasure to work with Senator MURRAY and her staff. They have been very cooperative throughout this

whole process. That is very important because we take our jobs here very seriously and this appropriations bill very seriously.

This bill was reported out of the full Appropriations Committee on May 9. The bill recommended by the Committee on Appropriations is for \$8,634,000,000. The bill is \$600 million over the budget request and approximately \$292 million over last year's enacted level. However, there are some considerations we must make. More importantly, the legislation reflects a reduction of \$1.2 billion from just 4 years ago—a decrease of almost 12 percent.

We sought to recommend to the Senate a balanced bill, and we believe it addresses the key military construction requirements for readiness, for family housing, barracks, quality of life, and the Guard and Reserve components.

As my colleagues well know, we take into strong consideration the Guard and Reserve components because we have seen a shift in our force structure. Our force structure has shifted from Regular Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marines to Reserve and Guard components. When we started to do that, we found that around this country our infrastructure was lacking for training of these personnel.

This bill honors a commitment we have to our armed forces. It helps ensure that housing and infrastructure needs of the military are given proper recognition.

Also, I am pleased to report to the Senate that the bill is within the committee's 302(b) budget allocation for both budget authority and outlays.

This bill has some points I want to mention. It includes \$3.5 billion to provide better and more modern family housing for our service personnel and their families.

On another quality-of-life measure, we have added substantially to the budget request for barracks construction projects. The bill provides \$712 million for 43 projects throughout the United States and overseas. This funding will provide single service members a more favorable living environment wherever they are stationed.

The committee also provides \$101 million for 14 environmental compliance projects.

We also address the shortfalls that continue to plague our Reserve components.

As our active force grows smaller, we are more dependent than ever on our Guard and Reserve for the maintenance of our national security. I continue to be greatly alarmed that the Department of Defense takes no responsibility for ensuring that our Reserve components have adequate facilities.

For the members of the Guard and Reserve, quality of life, too, is very important. It is all about buildings and it is all about facilities from which they work and perform their mission.

Their lack of regard for the total force concept very much concerns me

and many of my colleagues. In Montana, we have the greatest example of a unified Red Horse Division at Malmstrom Air Force Base. It is made up of Regular Air Force and Reserves and is working very well.

This comes at a time when our country is so heavily dependent on the Guard and Reserve to maintain our presence around the world. For example, the President's budget request was for only \$222 million for all of the Reserve components and the National Guard. That was just not enough.

Recognizing this chronic shortfall, we have again lent support by adding \$359 million to these accounts.

In each case, the funds will help satisfy the essential mission; quality of life, and, of course, our readiness requirements.

We fully fund the budget request for the base realignment and closure account by funding \$1.17 billion to continue the ongoing BRAC process and consummate the remaining closures and realignments.

As you know, in this line particularly, it has been very troubling to this committee that environmental cleanup has really soaked up a lot of our funding that should have been used for quality of life.

We will work very closely with the Senate Armed Services Committee as we put together a conference package for military construction.

This bill also includes year 2000 supplemental funding for the Department of Defense in peacekeeping operations in Kosovo and other requirements.

The chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS, will speak to these issues as we move along.

I urge the Members of the Senate to support this bill and to move it forward as quickly and as expeditiously as we possibly can.

Now I yield to my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am pleased to be on the floor today to offer the fiscal year 2001 military construction appropriations bill. I thank Senator BURNS, the chairman of our committee, and his staff, for being so good in a great bipartisan manner, in being able to work this bill through again this year. I publicly thank him for his work with me in a really solid manner. I appreciate the way he has done that.

Before I address this bill, I want to address some comments that were made about me on this floor by the majority leader just a short time ago.

While I was taking part in a hearing of the Senate Commerce Committee as part of my work to improve pipeline safety in this country, I understand the majority leader suggested that my schedule was a reason why a debate on commonsense gun control was not going to take place today.

Given the work that I have done over the years to protect young people from

gun violence, and my strong support of this weekend's Million Mom March, I was rather surprised by that suggestion. I assure my colleagues that this debate is too important to be delayed any longer.

While I support the majority leader's concern about a family obligation I have; namely, my son is going to be married, there is no excuse for not debating this legislation—especially the absence of any one Member.

If this had been a concern of the majority leader, perhaps he could have spoken to me personally before incorrectly citing me as the reason why the Senate would not be debating gun violence today.

I would like to remind the majority leader that, on November 4, I came to the floor, in the wake of a fatal shooting in my home State, and urged the Members of the Senate to work with me on commonsense solutions to gun violence. Since that time, it has been the congressional majority that has prevented this much needed debate from taking place, and it is the congressional majority today that, again, refuses to address this vital issue.

I would like to remind my colleagues that, on average, 12 children die every day from gunfire. We cannot wait any longer.

Mr. President, I will now turn to the issue before us.

I again am pleased to be here with my chairman, Senator BURNS, in recommending the fiscal year 2001 military construction appropriations bill to the Senate for its approval.

This is an unusual bill this year because it contains emergency supplemental funding for a number of defense items not related to military construction, including U.S. participation in the Kosovo peacekeeping operation and in the Colombia counternarcotics initiative.

I will defer to my ranking member on the full committee, Senator BYRD, and others, to address the items in the supplemental portion of this bill, and I will confine my remarks to the military construction portion of the bill.

This bill provides a total of \$8.634 billion in new spending authority for military construction for fiscal year 2001.

This level of funding exceeds the President's budget request for military construction by \$600 million, and provides nearly \$300 million above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2000.

Nevertheless, as usual, this bill comes up short of what the services need to meet their infrastructure requirements.

At the risk of sounding like a broken record, I once again urge the administration to increase the budget for military construction.

This is a bricks-and-mortar bill.

There is nothing glamorous or "gee-whiz" about aircraft hangars or barracks or armories.

But this is an essential bill, and the projects that it funds are vital to our men and women in uniform.

As many of my colleagues have pointed out to me in the course of developing this bill, the President's budget barely scratches the surface or infrastructure needs.

The requests that Senator BURNS and I have received this year address compelling needs throughout the services, and I wish that we had the resources to fund more of them.

Senator BURNS and his staff deserve a great deal of credit for their dedicated and thoughtful approach in drafting this bill.

As always, they have worked very hard to produce a balanced, bipartisan product that takes into account both the concerns of the Senate and the needs of the military.

In particular, they have done a superb job of continuing to shine the spotlight on the quality of life projects that are so important to our men and women in uniform, and to their families.

At a time when military enlistment and retention are declining—and the services are unable to match the financial incentives of the private sector—quality of life issues are amplified in importance.

Quality of life issues do not diminish the importance of readiness projects, but we must not dismiss their role in recruiting and retaining our military personnel.

Within the budget constraints that we are all forced to operate this year, this bill attempts to meet the most urgent and timely military construction needs with very limited resources.

All of the major construction projects that we have funded have been authorized.

In addition, we have ensured adequate funding for family housing and barracks construction.

However, I remain concerned that the nation's overall investment in military infrastructure continues to lag, and I hope we will see a more robust effort in future budgets.

This is an extremely important bill for our nation and our military forces.

I again commend Senator BURNS, and I thank the staff of the Appropriations Committee, including Sid Ashworth, Christina Evans, and Sonia King, as well as Mark Borreson, a fellow on my staff, for their excellent work in producing the bill.

Mr. President, I look forward to completing action on this important piece of legislation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go

into a period of morning business for the Senator from New Jersey to speak.

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

Under the previous order, the Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 30 minutes.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am going to continue discussing the issue we were talking about earlier. In my earlier remarks, while talking about trade, we talked about the value of trade with the sub-Saharan nations, whose economic subjugation created all kinds of problems. We talked about the economic strangulation that presents so many problems and creates violence and corruption and lawlessness in some of these countries. We are hoping that this trade can suppress those differences and that violence.

I was making the point that we in this country have a problem of our own regarding gun violence, which is very detrimental to the harmonious functioning within our society. We have these huge differences between those who think that "guns unlimited" ought to be the rule. I had the opportunity to hear a brilliant author, Gary Wills, talk about why it is that people distrust Government. One of the issues he brings up—and I am paraphrasing some here—is that when people see that violence pervades our society, we have to have some sense of a regulation. He pointed out that if we didn't have regulations on our highways, highway safety programs, our system would be rendered useless because people would be afraid to go out on the highways because of the mayhem it would create.

I think it is a fairly simple thing to understand that if you were able to drive as fast as you wanted on either side of the road, we would be killing and maiming one another. I don't understand why it is that we can't have some sensible gun violence control in this country, some regulation. Why is this one part of our society so exempt from any kind of sensible regulation that says a person who wants to buy a gun ought to be qualified physically and emotionally to do so, and that if they want to buy a gun they ought not have any history of violent behavior?

I wrote legislation regarding spousal abuse. I said anybody convicted of a misdemeanor for spousal abuse ought not to be able to own a gun. I had terrific resistance in this place. I could not get it through, really. Finally, we got it through as a piece of legislation on a budget.

What has happened in 3½ years? Well, 33,000 people who are not qualified by virtue of violence against a spouse or their children—domestic abusers—have been prevented from getting guns, where maybe they pointed a gun at somebody and said, "If you don't listen to me, I will blow your brains out." I think it was a positive measure.

The Brady bill was fought tooth and nail before it was passed. The Brady bill gave Government time to check out these individuals who are applying for guns or gun ownership at such a prolific rate that we ought to have some measure of control. Well, after a long debate and a lot of suffering, had Jim Brady, who was shot while an attempt was made on the life of President Reagan, not wheeled himself around the Capitol, it never would have passed.

What was the effect of the Brady bill—the thing the gun lobby was so afraid of that would "impair freedom"? Baloney, as we say. Well, 500,000 people were prevented from getting guns, thank the Lord. What would have happened? Those 500,000 people who were not qualified either by virtue of personal characteristics, background, a tendency toward violence, or trouble, could have gotten guns. Thank goodness they were not able to get guns.

We wonder whether or not, with a Million Moms March imminent on Mother's Day, anybody thinks mothers are clamoring to leave their homes and march in protest because they have nothing better to do on Mother's Day. That is the most revered holiday, next to Christmas, that we have in our society. It is when people flock to see moms. I know my children want to see their mother. My grandchildren want to see their mother. A lot of them in my family will be out there marching because they are sick and tired of worrying about whether or not their children, when they go to school to learn, to sing, to play, to make friends, are going to get shot, are going to get assaulted, are going to get killed or wounded in such a way that they never recover. That doesn't only mean those who were hit with a bullet. It means friends who saw their classmates at Columbine lying down and trying to crawl out windows to get away from the madness, in fear for their lives.

What was the impact of that throughout the school? Did the wounding stop with those hit with a bullet? Or do those wounds go on forever? Some lost friends who were 16 and 17 years old—kids in the prime of life. Those wounds will last forever. So it is not only those who are involved in the fracas; it is everybody—all of us across the country.

Look at the physical cost: metal detectors, guards, cameras, rigid processes for transportation. It costs a fortune. Frankly, I think we should just put a lid on this proliferation of guns and stop the unlicensed gun dealers from selling guns and not asking any questions of the buyer—"buyers anonymous"—at gun shows across the country. If you want to buy guns, just put your money down, brother, and you can have all the guns you want and walk away. You could be one of the 10 most wanted criminals in the United States on the FBI's Ten Most Wanted list. Even if they recognize you, they have no obligation in the States that don't

have control because the Federal Government doesn't have it all; they are under no obligation to say, hey, we know you are sought after. We know you are a criminal.

There are no rules. We ought to stop that and we ought to make a pledge to the mothers who are going to be out there on Sunday that we are going to do something about it, instead of sitting on our hands over a year since Columbine. It is almost a year now since we passed the gun show loophole closure in this body and sent it over to the House as part of a conference. That is what we do here. The House and the Senate confer and they try to agree on a bill. They don't want to act on it. The action is no action. That inaction is the rule because they don't want to bring up the gun issue. It is too sensitive. It might be too offensive to the NRA. It might be too offensive to the gun lobby. We are saying, no, we have to do something about it. The least thing we are going to do today is offer a resolution and, we hope, get it passed.

We ask those on the other side who won't join us to stand up in front of the American public and say: I don't think you are entitled to send your child to a safe school; you have to run the risk. After all, guns are more important than my kids or my grandchildren. I can tell you that the so-called "freedom to own a gun and maim people," and the Constitution says you are allowed to shoot at anybody you want to, is not a matter—in the wildest imagination—of the second amendment.

Mr. President we have a limit of time. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Senator has 20 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I want to give as much time as my colleague from New York needs, not more than 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from New Jersey for yielding. I thank him for not only his generosity in yielding time but for his leadership this year and last year on this issue, and in the 18 years he has been in the Senate. We will really miss him in many ways as he goes on to other things, but one of the most important reasons we will miss him is as the leader in this fight to bring sensibility and rationality to gun laws.

I hope we will pass the resolution the Senator from New Jersey is offering and that it will not be blocked. I hope people will let us vote because we are voting in the shadow of a momentous movement that is taking place in America.

I have been fighting in the Congress for gun control for 20 years. I have seen the various ebbs and flows in public opinion on guns. I have seen modest gun control measures, such as this one, bottled up in committee and picked to death by those who do the NRA's bidding. I was on the front lines when we

scratched and clawed our way through a few victories such as Brady and the assault weapons ban.

We are on this floor now because the world changes on Mother's Day. On Mother's Day, the political landscape will undergo a seismic shock. There is a classic sign in the movie "Network" where a TV commentator shouts, "I am mad as hell, and I'm not going to take it anymore." And that leads to a spontaneous reaction where families heave their TV set out the window.

That is what the Million Mom March is. It is a spontaneous assemblage of ordinary citizens who are not going to take it anymore. It is bigger, more passionate, and more widespread than any movement we have seen in years. It is a movement more powerful and more numerous than any of us could ever have hoped.

When the mothers of this Nation gather on Constitution Avenue, their collective footsteps will sound like a shot heard around the world. They are not going to put up with lame excuses from Congress about why the Lautenberg amendment is bottled up. They are not going to put up with any more reasons about why we can't pass the most basic, commonsense gun measures.

Let me say to George Bush, and anyone else who is standing in the way of closing the gun show loophole, that our mothers are watching. On Mother's Day, the mothers of this Nation will give us the gift of common sense. There is a new force in the country today and its name is Mom. Today we are simply giving this body a chance to not make Mom too angry.

I thank the Senator and yield any time I have not used to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, we are in morning business, I believe. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 17 minutes remaining in morning business.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I would like to make a unanimous consent request. In fairness, I want to see a Republican on the floor before we make that request about time. So if the staff would arrange to have someone come to the floor, I would appreciate it because I want to continue talking about this resolution we have already sent up to the desk.

We are looking for very simple, commonsense changes. I can't imagine anybody saying we should not prohibit juveniles from possessing assault weapons. It is hard to oppose that. Does anyone seriously believe juveniles need assault weapons? Additionally, we should require child safety locks to be sold with handguns. It is a simple step we can take to try to protect kids who get a hold of guns. We know that the 6-year-old who used a gun to murder another 6-year-old would not have been

able to do so, A, if the gun had been properly protected from reach by a child; or, B, if the gun had had a safety lock, the child wouldn't have been able to operate it.

We also ought to study—I know the Senator from California wants to talk about this—the marketing of guns to juveniles. She spoke about it a few moments ago. I heard her talk about it. It was so clear and so precise that it is hard to argue against it.

Why shouldn't we examine what it is we are doing to convince little kids that their mark of maturity is going to be to own a gun? I don't understand why.

When it comes to guns, we are talking about deadly weapons. We are not talking about play toys that might turn over or something such as that. This is automatically associated with killing, with death, with injury—a gun in the wrong hands.

No, we are not saying that every gun owner is out for murder. We are not saying every gun owner is out to hurt people, but there are enough people that it makes an enormous difference whether or not guns are out there in the hands of the wrong people. We ought to make sure they are not being sold as toys.

These are all commonsense measures. They passed this Senate as part of a juvenile justice bill just about a year ago next week. It was sent over to the House. We got our conference committee together.

How much time do I have, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I would like to yield 10 minutes to my colleague from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my friend from New Jersey. Let me echo what he has said on the floor in this matter—that we want to protect our children and our families from gun violence. He will be sorely missed.

I want to pick up on something that was said about the million moms. I think Senator LAUTENBERG, as a grandfather, has spoken most eloquently as to what the women of this country really want.

It is hard to generalize about it to people, but I can truly say, if there is anyone in our society who is more selfless than any other, it happens to be moms. When you love someone more than you love yourself, that is what happens. The fact that they are coming here in such amazing numbers is truly remarkable. I think when everyone across the Nation who is coming here on this issue is added up, it will be a million moms.

There is a web page for the Million Mom March. It is called the Tapestry, and moms are calling that site; they are writing their stories.

One woman from El Cerrito writes:

Ten years ago, my beautiful son, Andrew, killed himself with a bullet to his brain. He

was mentally ill, and never should have been able to buy a gun. I will be at the March with one of my daughters, who is also a mother, because something has got to bring Congress to its senses.

Then there are several others. One wrote the following:

Once I wrote a letter to my Congressman asking him to support sensible gun laws. He sent me back a three-page letter upholding the second amendment, but this had no effect on me as in my life I have lost my father and uncle and a nephew by marriage to guns. One was murder, one was a suicide, and one was accidental. Had guns not been around and easy to get, none of these untimely and sad deaths would have occurred.

We are at a time in our history when we can look back at what is happening to our people. When I was a young mom—now I am a grandmom—the reason I got involved in politics was that I thought the Vietnam war was wrong. I marched with my children in California at that time to say enough is enough; let's end the killing.

We lost 58,168 of our valued sons and daughters in that war. For that period of 11 years, let's look at the statistics we have in our Nation from a different kind of war, a war in our streets, in our suburbs, in our schools, in our counties, our cities, in churches and child care centers: 395,441 dead. If the moms of America marched to end the war in Vietnam where 58,168 died—and they did help end it—we can turn around this tragic number and win this war in our streets.

I say straight from my heart, we will not win this war unless people in this body have the guts and the courage to stand up to the gun lobby. We will not win this war if people in this body and in the House of Representatives do not have the heart and the guts and the courage to stand up to the gun lobby and its power. I pray that we will have that courage and we will have the strength to do it and turn around what is happening.

Senator LAUTENBERG has talked about the juvenile justice bill. It is stuck in limbo, twisting in the wind in the conference committee after we had five sensible gun laws attached to it. They are very sensible and include: closing the gun show loophole so that people who shouldn't have a gun cannot get a gun at a gun show; banning the importation of high-capacity ammunition clips for automatic weapons, Senator FEINSTEIN's amendment; requiring child safety devices be sold with every hand gun, Senator KOHL; an amendment by Senator ASHCROFT that says it is illegal to sell or give a semi-automatic to anyone under the age of 18; and the fifth, requiring the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General to study the extent to which the gun industry markets to juveniles.

If we thought Joe Camel was bad—and we know Joe Camel was bad—let's look at what the National Rifle Association is doing to market to our children. This is the beautiful, quite lovely NRA logo with the eagle. This is their logo. Here we see the cartoon version

of that eagle, "Eddie the Eagle." This is the gun lobby kids' cartoon. This is the eagle of the NRA. These kids are not 18. They are nowhere near 18. They are babies.

What makes us think the gun lobby wants to market to kids? Let's take a look at what they say in an ad from a firearm manufacturer: "Building the next generation of customers takes work and commitment. But it must be done." "Our greatest threat is the lack of a future customer base." "We continue to look for every opportunity to reach young people. . . ."

There shouldn't be any question about it. Just as Joe Camel was aimed at kids, so is Eddie the Eagle aimed at kids.

Here is Joe Camel, the cartoon version of the camel advertisement. Here is the gun lobby kids' cartoon. It is hard to do this all in 10 minutes, but that is all my colleagues on the other side would let me have. Here are Eddie Eagle products for kids: Eddie Eagle lunch box, Eddie Eagle Jitter Critter, 3D glasses, tattoo pac, Eddie E. B-Nee baby.

That is not marketing to grownups, my friends; it is marketing to kids. The gun lobby doesn't want us to look at it, but we will.

When they had the tobacco lawsuits, we were able to find out what the tobacco company said in secret memos: "If our company is to survive and prosper . . . we must get our share of the youth market." "Today's teenager is tomorrow's potential regular customer."

Sound familiar to the gun lobby?

Look at what they say: "The greatest threat we face is the lack of a future customer base. . . ." "We continue to look for every opportunity to reach young people. . . ."

Cigarette companies, Joe Camel, firearms company, Eddie the Eagle.

I don't have any objection in terms of a family learning to hunt, but tell me what is right about teaching a 4-year-old child how to load a handgun. Yet this ad is proudly displayed in gun magazines. This child is 4 years old.

This sums it all up. How is this for an ad in *Gun World*: "Start 'em Young! There is no time like the present."

This is a very young boy, maybe 15, holding a toy gun, that looks like a real gun, shooting at a can of soda. It is a little bit of a love letter from him about shooting. "Start 'em Young!"

In the juvenile justice bill, I was fortunate enough to get through this Senate, by a unanimous vote, a study of the gun dealers marketing to children. Guess what. ED MARKEY took that on the House side and got the same thing passed. So we have identical amendments in the House and Senate. Out of all of the gun amendments we passed, this is the only one that had identical language in the House and Senate. What does that mean? It means we could make this the law of the land tomorrow if there were good faith in this Republican Congress. We can in good

faith take my amendment that passed here by unanimous vote, and passed over in the House unanimously, and start this study right now.

But no. To all who say politics doesn't matter, let me state what this wasted time means. It means that every day they are starting them young. It means that every day, a child might pick up a gun because it so much fun—they see it in the ads. And they can pick up a gun and accidentally injure themselves or someone else.

It is an unbelievable situation that a year after we passed five sensible gun measures, we have done nothing.

Let me close with something from the Million Mom March from Janet Lazar of Menlo Park, CA. Listen to this.

As a social worker for children and families, I have heard the voices of many children who have become victims of violence. Listen to the still voice of a child describing her mother held at gunpoint by her father. Listen to the cold, dead voice of a beautiful 15-year-old girl describe the six friends and relatives she lost to gang warfare. Listen to her bewilderment as she wonders if she will live to raise children of her own. Listen to the suicidal voice of the young man who accidentally killed his best friend as they fooled around with an unlocked handgun.

She writes:

My heart cries for someone to listen to the children. The time to act is now.

To the creator of the Million Mom March, who is a constituent of Senator LAUTENBERG—and how appropriate that is—I say thank you. I say thank you for caring about the children. I say thank you for giving up your Mother's Day and coming here. I say thank you for taking a risk that maybe your idea would not catch on. I say thank you for doing what we Americans do best, acting—acting on facts, acting on information, and, yes, acting on anger.

It is an honor to be on the floor today with my friend, Senator LAUTENBERG. It is an honor to stand by his side as we, together, fight to make sure the laws of this land reflect the priorities of the people and the mothers and the children and the families.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Senator from California for her ever persistent fight to protect children and protect the families in this country. We are going to continue, no matter what turn of events we see. We want the public to be heard.

Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I have a resolution that simply commends the participants of the Million Mom March this weekend for rallying for their communities to demand sensible gun safety legislation. It calls on Congress to complete action on the juvenile justice bill before the Memorial Day recess.

I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 305, which was introduced by me, that the resolution and

the preamble be agreed to en bloc, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I object, as a Member of the Senate from the State of Colorado.

Objection is heard.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, and ladies and gentlemen who can hear me, what an irony it is. What an irony it is. The Senator from Colorado objects to simple gun safety legislation. What an irony it is that this place is empty, but the voice of negativism creeps through.

I want all the million moms across the country to hear this. They are saying: No, no to sensible gun safety legislation. They are saying: No, Mom, your kids are going to go to school and it is too bad, it is too bad if some little maniac, or some confused child has a gun in his or her hand. Too bad, too bad, unless it is their kid, God forbid.

What are we witnessing here? Foolishness. The public ought to know it. They ought to stand up and shout: We are not going to take it anymore. A million mothers marching across this country—I hope they are made furious by this objection.

Object to a resolution? A resolution, for my friends who do not know, is not a law. It is simply a thought. It is the way we think we ought to do things. We are far from legislation. We just think we ought to protect children. We think we ought to make it tougher for people to have guns randomly. We think we ought to make it tougher for young children to learn that guns are a step toward manhood. They ought to learn. They ought to learn.

Remember the image—the kids at Columbine, the bleeding boy reaching out the window for help: Somebody, help me before I get killed. Or the little children at the school in California—little kids, like my grandchildren, like your grandchild, being led by policemen so they could get away from a gunman. Or the youngsters saying a prayer in Waco, TX, heads bent in prayer, and some idiot comes by and starts shooting. Or that 6-year-old child killing another 6-year-old child.

So we cannot enact a law that says you have to put your gun away if you have one, so a child can't get ahold of it? Or make it childproof?

The Republicans say: No. We have 51-50 vote when the Vice President cast a tie vote and it went to the House. The House didn't want to cooperate, the Republican majority there said: No, no, let's bury this thing.

Bury it. What a terrible term. What a terrible term. Because we are talking about funerals and burials, instead of laughter, instead of love, instead of friendship. It is a black day, a bad day for America. I hope the million moms, when they get together, will talk about this.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for one last question?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Yes.

Mrs. BOXER. Was it part of my friend's resolution, welcoming the million moms to Washington?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. It was a resolution to welcome them.

Mrs. BOXER. Let's be clear here about what is being objected to. This is a resolution that says to the million moms: Thank you for caring about our children; thank you for being good mothers; Thank you for giving up Mother's Day to be here, to stand for a cause that is bigger than each of us separately.

It is hard for me to believe the Republicans would object to welcoming the million moms to this town, moms who are Democrats, Republicans, those declining to state—maybe they don't have a party. This is not a partisan issue.

I say to my friend, thank you for bringing this to the floor. I think the American people are finally going to see who stands up for what is right.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield the floor, not in exhaustion, not in fatigue, but ours to fight another day.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I commend our colleague, Senator LAUTENBERG, for his efforts. He has done the Senate a service and has called the Senate and the Nation's attention to the importance of the Million Mom March. I appreciate as well the participation and the leadership Senator BOXER is always able to provide for our caucus on so many issues before the Senate. They have articulated very ably and admirably for our caucus today in expressing to all of those coming from all parts of the country how important it is they express themselves, how important it is they exercise their constitutional opportunities in this great country, how important it is they send a message to the rest of the country, as well as to Members of the Congress, the critical nature of the need to address the gun issue in an effective way.

That is all they are coming to express themselves on, and it is appropriate at this time, and given the tremendous message that numbers of women will send by their presence, that we acknowledge their presence and welcome them to this city; that we tell them we are listening; that we resolve to respond in as effective a way as we can.

Again, I thank the senior Senator from New Jersey for his efforts, and the Senator from California for participating, for sending that message loudly and clearly and for doing all they can to recognize the importance of what will happen in Washington on Sunday.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, did the Senator wish to respond?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Can I have 1 minute?

Mr. WARNER. Without losing my right to the floor, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia for his always courteous response to a request.

It was disheartening to see we could not get a resolution adopted—not law, a thought, an idea, what we would like to do, that says we welcome the committed women who are involved in the march who are going to gather in places across this country to protest the threat of violence to their children.

I thank our leader, and my colleague from California, for being such active supporters of this protest against violence. I am sorry we did not have a chance to get a vote on it. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his friendly remarks as well.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this weekend, hundreds of thousands of mothers and "honorary mothers" will convene in Washington, DC and communities around the country to call for sensible gun legislation for safe kids.

On Sunday, Americans will unite for the Million Mom March, the first-ever national march for gun-safety. The mothers from Michigan and around the country come from all walks of life. They live in cities, in suburbs and in rural America. They are of all races, all religions and all political persuasions. They are our friends and neighbors, our community leaders.

On Mothers' Day, 2000, these "mothers and others" will join together to grieve over the loss of their loved ones, and the loss of more than 4,000 young people who are killed by gunfire each year.

Among these mothers will be Veronica McQueen, the Michigan mother who lost her six year old daughter, Kayla Rolland, to gun violence earlier this year. Ms. McQueen said, "I just don't want to see another parent have to bury another baby over this, over something that is preventable, something that is very, very preventable."

Gun violence is preventable. But mothers can not act alone. Mothers in the Million Mom March know: In order to reduce the level of gun violence in their homes and communities, Congress must pass legislation to keep guns out of the hands of children and criminals.

Some of us in this Congress have heard the cry of families around this country and worked to pass sensible legislation to protect our nation's children. That legislation would limit access to guns by prohibited persons by, among other things, closing the gun show loophole—applying background checks to guns sold at gun shows.

The Lautenberg-Kerrey gun show amendment that passed in the Senate,

but not in the House of Representatives, is one of the most important provisions we can pass this Congress. It will close the loophole that allows criminals and other prohibited persons to buy guns at gun shows that they would not otherwise be permitted to purchase.

It a loophole that is often exploited by those who do not want to undergo background checks—including Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold, the Columbine killers. Harris and Klebold used four semiautomatic assault weapons in their now infamous attack on their classmates. Of the four guns, three were purchased by Robyn Anderson at a gun show in Adams County, Colorado.

Robyn, who was 18 at the time, bought three semiautomatic assault weapons for her younger friends. She later testified before the Colorado Legislature about her purchase and the need to close the gun show loophole. She said: "Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold had gone to the Tanner gun show on Saturday and they took me back with them on Sunday. . . While we were walking around, Eric and Dylan kept asking sellers if they were private or licensed. They wanted to buy their guns from someone who was private—and not licensed—because there would be no paperwork or background check."

Robyn continues: "I was not asked any questions at all. There was no background check. All I had to do was show my driver's license to prove that I was 18. Dylan got a shotgun. Eric got a shotgun and a black rifle that he bought clips for. He was able to buy clips and ammunition without me having to show any I.D. The sellers didn't write down any information."

"I would not have bought a gun for Eric and Dylan if I had had to give any personal information or submit any kind of check at all. I think it was clear to the sellers that the guns were for Eric and Dylan. They were the ones asking all the questions and handling all the guns."

Robyn concluded: "I wish a law requiring background checks had been in effect at the time. I don't know if Eric and Dylan would have been able to get guns from another source, but I would not have helped them. It was too easy. I wish it had been more difficult. I wouldn't have helped them buy the guns if I had faced a background check."

The Columbine killers took advantage of the gun show loophole and the result was deadly. Congress has the chance to close this loophole with the Lautenberg amendment. That amendment requires prospective purchasers to undergo background checks at gun shows and gives law enforcement up to three business days to those checks if there is any potentially disqualifying information—as set forth in the current Brady law.

Honest, law-abiding Americans are not affected by these background

checks. 72 percent of the checks are completed within three minutes, and 95 percent are cleared within two hours. FBI records reveal that the five percent of people whose background checks take more than 24 hours to complete, are 20 times more likely to have a criminal record or otherwise be prohibited from accessing weapons.

Congress must pass legislation that gives law enforcement up to three business days, when needed, to complete background checks at gun shows, and truly close the gun show loophole. As of this day, Congress has failed to do so, and has subsequently failed the families of the Columbine victims and others who have lost loved ones to gunfire.

On this Sunday, I will march with the families of those victims from Michigan and around the country, who are calling on Congress to end their agony. In the words of one mother, it's time to turn tears into action. Congress must pass "sensible gun laws for safe kids." Let's start by closing the gun show loophole today. It's time to end the plague of gun violence on America's children.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in welcoming the Million Mom March to Washington this weekend. Their campaign for sensible gun control has captured the attention of the nation, and it deserves to capture the attention of Congress too. Their message is irresistible. Gun crimes and gun violence are a serious challenge to the nation, and it is wrong for the United States Senate to bury its head in the sand on this fundamental issue. More than a year has passed since the Columbine tragedy, and we have failed to finish the job we began last year on the Juvenile Justice Bill. Democrats have repeatedly asked for the House and Senate conferees to meet and approve a final bill that includes the Senate-passed gun control provisions. We wait and wait and wait, while schools and children across the country continue to suffer from the epidemic of gun violence that plagues so many of our communities.

Too many children are in continuing danger of gun violence in their homes and schools and neighborhoods. These are not new problems, but they have become increasingly serious, and it is irresponsible for Congress to look the other way and ignore them.

Our goal is to support parents, youths, educators, law enforcement authorities, and communities. We have a shared responsibility to find solutions to these problems. Fifty million school children are waiting for our answer.

The greatest tragedy of the school shootings across the nation is they have not shocked us into doing everything we can to prevent them in the future. By refusing to learn from these tragedies, Congress is condemning the country to repeat them. How many wake-up calls will it take before Congress finally responds?

Current statistics on children and guns are unacceptable.

For every child killed with a gun, four others are wounded. According to the Centers for Disease Control, the rate of firearm deaths of children 0-14 years old is twelve times higher in the United States than in 25 other industrial nations combined.

Over 6,000 students were expelled in 1996-97 for bringing guns to school. The Journal of the American Medical Association reports that between 36% and 50% of male eleventh graders believe they could easily get a gun if they wanted one.

In a 1997 survey, 9% of high school students had carried a weapon to school during the 30 days preceding the survey; 6% had a gun.

Between July 1, 1994 and June 30, 1998, there were 173 violent deaths in schools.

In a recent survey of over 100,000 teenagers conducted last month, 30% said they could get a gun in a few hours and 11% more said they could get a gun in one day.

1 in 5 of these teenagers have felt afraid at school since the Columbine High School shootings a year ago.

4 in 10 of these same teenagers said there are guns in their homes, and more than half of them say they have access to those weapons.

In 1996, more than 1300 children aged 10-19 committed suicide with firearms. Unlike suicide attempts using other methods, suicide attempts with gun are nearly always fatal, which means that a temporarily depressed teenager will never get a second chance at life. Two-thirds of all completed teenage suicides involve a firearm.

The firearm injury epidemic, due largely to handgun injuries, is ten times larger than the polio epidemic of the first half of this century.

The nation's gun laws are a disgrace. We need to close the gun show loophole, support child safety locks on guns, and provide greater resources for strict enforcement of the gun laws now on the books.

The guns used to kill nine of the 13 people murdered at Columbine High School were purchased at a gun show. The woman who bought the guns for Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold said that she would never have purchased those guns if she had to submit her name for a background check.

More than 800 Americans, young and old, die each year from guns fired by children under the age of 19. It shouldn't take a Columbine, a Jonesboro, or an urban drive-by shooting to persuade us to act.

Perhaps six-year-old Kayla Rolland would be alive today if the gun that her classmate used had a child safety lock on it.

Perhaps a 13-year-old school girl in Deming, New Mexico and a school vice-principal in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania would still be alive if the young shooters did not have access to the guns.

American children are more at risk from firearms than the children of any

other industrial nation. In a recent year, firearms killed no children in Japan, 19 children in Great Britain, 57 children in Germany, 109 children in France, 153 children in Canada—and 5,285 children in the United States.

Shame on the National Rifle Association, shame on the Republican Party, and shame on the United States Congress for tolerating figures like that. My fervent hope is that the Million Mom March will succeed where so many other efforts in recent years have failed, and that Congress at long last will be persuaded to act. The irresistible force of the Million Mom March is about to meet the immovable object of Congress—and I intend to do all I can to see that the immovable object of Congress finally moves.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I am proud today to recognize and welcome the visit to Washington, DC by a group of my fellow West Virginians for this Sunday's "Million Mom March."

The Million Mom March, coinciding with Mothers' Day, is a grassroots effort led by people across the country—Dads and Kids included—dedicated to educating our children and our nation about guns; both the dangers posed by their misuse and the tragic toll this misuse has taken on our country's youth, their friends, and their families. The people who attend this event here in Washington will have gathered in the parking lots of schools, churches, and synagogues across the country, and will have come here to let those of us in Congress know, in no uncertain terms, that we need to be doing more to protect our children.

I am pleased to say that among those relaying that message this weekend will be a delegation of Moms from West Virginia, many with their entire families in tow. As they point out, one difference many of these West Virginian Moms may have from others participating in this weekend's events is that they also have hunters in their own families. In fact, it would not surprise me at all to find out that more than a few of the folks marching were hunters themselves.

In West Virginia, we respect the rights of law-abiding citizens to keep and bear arms, and we consider parents and children hunting together to be a time-honored tradition. Yet our state legislature has already taken the responsible step of limiting possession and legal ownership of handguns to those 18 and older. Now the West Virginian Moms join with their counterparts from around the nation to demand that Members of Congress respond appropriately to the epidemic of American children killed and injured by accidents and crime involving guns.

Unfortunately, all too often when we in Congress discuss the misuse of guns, the debate turns into a pointless back-and-forth about whether we have too many gun laws, or too few. Rather than engage in that debate, I would just invite my colleagues to consider these staggering statistics:

One in 910 American children die because of the misuse of guns before the age of 20.

American children under the age of 15 are twelve times more likely to die from gunfire than children in 25 other industrialized countries combined.

Seventy-seven percent of murder victims aged 13-17 are killed by a firearm.

Last year:

4,205 children and teens were killed by gunfire;

2,562 were murdered by gunfire;

1,262 committed suicide using a firearm; and

306 died from an accidental shooting.

Each day:

Two children under the age of 5 are murdered;

Six children and youths under 20 commit suicide;

Ten children and youths under 20 are homicide victims; and

Twelve children and youth under 20 die from firearm misuse.

Between 1979 and 1997, gunfire killed nearly 80,000 children and teens in America—25,000 more than the total number of American soldiers killed in battle in Vietnam.

Firearms wounded an additional 320,000 children during this same period.

In that period, more than 25,000 children took their own lives with firearms, and nearly 10,000 died as a result of an accidental shooting.

In 1997, my home state of West Virginia lost 23 children younger than 20 to firearm misuse, up seven from the previous year. Nine were murdered, ten committed suicide, and three were the victims of accidents.

Mr. President, last year the United States Senate passed the Juvenile Justice bill. Among its provisions, this bill contained some courageous efforts to address the culture of crime and violence in which our children are being raised. The bill also featured some common-sense measures designed to make guns safer, and provisions to keep firearms out of the hands of criminals. The Senate also sought to close the so-called gun show loophole. Sadly, our seeming inability to have any discussion about guns has kept the conferees on this bill from reporting back to the respective houses with a version for final passage.

My purpose here today is to join the Million Moms in calling attention to the bottom line. We live in a society in which the lives of children are tragically at risk because of the virtually unfettered availability of guns. Our respect for the constitutional rights of gun owners should never overwhelm the love and caring we have for our children. I commend the Moms, from West Virginia and around the country, who come to remind us what our priorities should be.

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

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—Continued

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I make a parliamentary inquiry. Are we now out of morning business and on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are on the military construction bill.

Mr. WARNER. Fine.

Mr. President, in the course of the deliberations before the Senate Appropriations Committee on this measure, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD—former majority leader of the Senate; one who has served in the Senate 41 years—brought before that committee an amendment entitled the Byrd-Warner amendment dealing with the issue of the balance of power in the Constitution between the executive branch, the President, and the legislative branch, the Congress of the United States, as it relates to matters of foreign policy but, most particularly, as it relates to the matter—and perhaps the most important entrusted to both the President of the United States and the Congress—the most important matter of when the President, as Commander in Chief, sends beyond the shores of our great Nation men and women in uniform into harm's way in the cause of peace.

This week, those of us on the Republican side of the aisle had our weekly luncheon, as did our good friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle. At our luncheon, Senator STROM THURMOND stood and asked if we could observe a moment of silence as he recounted the closing day of World War II, when hostilities ceased in Europe—the bloodiest of all wars, in which 292,000 men and women, wearing the uniform of the Armed Services of the United States, lost their lives.

You could have heard a pin drop in that caucus as that great soldier, as that great statesman, asked for remembrance of the veterans of those generations.

In a very humble way, I have a brief memory. At age 17, I joined the Navy. It was January of 1945. I was simply trained, as were thousands of other youngsters my age, because at that point in January, in the winter of 1945, both the war in Europe and the war in the Pacific were inconclusive. I simply was at training command, waiting for the invasion of Japan. I thank God that last battle in the Pacific never occurred, not only for myself but for millions of others who would have been involved.

I look back very humbly on the modest contribution I made in uniform, both in that war and again during the Korean war, where I served in the Marines for a brief period.

The military did far more for me than I did for the military. Today, that 17-year-old sailor as of 1945 is privileged to be the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, a dream I thought would never be fulfilled.

I again reiterate, my service was modest. On both sides of the aisle, there are men who have served and show the scars of war, who understand the burden on the President of the United States as he sends forth troops into harm's way. I respect these individuals greatly for their knowledge, for having borne the pain in the field of battle, unlike myself. But I was there when others did.

The point of this is the gravity of the decision to send forth our people—the sons and the daughters of people from every village and town across this Nation.

I recount World War II. I then go to Korea, again, where I served as a young Marine officer. Over 50,000 men and women lost their lives in that conflict.

During the course of the Vietnam conflict, I was privileged to serve in the Navy as Undersecretary of the Navy and then as Secretary of the Navy. I was there 5 years, 4 months, and 3 days. Over 50,000 men and women lost their lives, not to mention the number of those wounded.

The point I make is, the last time this Nation declared war was World War II. Yet since that time we have sent men and women into harm's way, beyond our shores, over 100 times.

We never declared war in the Korean conflict. As a matter of fact, it was called the forgotten war. We never declared war in Vietnam, a war that not only brought tremendous casualties on the field of battle and a wrenching experience to the families—as each war does—but it divided this Nation. Indeed, it was the people of this Nation who rose up and, finally, through their elected representatives in Congress, provided the basis for the withdrawal of our troops from that conflict.

That is what this amendment is all about. It is a decision of power between the executive and the legislative branches. It is assuming the responsibility—the responsibility to join with the President or not join with the President—in sending those people beyond our shores. No greater responsibility rests upon a Member of Congress than that.

I have had the privilege to know Presidents. I have had the privilege to learn from my elder statesmen in this Chamber—foremost among them John Stennis, John Tower, Barry Goldwater, and “Scoop” Jackson, all of whom worked on the Armed Services Committee—of how Presidents of our great Nation face up to that decision to go or not to go.

Stennis used to tell the story that Lyndon Johnson told him. The President used to say to Stennis: When that phone rings at night, and there is a troubled spot in the world, and I have to make the decision, Do I or do I not send those troops? I always thought, Where is an aircraft carrier, an island of America? What is the nearest force structure of the U.S. to this conflict?

It is a big decision. Read the biographies of our Presidents. It is a tough

decision. Congress has an obligation to share with the President in the making of that decision. That is my point. That is what this amendment is about.

We have not really fully shared in that decisionmaking since World War II. Yes, we have the power to declare war under the Constitution. We also have the sole power over the purse—the power to decide whether that President can utilize the taxpayers' contribution each year in the operations of the United States.

Just this week, the Armed Services Committee concluded its bill—roughly \$309 billion—to provide for the Armed Forces of the United States. It is the biggest money bill that goes through here. It will be brought to the floor next week, hopefully.

That is what I am talking about—the power of the purse. Our committee authorizes, and the committee under the Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, and the distinguished cosponsor of this amendment, Mr. BYRD, then make the decisions on the appropriations against the authorization. That is what this amendment is about. It is about how we conduct the expenditure in this bill—\$2 billion-plus for Kosovo alone—how we go about spending the taxpayers' money for that. How does it directly relate to the safety and welfare of those brave men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces who are marching through, or patrolling through, or standing watch night and day in Kosovo?

Mr. President, I first went to Kosovo in 1990 with then-leader Bob Dole. There was a group of four or five of us. I remember that trip very well. I remember that we exited rather speedily from Kosovo because there was a riot developing. So many people wanted to see the American Senators, wanted to tell the American Senators about the cruelty and the deprivation of human rights that was then, in 1990, being inflicted on the people of Kosovo—Kosovo being a part of Yugoslavia—being inflicted by Milosevic. Little did we know that war would soon spread through this region—first in Bosnia, and then it would erupt in Kosovo.

Well, we saw those people. We went by the famous field where, hundreds of years ago, the people of that region fought off the barbarian insiders and lost the battle. They still consider that the most hallowed ground in Kosovo. That region has been subjected to fighting and internal strife ever since. Even Hitler put some 21 divisions in there to try to control the Yugoslav region, and finally he told his generals to just contain them as best they could. He never could subvert that province because of the internal fighting. Throughout the occupation of the German armies, a continuous civil war raged among the various religious and ethnic factions in that region. The Germans just sort of turned their back on them. One German general said in a dispatch to Berlin about those who died in this civil war: “Less mouths to feed, less backs to clothe.”

What a desperate, desperate cauldron of humanity. I expect that at one time or another in our deliberations in this body on Bosnia and Kosovo, every Member has availed themselves of the history of this region. As many times as I have been there—I believe I was the first U.S. Senator to go into Sarajevo in September of 1992, at the height of the fighting of the civil war in that town. I remember the French, who were controlling such security as was available, just in an airport where we were trying to bring in Red Cross supplies and food, put me in an armored vehicle and drove me around the town. We looked out through a little slit and firing was going on.

A French colonel and a former Foreign Legionnaire said, “I have fought in battles all over the world, and I cannot understand this one.” The Croats, Bosnians, Serbians were fighting each other. He said, “If you saw them in a room, you could not tell the difference. Most are well-educated people.” He said, “In all my years of combat in far-flung places of the world, I have never seen the violence that these people can inflict on one another. I have never seen anything like it.”

That violence raged for years, until the U.N. and then NATO forces finally came in and stabilized peace in that region. The war in Kosovo, we know well. We did everything we could at the diplomatic table. There were negotiations and valiant efforts by many. Not only the U.S. but, indeed, many nations tried to deal with Milosevic and to avoid the fighting. The rest is history. For 78 days, an air war was conducted in which the United States of America flew roughly 70 percent of the missions. Five or six other nations had their fighters, and they did the best they could. It was a consortium of nations.

Why did the U.S. have the largest burden? Very simply, we had the most modern equipment. It was a high-tech war. We employed every bit of high-tech equipment that we knew how to employ to protect the lives of the aviators. That was the correct decision. We gave as much as we could to our allies, but their planes simply weren't equipped with the high-tech guidance systems, radar systems, and other detection systems to defend themselves. So we flew the bulk of the missions. NATO is still without adequate airlift. We supplied the cargo planes, the troop carriers, in large measure. In that remote location in the airfields that ring Kosovo—Italy had a dozen airfields, and how valiant that country was in that battle. They turned over much of their civil aviation, air space, and airfields to allow the U.S. and allies to operate their aircraft around the clock.

Back to this amendment. The amendment is in two parts. I will refer to it as part 1 or 2. First, it is a contribution that I made some 2½ months ago, following my most recent trip to Kosovo. I went into that region, I think for the fifth or sixth time, and I went to the headquarters of the KFOR commander,

a fine German officer, well-trained. He had a modest office. We were joined by Ambassador Kouchner, who was given by the U.N. the primary responsibility for trying to rebuild Kosovo following the termination of the conflict. This was January. I remember it well. There were 1 or 2 light bulbs sort of hanging from the ceiling, and they were constantly flickering. Down the hall was a toilet that was inoperative because there wasn't enough power. You had to flush it by taking a big bucket of water and pouring it in.

I bring this up because Ambassador Kouchner said to me repeatedly in the hour or so I was there, as the lights were flickering, "We don't have enough money from our allies that fought this war and others who made the commitment to get adequate power." He said, "Half of the city of Pristina"—that is where we were, Pristina—"is freezing tonight because of the inadequacy of the power, inadequacy of the housing, inadequacy of everything, food and the like." That was in January. That is not an American; that is a Frenchman.

The general who commented on the lights said, "This is the best building in town. We are doing our best; we are going to make it through." This was the headquarters of all the KFOR, all the troops. Up to 30 nations had contributed troops to try to bring about a measure of stability.

The consequence of that trip and going out to visit our troops in a far region—the whole area was divided into various regions: The American sector, the French sector, the British sector. I visited our troops in the American sector. I watched these young men from places all across the United States, heavily dressed in their flack suits and protective vests, cold as the dickens, carrying weapons, but going around to try to maintain order in these war-ravaged communities. There was the Serb section in the town and the Albanian section.

There was an indivisible line between them. You couldn't see it. But everybody knew you didn't step across it. There was very little, if any, contact between two factions.

I visited other American soldiers—two and three stationed out to guard a church. Our soldiers then and today are doing all kinds of tasks at personal risk, for which in large measure they weren't trained. They do not teach us in boot camp how to solve marital disputes or how to solve disputes between shop owners who are arguing.

These wonderful persons in uniform are drawing on a lifetime of American experience with their families and their homes and their towns to perform tasks that are far beyond any training the military gives. But they are doing it. They have done it, and they continue to do it, and do it very well.

At the end of the war, there were commitments in which the various allies came in and said we will send so many million dollars; we will send so many police; we will send so many

building supplies; we will do this and we will do that. Bernard Kouchner, the man in charge, simply said it is not being done.

So I came back home and concocted an amendment in consultation with quite a few of my colleagues. I went about it very deliberately. I consulted on two occasions at the White House in constructive meetings. The administration wasn't at all supportive of this venture; that is, on the face of the draft that I had. But I had other people within the administration and elsewhere telling me privately: JOHN, if you do this, I think you will get the attention of the allies and they will begin to fulfill the commitments they made. Whether they are dollar commitments, commitments for police, or other commitments; they will do it.

I came to the floor of the Senate on Monday. I had quite a few cosponsors: The distinguished Senator STEVENS, the distinguished Senator INOUE, members of the Appropriations Committee, and a great number of the Armed Services Committee. There was nothing to file the amendment against. But my intentions were that at such time as the Kosovo supplemental came through, I would put it on and have it printed in the RECORD.

This thing reverberated around the world, known as the Warner amendment. I take no great pride of authorship. But they had to name it something. But, suddenly, the allies began to get the message that we mean business in the Congress of the United States. We mean business. They began to account for what they had done. They began to expedite their dollars. They began to expedite the building materials. They began to expedite in some ways sending police, although they are still far behind the goals. Now, some 2½ months later, I have just been advised as late as yesterday by a constant stream of U.N. and E.U. officials through my office. I thank them. They quietly thanked me and those who supported me for bringing this matter out in the public and making known the need of the allies to step up.

The House of Representatives, Mr. KASICH, called me one day with great respect and said: JOHN, I think your amendment is a good one. Would you agree if I brought it up on the House floor just as it is? I said: Fine. Give it a try.

There was quite a debate in the House of Representatives on that amendment. I will put it in the RECORD later today. But it was only defeated by a very few votes with basically 200 on each side. By a very few votes did it go down, largely because a number of Members had not really had a chance to think it through.

But this amendment, which is couched as the Byrd-Warner amendment today, simply says the following: That the allies made certain commitments that, in the judgment of this Senator and such others who support those commitments, have not been kept in a timely way.

We have about 15 percent of the troops there. I want to make this clear. Other nations have 85 percent of them.

As a consequence, our troops and the troops of other nations could be there indefinitely. There is no one—I defy anyone—who can come to this floor and give with any precision the dates on which the infrastructure of that nation, and particularly its judicial system, a police system, and other necessary infrastructure, can enable the troops of this Nation and others to go home.

It seems to me they needed a wake-up call. That is precisely what this amendment does that I partly drew up. It simply says to our President: Respectfully, Mr. President, of this \$2 billion coming through, you can utilize a certain percentage right away to reimburse the Department of Defense for expenditures it has already made for the Kosovo operation for this fiscal year to replenish the funds taken out of the Department of the Army, largely, but some out of the Navy, some out of the Air Force, but 25 percent we hold back—that is all, 25 percent of \$2 billion we hold back—until you can certify that you have examined, first, the commitments of our allies, and then, second, the extent to which they have completed their commitments. I have been told on good authority that in all probability the President can make that certification largely with what has occurred in the 2½ months since this Warner section of this thing has been made public.

So my amendment in large measure has met its goal.

I thank the many people who have helped me and stood by the purpose of this amendment. But had the President not been able to certify, I said the other 25 percent of the money would then be used to bring our troops home because this Nation has fulfilled its commitment and did its best certainly in the combat phase of this. Certainly in the year almost after the combat phase, we have done it. Now let the Europeans and other nations pick up.

If there is one thing in this bill I will bring to the floor next week for the colleagues of the Armed Services Committee, the most serious thing facing us today in the military is the retention of the middle-grade personnel, enlisted and officer, because of the constant deployment of these individuals all over the world away from their families. We are not today able to retain sufficient numbers to keep this military of ours, this magnificent military of ours, strong in the future. It is not the shortage of dollars. It is not the shortage of equipment in large measure, although spare parts is a problem. It is the fact that these men and women in the uniform of our Nation are constantly being sent away on ships, flown away in airplanes, and many times with very short notice so that the remaining spouse has to pick up the responsibilities as that serviceperson goes overseas.

I just think to keep an indefinite commitment in this region without any participation by the Congress of the United States is wrong. We should speak to that, and that is what my portion does. It simply says 25 percent is to be used to bring home the troops if you can't make the certification. But if the Congress wishes, it could meet and say: Even though you could not make the certification, Mr. President, we think you should continue the policy as you have laid it out despite the inability of making the certification, despite the fact that our allies have not made their commitments. That amendment simply says we should be involved. That is what the Constitution requires. We should be involved. We cannot come in here year after year, month after month, and just stamp these appropriations with an "aye" vote and then run out of the Chamber. We have to face up to this amendment. This amendment makes us face up to it.

That is my principal contribution. I join my distinguished colleague and friend, Senator BYRD, in his portion. I see my distinguished colleague from South Carolina who worked on this and voted for it in the Appropriations Committee. I shorten my remarks so the Senator may address the Senate.

The thrust of the Byrd amendment is not "cut and run," not that we are trying to undermine NATO, that we are turning our back. It is simply saying to the Congress of the United States and to the next President, give Congress a plan and show we can pull out just the combat elements of our troops, leaving the intelligence, leaving the logistics, leaving other segments of the military to help the remaining troops of the many nations—not cut and run. Bring out the combat troops. Show Congress a plan.

Those troops, in our judgment, should be out by July 2001. Is that too much to ask, 14 months hence? That is not cut and run. That is not undermining anybody. That is not sending a signal to Milosevic that the United States is turning its back. It is saying to the men and women of our Armed Forces, to this Nation, that we have done our share. It is time for us to pick up the combat share to the extent it is still necessary. And then, if it is in the infinite wisdom of this body that we should not make any changes, we should not come home with the combat elements. All we have to do is stand up and send a message, a sense of the Congress, we think we should stay. That would add far greater strength to the conviction of the American participation than this year after year after year of idly voting on an appropriations bill and not discussing it.

I respect my dear colleague from West Virginia. How many times he has been on this floor reminding Members of our responsibilities? Many, many times. This is an amendment that simply says: Congress, the hour has arrived where you have to stand up and

be counted if we will continue for an indefinite time the missions in Kosovo.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Dear Colleague letter.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2000.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On May 9, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, by a bipartisan vote of 23 to 3, adopted a major policy provision relating to the ongoing role of the United States military in the Kosovo peacekeeping operation.

The Senate is expected to quickly take up the FY 2001 Military Construction Appropriations Bill, which contains the Kosovo language. As the authors of this provision, we take this opportunity to provide you with our analysis of the language and a fact sheet on the provision.

We are particularly concerned about the possibility of misconceptions or misinterpretations of the provision. The Byrd-Warner language goes directly to the institutional and constitutional responsibilities of Congress. It does not require the withdrawal of U.S. military troops from Kosovo. To the contrary, the language makes specific provisions for Congress to vote, under expedited procedures, if the next President seeks to continue U.S. military involvement in the Kosovo peacekeeping operation beyond July 1, 2001.

The provision has three main objectives. First, it terminates funding for the continued deployment of U.S. ground combat troops in Kosovo after July 1, 2001, unless the President seeks and receives Congressional authorization to keep troops in Kosovo.

Second, the provision requires the President to develop a plan, in consultation with our European allies, to turn the ground combat troop element of the Kosovo peacekeeping operation entirely over to the Europeans by July 1, 2001. Assuming the President is successful in developing such a plan, there should be no need for funding the continued deployment of U.S. ground combat troops in Kosovo beyond July 1, 2001.

Third, related to current operations in Kosovo and to signal to the Europeans the need for them to fulfill their commitments for implementing peace and stability in Kosovo, the provision withholds 25 percent of the emergency supplemental funding for military operations Kosovo attached to the Military Construction bill pending certification by the President that our allies are making adequate progress in meeting the commitments they made to the Kosovo peacekeeping process. If the President cannot make the certifications by July 15 of this year, the funding held in reserve can only be used to withdraw U.S. forces from Kosovo unless Congress votes otherwise.

This last provision has been compared to an earlier proposal by Senator Warner, a version of which was narrowly defeated in the House. That language, however, has been modified to address a major concern expressed during the House debate; namely, that failure by the President to certify the requisite level of allied contributions would automatically trigger the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Kosovo with no opportunity for Congress or the President to intervene.

The Byrd-Warner language included in the Senate Military Construction Bill addresses that issue by including a provision for Congress to vote, under expedited procedures, to lift the troop withdrawal requirement on use of the funds held in reserve, thus disarming

the automatic trigger. Moreover, the allies appear to have gotten the message. They have in the past two months increased their contributions, and the President is expected to be able to make the required certification by July 15.

The larger issue addressed by the Byrd-Warner provision is that of the responsibility of Congress to exercise its constitutional duty. It was no accident that the founding fathers vested in Congress alone the power of the purse. Yet, we are seeking in Kosovo, as we have seen in so many other peacekeeping operations, a bastardization of that process. Instead of Congress' appropriating funds for expenditure by the Executive Branch, the Executive Branch is spending funds first and asking Congress after the fact to pay the bills.

Setting aside for a moment the foreign policy implications of the Kosovo peacekeeping operation, the Senate has a duty to vigilantly guard the rights bestowed on Congress by the Constitution. No such right is more central to the separation of powers on which our system of government is built than the vesting in Congress alone the power of the purse.

Provisions to put Congressional check reins on funding appropriated to implement U.S. foreign policy initiative are often criticized as micromanaging the Administration. Language dealing with troop drawdowns is subject to the additional criticism of endangering U.S. troops and emboldening foreign despots. The Byrd-Warner provision is carefully and deliberately designed to avoid those pitfalls.

First, the language offers guidance to the President; it does not dictate an outcome. Because the United States bore the lion's share of the air offensive against Yugoslavia, we believe that the Europeans should be responsible for the ground element of the Kosovo peacekeeping mission. The Byrd-Warner provision offers a road map to achieve that outcome by July 1, 2001. If the next President disagrees with our position, the language provides a mechanism, in the form of a joint resolution to be voted on under expedited procedures, for him to seek and receive congressional authorization to continue the deployment of U.S. ground troops in Kosovo beyond July 1, 2001.

The provision specifically exempts from the restriction on U.S. ground combat troops in Kosovo such U.S. military missions as support for NATO headquarters in Kosovo, intelligence support, air surveillance, and related activities. The United States can continue to assist NATO in Kosovo, with the exception of providing U.S. ground combat troops for the mission.

According to Administration estimates, the other NATO and non-NATO countries participating in the Kosovo peacekeeping operation are currently contributing about 85 percent of the total force structure. The Byrd-Warner provision provides ample time for those nations and others to augment their deployments of ground combat troops to Kosovo. In no way does this language undercut the NATO peacekeeping operation in Kosovo or provide encouragement to Slobodan Milosevic. If anything, it will give the Europeans the opportunity to demonstrate to the world the strength and unity of their opposition to Milosevic's brand of tyranny.

The time frames outlined in this provision are deliberate. Our intention is to shift long range decisionmaking on the role of the United States in Kosovo away from the politically charged atmosphere of an election year and into the next Administration. This language allows the next President, whoever is elected, to deal decisively with Kosovo and

prevents the U.S. from drifting, through inaction, into an indefinite and likely prolonged commitment of U.S. personnel and resources in yet another foreign peacekeeping operation.

To promote continuity between Administrations, and to ensure that the next Administration does not put off dealing with Kosovo until it is too late to plan effectively, our provision requires the current President to submit, by September 30, 2000, an interim plan for the U.S. to transition its ground combat troops out of Kosovo, and the next President to submit a final plan by May 1, 2001.

Should the Byrd-Warner language result in a drawdown of U.S. ground troops from Kosovo, the language provides for a "safe, orderly, and phased" withdrawal of troops, and leaves the planning of that withdrawal up to the President. Any troop drawdown would be managed by the generals, not the Congress.

We urge you to carefully consider the language of the Byrd-Warner provision, and we welcome your support. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Christina Evans of Senator Byrd's staff at 224-3088 or Judy Ansley of Senator Warner's staff at 224-4928.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. BYRD.
JOHN WARNER.

FACT SHEET: BYRD-WARNER KOSOVO
AMENDMENT

More than 5,500 U.S. troops are participating in the NATO peacekeeping operation in Kosovo despite the fact that Congress has never authorized, nor even formally debated, U.S. involvement in Kosovo since the Senate, on March 23, 1999, authorized air strikes against Yugoslavia.

Congress has a constitutional responsibility to address policy issues involving the deployment of U.S. troops overseas in instances, such as Kosovo, in which American men and women are being sent into potentially dangerous situations.

By tacitly endorsing, through emergency supplemental funding measures, Executive Branch decisions to deploy U.S. troops overseas without congressional authorization, Congress is effectively abrogating its responsibility under the Constitution.

This amendment terminates funding for the continued deployment of U.S. ground combat troops in Kosovo after July 1, 2001, unless the President seeks and receives congressional authorization to continue such deployment.

In recognition of the fact that the United States military bore the brunt of the NATO air campaign against Yugoslavia, the amendment also requires the president to develop a plan to turn the ground combat troop element of the Kosovo peacekeeping operation entirely over to the Europeans by July 1, 2001.

The timing is a key element of the amendment. First, it shifts the responsibility of determining future U.S. involvement in Kosovo from the current Administration, which will be out of office within months, to the next Administration, which will inherit the Kosovo peacekeeping mission. Second, the amendment provides ample time for the next Administration to either develop a plan to hand off the Kosovo ground combat troop mission to the Europeans or make its case to Congress to keep U.S. ground combat troops in Kosovo.

If the next President sees a compelling need to keep U.S. ground troops in Kosovo beyond July 1, 2001, the amendment requires him to seek congressional authorization. If Congress, acting under expedited procedures,

does not authorize the continued deployment of U.S. troops in Kosovo, funding would be terminated after July 1, 2001.

As an intermediate goal, the amendment withholds 25 percent of the FY 2000 supplemental appropriations for military operations in Kosovo pending certification by the President that the Europeans are living up to their commitments, including provision of at least 33% of the commitment for monetary reconstruction assistance, 75% of the commitment for humanitarian assistance, 75% of the commitment for Kosovo government administration monetary assistance, and 75% of the commitment for civilian police.

If the President cannot make such a certification by July 15, 2000, the money being held in reserve could only be used to withdraw troops from Kosovo unless Congress, acting under expedited procedures, votes otherwise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, let me first commend the chairman of our Armed Services Committee. He has been to war twice. He served as our Secretary of the Navy. He has a conscience with respect to the GIs now deployed in Kosovo. That is the reason I rise this afternoon.

My chairman, ranking member, and former majority leader, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, has a little bit of laryngitis. He is feeling well. He is at the committee markup right now with respect to the Labor, Health and Human Resources bill in appropriations over in the Hart Building. He wanted someone to be able to respond. I understood the opposition to this particular amendment were on their way to the floor. That is why I came. Maybe the better part of wisdom would be to say thank you and there is no debate, and when we get in one, then Senator BYRD can speak for himself.

However, I share that concern for our troops, their morale and the deployment of a so-called peacekeeping mission. There isn't any peace. There isn't any policy. All we have to do is look at the record. The record shows best that we debated airstrikes and we were split down the middle, 58-41, March 23, under the Biden amendment. We had the McCain amendment deploying armed forces in Kosovo, saying let's go to war. That was May 4, 1999. It was tabled by a motion of 78-22.

The record shows, at best, we have a lukewarm endorsement, maybe favoring some airstrikes, but against taking the life of a GI. That is the military policy right now. With respect to diplomacy, the policy is one of a so-called multiethnic society, as I remember Secretary Albright saying.

I visited Kosovo shortly after the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee did this year. I was never briefed on the importance of a multiethnic society . . . maybe the region should be partitioned. But that isn't the policy of the United States. I tried to verify the multiethnic policy with all of our experts deployed there—

the Army generals, the Navy admirals, and everyone else. I could find no support for any kind of multiethnic society in light of what was going on on the ground.

Here we have another Vietnam, not in the sense of deploying more and more troops, but actually having a military deployment in an impossible situation. Don't go forward, don't go backward, just stay there; we will send movies. It is sort of embarrassing to see our military hunkered down like chickens in a hailstorm at Camp Bonsteel and everybody bragging that we have wooden buildings and catwalks through the snow and we can get hamburgers at McDonald's. That is not for the GI, the one who volunteers to serve in the military. He is looking to be trained and go to battle for our national security.

To address these conditions that continue and languish is a reason I am confident Senator BYRD introduced his amendment, which is part of our bill. And certainly it is my feeling, likewise, that we have a responsibility here.

The other day we had the 25th anniversary of Vietnam. The Secretary of Defense said, almost 25 years later, it was a mistake. Are we going to have to wait 25 years to resolve Kosovo? Bosnia was to last 1 year. That policy has been going on for 5, 6 years now.

We just cannot willy-nilly go along with mixed policies. Of course, the clarion call for the Kosovo initiative was ethnic cleansing. At the time they were briefing us, they had 100,000 Albanians living peacefully in Belgrade. Milosevic lived down the street. Heavens above, this was not the Holocaust. Everybody confuses ethnic cleansing with enemy cleansing. When you start bombing somebody and you make that the enemy, an outright open warfare, then the other side has got the right, title, and interest to clear the area of any on the side of the enemy. More ethnic cleansing occurred after the bombing than before the bombing. Actually, it was enemy cleansing because Milosevic is a cagey fellow and a scoundrel and we all know it. He says to himself, whoopee, now I can go in there and get rid of the real Albanians that have been giving me problems down there in Kosovo. And he did it.

That is exactly what was happening. The talk now is trying to deal with, ex post facto, a million refugees spilling over into Macedonia, down into Albania and back up into Montenegro and elsewhere. But the real spilling over and the cleansing was enemy cleansing. We are trying to talk about war and victory, trying to give dignity to a mistake.

No. 1, it was a flawed policy from the word go. We came in where there weren't any guys with the white hats. It wasn't the good guys versus the bad guys. Anybody who knows anything about Kosovo and this part of the world knows that both sides are really something else. I would not want an American to go to battle for either side. I

say that advisedly because it has been proven. When we went there earlier this year, what did we learn? Yes, there was violence upon violence upon violence. It was continuing. And 95 percent of the violence was being inflicted by Albanian on Albanian.

It is interesting to me to see here, recently, in *The Economist*, that:

The war has done nothing to bring the two sides together. On the contrary, it has intensified ancient animosities.

Then going down it says:

At present, the Albanians can look to NATO for their security and to the U.N. for their administration, while many of them traffic in drugs and other contraband and generally profit from the legal limbo in which they live.

Peacekeeping? Where is the peace? Where is the peace? We are now saying we have a deployment for peacekeeping. It is an enforced cease-fire.

I was briefed by the brass in Kosovo. They said both sides ran out of targets. We hit all the targets we wanted to hit. We were even going up there knocking out the Chinese Embassy.

Of course, Milosevic had gotten rid of everything and cleansed everything he possibly could. What a wonderful war. We won. Now we want to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. Come on, don't give us that.

We were there in the little town of Urosevac. The President visited that town at Christmas time. They had a big show. They had 400-some troops, and they all were hunkered down in the city hall. You could tell the 65,000 or 70,000 residents of the town were not friendly. We drove around and they glowered at us. They were in charge. We were not in charge of the town the President was in. We were not in charge of anything, really, in Kosovo. We have deployments here with walls around them, fences and everything else. We do not wander down the street or outside the compound.

Similarly, in Mitrovica, we have a GI at one end of the block, a GI at the other end of the block, and a GI in the middle of the block on a 24-hour, three times eight, 24-hour routine, guarding people going to the grocery store.

It's public knowledge what the reporter says in *The Economist* about this thing not working:

The war has done nothing to bring the two sides together. On the contrary, it has intensified ancient animosities.

There are the soldiers in the peacekeeping force, having to spend 6 months away from their families. People hate to waste time. We, in the Senate, we love wasting time. There is nothing to do tomorrow and nothing on Monday. We cannot wait for November and the Presidential election to be over with so we can all go back to work. But the normal attitude is not to waste time and, you see, that is exactly what is happening in Kosovo.

I finally understood about the Albanians when I was in London and I met with one of the leaders of Parliament. He said the Albanians are bringing 14-

and 15-year-old girls to Portsmouth and forcing them into prostitution. They have drugs all over England now. He said: It's the worst threat and problem that we have here in England. He said: I never thought I would ever say anything good about Milosevic, but I can sort of understand his problem.

That is not to say Milosevic is a good guy, or the Albanians are all bad. But you generally get a feel for what is out there and what is going on when responsible people tell you: Look, all the Afghanistan drugs are coming up through Kosovo, and into Europe. Instead of keeping the peace, we are keeping the flow of drugs.

The GI with any common sense is saying to himself: Where is this peace we have here? We have one fellow who murdered another one but we had to let him go in 48 hours because we only had 93 slots in the prison and the United Nations had not supplied a police force. The United Nations had not supplied a court system. The United Nations had not put up their money for a prison system.

So we go right to the ultimatum. If this is diplomacy, let me quote none other than our friend, the former Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger:

Rambouillet was not a negotiation—as is often claimed—but an ultimatum. This marked an astounding departure for an administration that had entered office proclaiming its devotion to the UN Charter and multilateral procedures.

And on and on.

The transformation of Alliance from a defensive military grouping into an institution prepared to impose its values by force occurred in the same month that three former Soviet satellites joined NATO.

That is none other than Kissinger himself. In that light, I am glad we did not send Secretary Albright to Northern Ireland. We sent Senator George Mitchell instead. But under the Albright policy, you either agree by 12 o'clock midnight or we go bombing. Come on. This thing is afoul, amiss, and a mistake, and we don't have to wait for 25 years to know it. Those are my words, the words of the Senator from South Carolina, and not the words of the Senator from West Virginia. He will be glad at the first of the week—I am confident he will be in good shape again. He will explain it, no doubt, to everyone's satisfaction.

We all agree on one thing. With GIs deployed on account of our mistakes, we are going to give them every dollar necessary, every benefit, every support we possibly can.

We cannot possibly continue day in and day out in limbo with a flawed policy and act like it is a policy. It is a nonpolicy and a flawed policy and a mistaken policy. We have to somehow bring it to a head.

How do we do that in a deliberate, tactful manner? What we say is: Look, get these countries of the U.N. to support it.

Of course, we learned at the briefings that the Greeks were not for it in their

sector. They did not like it. The French, are *comme ci comme ca*. The Soviets never were for it, and they do not adhere to us. NATO responds to Moscow. The Brits are pulling out. In one place they pulled out, 3 hours later a church was burned.

I asked our British friends what their reason for pulling out was and they said they were too stretched. We are stretched, too. We have nine peacekeeping missions. We have Kosovo, Sierra Leone, the Congo, and East Timor. There are four more we are going to be asking for. The GIs are given a policeman's duty in a totally hostile place where one cannot take sides and one has to defend oneself and not act like an authority on keeping the peace but, by gosh, keep out of trouble.

We are not in charge in Kosovo, nor is the U.N., nor is NATO. We have invaded a sovereign country without a full debate. We made that mistake in Vietnam. We have the feeling of responsibility. I understand the distinguished Senator from Arizona is very much in favor of Kosovo. I could have saved him 4 or 5 years in prison if I knew at the time I got to the Senate in 1966 that McNamara felt Vietnam was a mistake.

Come on. Are we going to continue just because we do not want to send a message to Milosevic? Do my colleagues really think that Milosevic does not know what is going on? He has already removed the opposition authorities in Montenegro. If he went in there tonight, what would we do? Nothing. He is corralling his support. Read this week's *Time* magazine about what the Air Force did not hit. I wish my colleagues would get a copy and read it because it reports we were misled in that particular briefing about how we destroyed so many tanks, so many planes, so many targets; we just ruined the country.

Our distinguished friend, the Secretary of State, said: Give peace a chance; it takes time to get the roads and the bridges and industry and the hospitals and the air fields all repaired.

I remember a visit I had when I first came to the Senate. I was at the Connaught in London having dinner with Martin Agronsky who had been behind the lines in Northern Ireland for a 3-week period. He came out in despair. He said: That crowd is never going to get together.

Fortunately, under the leadership of President Clinton and Senator Mitchell, there was a break last Friday, and, finally, the IRA says they are going to disarm, and it looks like it might work.

For 30 years, they have had the infrastructure—the roads, the bridges, the hospitals, the universities. I have been to Northern Ireland. Some sections of Belfast have better housing than my hometown. With all that infrastructure, the British troops are still deployed years and years later.

Is that the policy of the United States of America with our GIs? That

is why we rise this afternoon and are ready, willing, and able to draw some lines that are understandable that will develop into a firm policy.

If the U.N. wants to get in there, fine, but if they are not going to support it, then we have a problem. I will never forget the story about Vaclav Havel saying he hoped Secretary Albright could come back to the Czech Republic, her native land, and succeed him as President. He said the one difficulty was that 75 percent of the people of the Czech Republic opposed "Madeleine's war."

Take a rollcall. Go up to the U.N. See how enthused they are about the non-policy.

Quit giving this patina of deliberation and positivity by doing nothing and keeping the troops out there and praying like we all do that no one gets assaulted or loses a life at Bonsteel. We have an impossible situation. It is not going to get better in the foreseeable future. We ought to bring it to a head and certainly let the next President, whomever that is, have a 6-month period to review the mistake we made and say: Wait a minute, it was not a mistake.

I do not mind if they are right and I am wrong. I can tell my colleagues right now though, unfortunately, I think I gave the right vote when I opposed the Biden amendment.

I appreciate the leadership and the conscientious approach the distinguished Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has given this responsibility. We are not trying to embarrass the President. We are not trying to take a political position. On the contrary, I have my GIs out there. I saw what happened in Vietnam, and I saw what happened in Somalia. If it had not been for the Byrd amendment, we could possibly still be there.

This is a similar call to arms politically for us to set the policy and do so in a judicious way. We all know they want to try to subvert it; they do not want to talk about it. With this crowd in Washington, you have to be on message: Let's not talk about it because it might get on to the weekend shows, and if it gets on to the weekend shows, it might send the wrong message to Milosevic. Bah humbug to Milosevic. I am trying to send a message to those fellows at Bonsteel. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from South Carolina. I remember when I first came to the Senate 22 years ago, two-thirds of the Senate or more had the opportunity to serve in uniform. Today, there are fewer. I cast no aspersion against those who do not. It is just a generational thing.

Listening to my dear friend from South Carolina, I know he draws on his experiences in the army in World War II as a young officer in the battle to free Europe when he had the responsi-

bility of life. No one else but him, as an officer, had the responsibility for those young men under his command.

This type of amendment we discussed—certainly I have and others—with many veterans who have worn the uniform of this country and many who are on active duty today.

The distinguished Senator said he has seen war. I saw it in the continental limits in World War II, and then I had a brief tour in Korea as a ground officer with an air wing. I saw the others who had to fight it, but I never put myself in the category of a combat soldier. I have always said my orders did not take me there, but they took the Senator there and he saw it.

I know in the course of this debate, the issue will be raised: We may be putting the young men and women in the Armed Forces in jeopardy as a consequence of this amendment, even the act of filing it and debating it.

I want to get into that. I am sure the Senator will rejoin in this debate if and when that happens.

I see our distinguished colleague here, who is a naval veteran, who is about to speak. I do not know if it is on this matter or on another matter. It is not on this matter.

But I am willing to join in that debate. When 23 members of the Appropriations Committee voted "yea" to put this in—and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina can correct me—but of that group who voted "yea," the following have been privileged to wear the uniform of our country: Senator COCHRAN, Senator SPECTER, Senator GORTON, Senator BURNS, Senator BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, Senator DANIEL INOUE, Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, Senator HERBERT KOHL, and Senator STEVENS, the chairman. They are veterans.

Let us debate it, but let us debate it with great care.

The letter which I put in the RECORD from Senator BYRD and myself states our point of view. This letter is just going out to Members, but already the following cosponsors, who likewise were veterans, have signed on: Senator ROBERTS, Senator STROM THURMOND, Senator INHOFE, Senator ROBERT SMITH, and Senator SESSIONS. So a goodly number of those who have been privileged to wear the uniform of our country have joined behind this.

We would not have done it, I say to the Senator, if we had had a moment's concern we were increasing the risk to our people. They are at risk today. They will be at risk tomorrow and the next day. And as we are drifting into this endless—endless—commitment, they are at risk every single day.

This amendment simply says: Congress, either join with the President or state your case and bring them home. That is the purpose of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator HARKIN for up to 20 minutes, Senator HELMS for up to 10 minutes, and Senators ROBERTS and CLELAND in control of 60 minutes total.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for me to make my presentation seated.

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

(The remarks of Mr. HELMS pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 306 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

DAMS IN WASHINGTON AND OREGON

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the Vice President of the United States is flying to Oregon this evening, or tomorrow morning, for a visit to that State. On the last five or six occasions on which he has visited the State of Washington, I have inquired of him, as politely as possible, as to his intentions with respect to the future of four dams on the Snake River. This inquiry is of significant importance to the people of the State of Washington, as well as the people of the State of Oregon. The answer from the Vice President is peculiarly important because of the disarray of the present administration. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has recommended that the dams come down, be removed, for salmon recovery. The Corps of Engineers, almost a year ago, was ready to recommend that the dams stay in place and that we deal with salmon recovery in another productive fashion. That recommendation was vetoed by the White House and removed physically from the Corps of Engineers' report.

More recently, the National Marine Fishery Service has said that we don't know enough to decide whether or not we should remove the dams and that the decision may be at least 5 or 10 years away. The Governor of Oregon has recommended that the dams come down. The Governor of Washington, also a Democrat, has opposed that recommendation. As you know, Mr. President, so have I, in the most vehement possible terms. Of all of the proposals for salmon recovery, dam removal is, first, the most ineffective and, second, of the most marginal utility with respect to the recovery of the salmon resource in the Pacific Northwest.

At a capital expenditure of \$1 billion to \$2 billion, and annual losses of at

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

least a third of a billion dollars in perpetuity, the promise of salmon recovery from dam removal is extremely marginal, with no impact on some of the endangered runs, and only a modest improvement in the order of 10 to 20 percent in the prospects for certain other runs. Weighed against that are the potential real successes from the Salmon Recovery Board of the State of Washington, which has for the current year an appropriation from the Congress of \$18 million for the work of citizen-based salmon recovery teams, which will be the beneficiary of an appropriation from this body of about \$4 million.

There is a very real concern with predation at the mouth of the Columbia River—a concern now frustrated by a lawsuit against any removal of Caspian terns from an artificial island at the mouth of the river by at least a temporary injunction. These and dozens of other projects in the Pacific Northwest have a far greater promise for the salmon recovery than does dam removal, with all of its devastating impacts on the loss of benign, renewable energy power, to be substituted by the use of fossil fuels, for all of the loss of agricultural land that requires irrigation to be anything other than a desert, for all the loss of a transportation system which is the most efficient and environmentally benign for the transportation of grain to ports on the lower Columbia River.

All of these factors argue against dam removal. But the Vice President of the United States, in his candidacy for President of the United States, refuses to make any commitment whatsoever on this matter. Now, it may be that he didn't want to respond to this Senator on these visits to the State of Washington. But he is now going to be asked to respond by the Governor of Oregon, who supports his candidacy. His response has been demanded by the Portland Oregonian, the largest newspaper in the State of Oregon, which, incidentally, holds my position and that of my colleague, Senator SMITH of Oregon, on the subject. One hopes that the Vice President will finally be able to come up with an opinion. Now, he has taken positions on other local issues. He is certainly quite willing to tell the people of South Carolina what flag they can fly. But he seems unwilling to tell the people of Washington and Oregon what his views are on an issue of vital importance to them and to their regional economy.

So I am here to express the hope that the Vice President will finally come clean with his views on this subject. But I must express the expectation that he will, once again, dodge the issue, pretend that he has not made up his mind when, in fact, he has, and claim that he can't make a substantive comment on this until after the election in November is over. I will regret that, Mr. President. His opponent, the Governor of Texas, has taken the forthright stand that it is improper and un-

economical and unwise to remove those dams. He will protect the physical infrastructure of the Pacific Northwest. I am here to invite the Vice President of the United States to do likewise, without, I regret to say, any expectation that he is willing to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Georgia.

DIALOG ON AMERICA'S GLOBAL ROLE III, MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I rise today, along with my distinguished colleague from Kansas, Senator ROBERTS, to continue our dialog on the global role of the United States. This is the third such dialog in what we have intended to be a year-long series. In February, we began by taking a broad look at the priorities and approaches of U.S. foreign policy in the post-cold-war period. A few weeks ago we narrowed the focus somewhat by trying to define and defend our national interest, which must be the first step in arriving at a coherent national security strategy.

Today, as we start to go from general principles to concrete applications, Senator ROBERTS and I, along with several of our colleagues, will attempt to zero in on the U.S. role in multilateral organizations which strongly impact our national security, especially NATO and the U.N.

I have just returned from a trip to Brussels and Italy where we were briefed on the air campaign from Aviano Air Base. In Brussels, I met with the Deputy Secretary General of NATO. As I said, Italy and then on to Macedonia, where we saw the regions where the refugees were kept during the war in Kosovo. Then, into Kosovo itself.

I met with key military leaders and key political leaders from the United States, European nations, and NATO. These meetings only served to reinforce my strong belief that there is a pressing need to address the global role of the United States, both in our own national strategic planning and in NATO's planning. This conclusion is not a result of the recent actions taken in Serbia and Kosovo. Rather, these actions were merely symptomatic of, I think, the problem.

A large portion of the military operation in Kosovo was supplied by the United States. I believe it is now time for the United States to lead in finding a political solution. Similarly, I believe the time has come to "Europeanize" the peace in Bosnia and Kosovo. While the soldiers I spoke with at Camp Bond steel certainly displayed high morale, reflected in the excellent job they actually have done, if we stay in the Balkans indefinitely with no clear way out, I believe we run an increasing risk of further overextending our military, thus exacerbating our recruitment and retention problems and lessening our capability to respond to more serious challenges to our vital national interests.

From my perspective, the basic problem in the Balkans today is political, not military, and requires a political rather than military solution. Essentially, at this point in time, the various communities wish to live apart and exercise self-determination along ethnic lines. I would agree that such a development is unfortunate and not in keeping with our American view of the way the world should be. However, for any solution to the current situation to be acceptable to the parties directly involved—and, thus, durable—this inescapable fact must be taken into account.

On June 30 of last year, the Senate accepted by voice vote my amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill which expressed "the sense of the Senate that the United States should call immediately for the convening of an international conference on the Balkans" to develop a final political settlement of both the Kosovo and Bosnia conflicts.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1163 TO S. 1234, FISCAL YEAR 2000 FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS SUPPORTING AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TO ACHIEVE A DURABLE POLITICAL SETTLEMENT IN THE BALKANS

(Adopted by Senate by unanimous consent on 6/30/99)

SEC. X. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE BALKANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The United States and its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) conducted large-scale military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(2) At the conclusion of 78 days of these hostilities, the United States and its NATO allies suspended military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia based upon credible assurances by the latter that it would fulfill the following conditions as laid down by the so called Group of Eight (G-8):

(A) An immediate and verifiable end of violence and repression in Kosovo.

(B) Staged withdrawal of all Yugoslav military, police and paramilitary forces from Kosovo.

(C) Deployment in Kosovo of effective international and security presences, endorsed and adopted by the United Nations Security Council, and capable of guaranteeing the achievement of the agreed objectives.

(D) Establishment of an interim administration for Kosovo, to be decided by the United Nations Security Council which will seek to ensure conditions for a peaceful and normal life for all inhabitants in Kosovo.

(E) Provision for the safe and free return of all refugees and displaced persons from Kosovo and an unimpeded access to Kosovo by humanitarian aid organizations.

(3) These objectives appear to have been fulfilled, or to be in the process of being fulfilled, which has led the United States and its NATO allies to terminate military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(4) The G-8 also called for a comprehensive approach to the economic development and

stabilization of the crisis region, and the European Union has announced plans for \$1,500,000,000 over the next 3 years for the reconstruction of Kosovo, for the convening in July of an international donors' conference for Kosovo aid, and for subsequent provision of reconstruction aid to the other countries in the region affected by the recent hostilities followed by reconstruction aid directed at the Balkans region as a whole;

(5) The United States and some of its NATO allies oppose the provision of any aid, other than limited humanitarian assistance, to Serbia until Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic is out of office.

(6) The policy of providing reconstruction aid to Kosovo and other countries in the region affected by the recent hostilities while withholding such aid for Serbia presents a number of practical problems, including the absence in Kosovo of financial and other institutions independent of Yugoslavia, the difficulty in drawing clear and enforceable distinctions between humanitarian and reconstruction assistance, and the difficulty in reconstructing Montenegro in the absence of similar efforts in Serbia.

(7) In any case, the achievement of effective and durable economic reconstruction and revitalization in the countries of the Balkans is unlikely until a political settlement is reached as to the final status of Kosovo and Yugoslavia.

(8) The G-8 proposed a political process towards the establishment of an interim political framework agreement for a substantial self-government for Kosovo, taking into full account the final Interim Agreement for Peace and Self-Government in Kosovo, also known as the Rambouillet Accords, and the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the other countries of the region, and the demilitarization of the UCK (Kosovo Liberation Army).

(9) The G-8 proposal contains no guidance as to a final political settlement for Kosovo and Yugoslavia, while the original position of the United States and the other participants in the so-called Contact Group on this matter, as reflected in the Rambouillet Accords, called for the convening of an international conference, after three years, to determine a mechanism for a final settlement of Kosovo status based on the will of the people, opinions of relevant authorities, each Party's efforts regarding the implementation of the agreement and the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

(10) The current position of the United States and its NATO allies as to the final status of Kosovo and Yugoslavia calls for an autonomous, multiethnic, democratic Kosovo which would remain as part of Serbia, and such an outcome is not supported by any of the Parties directly involved, including the governments of Yugoslavia and Serbia, representatives of the Kosovar Albanians, and the people of Yugoslavia, Serbia and Kosovo.

(11) There has been no final political settlement in Bosnia-Herzegovina, where the armed forces of the United States, its NATO allies, and other non-Balkan nations have been enforcing an uneasy peace since 1996, at a cost to the United States alone of over \$10,000,000,000 with no clear end in sight to such enforcement.

(12) The trend throughout the Balkans since 1990 has been in the direction of ethnically-based particularism, as exemplified by the 1991 declarations of independence from Yugoslavia by Slovenia and Croatia, and the country in the Balkans which currently comes the closest to the goal of a democratic government which respects the human rights of its citizens is the nation of Slovenia, which was the first portion of the

former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to secede and is also the nation in the region with the greatest ethnic homogeneity, with a population which is 91 percent Slovene.

(13) The boundaries of the various national and sub-national divisions in the Balkans have been altered repeatedly throughout history, and international conferences have frequently played the decisive role in fixing such boundaries in the modern era, including the Berlin Congress of 1878, the London Conference of 1913, and the Paris Peace Conference of 1919.

(14) The development of an effective exit strategy for the withdrawal from the Balkans of foreign military forces, including the armed forces of the United States, its NATO allies, Russia, and any other nation from outside the Balkans which has such forces in the Balkans is in the best interests of all such nations.

(15) The ultimate withdrawal of foreign military forces, accompanied by the establishment of durable and peaceful relations among all of the nations and peoples of the Balkans is in the best interests of those nations and peoples;

(16) An effective exit strategy for the withdrawal from the Balkans of foreign military forces is contingent upon the achievement of a lasting political settlement for the region, and only such a settlement, acceptable to all parties involved, can ensure the fundamental goals of the United States of peace, stability and human rights in the Balkans.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) The United States should call immediately for the convening of an international conference on the Balkans, under the auspices of the United Nations, and based upon the principles of the Rambouillet Accords for a final settlement of Kosovo status, namely that such a settlement should be based on the will of the people, opinions of relevant authorities, each Party's efforts regarding the implementation of the agreement and the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act;

(2) The international conference on the Balkans should also be empowered to seek a final settlement for Bosnia-Herzegovina based on the same principles as specified for Kosovo in the Rambouillet Accords; and

(3) In order to produce a lasting political settlement in the Balkans acceptable to all parties, which can lead to the departure from the Balkans in timely fashion of all foreign military forces, including those of the United States, the international conference should have the authority to consider any and all of the following: political boundaries; humanitarian and reconstruction assistance for all nations in the Balkans; stationing of UN peacekeeping forces along international boundaries; security arrangements and guarantees for all of the nations of the Balkans; and tangible, enforceable and verifiable human rights guarantees for the individuals and peoples of the Balkans.

Mr. CLELAND. I truly believe that such an approach is the best, if not the only, way to resolve the difficulties in Bosnia and Kosovo—allowing our troops eventually to come home but avoiding an unacceptable security vacuum in southeast Europe—and is definitely in the best interest of the United States and Europe.

Two years ago this week, the Senate was debating the expansion of NATO, and I should add that I found that discussion to be perhaps the finest deliberation on national security issues that I have witnessed in the time I have served in the U.S. Senate. The de-

bate raised serious questions regarding both the makeup and purpose of NATO, but, in the end, I, and a large majority of the Senate, concluded that extension of NATO membership to Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary was in our, and NATO's, best interest because NATO was the only entity ready and able to fill the security void in north-eastern Europe.

Much has changed in the time since that vote, including the launching of the first offensive military operations in the history of the alliance last year in Kosovo and Serbia, an action which also represented the first time NATO asserted the right to intervene in the internal affairs of a sovereign nation. Both of these were significant departures from the Senate's understanding of NATO as expressed during that debate as well as the representations we made to other nations, most notably Russia, about the goals and the intentions of NATO in the aftermath its eastward expansion. Specifically, section 3 of the Senate Resolution of Ratification affirmed that the "core mission" of NATO remains "collective self-defense," and we sought to calm Russian anxieties by pointing to the 50-year record of NATO in never launching offensive operations, and never violating the sovereignty of states except in pursuit of collective self-defense.

Since we voted for NATO expansion we have also witnessed the issuance of a new Strategic Concept for NATO, in April of 1999, and here again, the results were not exactly as anticipated at the time of the Senate's ratification vote on NATO expansion 2 years ago. For a particularly insightful and detailed treatment of this subject, I would commend to all Senators a May 24, 1999 floor statement by my distinguished colleague from Kansas, Mr. ROBERTS, which dissected in some detail the numerous departures from the Senate's 1998 Resolution of Ratification in the April 1999 NATO Strategic Concept.

For purposes of today's discussion on how multilateral organizations impact on the U.S. global role, I would like to highlight just two of the issues identified by Senator ROBERTS: the central issue of NATO's purpose, or "core mission," and the matter of how European nations should provide for their own defense, the so-called European Security and Defense Identity.

For its first 50 years, which culminated in its victory in the Cold War without ever having to fight a battle, the core purpose of NATO, recognized by friend and foe alike, was set forth in article 5 of the North Atlantic treaty of April 4, 1949:

The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and

in concert with other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

In contrast, the new NATO Strategic Concept goes well beyond the traditional collective security role in its aspirations for NATO. Item 24 in the April 24, 1999 text states that:

Any armed attack on the territory of the Allies, from whatever direction, would be covered by Article 5 and 6 of the Washington Treaty. However, Alliance security must also take account of the global context. Alliance security interests can be affected by other risks of a wider nature, including acts of terrorism, sabotage, and organized crime, and by the disruption of the flow of vital resources.

I wonder if NATO is designed to track terrorism around the world, sabotage around the world, and organized crime around the world.

I continue to quote:

The uncontrolled movement of large numbers of people, particularly as a consequence of armed conflicts, can also pose problems for security and stability affecting the Alliance.

Item 10 in that document includes as "fundamental security tasks" for NATO the traditional objectives of security, consultation, and deterrence and defense, as well as "crisis management," within which allies are "to stand ready, case-by-case and by consensus, in conformity of Article 7 of the Washington Treaty, to contribute to effective conflict prevention and to engage actively in crisis management, including crisis response operations."

I wonder if NATO has become not a self-defense organization but a crisis management and crisis intervention organization. I wonder.

I point out that Article 7 of the NATO Treaty says that:

This Treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the Parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

While some Western observers, especially in the United States, maintain that the 1999 Strategic Concept does not represent a significant change in NATO's policy, I believe that the Norwegian newspaper, *Oslo Aftenposten*, was much closer to the mark when it wrote last April that:

In its new "strategic concept" NATO has approved a radical expansion of the alliance's tasks, both geographically and with regard to content. From now on it will be the alliance's task to promote "security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area" by "becoming actively involved in dealing with crises, including operations in response to crises." We see the first example in Kosovo.

It is my view that the members of the NATO alliance, and especially the United States, need to think much more carefully about the expanded aspirations of their new strategic concept, and the costs—economic, political, and human resource—they are willing and able to pay in pursuit of these aspirations. Specifically, at the

very least I believe both Houses of Congress, especially this House, the Senate, need to undertake a thorough series of hearings on the strategic concept and the future of NATO.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I could not urge this set of hearings more strongly.

The Norwegian paper goes on to say that:

It is also new and important that the alliance said "yes" at the summit meeting to the desire of the EU countries to play a more independent role and thus acquire greater political weight in the NATO cooperation. Behind this also lies a desire for a cautious counterweight to a United States that is perhaps more strongly dominant now, militarily and politically, than ever before in NATO's history.

Distinguished colleagues, this leads to my other major concern about the United States and NATO: the question of a "more independent role" for the European Union countries. John Keegan, one of the world's leading military historians, summed up the current debate in an article last December. He said:

Though it has long been American policy to encourage European political and economic integration on the model of its own federal structure, the United States is far less ready to welcome moves by the Europeans to go their own strategic way. There are two reasons for that. The first is that the United States sees its own security as inextricably bound up within the alliance system in which it is a partner. The second is that it doubts the ability of the Europeans to construct parallel systems which will deliver military value. . . . The Americans are right to regard all current European attempts, either through the European Union, or the belatedly revived Western European Union or through ad hoc arrangements such as the newly announced Anglo-French force, to bypass NATO as damaging to the security structure that already exists.

Despite its advances in economic integration, the European community still lags far behind in developing a common national security structure. As we witnessed in Bosnia, and most recently Kosovo, Europe lacks either the will or the means, or both, to conduct independent military operations even in its own backyard. And whatever the end result of the recent European Security and Defense Initiative, or Identity it will be many years before the Europeans can develop a military capable of significant action independent of the United States. When one adds the additional questions of national sovereignty, domestic pressures to cut defense spending, and, of course, the need for consensus on how and when to take military action, the challenges facing the Europeans are daunting indeed.

Until Europe can surmount these challenges, which, most likely, will be many years from now, American involvement and leadership via NATO will still be seen, by Europeans at least, as essential. On my recent trip, I was discussing the role of the United States in Europe with the Deputy Secretary of NATO, Sergio Balanzio, when

he told me that the United States is, "a European power whether you like it or not—obviously, indicating we are a European power, whether we like it or not, in Europe and in the Balkans. I responded that it is one thing to be on the point of the spear and to bear the heavy load in certain cases, as the U.S. did in Bosnia and Kosovo, but quite another to always be called upon to ride to the rescue, even in Europe itself.

Going back to 1949, when NATO was formed, one of the quotes that rings in my ears is a quote from Lord Ismay, the first Secretary General of NATO. When he was asked the purpose of NATO, Lord Ismay said: The purpose of NATO is to keep the Americans in, the Russians out, and the Germans down.

I have serious reservations about that particular mission statement now. There is no need to keep the Russians out. As a matter of fact, we are wrapping our arms around the big bear in every way in every trade agreement, every cooperative agreement we can possibly put together. Secondly, there is no need to keep the Germans down. They are an emerging strong force on the European continent.

I wonder, though, having just come back from dealing with my NATO friends and our NATO allies, and having gone to Kosovo, whether the real ultimate purpose of NATO for the Europeans now is to keep the Americans in.

Personally, I do not mind sharing power. I do mind always being the lead dog that is called upon to bear the burden. I think more and more Americans are feeling that way themselves.

For me, however, the bottom line is that, despite all of the difficulties, despite the possibility that there may well be some short-term disadvantages for the United States, I believe the United States must, I repeat must, be unequivocally supportive of the development of a strong, independent European military capability to accompany Europe's growing economic and political integration. There is at present, and for the foreseeable future, no overwhelming threat to European security such as that posed by the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact. Europe should be able to attend to its own defenses in the post-Cold War world. The fact that it has not done so is certainly attributable to many factors, especially its divided and conflict-ridden history, but if it does not act now—when the threat is so low—then when will it?

Developing the necessary support structures, both political and military, to produce an effective European security identity will be neither quick, nor easy, nor cheap. But they have to start sometime, and while the United States must avoid precipitous actions—such as threatening a unilateral troop pull-out—I believe we must clearly signal that we fully understand and support moves toward greater European self-defense capabilities. Such moves may well produce some short-term redundancies and inefficiencies in

NATO, but I believe that unless we encourage the Europeans to develop their own capabilities for their own defense, we will not see the kind of increased defense efforts that Europe ought to undertake. Certainly American taxpayers have done their share, throughout most of the 20th Century, to contribute to European security.

I think British Prime Minister Tony Blair said it best in a November 22, 1999 speech in London. He said:

We must shape European Defence policy in a way designed to strengthen (the) transatlantic bond by making NATO a more balanced partnership, and by giving Europeans the capacity to act whenever the United States, for its own reasons, decides not to be involved. Only then will Europe pull its weight in world security and share more of the burden with the United States.

I could not have said it better.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, my friend and colleague in these dialogs on the U.S. global role in the world, Mr. ROBERTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, let me again thank my good friend and a distinguished American hero and statesman, the Senator from Georgia, for setting in motion our bipartisan foreign policy dialog. His common sense approach and his insightfulness to our country's national security obligations, I think, have been most helpful and most educational.

I say to the Senator, I believe and I hope that our endeavor is accomplishing the original goals we outlined in our first dialog. Our dialog has attracted attention from the media, and some academics. We have been invited to participate in various academic panel discussions and foreign policy dialogs.

I hope both our colleagues and the American public have been paying attention in our effort to come to grips with America's role in an environment so different that we cannot even name it, other than calling it the post-Cold War period.

When I have the opportunity to go back to Kansas and address the issue of what our vital national security interests are; I realize foreign policy is not a very bright return on the public radar screen which is unfortunate.

Robert Kagan recently stated that the campaign for the Presidency should focus more on foreign policy. I certainly think that is the case. He asked a simple question, "Is the world a safer place than it was 8 years ago?" His article took us on a world tour of uncertainties, specifically identifying Iraq, the Balkans, China, Taiwan, and weapons of mass destruction proliferation, Haiti, Colombia and Russia.

A realistic evaluation of emerging patterns in the world lead us to the fact that the world is dangerously close to coming apart at the seams. It is time for a serious debate about foreign policy, and this dialog we have started is a small step in that direction.

In our last dialog Senator CLELAND and I discussed the importance of identifying and establishing levels of priority to our U.S. vital national interests. Many other think tanks and foreign policy organizations have recommended a similar priority ranking. I noticed the other day in an article that Vice President GORE has recently articulated, a new kind of foreign policy suggestion—a new agenda—adding the destruction of the natural environment and the AIDS pandemic overseas as "a threat to U.S. national security interests." These unique and unprecedented issues are important issues, however, they have never made the cut in any other U.S. national interest lists. They definitely did not make the cut in the last bipartisan dialog that I had with my friend and colleague from Georgia. Nonetheless, it is a healthy debate, and I think it is a very proper debate for our country and the Presidential candidates.

What did make the cut is the fact that the United States does not want a hostile regional hegemon to develop in Europe or Asia. And then, in the meantime, what happened in the Balkans post-Bosnia and post-Kosovo is the fact that we have a paradox of enormous irony. The irony is the United States continues in the role of being a world hegemon, or superpower—the only one. Some critics say we have developed into a humanitarian world global cop and our actions and means are viewed by them as contrary to their own national interests.

Mr. President, the consequence of the U.S. role is the rest of the world is responding as any sovereign nation would respond to a hegemon.

Former Ambassador Bob Ellsworth, a former Member of the House of Representatives, and Dr. Michael May, wrote in the Los Angeles Times that U.S. military forces are so large, so advanced technologically, and so active all over the world, that a climate of "hegemony envy" has developed in key strategic areas in Asia, Europe, and the Middle East.

Ambassador Ellsworth explains, the U.S. post-Cold War, change in posture from defense and deterrence to enlargement and offense, and the Clinton doctrine proclaiming and executing intervention around the world in regard to a rather questionable definition of U.S. vital national interests is creating antihegemonic coalitions against the United States.

This current trend of both allies and nonallies asserting themselves against the U.S. is a very troubling digression.

The Nobel Prize novelist and diplomat, Gabriel Garcia Marquez, observed that "President Clinton has found the political legacy he wants to leave behind: The Imperial American Model." Obviously, that depiction of American foreign policy is counter to the goal of multilateral cooperation in the world today.

As Senator CLELAND stated, our third dialog today will focus on the role of

multilateral organizations in foreign policy.

What are we talking about? Well, currently the United States is a member of a staggering 90 multilateral organizations and numerous other bilateral agreements. It took a great deal of effort by staff and by research specialists to determine the number of multilateral organizations where the U.S. is obligated. I venture to guess, I say to my colleague, that the State Department, the Department of Defense, the Congress, and most foreign policy experts really don't have any idea individually or collectively of the responsibilities, commitments, or obligations or the money that these organizations require of the U.S. all throughout the world.

Richard Haass of the Brookings Institution tried to tackle the issue of how much the U.S. should try to do, largely or entirely on its own—unilaterally—depending on the policy priorities or the level of U.S. national interests versus how much the U.S. should do in cooperation with others. He articulated that the choice is very complicated, as the multilateral options subsume multiple approaches of multiple organizations, including using the U.N. and other international institutions, alliances, and other regional organizations, and coalitions of those able and willing to act.

The fact is, the U.S. almost never acts unilaterally, and it probably should not. The U.S. has fought five major wars during the 20th century, and in each of these conflicts the U.S. operated as part of an alliance or a coalition. The recent U.S. actions all were conducted in conjunction with forces from other nations, even as our military superiority has reached a level unmatched in history.

Therefore, if the U.S. is going to operate within the constraints of multilateral organizations—and that appears to be the case—the U.S. must structure alliances in such a way that promotes our national interests and ensures that U.S. power is not undermined.

The following list of multilateral organizations associated with countries that the U.S. has current, ongoing operations is staggering: Iraq, 23; East Timor, 5; Korea, 42; Kosovo, 6; Yugoslavia, 30; Colombia, 15.

We don't have enough time in the rest of the session of Congress to examine all of the multilateral organizations where the U.S. has obligations. Obviously, that is going to be an effort that should take place as we change administrations, whether it be the Vice President or whether it be the Governor from Texas. Today, like my colleague, I want to focus on NATO a bit and offer some possible suggestions for the future of America's alliances.

During the Cold War, containment of Soviet power provided a simple and easily definable job of deterrence from Warsaw Pact aggression. The new Strategic Concept that was adopted over a year ago during the 50th anniversary of

NATO is a far different concept from the collective defense organization originally developed from the ashes of World War II.

If you read the Strategic Concept, you will find that the new commitments outlined have evolved, as I have indicated, NATO from a collective security organization concerned with self-defense to an international crisis management and humanitarian relief operation and organization.

Alexander Vershbow, U.S. Permanent Representative on the North Atlantic Council, recently said:

Unbeknownst to many is the fact that the Strategic Concept's most important function is to instruct Alliance military authorities how to configure NATO defense forces so that they are equipped for the full range of Alliance missions, from collective defense to peacekeeping.

He also said:

The U.S. believes that the most important new elements of the revised Strategic Concept is the recognition that the fundamental tasks of the Alliance is to carry out so-called "non-article 5" missions—operations in response to crises that go beyond the defense of a Allied territory.

I am concerned that the most important and successful alliance in the history of our country has been so dramatically restructured that the future of the alliance is uncertain. Our force structure cannot stand another swampy intervention with unclear and unsound objectives with no exit strategy in sight.

The new Strategic Concept, as tested in Kosovo, in my personal opinion, is drying out the Cold War glue which holds the alliance together. Targeting by committee and escalation warfare has stressed the system and turned a 3-day war into a 78-day war of limited escalation. As indicated by the debate on this floor just about an hour or two ago, an amendment introduced by both Senator BYRD and Senator WARNER will cause considerable and useful debate on Monday and Tuesday ending in a critical vote about the future of the Kosovo operation.

Gen. Brent Scowcroft expressed his concern last November stating:

The revised Strategic Concept of NATO and the U.N. Secretary General separately have taken on the task of advocating the support of persecuted minorities inside state boundaries; that is, humanitarian operations such as those in Kosovo. In Yugoslavia, we heavily bombed a country in an attempt to protect a minority within that country. Now we are in Kosovo presiding over reverse ethnic cleansing—surely a case of unintended consequences.

Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Dean of the Kennedy School of Government, recently posed several thought-provoking questions:

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, what should be the limits of NATO's mission? With the Kosovo crisis, NATO fired its first shot in anger in a region outside the alliance's treaty area, on declared humanitarian grounds. What criteria might NATO draw on to guide a policy on the threat, or use, of its force in a new strategic environment of the 21st century?

Some experts predict, and I hope they are not right, that due to the ugliness of Kosovo, NATO may never again mount another military offensive. I fear that Kosovo or future Kosovo-type interventions will also undermine U.N. Security Council credibility. By the way, that credibility is being questioned with the U.N. mission in Africa.

Mr. President, if knowing what we know now about the new Strategic Concept and NATO with respect to a Kosovo or a Chechnya or Rwanda, would Senators still support the changes?

Again, I maintain that most Senators are not aware of all the obligations listed in the Strategic Concept. I said it at the time, I said it 6 months ago, I said it during the first dialog, and I say it again today. How many people need to be placed in jeopardy before we act? What criteria do we set for humanitarian or C-list interventions? Does the United States intervene with or without NATO allies or U.N. Security Council approval on humanitarian grounds? Can we possibly justify intervention in some areas of the world and not others when none reach the threshold of vital or important national interests?

Our country cannot support militarily a future which pursues U.S. and allied interests more widely around the world. The new Strategic Concept that our country is currently operating under effectively enrolls the United States and NATO as a world policeman.

Some say that is not all bad. Some say that is what we must do as the world's only superpower.

In this regard, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia pointed out, Europe is not standing still. They are proceeding with a Defense Capability Initiative and the development of the European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI) within the alliance.

I believe it is in U.S. interests for the European alliance to develop their defense capabilities, to strengthen their collective will, and to make a greater contribution to security and defense in Europe. However, my Dodge City gut feeling says, sure, go ahead and provide for your own defense, and bring our American men and women home. The Balkans are in your ball park. You decide the players.

However, history and military experience, and the experience and expertise of others, rightly point out that challenges with force structure, allocation, balance, interoperability, and the growing gap in tactics and capability between our countries underlying the auspices of NATO are counter-productive to peace.

In Kosovo, the U.S. aircraft flew two-thirds of the strike missions. Nearly every precision-guided munition was launched from an American aircraft, and U.S. intelligence identified almost all the targets. With the current European shrinking defense budgets and a reluctance to support the current mission, the road to ESDI may be a rocky one filled with potholes indeed.

Even members of NATO who do not belong to the European Union are worried that plans for yet another new E.U. military force could weaken the collective defense.

Another concern of hierarchy and command structure with respect to ESDI, E.U. corps, and NATO still retaining the rights of first refusal and how the U.N. Security Council structure fits among the organizations is also a very troubling problem to overcome.

The number one concern should be to preserve NATO as the overarching framework and avoid duplication of effort or any political divisiveness from establishing separate capabilities. The Kosovo crisis raises questions that must be answered about the alliance's capability to reshape itself for new conflicts of the 21st century and at the same time accommodate the E.U.'s ambition to play a greater role in the continent's security.

Mr. President, I also want to address the issue of NATO expansion.

I realize the NATO membership is an affair of the heart for many nations who aspire to become members. However, as Senator LUGAR has alluded to we need to step back a little bit and keep the door open but put the future enlargement on hold.

We had a lunch hosted yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Indiana and Gen. Wesley Clark. Gen. Clark emphasized the fact that nations in Europe who aspire to become either members of the European Union, Partnership for Peace, or NATO without recognizing the tremendous fervor and the tremendous emotion involved in regard to their self-determination and what they think will be the bulwark for them and their individual liberty.

First and foremost, NATO, I think, must rebuild Russian relations, which were strained over the Kosovo conflict. I know that belief is shared by Senator LEVIN. We have been working together on a cooperative threat reduction program within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee which we believe will make some meaningful threat reduction progress and at the same time help rebuild stressed relations.

The London Times diplomatic editor, Christopher Lockwood, reflects that NATO's possible new members at the current time cannot contribute militarily with force structure, compatible doctrine, or political and economic stability.

I have been a strong supporter of NATO. I will remain a strong supporter of NATO. But I think we have to rethink the current NATO flightpath and answer the hard questions that require our attention.

Mr. President, I now want to offer what I think are extremely insightful approaches to the future of multilateral organizations.

Richard Haass expressed:

Alliances, such as NATO, are one manifestation, although such groupings are rare

and likely to become even less common in a world of few fixed adversaries. Much more common are informal coalitions of parties able and willing to work together on behalf of a common purpose—be it to rescue the Mexican economy, contain Saddam Hussein, or enter East Timor. Such groupings are not ideal—they are invariably ad hoc and reactive and lack the legitimacy of more formal regional or UN undertakings—but they are consistent with a world where the willingness of governments to cooperate varies from crisis to crisis and situation to situation, where great power consensus is unreliable, and where U.S. resources, however great, are still limited.

Samuel Huntington, in this book "The Clash of Civilizations" explain: "In the emerging era, clashes of civilizations are the greatest threat to world peace, and an international order based on civilizations is the surest safeguard against war." And, since the Cold War the question of "Which side are you on?" has been replaced by the much more fundamental one, "Who are you?" Every state has to have an answer. That answer, its cultural identity, defines the state's place in world politics, its friends, and its enemies.

Mr. Huntington further explains that we must nurture other Western cultures that identify with the U.S. and accept our civilization as unique not universal and uniting to renew and preserve it against challenges from non-Western societies. Avoidance of a global war of civilizations depends on world leaders accepting and cooperating to maintain the multi civilizational character of global politics.

Roberts translation: Why not concentrate in areas of the world where Western values, Western democracy, have been cherished, nurtured, and appreciated? At the same time the U.S. needs to stop trying to impose Western values in areas where they are not and will not take root?

Andrew Krepinevich from the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments recently finished a thought-provoking future vision titled "Transforming America's Alliances." He believes that America's alliances are in need of transformation due to the following reasons: Relative decline in U.S. global power, the rise and recovery of great regional power, with an increased focus on Asia, the eroding of current ally durability and reliability, the current military revolution will make power projection more difficult, and finally the growing need to provide for homeland defense.

Mr. President, I feel Mr. Krepinevich's assessment undertakes bold steps toward the future in his following statement:

If the U.S. is to preserve the current favorable military balance in regions around the globe in the future, it will find itself increasingly dependent upon allies for support. This may require a somewhat different set of alliances than exist today. Restructuring alliance relationships to meet requirements will take years, perhaps decades. Yet the geopolitical and military revolutions that will likely stress the U.S. alliance relationships should be undertaken now.

Mr. President, that is what we are trying to do. That is what Senator

CLELAND and I are trying to accomplish with our foreign policy dialog. America cannot afford to miss this opportunity to shape the future.

I thank my colleague for initiating the third dialog. I especially thank my colleagues who have been very patient listening to my remarks. Senator LUGAR, Senator LEVIN, and I welcome their input.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the Senator from Indiana yield for 2 minutes?

Mr. LUGAR. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent, after the Senator from Indiana is finished with his remarks, I be recognized to participate in the dialog which is going on between Senator ROBERTS and Senator CLELAND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia controls the time.

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 9½ minutes.

Mr. CLELAND. I yield the time necessary to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ROBERTS. I ask the Presiding Officer how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators from Kansas and Georgia are sharing the time.

Mr. ROBERTS. So the time remaining in regard to both Senators is now 9 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTS. That does not give enough time for the distinguished Senator from Michigan or the distinguished Senator from Indiana. I ask unanimous consent we be granted an additional 30 minutes.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent, after the Senator from Indiana has completed his statement, I be recognized with whatever time is available.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from me along with one I received today from Gen. Wesley Clark, who, until last week, was NATO's Supreme Allied Commander in Europe and the senior military commander of the NATO-led operation at Kosovo. It relates to his views on the Byrd-Warner amendment, as it is called, which is part of the military construction appropriations bill.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
Washington, DC, May 10, 2000.
General WESLEY K. CLARK, USA,
Department of Defense, Washington, DC.

DEAR GENERAL CLARK: Following up on our conversation today, I am enclosing a copy of

an amendment adopted by the Appropriations Committee yesterday that, among other things, would terminate funding for deployment of U.S. ground combat troops in Kosovo after July 1, 2001, unless the President requests and Congress enacts a joint resolution specifically authorizing their continued deployment.

I would very much like to have your personal views on this amendment, particularly your views on the impact this amendment could have on U.S. troops currently on the ground in Kosovo and whether or not this amendment would increase the risk to those troops; the impact of this amendment on U.S. interests in the region; and the impact of this amendment on our relationship with our NATO allies.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

CARL LEVIN,
Ranking Minority Member.

MAY 11, 2000.

DEAR SENATOR LEVIN: Thank you for your letter of 10 May and the opportunity to provide my personal views on the amendment adopted by the Senate Appropriations Committee governing the future of U.S. troops in Kosovo.

While I support efforts of the Congress and the Administration to encourage our allies to fulfill their commitments to the United Nations mission in Kosovo, I am opposed to the specific measures called for in the amendment. These measures, if adopted, would be seen as a de facto pull-out decision by the United States. They are unlikely to encourage European allies to do more. In fact, these measures would invalidate the policies, commitments and trust of our Allies in NATO, undercut US leadership worldwide, and encourage renewed ethnic tension, fighting and instability in the Balkans. Furthermore, they would, if enacted, invalidate the dedication and commitment of our Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, and Marines, disregarding the sacrifices they and their families have made to help bring peace to the Balkans.

Regional stability and peace in the Balkans are very important interests of the United States. Our allies are already providing over 85 percent of the military forces and the funding for reconstruction efforts. US leadership in Kosovo exercised through the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, as well as our diplomatic offices, is a bargain. It is an effective 6:1 ratio of diplomatic throw-weight to our investment. We cannot do significantly less. Our allies would see this as a unilateral, adverse move that splits fifty years of shared burdens, shared risks, and shared benefits in NATO.

This action will also undermine specific plans and commitments made within the Alliance. At the time that US military and diplomatic personnel are pressing other nations to fulfill and expand their commitment of forces, capabilities and resources, an apparent congressionally mandated pullout would undercut their leadership and all parallel diplomatic efforts.

All over Europe, nations are looking to the United States. We are their inspiration, their model, and their hope for the future. Small nations, weary of oppression, ravaged by a century of war, looking to the future, look to us. The promise of NATO enlargement, led by the United States, is the promise of the expansion of the sphere of peace and stability from Western Europe eastward. This powerful, stabilizing force would be undercut by this legislation, which would be perceived to significantly curtail US commitment and influence in Europe.

Setting a specific deadline for US pull-out would signal to the Albanians the limits of

the international security guarantees providing for their protection. This, in turn, would give them cause to rearm and prepare to protect themselves from what they would view as an inevitable Serbian reentry. The more radical elements of the Albanian population in Kosovo would be encouraged to increase the level of violence directed against the Serb minority, thereby increasing instability as well as placing US forces on the ground at increased risk. Mr. Milosevic, in anticipation of the pullout and ultimate breakup of KFOR, would likely encourage civil disturbances and authorize the increased infiltration of para-military forces to raise the level of violence. He would also take other actions aimed at preparing the way for Serbian military and police reoccupation of the province.

Our servicemen and women, and their families, have made great sacrifices in bringing peace and stability to the Balkans. This amendment introduces uncertainty in the planning and funding of the Kosovo mission. This uncertainty will be undermine our service members' confidence in our resolve and may call into question the sacrifices we have asked of them and their families. A US withdrawal could give Mr. Milosevic the victory he could not achieve on the battlefield.

In all of our activities in NATO, the appropriate distribution of burdens and risk remains a longstanding and legitimate issue among the nations. Increased European burden sharing is an imperative in Europe as well as the United States. European nations are endeavoring to meet this challenge in Kosovo, and in the whole KFOR and UNMIK constitute a burdensharing success story, even as we encourage Europeans to do even more. The United States must continue to act in our own best interests. This legislation, if enacted, would see its worthy intent generating consequences adverse to some of our most fundamental security interests.

Thank you again for your support of our servicemen and women.

Very respectfully,

WESLEY K. CLARK,
General, U.S. Army.

Mr. LEVIN. I will take 30 seconds to read two paragraphs about the language in the letter from Wesley Clark:

These measures, if adopted, would be seen as a de facto pull-out decision by the United States. They are unlikely to encourage European allies to do more. In fact, these measures would invalidate the policies, commitments and trust of our Allies in NATO, undercut U.S. leadership worldwide, and encourage renewed ethnic tension, fighting and instability in the Balkans. Furthermore, they would, if enacted, invalidate the dedication and commitment of our Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, and Marines, disregarding the sacrifices they and their families have made to help bring peace to the Balkans.

Setting a specific deadline for U.S. pull-out would signal to the Albanians the limits of the international security guarantees providing for their protection. This, in turn, would give them cause to rearm and prepare to protect themselves from what they would view as an inevitable Serbian reentry. The more radical elements of the Albanian population in Kosovo would be encouraged to increase the level of violence directed against the Serb minority, thereby increasing instability as well as placing U.S. forces on the ground at increased risk.

Mr. Milosevic, in anticipation of the pullout and ultimate breakup of KFOR, would likely encourage civil disturbances and authorize the increased infiltration of para-military forces to raise the level of violence. He would also

take other actions aimed at preparing the way for Serbian military police reoccupation of the province.

I know this subject will be a matter of some debate on Monday and Tuesday. I intend to participate in that debate on the appropriations bill containing the Byrd-Warner provision. But at this time, because of the interest in the letter of General Clark, I thought I would ask that be printed in the RECORD.

Again, I thank my friend from Indiana for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senators from Georgia and Kansas. It is a privilege to follow on some of the thoughts of the distinguished Senator from Kansas, as he has discussed multilateral organizations and focused especially on NATO which, in the judgment of many of us, is the most important and successful of these organizations in which the United States is a member.

It is axiomatic, at least for many in foreign policy, that Europe counts for the United States. By that I mean simply this: that although throughout our history many have argued that we could get along by ourselves on this continent and that entanglement in the affairs of Europe was often described as nefarious skullduggery statesmanship without scruple, that eventually we come back to the fact that in the small world in which we live now, what happens on that continent matters a great deal to our security and to our prosperity.

It is for this reason that the United States stayed in Europe after World War II. To state it very simply, as German Foreign Minister Fischer stated when he visited with our Foreign Relations Committee this week: The United States presence, the decision to stay, made all the difference in the last half century. It made a difference in terms of peace on the Europe continent, which had not had such an era of peace in a whole millennium.

It made a very great difference for us, the United States, leaving aside NATO and the security it provided, because of the collective defense of NATO members against the perceived menace of the former Soviet Union and its allies. The fact is that through the Marshall Plan, and through many other economic associations, the European countries grew substantially and so did our markets and so did our prosperity. We tend to take this all for granted, but only in the last 50 years has this been a fact.

We came to a point after the breakup of the former Soviet Union in which many argued, and I was not the one who originated the term, but I adopted it in a tour I took of Europe in 1993, that either NATO would go "out of area or out of business." By that I meant simply that the idea of collective defense against the former Soviet Union, which had broken up, made

much less sense than it had made before. Some would have said the Soviet Union might revive suddenly and attack hapless European nations, but this became less and less likely. In fact, we found in the Desert Storm war, that our problem was that NATO was not equipped to deal with conflicts out of area. It was a pickup game in which we enlisted various nations.

This out of area action had been contemplated at the time of the United Nations Charter in Article 4, which Senator ROBERTS has cited. John Foster Dulles spoke openly and eloquently on that point. It was anticipated that NATO members from time to time would act out of area in their collective efforts and for collective security. So we did that in Desert Storm and the idea was always, from the time of the United Nations Charter and the NATO Charter onward, that nations could freely decide to join in such actions. In the case of Desert Storm they did so.

Now that a whole new set of facts began to come forward, in which there were countries—Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and others—but mainly the first three—in which the point was made: We are a democracy. We are searching for freedom. We are searching for relevance and association with others who want freedom as we do.

Some argued the evolution of Europe might have come entirely through the European Union, through the economic union of the members. But most of us noted that was going very slowly. It still goes slowly. Poland is not a member of the European Union as we speak, and it is not contemplated that it will be for several years. This is now a very large country with a functioning economy and a democracy.

The point was that collective security meant making certain that the gains, the victories of the cold war, were ensured and were solidified. That was the debate that we had a short time ago with regard to expansion of NATO. Some argued: Why expand if there is no particular threat? Why not wait and see how the threat shapes up? You can always take on new members in the event things are troubled.

But many argued, and I was one, that the integration of forces, the building of institutions, takes time. Even in the successful war we fought in the desert, the weapons systems that were employed took 25 years to evolve. It is very probable that the strengths we are now building with new members in Europe, in NATO, will make a difference in terms of their collective security, and I believe in ours. With the crisis over, many persons in the United States and maybe in this body, tend to ask: Why are we involved in Europe? In fact, why can't Europeans run their own affairs? They say it is a troublesome situation to have our forces involved there, meddling and in harm's way.

We went through this in a very practical way with regard to the war in Bosnia. As you may recall, in the latter stages of the Bush administration,

there was anxiety on the part of President Bush as to what was happening in the former Yugoslavia. He was strongly advised by European leaders that they knew better what was happening there, that our involvement was really not particularly welcomed. President Bush may have welcomed that advice, for all I know. But in any event, his determination was to leave that problem alone, so the conflict continued to progress badly in terms of the loss of life and displacement of persons and refugees and so forth.

President Clinton attacked former President Bush in the 1992 campaign for failing to have a plan for Bosnia. But when President Clinton came into office in 1993 he found out how difficult that situation was.

I know from my own experience, traveling with Senator Nunn in 1993, talking on the phone with President Clinton over long distance as he asked what we were finding out and how things were going? He was attempting to evolve a policy.

He sent Secretary Christopher to Europe about that time, a trip which was very unsuccessful. The Secretary talked with the British and then the French and gave our views and asked their views. They had all sorts of views, all of them contradictory, and none of them helpful with regard to anything we had in mind.

As a result, things drifted. Some may say that was simply too bad. Here are people with intractable views, demagogues. Whatever was happening in Yugoslavia was miserable and unfortunate for those people, and especially for their neighbors, our European allies. But that was their problem—and perhaps it was. But late in the game, Europeans came to us and said: We cannot solve it. It is insoluble without the United States.

We might have said, "Tough luck. You are on your own. This is what you wanted. You made your bed, now sleep in it."

We could have said that. We could have watched the unraveling of various parts of Europe as refugees and economic difficulties and aggression proceeded. But we took a different view—I think the correct view—namely, we are the leaders in NATO. NATO was relevant to that situation.

That was a big step but not all Senators agreed. The point being made in the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and the distinguished Senator from Virginia is that we have not gone to war very often. We have declared war even less. It is time to stop these informal arrangements in which we get involved in operations without having an up-or-down vote or authorization to spend money or send the troops.

That is a good point. I can remember arguing before the Desert Storm war that we ought to do that, and there was great anxiety in the White House about any such vote for fear it might come out badly that Saddam Hussein, there-

fore, would have a free ride. Ultimately, the vote was very close.

I understand the constitutional point very well. It could very well be that historians will argue we misplayed our hand at Rambouillet, that our diplomacy was not as swift as it should have been, that we made threats when we did not understand the military power that would be necessary to make those threats good, and that even having made the threats, we did not have a very good plan once we were tested. I make no apologies for any of what proceeded, but the point is, we finally come back to the fact we are in Europe because it is our security—our security—that is at stake. It could be argued, too, that for the moment the Europeans are not sharing the burden, although they would argue, by this time, that they are shouldering their burden—but that is another debate all by itself. Or they might argue we should not be involved without having up-or-down votes in the Congress on these things in any event, or that many Americans believe we are in Kosovo or in Bosnia purely for humanitarian purposes, not for gut strategic purposes of the United States, but because of ethnic cleansing or refugees or displaced persons.

The case will be made that this is not a real war, this is a policing action; it is a structural problem, like that faced by a mayor of a city or police or other situations analogous that can be handled by police, and European policemen rather than American policemen.

We keep coming back to this haunting question that President George Bush had to face and then President Bill Clinton when the Europeans said: We cannot make it by ourselves. Ultimately, Europeans might say: We can; we are different now; we have new institutions—whether they be security or economic—and you Americans can go home; we can get along without you; it's been nice to have you around.

That is not what they are saying. As a matter of fact, every European statesman who comes to Washington—and the Chair presides over these coffees in our Foreign Relations Committee—we hear every single foreign minister and defense minister vowing how important it is the United States is there, stays there, stays there big, how we must take the lead and help organize the situation. We may say in our impatience: Will they never be able to pull it together? Perhaps not in our lifetime.

What are the consequences if we leave? The consequence is the same one the German foreign minister told us this week. We left after the First World War. As a matter of fact, throughout the 1930s, we were not only isolationists, we were glad we were not close to the action, and we suffered for that. We lost a lot of lives. We had a war around the world that was touch and go for some time because we were not prepared to do the difficult work, the tedious work, the actual intervention day

by day, the grimy, grubby work of diplomacy country by country, case by case. That is the problem.

Duty in Kosovo, duty in Bosnia is not a popular assignment for anybody and never will be. I can think of various other places in Europe in which it is not going to be very pleasant. Yet to keep the peace for over 50 years, to have prosperity for them and for us, to make a difference in terms of stability of the world, that counts for something.

On the cheap, we can say, by and large, we did not vote for it, we are tired of paying too much for it. Europeans understand that a little bit, and I give credit to the distinguished Senator from Virginia for trying to urge them to step up to the plate, and they have now demonstrated they are paying more than 85 percent—the lion's share—whether it is the policing side or the economic side, and that we are paying 15 percent, and that is about what we agreed to do.

They said, in essence: You fought most of the war, we will pick up five-sixths of the cost. That may or may not be a good agreement, but that is roughly where we have come to in Kosovo. We could say we are tired of paying the 15 percent and, as a matter of fact, our 5,000 or 6,000 troops are tired of being there and, as a Senate, we are tired of debating the issue. We would just like to get a vote on this and get rid of it cleanly. Tell the President, whoever he is, where to go in this situation. It makes no difference whether we have a Secretary of State negotiating over there or not, we know better because we represent the people and we have the power of the purse and we can jerk this thing out immediately.

Some will argue whether or not to do that as a matter of fact. The vote would not come for a year. General Clark has testified to this in the letter the distinguished Senator from Michigan just read, that other countries will make their own calculations. We, frankly, do not know what the foreign policy of President Putin of Russia will be. We suspect, as a matter of fact, as we have heard from the Russian Ambassador and from others that the Russians want a zone in Kosovo, maybe ours. Let's say we withdraw and the Russians say: It would be fine, as a matter of fact, if we were there because we could help integrate the Serbs as they want to come back to their homes, or help with a little bridge there; that would be a good thing in terms of integration of Europe as we see it; and we are here as Russians; the Americans have gone home; they were tired of this, tired of the policing action and all the burdens, all the difficulties. That is one possibility.

President Milosevic might say: Let's be at ease for a year, wait it out. Kosovo was sort of a contretemps, a bad nightmare. A good many bombs were dropped around the country, there was some difficulties with the power stations and difficulties in terms of

deprivation, but, by and large, that is in the past, and in a year's time, we can be home free. We can begin to operate business as usual.

The Albanians noting the situation likewise say: We have a year to prepare for the war to take on the Serbs who are back with perhaps the help of Russian friends and others who come in to fill this vacuum.

European allies will be accused frequently of withdrawing people from the country. They will say, by and large, the Americans are a strange leader; they are gone. This is the only war NATO ever fought and some may feel the only one it ever will fight because there was not very much leadership here, not much standing to talk to us about whether we have an independent force, whether it is with NATO or anybody else.

We have a very fateful vote coming up, and it comes right to the point we are discussing today: multinational organizations and particularly NATO, the most important security alliance, because Europe counts.

I suggest we do reaffirm NATO.

As a matter of fact, as the distinguished Senator from Kansas pointed out, I suggested last year at the NATO celebration that we consider carefully new members. There were nine applicants. I say it is imperative that we keep hope alive for all nine. That is the incentive for their reform and for the courage to continue on.

As a matter of fact, I hope we will move to adopt new members. I hope we will offer leadership to fill out much more substantially those who have fought for freedom, those who have a lot at stake in the kind of Europe we think would be more secure for them and for us.

I think we ought to be devoting more resources to NATO rather than less. It seems to me we have a golden opportunity. Historically, we have been established there for a long time. To abandon or weaken NATO at this point, or to give hints we are going to abandon it, or to give hints that it can be taken for granted, would be an unfortunate policy.

By the same token, this debate gives us an opportunity to finally establish, once and for all the question: Does Europe count? Do we care? Can Europe make it without us? I believe it counts. I do not think they can make it without us. I think we have to be there. And if we are going to be there, we ought to lead, and we ought to have the resources that make it count. We ought to expand the operation, as a matter of fact. We ought to be assertive and bold as opposed to timidly pulling back into our tent.

I believe that is what the debate ought to be about. It ought to be about the strength of the very best multinational organization we have, about the reasons our allies are important to us, and what we intend to do about it.

I thank the Chair for the opportunity to give this address.

I thank the distinguished Senators from Georgia and Kansas, again, for inviting me to be a part of the colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLELAND. How much time is left on our time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I would like to conclude my remarks with some additional thoughts and comments.

I thank Senator LUGAR, a distinguished student and practitioner of foreign policy in this body for many years, and the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, and thank him for his wonderful letter from General Clark, who is a man with whom I have shared a meal recently and discussed Kosovo and many other matters. He is a distinguished American. I respect him highly.

I thank my distinguished colleague from Kansas. One of the things that impressed me was the point the Senator from Kansas mentioned, that this country is committed and obligated in some form or fashion to 90 different treaties or organizations, and that is indeed quite an astounding number.

I have two basic fears about America's global role. One is that, like Gulliver, we will get wrapped up in many lilliputian events and treaties and entanglements and not be free to move to crises in the world where we need to have a maximum impact; secondly, that we get drawn into power vacuums around the world, particularly in the wake of the fall of the Soviet Union, and institute a pax Americana.

I was recently in Macedonia. As the helicopter took off, headed toward Kosovo, an Army colonel pointed out that if you looked out of the helicopter to your left, you could see a Roman aqueduct. I had never really been in that part of the world. It was amazing to actually see a Roman aqueduct put together by the Roman armies there in Macedonia over 2,000 years ago and it still be intact.

I began to think the very ground over which I was flying had been occupied by not only Alexander the Great but his father Philip, and that Greek and Roman armies had gone over this very terrain. Later, after the Dark Ages, for some 600 years the Turks and the Ottoman Empire occupied this particular land. Now we, the Americans, were there.

It was a sobering moment for me. I wondered exactly how effective we could really be in that part of the world with those conflicts which seem to be eternal. I wondered exactly what we could do there, what we could contribute, especially with our military force.

Those are some thoughts I have.

I would like to address one other issue in terms of our multilateral and multinational relations, and that is our relationship with the United Nations.

In large part because of American support, the UN was founded in 1945 with the purpose, according to its Charter:

To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Furthermore, under Article 34 of the U.N. Charter, U.N. "members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf." And Article 52 provides that:

Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.

In recent years, the United States has worked with, and sometimes without, the cooperation of the U.N. Security Council when seeking to accomplish its objectives. Despite all the difficulties associated with it, the Security Council remains the only widely accepted, multinational, legitimizing force for conducting military operations against a sovereign nation. In the 1995 book, "Beyond Westphalia," editors Gene Lyons, Michael Mustanduno and their colleagues tackled the difficult question of "state sovereignty and international intervention." The authors write that:

A historical transition was marked by the settlement of Westphalia in 1648, which ended the Thirty Years' War and opened the quest—which goes on to this day—to find a way for independent states, each enjoying sovereignty over a given territory, to pursue their interests without destroying each other or the international system of which each is a part.

One of the recurring themes which has been highlighted in these floor dialogues organized by Senator ROBERTS and myself about the global role of the United States in the post-Cold War world is on this very question of sovereignty. More specifically, under what conditions is it permissible and appropriate for a nation or coalition of nations to intervene in the internal affairs of another sovereign state?

In an April 1999 speech in Chicago, British Prime Minister Blair posed the question in a way which is representative of the concerns of many of those—especially in the Western democracies—who believe that, under certain egregious circumstances, there must be limits on national sovereignty in today's world. Prime Minister Blair said:

The most pressing foreign policy problem we face is to identify the circumstances in

which we should get actively involved in other people's conflicts. Non-interference has long been considered an important principle of international order. And it is not one we would want to jettison too readily. One state should not feel it has the right to change the political system of another or foment subversion or seize pieces of territory to which it feels it should have some claim. But the principle of non-interference must be qualified in important respects. Acts of genocide can never be a purely internal matter. When oppression produces massive flows of refugees which unsettle neighboring countries then they can properly be described as "threats to international peace and security."

It is interesting that on that same day in 1999, Brazilian President Fernando Henrique Cardoso offered some related observations, with his views on the Kosovo War, which he and his country supported. President Cardoso's views reflect the concerns of many of those in the developing world who worry about the consequences of a loss of sovereignty in reducing their ability to control their own destiny.

We heard Senator ROBERTS talk about the fear of the United States and its growing hegemony or being a great hegemony in various portions of the world, or being the "big dog."

President Cardoso said this:

Who has the authority and approval of the international community to drop bombs? Such attacks are not endorsed by an international organization that legalized such actions. The United Nations was left aside . . . The United States currently constitutes the only large center of political, economic, technologic, and even cultural power. This country has everything to exert its domain on the rest of the world, but it must share it. There must be rules, even for the stronger ones. When the strongest one makes decisions without listening, everything becomes a bit more difficult. In this European war, NATO made the decision, but who legalized it? That is the main problem. I am convinced more than ever that we need a new political order in the world.

How do we reconcile these different and sometimes conflicting, yet both legitimate, concerns: the need on the one hand to protect powerless individuals from the depredations of their own governments, and on the other to protect less powerful nations from unilateral or even multilateral decisions by the stronger powers?

Mr. President, in the last dialog, I tried to quote President Kennedy. I think I got the quote wrong. I think he said that "we must dream of a world in which the strong are just, the weak secure, and the peace preserved." I think that is what President Cardoso was after.

The editors of *Beyond Westphalia* draw four principal conclusions which bear on this matter. The first two offer encouragement to those who see a clear need for constraints on unfettered sovereignty, especially in cases of massive human rights violations:

First, constraints on state sovereignty not only have a long history but have been increasing significantly in recent years as a consequence of both growing interdependence and the end of the cold war . . . (Second), while constraints on state

sovereignty traditionally were largely constraints on states' behavior with regard to other states, in recent decades constraints on sovereignty have increasingly involved the internal affairs of states, or how governments relate to their own citizens, economies, and territories.

However, the current limits on international interventions are captured in the final two observations:

(Third), the international community has developed a formidable institutional presence, yet clearly lacks the resources and organizational capacity to serve as a viable alternative to the society of sovereign states . . . (Fourth), the legitimacy of the international community will continue to be questionable as long as there are fundamental differences between North and South with regard to whose values and interests the international community represents . . . If the major powers claim to be acting, through the exercise of their international decisionmaking authority, as the guardians of the common good, less powerful states seem to want to know, who is guarding the guardians?

Lyons and Mastanduno conclude that we are likely to experience an ongoing "chipping away" at the sovereign autonomy of nations. However, they end with the following cautionary note:

The idea of state sovereignty is alive and well among both the more powerful and less powerful members of contemporary international society. Even if states increasingly share authority with intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations, the state system endures.

So where does that leave us? For the isolationists and the unilateralists, the question of international intervention is, of course, not important for they believe that the United States should not, or need not, rely on other nations or the international community in advancing our security interests. However, as I have said in the first two of these dialogues, I do not believe the people of our country are prepared now, or in the foreseeable future, to pay the substantial—albeit quite different—costs arising out of either the isolationists' or the unilateralists' agendas.

For everyone else, including balance of power realists, Wilsonian idealists and everyone in between, they have to face the dilemma of balancing the reality of the continuing dominance of the nation state as the key player in international security affairs with the increasing transnational communications, economic forces, and values which are circumscribing national sovereignty.

In my opinion, we have no choice but to try to improve the international machinery for legitimating and, in some circumstances conducting, interventions in extreme cases where a nation's actions within its own borders necessitate such a response. To do otherwise would be to ignore the trends noted by Lyons and Mastanduno in 1995 and which have certainly considered apace since then. And whatever its shortcomings, and they are many, it is clear that the international machinery of choice, for the United States as well

as for most of the world, and recognized in solemn commitments—for example including NATO's own charter—is the United Nations and more particularly its Security Council.

But it is equally clear that the UN's machinery is not now capable of fulfilling this role assigned to it by the international community. The sad current events in Sierra Leone, and previously in Bosnia, in Rwanda, in Angola, and in Somalia demonstrate convincingly that the UN cannot enforce the will of the international community unless all local parties accept its intervention. In other words, it can enforce an existing peace but cannot make peace.

And in the absence of an effective United Nations, I say to the advocates of humanitarian intervention, we have to proceed with great caution. Furthermore, while various Western leaders and theorists have proposed standards to determine when and how national sovereignty should be overridden, such standards are neither comprehensive, nor clear, nor widely accepted.

Though I do not oppose the notion of international intervention in principle—because as I said before various global trends are moving us in that direction—in my opinion much will have to be done before we can or should stake important national interests on it. Among the steps which must be undertaken are:

Reforming the peacekeeping operations and decision-making processes within the UN and the Security Council.

Strengthening the capabilities of regional organizations, like the Organization for African Unity, the Organization of American States, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations—and as I suggested earlier the European Union—to deal with regional threats to international order.

Thoroughly debating—including in this body—the proposed frameworks for intervention put forward by the Clinton Administration, the British government, and others.

None of these steps will be easy. For example, reforming the decision-making processes of the Security Council in a way that improves its ability to act would presumably involve curtailing the veto power of the permanent members. However, while such a change would eliminate or reduce the ability of China or Russia to block what we view as appropriate interventions, it would also similarly constrain our own capacity to prevent what we view as undesirable actions by the UN. Strengthening the capabilities of regional entities raises resource questions, and, as already discussed, developing a serious European defense capability raises a number of additional concerns. And developing any sort of meaningful consensus about the principles for international interventions even among NATO members—let alone among both developed and developing countries—will be an extremely long

and difficult process. But for anyone who can conceive of circumstances where an international response will be in our national interest, it is the type of effort we will have to undertake.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks in this, our third session on the US Global Role. Our next discussion will hopefully take place during the week of May 22, and in many ways is at the heart of the concerns which motivated both me and Senator ROBERTS to initiate these dialogs: the central question of when and how to employ American military forces abroad. I look forward to that debate—which will appropriately occur just before the Memorial Day break—and I hope other Senators will participate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Is there any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

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

MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I want to commend Senator CLELAND and Senator ROBERTS for instituting this bipartisan dialogue relating to the global role of the United States. We normally only discuss these issues when a real-world contingency is looming and we do so under significant time constraints and within the dynamic of rapidly unfolding crises. This dialogue, which allows us to discuss these issues in a better setting, will hopefully contribute in a better understanding of the various perspectives on these issues and may bring us closer to a consensus on the fundamental issue of the global role of the United States.

This week's subject—"Multilateral Organizations"—is a very broad area. I will confine my remarks to those multilateral organizations that have responsibilities relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. I have in mind organizations like the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Union, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the mutual defense treaties to which the United States is a party.

I would like to briefly discuss several recent international crises and the role that the various multilateral organizations played in addressing those crises. I want to note, at the outset, that sometimes they were successful and sometimes they failed.

Mr. President, I don't know how many of my colleagues have ever been to Dubrovnik. It is an ancient and breathtakingly beautiful seaside city on Croatia's Dalmatian coast. When the Yugoslav Army subjected Dubrovnik to indiscriminate shelling in October 1991, resulting in the systematic destruction in the old city and

the loss of many civilian lives, the European Union or the Western European Union should have used force to end this barbarity in their own backyard. If they had, the ensuing damage and loss of life throughout the Balkans might have been avoided. Instead of acting with force, however, the European Union declined to take any forceful action. For its part, the UN Security Council imposed an international embargo on the supply of arms to the combatants, thus succeeding in locking in the advantage that the Yugoslav Army enjoyed. It doesn't appear that NATO even considered taking action at that stage of the Balkan conflict. This was an example of the inability or unwillingness of the United Nations, the European Union, NATO and other multilateral organizations to effectively deal with a real-world crisis that had the potential of spreading.

It should be noted that NATO has substantial forces under its command but the United Nations does not have a standing UN army, nor, in my view, should it. The United Nations is dependent upon the political will of its members to supply the forces and the financial resources to take action. It is ironic that politicians of all nations feel free to criticize the United Nations for failing to successfully carry out its missions but the reality is that any failure of the United Nations is a failure of the UN member nations to provide the UN with the necessary means for its missions. We can't have it both ways—we can't refuse to provide the UN with the necessary means to do its job and then hammer the UN for its failings.

UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, in commenting upon a December 1999 Report of an Independent Inquiry that he commissioned and that documented the UN failure to prevent genocide in Rwanda and on his own earlier report on the UN's failure to safeguard Srebrenica, stated that "Of all my aims as Secretary General, there is none to which I feel more deeply committed than that of enabling the United Nations never again to fail in protecting a civilian population from genocide or mass slaughter."

Mr. President, I welcome Secretary General Kofi Annan's statement, but I recognize the reality that the UN's ability to take effective action in the future—even to prevent genocide—remains dependent upon the political will of UN member nations to provide the UN with the forces and the financial resources it needs.

Mr. President, just as the United Nations has learned some hard lessons in places like Rwanda and Srebrenica, so the United States learned a hard lesson in Somalia, where we lost 18 of our finest soldiers in a single engagement.

In response to the need for an effective peacekeeping capability in Africa, the United States, Britain and France are embarked on parallel and coordinated programs to enhance the capabilities of African countries to carry

out humanitarian and peacekeeping operations in Africa. The United States program, called the African Crisis Response Initiative or ACRI, has trained over 6,000 peacekeepers from the African nations of Benin, Ghana, Malawi, Mali, Uganda, and Senegal. The ACRI program, whose program of instruction has been approved by the UN Department of Peacekeeping, also promotes professional apolitical militaries and reinforces respect for human rights and the proper role of a military in a democracy.

Mr. President, while most people only associate the UN with peacekeeping or peace enforcement missions, there are other actions that it has undertaken. In December 1992, the UN Security Council, at the request of the Government of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, established a preventive deployment mission in Macedonia in an effort to prevent the Balkan conflict from spreading into that nation. Originally composed of a Nordic battalion, it was augmented by a U.S. Army contingent in July 1993. The conflict did not spread to Macedonia, perhaps because of this mission. It was the first deployment of an international force prior to an initiation of hostilities.

The crisis in Kosovo also produced unprecedented actions by several multilateral organizations. In 1998, amidst mounting repression of the ethnic Albanian population by the Yugoslav Army and special police, Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic reached an agreement with U.S. envoy Dick Holbrooke to comply with UN demands for a cease-fire and to accept an intrusive verification regime of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Involving approximately 2,000 unarmed personnel, this was the largest, most complex and potentially most dangerous mission ever undertaken by the OSCE. Additionally, NATO deployed an Extraction Force to neighboring Macedonia that was poised to come to the assistance of the OSCE personnel if they came under attack. While the OSCE mission was not able to prevent all armed attacks, particularly the mass killing of ethnic Albanians in Racak in January 1999, it did enable international humanitarian relief organizations to provide direly needed assistance to the Kosovar population until forced to withdraw on March 20, 1999 in the face of an untenable situation, including additional large-scale deployments of Milosevic's military, special police and paramilitary forces into Kosovo.

By the time of the OSCE's withdrawal from Kosovo, repression of the ethnic-Albanian population of Kosovo escalated to a full-scale attempt to ethnically cleanse Kosovo. Unfortunately, the UN Security Council was unable to act as both Russia and China signaled that they would veto any resolution authorizing the use of force against the security forces of Slobodan

Milosevic. Despite the lack of international legitimation that a UN Security Council authorization would have provided, NATO was resolute and launched a 78-day air campaign that forced Slobodan Milosevic to accede to NATO's demands. This was the first time in its fifty-year history that NATO had embarked on a large-scale combat operation. Following the air campaign, the UN Security Council established a UN mission to administer Kosovo and authorized an international armed force under NATO leadership to provide a secure environment. And for the first time in the 20th Century, ethnic cleansing in Europe was reversed. The United States bore the major burden in NATO's air campaign but the European Union pledged to bear the major share of the reconstruction effort and has provided most of the peacekeeping forces for Kosovo. I welcome the fact that the United States is playing a junior role in the peacekeeping effort with only about 15 percent of the troops, and I also welcome our European NATO allies' expressed determination to play a more substantial role in future conflicts in Europe, either as part of a NATO or a European Union-led effort.

Additionally, in a departure from the normal UN practice, the UN Mission in Kosovo or UNMIK has been organized into four pillars, under the overall supervision of the UNMIK head, Dr. Kouchner. Those four pillars are: civil administration under the United Nations itself; humanitarian assistance, led by the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees; democratization and institution-building, led by the OSCE; and economic reconstruction, managed by the EU.

Despite the fact that our NATO allies would have borne the effects of a massive flow of ethnic-Albanian Kosovars, regional instability, and the potential involvement of two of its member nations—Greece and Turkey—on opposite sides of the conflict, no individual European nation had the military or political wherewithal to use force against Serbia to end its barbarous acts. I doubt that a coalition of European nations could have done so. Although the United States had the military capability to carry out such an operation, as Secretary Cohen and General Shelton noted in their joint statement to the Armed Services Committee, "Operation Allied Force could not have been conducted without the NATO Alliance and without the infrastructure, transit and basing access, host-nation force contributions, and most importantly, political and diplomatic support provided by the allies and other members of the coalition."

Mr. President, much has been said and written about NATO's use of less than overwhelming, decisive force in the air campaign against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. NATO's capability was limited to what I call "maximum achievable force," i.e., the maximum force that is politically achiev-

able and sustainable. As General Wesley Clark, NATO's Supreme Allied Commander during the air campaign, testified in response to my use of the concept "maximum achievable force":

"We knew we had to avoid collateral damage, keep the allies together, do the most we could against the targets on the ground, and avoid the loss of air crews. We had to keep it in balance. It was, as you put it, a maximum achievable force strategy."

An Alliance goes to war differently than an individual nation does. The United States clearly would have carried out the air campaign more robustly from the outset if we had been acting unilaterally.

Overwhelming, decisive force undoubtedly is the first and most preferred option for the United States in any military operation. That is the lesson of Vietnam. But if it is not possible, as it will rarely be when a coalition is considering action, then the next option is to use the maximum achievable force in an alliance setting. The question then becomes whether the greater risks entailed in using less than overwhelming, decisive force are worth taking.

If the participation of the whole NATO Alliance was both critical to the success of the military operation against Milosevic and the only politically achievable option, were we wise to proceed? If so, does this mean that we should automatically resign ourselves to using less than overwhelming, decisive force in any future conflict?

The answer is we should not resign ourselves to the use of less than overwhelming divisive force. But there will be times when because we can achieve an alliance action with maximum achievable force that it will be worth the risk, and there will be times when it will not.

An overwhelming, decisive force strategy is best when U.S. forces are involved in hostilities. In the case of Kosovo, our NATO allies were unwilling to adopt such a strategy. Our remaining options were to do nothing, to go it alone, or to use a maximum achievable force strategy, which meant a phased air campaign and no ground forces.

In my view, while there were drawbacks to going to war in Kosovo as part of a coalition, the benefits of fighting as part of the NATO coalition, under all the circumstances, outweighed those drawbacks. Napoleon said it well: "The only thing worse than fighting in a coalition is fighting against one."

If the use of overwhelming, decisive force is also not an option in some future conflict, we will once again have to make the judgment whether the risk involved in utilizing maximum achievable force, i.e. less than overwhelming, decisive force, outweighs the risk to U.S. interests of not proceeding.

Meanwhile across the globe in East Timor, the international community reacted in horror at the death and destruction wrought by pro-Indonesian

militias in the aftermath of a referendum that overwhelmingly favored independence from Indonesia. The UN Security Council authorized a multinational force to restore peace and security in East Timor. Australia took the lead in this peace enforcement mission and the United States provided support but did not provide any ground combat forces. As Admiral Blair, Commander in Chief of the Pacific Command, put it in testimony before the Armed Services Committee, "East Timor demonstrated the value of having the U.S. in a supporting role to a competent ally, providing unique and significant capabilities needed to ensure success without stretching the capability of U.S. forces and resources to conduct other operations worldwide."

Mr. President, the United States cannot be the world's policeman. But we also cannot withdraw to fortress America and seek to ignore what goes on in the rest of the world. The United States possesses unparalleled economic and military strength. But no nation—no matter how strong—can go it alone. Understanding this, our forebears formed alliances many years ago throughout the globe. Our collective defense treaties with the other 18 nations of the NATO Alliance and with countries like Australia, Japan, the Philippines, and the Republic of Korea are major contributors to the protection of our national security interests. Our status as one of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, with veto power, also enables us to ensure that the actions of the Security Council are consistent with our national security interests. Our Alliances and our participation in the United Nations and other multilateral organizations also help to ensure that there is a shared responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. The UN's authorization and approval of a mission adds great universal political support to the undertaking.

None of these organizations I have described are perfect and none of them will succeed in maintaining the peace if their Member nations lack the political will to provide the military forces, the financial resources, and, increasingly, the police forces to carry out the missions that are undertaken.

Mr. President, I realize that Senators CLELAND, ROBERTS and others talked about the security interests of the United States in a prior week. I don't plan to comment at length on that subject today, but I do believe that it is necessary to touch on it with respect to multilateral organizations.

The obvious point is that the extent to which the United States participates with its armed forces in a particular mission will be determined by the extent to which our national interests are involved and the degree of risk it entails, including, as noted above, the greater risks that may result from acting within a coalition.

Accordingly, the United States has made clear that it will not provide

troops for the United Nations peace-keeping mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo. In the same vein, the United States will not provide troops for the UN Transitional Administration in East Timor, the follow-on mission to the Australian-led intervention force, but will provide a few U.S. officers to serve as observers and will, as part of their normal exercises, periodically deploy U.S. personnel to perform activities such as the rebuilding of schools and the restoration of medical services.

Mr. President, I believe that it is in the United States national interest to support the United Nations as it seeks to fulfill its primary responsibility to maintain international peace and stability. We also need to work to strengthen our alliances and to encourage our allies to strengthen their military capabilities so that they can share the common burden. We also need to utilize the various other multilateral organizations that can contribute to international peace and stability. Finally, we need to explore every opportunity to bring about actions that will serve to end conflict at the earliest possible time, as wasn't done in 1991 at the time of the initial shelling of Dubrovnik, and to prevent the spread of conflict, as was done by the UN preventive deployment mission to Macedonia in 1992.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to end in the same way that I started; namely, by commending Senator CLELAND and Senator ROBERTS for instituting this dialogue. I look forward to the continuation of this dialogue in the coming weeks and I hope to be able to participate again in the future.

I again thank our good friends from Georgia and Kansas. I add my thanks also to the Senator from Indiana for his extraordinarily thoughtful remarks this afternoon. I was not able to hear all of it. I would like to have heard all of it. But I heard enough to know that, as usual, the Senator from Indiana adds an extremely thoughtful and thorough contribution to this debate.

I commend our good friends from Georgia and Kansas for carrying on what I consider to be a very significant dialog. It takes a lot of effort and a lot of energy to do what they are doing. It is critical to this nation's security. Both of them have already made huge contributions to our Nation's security. Now, on the floor of the Senate, they are making an additional major contribution, and this country is again in their debt.

I thank my friends.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Democratic leader is recognized.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I know we are about to go out. Before we do, I wanted to call attention to the fact that I wish we could have taken up the ESEA bill again this afternoon. The fact is that we have amendments that could have been offered on either side. We have indicated a willingness to even offer time agreements on virtually all amendments. There are a number of amendments that are pending. We are told that we just do not have time on the schedule to revisit ESEA this week. I really question that. The fact is that we have been in morning business all afternoon. We are not going to be in session tomorrow. We will be in debate only scheduled on Monday for the military construction bill. We are not overworked here.

It seems to me that on an issue as important as ESEA needs to be addressed. The fact is, it should have been reauthorized last year. It wasn't. It needs to be reauthorized this year.

We have fewer than 40 legislative days left between now and the time that we are scheduled to adjourn. With appropriations bills, the China debate, and a number of other issues unfinished—bankruptcy we hope, and other issues—there is very little time.

So it seems to me that we ought to be using what time we have available to us to our best advantage. Being in morning business for most of the day is not my concept of utilization of time in an appropriate way.

Again, I express the regret that we haven't had more of a chance this week to deal with this very, very critical bill. The education bill ought to be finished. We worked on it in a very constructive way, I have felt. There has been progress—limited, but, nonetheless, progress. We could have had a lot more progress. There is no reason why we can't finish this bill. There is no reason why we couldn't have done another bloc of amendments today and some amendments tomorrow. In fact, I think maybe we could have finished the bill this week. That is now impossible. And there is no prospect of bringing the bill up at least for the foreseeable future, given what the majority leader has indicated is his intention with regard to appropriations bills. I am troubled and disappointed by that.

I make note of that as we end the day today. Hopefully, we will have more productive weeks and more opportunities to debate this issue. But time is going by quickly. We don't have that much more time. I hope we can better use the time we have.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I have had the privilege for the last hour of sitting in

that chair and hearing our colleagues debate the issue of NATO and our place in Europe and the broader national security issues and the specific issue of whether or not we should remain in Kosovo. It is entirely appropriate that this body debate this issue. No one should criticize any Senator for bringing that up or for crafting a piece of legislation designed to focus this Government on an exit strategy. Everyone knows we need one.

I add my voice to that of Senator LUGAR, Senator LEVIN, and others, who have expressed concern that while it is appropriate to debate, it is not appropriate to leave at this moment. I wish I could say it is time to leave, but I believe America still has a place in Europe. I believe if we set in motion the wheels to leave Kosovo, we will set in motion the mechanism to decouple the United States and NATO with Europe. I think we need to be very thoughtful about that.

I wish Mr. Putin and the new Russian Federation well, and I hope they join the democratic nations of Europe. I hope we can include them in more ways than ever imaginable throughout all of my lifetime. But I think the jury is still out. I hear from their neighbors, still, they are afraid of what happened in Chechnya. The Nation of Georgia trembles. I know Moldovians do, I know Ukrainians do, I know Romanians do. They have all been in my office this week, worried that the United States would pull out its stabilizing influence, an influence that, frankly, these emerging democracies look to, count on, and still need. I know we are tired of it. I know we are tired of funding it. I know our fighting men and women don't like being in a police operation.

But I also know the cost of leaving Europe is a cost that is much larger than the one we are paying now to stay in Europe. I hope President Clinton and Madeleine Albright and others in our executive branch can figure out how we can get out of there, but get out in a way that does not destroy this institution called NATO, which the world still needs. As Senator LUGAR said, that day may come, that we can go home and the Europeans say goodbye, but that day is not now.

I think we should have a vigorous debate, but I think we should be exceedingly careful before we say to our European allies and to everyone watching the United States and counting on the United States, that we are pulling out of Dodge. I don't think we can say that yet. I hope we can say it soon. But I know we can't say it now.

PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES IN OREGON

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I have come to talk to citizens of my State who have a rare privilege in the next few days: The two leading candidates for the highest office in our land will be in the State of Oregon. Vice President GORE will be there tomorrow, and Governor Bush will be

there on Tuesday. I will have occasion to be with Governor Bush, and my friend and colleague, RON WYDEN, will have occasion to be with Vice President GORE tomorrow.

Oregonians need to ask a lot of questions to find out where these men are on issues that affect their lives. I came to speak in terms similar to those of Senator GORTON, who wants Washingtonians to ask what I want Oregonians to ask; that is, Mr. Vice President, where are you on the issue of hydroelectric power on the four Snake River dams in the State of Washington? I am not sure I know of an issue of greater importance to our State's environment and our State's economy. As a background to this question, Mr. GORE, where are you on the question of breaching these dams?

I would like to talk a little bit about our energy policy in this country. So I say to any Oregonians that may be watching, I want to share a memo which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

ENERGY SECRETARY RICHARDSON ANNOUNCES SIX SHORT-TERM ACTIONS TO HELP PREVENT POWER OUTAGES

STRESSES NEED FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE TO PROTECT RELIABILITY IN THE LONG TERM

Energy Secretary Bill Richardson today announced a series of short-term actions that the Department of Energy will take to help ensure the reliability of the nation's power supply in the coming months. Several regions across the country have experienced reliability problems in recent summers and there are concerns about the reliability of the nation's grid this summer.

These short-term actions by the Department of Energy, while not a cure-all, are designed to help keep the lights on this summer," said Secretary Richardson. "To protect reliability in the long term, we need new policies and passage of federal electricity legislation to keep pace with rapidly changing market developments.

The Department of Energy will: work with other agencies to identify opportunities to reduce electric consumption at federal water projects during times of peak demand; urge the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and state utility commissions to solicit and approve tariffs that will help reduce electricity demands during peak time periods. For instance, large industrial consumers could find it to their advantage to sell their power entitlement back to their utility if it would be profitable; explore opportunities for the use of existing backup generators during power supply emergencies to reduce the strain on electric systems and help avoid blackouts; conduct an emergency exercise with state and local governments to help prepare for potential summer power supply emergencies; work closely with the utility industry to gain up-to-date relevant information about potential grid-related problems as quickly as possible; and prepare public service announcements to provide tips to help consumers reduce electricity use and lower their bills.

Secretary Richardson began a series of regional summits this week between federal, state and local government officials, regulators, utilities and consumers to discuss ways to enhance the reliability of our electric system. The first meetings are taking

place on April 24 in Hartford, Newark and New Orleans. On April 28, he will co-host a summit in Sacramento.

After last summer's outages Secretary Richardson formed a Power Outage Study Team to review the events of last year and provide recommendations for making the nation's grid more reliable. The team's final report, issued last month, is available online at <http://www.policy.energy.gov>.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. This is a news release from Department of Energy Secretary Richardson announcing six short-term actions to help prevent power outages.

This will blow your mind.

We are expecting power outages all over the United States this summer. The long-term forecast for the Pacific Northwest is for energy shortages, as well. If you look at the six proposals for what this Government is going to do, there isn't one proposal about producing energy. The first one is: Look for opportunities to reduce electric consumption at Federal water projects.

Let me tell the farmers what that means, they are turning off the switch and they are turning off the water. That is what that means.

Second, solicit and approve tariffs that will help reduce electricity demands during peak times. Do you know what that means, Mr. President? That means the rates are going up. It is like a tax increase. So the cost of your energy is going up. We are not going to produce any more, Heaven forbid, we are just going to make it more expensive.

The next actions prescribed: The Energy Department will conduct an emergency exercise with State and local governments to help prepare for potential summer power supply emergencies. So we essentially will do a fire drill to see what happens when a whole city shuts down because electricity isn't produced when hitting a switch. Somebody has to turn something before we can have lights.

The next one prescribed: the Government is going to gain up-to-date relevant information about potential grid-related problems as quickly as possible.

Great. We don't already have that information?

Finally, we are going to prepare public service announcements to provide tips for how you can conserve electricity.

Nothing in the news release about producing.

When Mr. GORE and Mr. Bush are in the State of Oregon, I want Oregonians to ask about our power. I want them to ask how are our lights going to go on at night? How are we going to stay warm in the winter? How are our factories going to continue to operate? How will we have jobs?

This is not a hypothetical situation I am posing. These are real potential threats.

In spite of all of that, the Vice President is talking about shutting down any offshore drilling. Fine, but realize that has a cost to the environment.

Talk about not renewing nuclear licenses for energy plants—but that has an environmental cost as well. I see Senator BYRD on the floor all the time, decrying how the coal fields of West Virginia are being shut down because this Administration does not want to produce any more coal. I hear the people in the northeastern United States screaming about skyrocketing fuel prices in the winter, yet we are becoming more dependent upon foreign oil. Now I hear this Administration, in my neck of the woods, the Pacific Northwest, saying they are going to tear out our hydroelectric power.

It is not unreasonable, my fellow Americans, to ask how are the lights going to go on? Our own Energy Department is admitting we have a problem on the horizon. I think the whole country was just reminded that gasoline does not come from a filling station. It is \$2 a gallon and climbing in some cases, falling in others, I hope.

We need an energy policy.

I support conservation initiatives. Raise CAFE standards? I am for that. I am looking for ways to conserve. But Americans are demanding energy and this Administration's policy is to shut down domestic energy production and leave America more dependent on foreign oil. This does not add up.

I hope Oregonians understand that it is very important to ask the Vice President of the United States what his policy on energy is. Mr. Bush has already answered it. He said if he is elected President, the dams will stay and you will keep your jobs and the lights will go on at night. I like that answer. It is clear.

He also made the point that we can have our energy and we can have our fish as well. Let me tell you a real dirty little secret. As we speak, all that can be heard here in Washington is the gloom and doom about the fish going away. Do you know that in the Columbia/Snake Rivers right now, those rivers are teeming with salmon coming back to spawn?

Let me give some numbers. As of today, at the furthest dam they want to take out, called the Lower Granite, 18,000 chinook have passed through this season. Some say, "Oh, but they must be hatchery fish." To those I say no, they are not. A few of the fish are from hatchery stock, but many of them are wild. Do you know how many fish passed through this same dam last year? It was 240. This year it was 18,000. These numbers have many in the environmental community looking pretty ashen-faced.

The first dam on the Columbia River that the fish pass through is called the Bonneville Dam, a dam Franklin Roosevelt dedicated, I believe in 1936. As of today, 160,000 spring chinook have passed over that dam this season. These are big returns. There are lots of fish returning. In fact, there are so many coming back that the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife is clubbing nearly every fish they can find

that is a hatchery fish. They are killing them so they will not spawn because they say that hatchery stock affects the ethnic purity of the wild stocks.

The real secret about hatchery fish is that their eggs come from wild fish. But, nevertheless, we have so many fish now, apparently, that we have the luxury of clubbing them to death before they can spawn. By the way, the hatchery fish in the Atlantic salmon recovery program are treated the same as wild fish. But in spite of all this, we're told in the Pacific Northwest that we have to take out our dams. We have to take them out in order to have a normative river.

What do we hear from the administration? We hear on the one hand that Fish and Wildlife has concluded the dams have to come out. The National Marine Fisheries Service says we need to study dam breaching for at least 10 years because we do not have a good answer yet. And, by the way, the studies they have been producing are all predicated on data from 1980 to the current date. However, if you look at data dating back to 1960, which is available, you do not come up with extinction modeling. But federal agencies just picked the years that had the worst ocean conditions to argue that the salmon are going to become extinct unless we tear out our dams. I want the fish but I don't want the people to be suckers. I think we are being set up to be that.

I would like to know, also from Mr. GORE, why it is that the Corps of Engineers was about to issue their recommendation, which was don't take the dams out, and they were ordered by the White House not to make that recommendation? Why were they ordered to make no recommendation? What that adds up to, I believe, is that this is not about science—this is about political science. Political science is not the basis upon which this decision should be made, particularly when our rivers are full of fish as we speak.

What are the consequences if they pull the dams out? I have named a few already, but I do know it adds 13 cents a bushel to every farmer's wheat. I know it means \$11 million a year lost in revenue to the barging industry. When you take this wheat from the barges and put it on a truck, do you know how many trucks it takes to replace those barges per day? It takes 2,000 semi trucks a day. You say you care about the environment? Are you going to burn that kind of fuel, burn up those kinds of miles, cause that kind of congestion in the city of Portland and the city of Seattle? Not on my watch you will not.

What else does tearing out the dams mean? It means a loss of about \$130 million in property values to farmers. What does that mean to property taxes? School support? Roads? All those things are in jeopardy if you take those dams down. Dam breaching takes 37,000 acres of wheat out of production.

What happens to those families? Their land goes back to sagebrush.

It takes at least 5,370 direct jobs in Portland. I actually think it is higher than that when you look at the ripple effect. When you take out these dams, you lose longshoremans in Portland and the many other service-related jobs that depend on them. Not only that, but to take these dams out, it would cost \$809 million. Some have said that it could cost that much for each dam—I don't know whether we can get through this body an appropriation to destroy Federal assets that will be in the billions of dollars. What are you going to replace the energy with? What are you going to burn? This is crazy.

What else do you lose? You lose 3,033 megawatts of clean hydroelectric power. That is the amount it takes to run the city of Seattle every day. We are going to take that out in the face of projected energy shortages? Not on my watch.

So I say with the Senator from Washington: No, not on our watch.

I say to my fellow citizens in Oregon, this is the most important question you can ask Al Gore. Governor Bush has answered it. Please, Mr. Vice President, tell us what is your position on tearing out hydroelectric power in the Pacific Northwest? One of your agencies says do it. Another says we don't know enough yet. A third says don't do it. And GORE is refusing to answer the question.

We can have our fish and we can have our power. There are many things we can do, short of destroying our energy infrastructure and our clean, hydroelectric power. There are many things we can do to save fish short of the destruction of this kind of energy. To replace our clean energy with any other type, you are going to burn something and Oregonians will live in a dirtier place. I do not want them to.

I ask the Vice President, respectfully, to answer the question. What is your policy on dam breaching?

EUROPEAN UNION HUSHKIT REGULATION

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, the International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO, is a specialized agency of the U.N. that has been tasked for more than 50 years with the safe and orderly growth of international civil aviation. Based in Montreal, this 185 countries strong organization develops international standards on such critical issues as noise, emissions, and air worthiness.

I am saddened to report that, last week, the European Union dealt a severe blow to the integrity and future viability of this critical organization. I, of course, am speaking of the EU's implementation of the so-called hushkit regulation. This regulation bans hushkitted aircraft from being registered in Europe, prohibits such aircraft that are not European registered from flying in Europe within

two years, and bars certain reengineed aircraft with low by-pass ratios from European airspace. The regulation was implemented despite the fact that the aircraft in question meet the highest international noise standards.

Thankfully, in March, the U.S. filed an Article 84 case within ICAO against the fifteen EU Member States arguing that the regulation violated the Chicago Convention. ICAO will review the matter this fall, and hopefully resolve it in a way that reaffirms its position as the sole, international standard setting body.

Ironically, the EU wants to have its cake and eat it too. EU Members States are now anxious for ICAO to establish new, more stringent, Stage 4 noise standards. Indeed, the U.S. is working with ICAO on this endeavor as we speak. The key question becomes, why should we develop new standards if the EU has demonstrated that the old ones can be disregarded at whim? If the EU wants Stage 4, it must begin by demonstrating its respect for Stage 3 by withdrawing the hushkit regulation.

Mr. President, I will be following the resolution of this dispute very carefully. It is critical to future trading opportunities that the integrity of the ICAO process be upheld.

SECURITY AND COMMERCIAL SATELLITE IMAGERY

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, as Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services of the Governmental Affairs Committee, I am concerned about an emerging issue that has important implications for our national security: the commercial satellite imaging industry. Soon the public will have access to high resolution pictures able to show objects as small as three feet in size.

The rapid evolution of satellite technology has suddenly made the "eye in the sky" accessible to everyone, from foreign governments to the average individual. Secret sites are suddenly no longer secret. Photos of Area 51, a top-secret military installation located in Nevada, were recently made available by a private company selling commercial satellite images. The wide availability of these pictures to any person or country that can afford to buy them has the potential to both help or hinder our security.

Initially satellites were used during the Cold War for defense purposes. These classified images were only available to the government. However, civilians began to benefit from satellite pictures about thirty years ago when the government satellite, Landsat, began to sell photos to the public for agricultural planning purposes. The first commercial satellite launch did not occur until 1986, when France, Sweden and Belgium jointly launched SPOT I.

The technology of satellites today has evolved considerably since

Landsat, in 1972, began providing photos to the public. Those pictures could only render images of objects larger than 250 feet across.

This all changed when earlier this year a private company called Space Imaging made history by distributing the first high-resolution satellite images of a North Korean ballistic missile site. Their photos had a one-meter resolution, providing the public a detailed look at the missile facilities of this rogue nation. Ruts in the road used by North Korean trucks could be seen.

The industry for commercial satellites is growing steadily. In 1994 President Clinton issued Presidential Decision Directive 23 which permitted the Commerce Department to license 12 U.S. companies to operate remote-sensing satellites. Space Imaging and Aerial Images, the company which took the Area 51 pictures, may be the first two of these companies to get a satellite aloft, but there are more to come. At least two other U.S. companies plan on launching satellites this year and several foreign companies have similar plans.

Legal restrictions surrounding these photo purchases are few. Imaging companies do not have to identify either their customers or their pictures. An amendment to the 1997 Defense Authorization Act prohibits U.S. companies from selling satellite images of Israel that show objects with a diameter under 6 feet. Any sale of images to a terrorist state or any regime under U.S. or international sanctions is also prohibited. Aside from these restrictions, there are virtually no limitations on any satellite or any sale of satellite pictures. And even these restrictions are going to be harder to maintain as competition increases from more companies outside the United States.

At the moment, the images are expensive, limited in coverage but not difficult to purchase. Foreign governments, private groups or individuals can now place their orders. In a competitive market with more countries offering this service, there will be competition to provide more precise pictures, of a greater number of subjects, in a more timely manner, at less cost. The restrictions the U.S. now imposes will be harder to maintain in such a free market. What was secret once, will be secret no longer.

Pictures of Area 51, for example, were provided by a Russian launched satellite. India is also beginning a program to launch high-resolution imaging satellites and Israel is planning to launch its own commercial satellite. American restrictions on satellite images of Israel only apply to American satellites. Soon commercial satellites will also be using radar imaging—and thus will no longer be limited by the need for clear skies—and hyperspectral sensors which permit analysis of chemical characteristics. The United States government has long been part of the action. NASA's Commercial Remote

Sensing Program is based at the Stennis Space Center in Mississippi.

But it is clear that as this competitive industry grows in the future, we should examine the impact of commercial satellites on our nation's security. Many have applauded the growth of this industry as a means of keeping the public well-informed and expanding the national discussion on issues of national and international security. It is true that having access to satellite images of other countries does enable the U.S. to monitor more areas around the world, to identify violations of international agreements, detect human rights abuses and watch for possible security threats. It will mean private, non-governmental organizations, such as the one which commissioned the pictures of North Korea, will be watching the world too, and issuing their intelligence bulletins.

This may result in confusing interpretations. Countries could take advantage of the fact that they may be monitored by one of these satellites. Knowing that they are being photographed by a satellite and that these images may be made public, states could attempt to blackmail the international community by staging what appears to be a more robust nuclear program or preparations for a missile test for the benefit of the threatening images that this would produce. After all pictures do not lie, do they? Or they could do exactly the opposite and disguise their advanced defense capabilities so that the images captured and released to the media actually reinforce a rogue nation's efforts to circumvent international law.

This possibility calls to mind the pictures taken last January of the Nodong missile launch site in North Korea. As I mentioned earlier, those pictures depicted a crude missile site and a launch pad that cuts through a rice paddy, making the North Korean facilities appear primitive and unthreatening. But these observations contradict the September 1999 National Intelligence Estimate which believes North Korea to be the country most likely to develop ICBMs capable of threatening the U.S. during the next fifteen years. If the U.S. accepts these pictures as fact and believes that the North Korean missile site is as unthreatening as it appears, should we let down our guard and disregard the threat they may pose to our country? I think not.

Similarly, in March of this year, satellite photos of Pakistan's nuclear facility and missile garrison were taken by a commercial satellite and sold to a Washington-based arms control organization. These images have sparked a public policy debate over their interpretation and international security implications. The organization that purchased these photos insists that they are proof that Pakistan will not be persuaded to give up its nuclear weapons program. However, a possible misinterpretation of this data could easily incite a flare-up of the already

volatile relationship between Pakistan and India.

We cannot make assumptions about what these pictures mean when constructing our national security policy. Our eyes can deceive us. Photo interpretation is going to open up a new area of commercial employment for former government analysts. This evolving space race of the commercial satellite industry can offer us many military and civilian benefits. It can be an important tool in assisting us to make many of our national security decisions in the future. But we must also be wary about jumping to conclusions from what we see. A single picture may not be worth a thousand words. We must contemplate the use of these commercial satellites carefully and find the way to best utilize them so that they bolster, not threaten, our national security.

Just as Global Positioning System (GPS) navigation devices are now widely accessible, we could have a situation in which an enemy uses GPS to attack an American target identified by commercial satellite imaging. Recently, the White House announced the United States would stop its intentional degradation of the GPS signals available to the public, giving the public access to the precise location system previously possible only for the Department of Defense. Defense is requesting \$500 million in FY2001 to sustain and modernize the GPS program. Much of the technology used in commercial space launches came from the military.

This is a strange new world. We need to gain a greater understanding of the implications of this technology on our national security. The technology may be inherently uncontrollable—just as export controls over computer encryption became impossible to sustain. Satellite imagery has the potential to be a major asset to the arms control, human rights, and environmental communities. We are witnessing the birth of a new area of information technology. I would urge my colleagues to consider this issue as we begin to examine American security in the 21st century.

142ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA INTO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

• Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, the State of Minnesota has truly been blessed with a wide array of remarkable gifts. Few places on Earth can boast such diversity amongst its abundant natural resources, prosperous industries, and exceptional people. Today marks the 142nd anniversary of Minnesota's admission as the thirty-second state of the Union, and I want to take this opportunity to reflect on a few of the things that make my state special. This is a difficult speech to make in such a short amount of time, as I am sure I could break Senator THURMOND's twenty-four hour and eighteen minute

filibuster record by talking about Minnesota's contributions to America but I will stick to just a few of the highlights and try to finish up by sundown.

Minnesota's natural beauty has been photographed and documented time and time again. License plates may proclaim Minnesota to be "The Land of 10,000 Lakes," but in reality, our vast lakes number in excess of 12,000, and we have more than 63,000 miles of natural rivers and streams. But there is something about sitting on the shore of Mille Lacs Lake at dawn on a Saturday in July that even a two-page spread in National Geographic cannot capture.

Minnesotans have a unique relationship with their great outdoors. Many take advantage of our pristine environment through a large assortment of activities, such as taking a week to canoe through the Boundary Waters or going for a walk along the Mississippi River over a lunch hour. Minnesota is a true sportsman's paradise. Our unique habitat creates some of the best hunting and fishing in the country. We are proud of our outdoor heritage, and take seriously our commitment to maintaining the delicate balance between protecting the environment and the responsible use of our resources.

Nor are we shy about sharing our bounty with others. Minnesota welcomes more than 20 million vacationers every year, who support 170,300 tourism jobs and return \$9.1 billion to the local economy. Yet, for all those visitors, our state offers places of such solitude that a camper or canoeist can travel for a week and spot any number of deer, bears, and bald eagles, but never see another person.

The influence of agriculture on Minnesota life and traditions cannot be overstated. Even as family farms struggle in today's difficult market, the resilience and dedication of our farmers establishes the backbone of the Minnesota economy. One in every four Minnesota jobs is tied to the agriculture industry in some way. Minnesota has become a national leader in international exports, as our producers export billions of dollars worth of grains, meats, and other products every year. I am proud of my ongoing efforts to ensure that even more world markets are opened to Minnesota agriculture products—they are among the best products in the world, and they should be shared. Many of the nation's top job providers call Minnesota home. Well-known names like General Mills, Pillsbury, 3M, Target, and Cargill have deep roots within our communities. Aside from the economic impacts made by our corporate community, there is an impressive philanthropic presence in the state. For example, Cargill's generous contributions to causes such as education, environment, and youth programs total in the tens of millions of dollars.

Firms such as Medtronic and St. Jude Medical are national leaders in the bio-medical industry. Their products have given hope to those who pre-

viously faced a bleak medical outlook. Other Minnesota organizations are searching for answers to tomorrow's problems—today. The world-renowned Mayo Clinic not only treats over half a million patients a year, but is leading the charge against the mysteries of mankind's deadly diseases through its ongoing research.

Of all the successful companies, natural beauty, and bountiful resources Minnesota plays host to, the real treasures are the people of my state. Successful Minnesotans come from all walks of life. Some of the most prolific writers of the past century have hailed from the North Star State. The first American to be awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature was Sinclair Lewis, a native of Sauk Centre, Minnesota. F. Scott Fitzgerald, Jon Hassler, and Garrison Keillor are all writers we are proud to call our own.

Something about the fresh air in Minnesota inspires us to do bigger and better things. Charles Lindbergh must have gotten a big whiff of that air; so did Judy Garland, Kevin McHale, and Bob Dylan, just to name a few. Our state and nation recently mourned the loss of one of our most beloved natives. Charles Schulz captured the hearts of young and old alike with his long-running Peanuts comic strip, and we will miss him each and every Sunday.

There are many Minnesota celebrities who have contributed to the richness of our nation, but the people who really deserve the applause and recognition are the men and women who day in and day out strive to make their communities, state, and nation a better place to live. The farmer who harvests our nation's corn, the police-woman who patrols the streets, the stay-at-home mom who supervises a household of kids, and the volunteer who takes the time to visit a disabled veteran rarely receive the accolades they deserve. These people are as indispensable to the growing, bustling community of St. Michael-Albertville as they are to the thriving metropolis of Minneapolis-St. Paul. I applaud them and am proud to represent each of them here in the United States Senate.

The quality of life in Minnesota is outstanding for a reason. Ideals such as hard work, dedication, personal responsibility, and a true passion for life are all essential to my state's success. Growing up on a Minnesota dairy farm, I was fortunate enough to witness these qualities and their importance at a very young age.

And for any of my colleagues who may be wondering, you don't have to be a native to spread the "Minnesota Nice" spirit. For example, some of the most outstanding Minnesota citizens are those from its many ethnic communities. Their devotion and contribution to Minnesota's way of life is commendable, and representative of the way our state seems to bring out the very best in its people.

I am deeply proud of my state, Mr. President, and representing her and her

citizens is a great honor. So, on this 142nd anniversary of our statehood, I encourage Minnesotans to take time to discover something new about our state and ponder some of the many treasures with which we have been blessed. Visit one of our sky-tinted lakes, the Mall of America, Split Rock Lighthouse, Fort Snelling, or even the world's largest ball of twine. Take pride in our state and continue the efforts to make Minnesota an even better place to call home.●

CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, for the eighth year in a row, the Uniform Crime Report indicates that violent crime has decreased across our country. In 1999, the number of murders, rapes, aggravated assaults, robberies, and property crimes decreased eight percent in the Midwest and seven percent overall. While crime experts will argue endlessly on the reasons behind this remarkable trend, I believe that local, state, and federal law enforcement are primarily responsible for making our streets safer than a decade before.

While I am pleased with the results of this new report, it is important to remember that behind every crime statistic, there is a child, a spouse, a relative, or a friend that has been victimized. Even one crime is too many because that crime victim has been violated in a way that forever changes their life. In our country's haste to focus on what should happen to the criminal, the victim is too often overlooked. That doesn't have to be the case, and I believe that more should be done to assist crime victims in South Dakota and around the country.

As a former prosecutor, I am well aware that victimization in and of itself is terrible to cope with, let alone the anguish of a legal proceeding and restitution recovery. The voice of the victim should be heard at every step of the criminal process, and local and state programs should have adequate resources to effectively deal with crime victims.

States have taken the lead in protecting the rights of crime victims, and it is time for the federal government to follow suit. South Dakota provides a number of specific "victim rights" including the right to restitution, notices of scheduled hearings and releases, an explanation of the criminal charges and process, and the opportunity to present a written or oral victim impact statement at trial. South Dakota also has victim/witness assistants in many of the prosecutor's offices across the state who work with crime victims on a daily basis.

I am a cosponsor of the Crime Victims Assistance Act which enhances victims' rights for federal crimes and provides several grants for state and local prosecutors, judges, prison employees, and law enforcement officials

to improve their handling of crime victims as well. However, instead of passing this important piece of legislation that would have an immediate impact on state and local efforts to improve crime victims services, some in Congress prefer to focus their attention on proposals to amend the United States Constitution. I have reservations about amending the constitution while Congress has the ability to enact legislation instead to accomplish the same goal. I am more concerned that this focus on a constitutional amendment has slowed the pace of crime victim legislation over the past several years. It is critical that Congress pass and the President sign into law the Crime Victims Assistance Act this year.

In addition to the Crime Victims Assistance Act, Congress must pass this year the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA II). Since enactment of the Violence Against Women Act in 1994, the number of forcible rapes of women have declined, and the number of sexual assaults nationwide have gone down as well. South Dakota organizations have received \$6.7 million in federal funding for domestic abuse programs and \$1.6 million in federal funding for battered women's shelters.

Despite the success of the Violence Against Women Act, domestic abuse and violence against women continue to plague our communities. Consider the fact that a woman is raped every five minutes in this country and more women are injured by domestic violence each year than by automobile accidents and cancer deaths combined. Local and state officials should have access to more—not fewer—resources to address domestic violence, and it is critical that programs authorized through VAWA II receive stable levels of funding for the next five years.

Supporters of a constitutional amendment for crime victims have withdrawn their proposal from consideration on the Senate floor this year. I am hopeful that my colleagues will seize this opportunity to continue the very valuable discussion on crime victims' rights and work to pass the Crime Victims Assistance Act and VAWA II as soon as possible.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, May 10, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,664,193,479,449.87 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty-four billion, one hundred ninety-three million, four hundred seventy-nine thousand, four hundred forty-nine dollars and eighty-seven cents).

One year ago, April 26, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,571,920,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred seventy-one billion, nine hundred twenty million).

Five years ago, May 10, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,856,767,000,000 (Four trillion, eight hundred fifty-six billion, seven hundred sixty-seven million).

Ten years ago, May 10, 1990, the Federal debt stood at \$3,075,637,000,000 (Three trillion, seventy-five billion, six hundred thirty-seven million).

Fifteen years ago, May 10, 1985, the Federal debt stood at \$1,739,232,000,000 (One trillion, seven hundred thirty-nine billion, two hundred thirty-two million) which reflects a debt increase of almost \$4 trillion—\$3,924,961,479,449.87 (Three trillion, nine hundred twenty-four billion, nine hundred sixty-one million, four hundred seventy-nine thousand, four hundred forty-nine dollars and eighty-seven cents) during the past 15 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ON THE RETIREMENT OF GORDON C. KERR

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a member of my staff, an advisor, and a man I feel honored to call my friend, Gordon Kerr.

Gordon, who has served as my Chief of Staff since 1982, has retired from government service to join the National Trust for Historic Preservation as the Director of Congressional Affairs. His 17 years as my top aide made him the dean of Senate Chiefs of Staff.

Gordon has served me for these many years in a variety of ways. He has been an invaluable advisor on issues of public policy and legislative strategy, as well as on personal and political matters. He has a clear-eyed, straightforward, right-in-your-face way of evaluating issues and events, and expressing his opinion about them which makes it nearly impossible to walk a bad idea past him. At least not without his calling you on it.

And yet, the first thing that anyone who knows Gordon immediately says is, "what a wonderful human being". How does a plain-speaking, realist like Gordon, come to be so uniformly regarded with such warmth and affection? It's simple when you think about it. Gordon is so open, principled, ethical and kind-hearted in his approach to the people he comes in contact with that it is nearly impossible to take offense at his candid advice. I'm reminded of what I've read about Robert Kennedy who also was known both for his brusque, sometimes harsh candor, but also for his high principles, and thoughtful consideration of others. "My, he is unassimilated, isn't he?" poet Robert Lowell was reported to have said when he first met him.

In all, Gordon spent more than 30 years on Capitol Hill, beginning as a Legislative Assistant for former-Congressman James Scheuer of New York in 1970, joining former-Congresswoman Barbara Jordan of Texas in 1973, and then working for former-Congressman Jonathan Bingham of New York from 1973 until 1982, when he joined my staff as Chief of Staff. Gordon is a graduate of Yale University with a B.A. degree

in Political Science and he holds a Masters degree in Public Administration with Distinction from American University, awarded in 1980. He served in the United States Navy as an Intelligence Officer for three years.

In 1990, Gordon served as my campaign manager. Former Senator Eugene McCarthy, with his wonderful irreverent sense of humor, once remarked that practicing politics is a little "like being a football coach; you have to be smart enough to understand the game, but dumb enough to think it's important." Well, Gordon is a brilliant strategist, an outstanding "coach", and although his acute sense of humor would appreciate Senator McCarthy's self-deprecating quip, nonetheless he's always known the importance of the game. He's proud of the work he's done in the Senate as a public servant, and rightly so. And, he's proud of his work in the world of campaigns and politics, doing his part on that tough battleground. He was ever-conscious of the role of politics, which we sometimes tend to forget, in the accountability which is at the heart of the democratic system.

Characteristic of Gordon is his ability to see things from a new, fresh, sometimes unique angle. In a time when even the public policy debate is increasingly driven by political polls, television sound-bites, and oversimplified sloganeering, it was particularly valuable to me to have his contributions. Even when I did not ultimately adopt his viewpoint or accept his recommendation, having the benefit of Gordon's input nearly always informed my decisions.

While Gordon has been a dedicated public servant and loyal and hard-working employee, his first priority has always been his wonderful family. His love of his wife Suzy, his son Charlie and daughter Sarah were evident in his voice whenever he spoke of them and in the special sparkle in his eyes when he was with them. I know I speak not only for myself and the Levin family, but for the entire Levin staff and many in the Senate family, when I say we will miss Gordon and the Kerr family. Fortunately, in his new role at the National Trust for Historic Preservation he won't be too far away.

Mr. President, I owe Gordon Kerr a great debt for the loyal service which he has performed; and I believe that all of us here in the Senate, in my home state of Michigan, and in the nation, owe a debt of gratitude to him and the many like him who serve us here. This tribute to Gordon Kerr, in a small way, is an effort to recognize that role.●

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD KEHOE

• Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to an extraordinary Vermonter and a determined leader, Edward Kehoe. Ed Kehoe was born in Rutland, my hometown, to the late James and Grace Kehoe and graduated from Rutland High School

before serving in the U.S. Army with the 26th Infantry Regiment during World War II. As a decorated war hero, Ed Kehoe returned to Vermont to own and operate Kehoe's Diner in Hydeville.

Ed Kehoe served as the town manager of Castleton from 1955 to 1965 before being elected the Vermont House for a single term. In August 1965, Ed Kehoe was appointed to head the Fish and Game Department where he served as the Vermont fish and wildlife commissioner under four governors until he retired in August 1982. He was an avid sportsman and member of an many Vermont sportsmen organizations until his death in late April. At the time of his appointment Ed Kehoe was initially troubled by his lack of a "professional" background in biology or wildlife management. However, his experience as a hunter and angler gave him the needed edge.

Led by his ability to draw on experience and heed the advise of biologists, Ed Kehoe led the Vermont crusade to resist development pressures. During his 17-year tenure as commissioner, Ed Kehoe established two Green Mountain Conservation camps to help teach younger Vermonters how to fish and camp, helped to improve the state warden force, expanded the statewide Hunter Safety Program, and worked to restore Connecticut River salmon and wild turkeys throughout Vermont. Perhaps Ed Kehoe's greatest contribution to the state was his ability to push, acquire, and protect lands with significant wildlife and recreation value.

Ed Kehoe's most recent award speaks to his accomplishments. Last year the Rutland Herald honored his visionary concerns about nongame species and protection of important property by naming him, "Outdoorsman of the Century." John Hall, spokesman with Fish and Wildlife Department, recently alluded to Ed Kehoe's achievement, "Ed wanted to make sure we were passing on the hunting and fishing traditions to future generations of Vermonter to enjoy. He always had the everyday Vermonter in mind, the average person of average means. He was the supreme steward of fish and wildlife resources."

I pay tribute today to a man who paid tribute every day, to the values the everyday Vermonter holds dear. We have lost an extraordinary man, but his contributions to Vermont wildlife policy will live on.●

TAIWANESE AMERICAN WEEK

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, this month I join Americans throughout Wisconsin and across the nation in celebrating Taiwanese American Heritage Week, honoring the many important contributions to American society of the more than half a million Taiwanese Americans in the United States. Without the contributions of Taiwanese Americans, we would lack the important AIDS research of Dr. David Ho. We would be denied the work of Nobel Laureate chemist Dr. Lee

Yuan-Tse and that of the many American scientists he inspired. We would not be able to search for information on the internet by using Yahoo, co-founded by Jerry Yang. Thousands of Taiwanese Americans throughout the country have made important achievements in a wide range of sectors, including doctors, teachers, lawyers, and computer technology experts. They have improved the lives of their fellow American citizens, and they will play an integral role in our future.

Besides their many contributions here at home, Taiwanese Americans have also played a vital role in the political transformation of Taiwan. For many years, they organized letter-writing campaigns, planned marches and demonstrations, and talked to any U.S. policy-maker who would listen about their dreams for Taiwan's future as free and democratic. Many risked arrest in—or exile from—their homeland as a result of their activities. The tireless work of Taiwanese Americans helped ensure the success of Taiwan's democratic evolution, beginning with the lifting of martial law in 1987 and culminating with the first fully democratic presidential election in 1996. These are achievements that all Americans can celebrate. I join Taiwanese Americans in congratulating the winners of the March presidential elections in Taiwan.

Mr. President, Taiwanese American Heritage Week recognizes the long-standing friendship between the people of the United States and Taiwan, and celebrates our shared values. I commend the great accomplishments and contributions of the Taiwanese American community.●

BE KIND TO ANIMALS WEEK

● Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of "Be Kind to Animals Week." This week is a time to draw attention to how important animals are to our lives and to make sure they receive the treatment and protection they deserve.

The American Humane Association was founded in 1877 with a goal to unite a few groups to give a national voice to those who could not speak for themselves: animals. The Association established Be Kind to Animals Week in 1915, the first national week specifically for animals and now the oldest week of its kind in existence in this country.

This is the 85th year "Be Kind to Animals Week" will be celebrated. The leader of the American Humane Association in 1915 was Dr. William O. Stillman, who foresaw this week continuing on "as annual events to stimulate and revive human thought."

The three main goals of the first Be Kind to Animals Week were to encourage the clergy to spread the message about kindness to animals by observing Humane Sunday, to visit schools and teach children the message of being humane, and to publicize the good works

of our nation's humane societies. These noble goals continue on today through the American Humane Association.

Mr. President, I would like to recognize the many Humane Societies in my home state of Minnesota. These organizations are on the front lines of standing up for and protecting animals across Minnesota. By visiting a local animal shelter, I know many citizens have benefited not only the lives of countless animals through adoption, but surely their own lives in the process. The staffs and volunteers of Minnesota Humane Societies continue to make this possible for all citizens—and their efforts to teach people the importance of spay-neuter programs have also been extremely helpful.

Animals certainly have a tremendous effect on our lives. Domesticated animals are considered family members to many of us. Farm animals provide nourishment to families here at home and around the world. And wild animals provide a balance to our overall ecosystem.

I am sure Dr. Stillman would be extremely pleased to see his plan of having an annual week to remember the important role of animals continuing on in its 85th year. I want to urge everyone to use this week to take a minute and reflect on what animals mean to our lives, and how we can continue to give animals the protection and care they deserve every day.●

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD BUNKER

● Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a distinguished Nevadan, a good man, and a good friend, Mr. Richard Bunker. Richard will be receiving the National Jewish Medical and Research Center's Humanitarian Award on June 3, 2000. The Humanitarian Award recognizes individuals who have made significant civic and charitable contributions, and whose concern is not personal, but for the greater community. There is no one more deserving of this honor than Richard Bunker.

Richard's legacy of service to the state of Nevada is long and remarkable. He has served as Assistant City Manager of Las Vegas and Clark County Manager, before being appointed Chairman of the prestigious State Gaming Control Board, and is now a member of the Colorado River Commission while being a member of the Board of Trustees for the Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union Welfare/Pension Funds. I was Chairman of the Gaming Commission when Richard was Chairman of the Gaming Control Board. We were partners then and still are.

As Chairman of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, Richard is Nevada's ambassador on the Colorado River. With shrewdness and finesse, he has developed positive relations with officials of the Colorado River basin states. His political skill has firmly re-established Nevada as a player on the important issues of the Colorado River

community. He also made the critically needed expansion of Southern Nevada water facilities a reality when he brokered a financial plan with the business, developer, and gaming communities.

Over the years, Richard Bunker has also been recognized by a variety of distinguished organizations. In 1993, he received the prestigious Distinguished Nevadan of the Year award from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The Anti-Defamation League honored Richard with the Distinguished Community Service Award in 1996. In June 1999, he was presented with the Lifetime Achievement Award by the Nevada Gaming Attorneys and the Clark County Bar Association.

For those of us who have had the pleasure to work closely with Richard, as I have, the above awards pale in comparison to his true grit. He is knowledgeable of the system of government and totally aware of the magic of our system of free enterprise. For the growth and development of southern Nevada, no one for the past twenty-five years has played a more key role than Richard Bunker.

On a more personal note, Richard has played an important part in my political endeavors. He has been an advisor, counselor, and sounding board. Above all else, he is a good listener, for this Richard, I am grateful.

I extend to you my congratulations and the appreciation of all Nevadans for your good work on their behalf.●

A TRIBUTE TO GENERAL WESLEY CLARK

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, last week, in a EUCOM change of command ceremony, General Wesley Clark relinquished his position as Supreme Allied Commander Europe, concluding one of his generation's most illustrious and eventful military careers. As he testifies before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence today, I want to highlight the contributions of General Clark to the national security of the United States and to its friends and allies in Europe and around the globe, and thank him for his service to NATO as Supreme Allied Commander Europe.

As NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson put it: Wes Clark has been the right man, in the right place, at the right time. He has been instrumental in bringing a degree of stability to Bosnia-Herzegovina, so that efforts at reconstruction and reconciliation could proceed. General Clark welcomed three new members to the Alliance and has worked tirelessly to integrate them fully—militarily and politically—into the activities and decision-making processes of the Alliance. The General has worked to turn the Partnerships for Peace into stepping stones rather than alternatives to Alliance membership, and he has kept the door open to new entrants, while setting forth high military standards for full integration.

But nowhere have General Clark's political and leadership qualities been

more evident than during NATO's Kosovo campaign. Having been a key participant in diplomatic efforts seeking a solution to Yugoslavia's ethnic turmoil and disintegration, General Clark changed hats without missing a beat and assumed command of the Alliance strategy to complement diplomacy with military power. General Clark's steadfast pursuit of military victory coupled with the maintenance of political cohesion in Alliance planning cells at NATO Headquarters brought the Western coalition to one of its finest hours in its 50-year history.

Equally important, General Clark recognized that military success could not produce peace, prosperity and stability on the ground without an effective civil implementation program that allowed the peoples of the Balkans the tools to address their historical grievances toward one another. He knew that the political unity he helped to forge as a prerequisite to military success must now be sustained and strengthened if the civilianization process is to succeed.

Secretary of Defense Cohen put it well at the EUCOM Change of Command ceremony last week in Europe. He said:

In General Wes Clark, America found a scholar, a soldier and a statesman: a scholar of unquestioned courage, a bronze and silver star hero who, despite grievous wounds, inspired his unit to survive in the jungles of Vietnam; a soldier of insight who returned to train those who prevailed in Desert Storm. He is a statesman whose influence has been felt from the Americas where he helped to guide the fight against drug barons to Dayton where his counsel helped end the blood-letting in Bosnia.

Those sentiments are shared by those of us in the Senate who have benefitted from General Clark's wise counsel over the years. He was never too busy for one more briefing at NATO Headquarters or in the field. When the relevant committees held their hearings, General Clark was on the plane so that he might address Congressional concerns across the table, not across the ocean.

Members of both branches of government are now in the process of assimilating the "lessons learned" from the Kosovo campaign. General Clark has recently completed his own "after action" report. But for the United States, there is one incontrovertible lesson to be learned: If the history of the last year or so in the Balkans were to repeat itself, the United States and the Alliance would be well served by having Wes Clark again at the helm of a coalition of nations intent on defending their common interests.●

RETIREMENT OF DON GUNDERSON

● Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, on May 21, students and former students, their parents, teachers and administrators of Los Altos High School, will come together in Southern California to show their appreciation, and express their thanks and best wishes to Don

Gunderson, who is retiring this year after 41 years as a music educator.

Don Gunderson began his teaching career at the halfway point of President Dwight Eisenhower's second term, working with his mentor in Washington state, teaching instrumental music in the junior high, as well as music to elementary schoolers. Three years later, in 1961, Mr. Gunderson came to Anaheim, California to be the band, orchestra and choir director at Crescent Junior High School, which was still in construction when he was hired. Five years later, he began a very distinguished eleven-year career as the band and orchestra director at Savannah High School in Anaheim. In 1978, Mr. Gunderson rose to the college ranks, serving as head of the jazz and student teacher programs at California State University at Fullerton.

Three years later, in 1981, Don Gunderson decided to return to high school instruction at Los Altos High School, in Hacienda Heights. At that time, Los Altos was one of the largest musical programs in Southern California, with a strong reputation in marching band competitions. For the next nineteen years, Los Altos High School would become more than just the home of one of Southern California's largest marching bands—it would be the site of one of our nation's internationally recognized music education programs. The Los Altos Entertainment Unit has performed at the Fiesta Bowl pageant twice and marched in the Tournament of Roses Parade four times. They've been here in Washington, where they performed at the White House, and traveled for performances in Florida and the Bahamas.

Don Gunderson began building the music program's international credentials in 1982, when he led the Los Altos Entertainment Unit on a two week tour of England and Scotland. Knowing that very few, if any Americans, knew of Hacienda Heights, Mr. Gunderson was prepared when inquiring Brits asked where in the world is Hacienda Heights: "We're not far from Disneyland" was his reply. It's safe to say that after that 1982 trip, along with a return visit ten years later as guests of the British Military as part of the prestigious Royal Tournament, the people of Britain know how to find Hacienda Heights on a map. The same can be said for music-lovers that had the good fortune to see and hear Los Altos perform in Germany, Italy, Austria, and Switzerland. The Los Altos Entertainment Unit has been the recipient of countless awards and achievements. Los Altos was designated the Official Youth Band of the 1984 Summer Olympics, and was crowned three times as marching band champions at the Southern California Tournament of Champions. And that's just the marching band, color guard and dance team. Don Gunderson brought to Los Altos a commitment to a total music program, and strived to establish the same standard of excellence to the orchestral and jazz programs.

Perhaps just as significant are the signs of recognition and respect given to this program in ways other than award ceremonies. Go to a Friday night football game at Los Altos and you're sure to find a few young people from other high schools in Southern California in the stands not to see the football team, but to watch and hear the Entertainment Unit. Those same football games certainly sparked the imaginations of young elementary and junior high school students, who would come home interested in learning music and being a part of the Entertainment Unit. Come to the football field on a night when the Entertainment Unit is rehearsing and you're sure to find parents, students, teachers, former students, and even students from other high schools in the stands. Trace the career paths of those who learned from Don Gunderson and yes, you'll find those who have gone on to rewarding careers in music and music education. However, there are many more alumni of the Los Altos Entertainment Unit that pursued other careers, but they carry with them lessons learned from Don Gunderson on football fields, concert halls, or the band room that go beyond musical notes on a page—lessons in teamwork, preparation, determination, and excellence.

Mr. President, those who have learned and applied these and countless other lessons from Don Gunderson will have an opportunity to say thanks in a few short weeks. Let me join them in expressing my admiration to a man who has brought the joy of music to thousands of students and parents, and to countless more around the world who have heard the stirring opening fanfare, "Conquistadores." Perhaps more important, let me express my own thanks to Don Gunderson for the honor and inspiration he has brought to the teaching profession for more than forty years. To borrow from the Los Altos motto, Don Gunderson has engaged and conquered.

I wish Don Gunderson, his wife Judy and his family, all the very best.●

REAR ADMIRAL STEPHEN TODD FISHER

● Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to honor Rear Admiral (Upper Half) Stephen Todd Fisher as he retires from the United States Navy after more than thirty-four years of active duty service. For the last five years, Rear Admiral Fisher has been the Deputy Surgeon General of the Navy—the first non-physician officer to serve in that position.

In addition, Rear Admiral Fisher was the first Medical Service Corps officer to be selected by a board to the rank of two-star Admiral within the Department of Defense. He served as the Director of the Medical Service Corps from 1993–1995. RADM Fisher's assignments included tours on the U.S.S. *Repose* (AH 16); Headquarters, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific; various Navy

Hospitals and Clinics; the Naval School of Health Sciences; the office of the Chief of Naval Operations; and the Headquarters for Navy Medicine. He is also the recipient of the 2000 American Hospital Association award for Excellence in Federal Service.

Rear Admiral Fisher's leadership as the Executive Agent for the Department of Defense Clinical Business Area led to the development of a computerized patient record which will be tested and evaluated this summer for government-wide adoption. This accomplishment has been highly praised by the National Library of Medicine Board of Regents and completes the planning segment of the Composite Health Care System II program. As Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Government Computerized Patient Record, Rear Admiral Fisher coordinated linkage between the Department of Veteran's Health Administration, the Department of Defense, and the Indian Health Services. A prototype of the Computerized Patient Record has been developed and will be alpha tested in Alaska in 2001. Under his leadership, the Composite Health Care System II Program Office was selected for the Government Technology Leadership Award and the Smithsonian Technology Award in recognition of its visionary use of information technology.

As a principal member of the Military Health System Information Management Proponent Committee, Rear Admiral Fisher worked closely with the Deputy Surgeons General of the Air Force and Army, and the Executive Director of the Defense Medical Information Management System orchestrating the development, prioritization, and achievement of information management goals for medical readiness and peacetime health care programs for the Department of Defense. His contributions are far-reaching and will positively impact military health care for years to come.

Mr. President, Rear Admiral Fisher's many meritorious awards and decorations demonstrate his contributions in a tangible way, but it is the legacy he leaves behind for the Navy Medical Service Corps, the United States Navy, and the Department of Defense for which we are most appreciative. It is with pride that I congratulate Rear Admiral Fisher on his outstanding career of exemplary service.●

IN MEMORY OF JO-ANN MOLNAR

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to share just a few words about a good friend we recently lost, someone I have known since I first ran for Lieutenant Governor in Massachusetts in 1982, a good hearted and selfless individual who was always an inspiration, Jo-Ann Molnar. Jo-Ann recently passed away after bravely battling cancer, and I know that I am not alone in saying that as someone whose life was touched by Jo-Ann Molnar's service, activism, and warmth, there is today a deep and

profound sense of loss. In Jo-Ann many of us have lost—and today I would like to honor—a committed activist, a person of enormous courage and character and, most simply, a great friend.

I first met Jo-Ann Molnar when I was running for Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, and Jo-Ann approached me at one of our earliest events and offered to help in any way she could. It was on that race in the middle of a difficult and heated campaign that Jo-Ann first demonstrated to me not just that she was an indefatigable volunteer, but that she was one of those individuals who—through her commitment to do what is right, through her belief in politics not as sport but as a fight for principle—could reaffirm precisely why politics matters and why public service is worthwhile.

Jo-Ann and I remained close ever since that first campaign, and I looked forward to and always appreciated Jo-Ann's warm cards and greetings. Always a loyal friend, Jo-Ann would share with me her thoughts on issues of importance, keep me abreast of her accomplishments, and offer me words of encouragement as I worked to find my way in the United States Senate.

It was through her frequent cards and letters—and the occasional happy meeting either in Massachusetts or at political gatherings around the Maryland area—that I learned of the many ways in which Jo-Ann continued to dedicate herself to public service. Her determination to make a difference led her to remarkable achievements. In 1977, Jo-Ann graduated magna cum laude from Fairleigh Dickinson University, with a degree in history and political science. She went on to earn a master's degree in political science from American University. Jo-Ann selflessly offered her leadership to her fellow Democrats, serving admirably as President of the Montgomery County, Maryland Young Democrats, as Vice Chair of the Handicapped Commission in Montgomery County, and on the Board of Directors of the Montgomery County public libraries. In addition to her help with my campaigns, Jo-Ann served as a legislative intern to U.S. Senator Donald Reigle, U.S. Representative Gene Andrew Maguire, and Montgomery County Council member Michael L. Gudis. She also worked as a Congressional Liaison Assistant for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. For almost a decade, Jo-Ann served as a legal researcher for the Human Relations Commission. She gave of herself as a Sunday School teacher and a confirmation teacher at the Foundary United Methodist Church in Washington, D.C., as well as an instructor at Colesville United Methodist Church in Silver Spring, Maryland.

Mr. President, Jo-Ann lived a life true to her ideals of service—service to community, service to faith. I would add, though, that none of these achievements would have been possible if Jo-Ann had not worked so hard to overcome cerebral palsy. Jo-Ann refused to be slowed by her disability—

and in fact rejected the notion that she should in any way lower her expectations for herself or expect different expectations from those to whom she so selflessly offered her best efforts. Jo-Ann was a fighter, and I continually marveled at her drive to rise above what some would view as limitations.

For that reason, Jo-Ann served as one of the best possible advocates and activists for the Americans with Disabilities Act. Honored as a teenager for her activism on the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Jo-Ann kept pushing as an adult to break down barriers in our society that she believed kept disabled Americans from maximizing their contributions to their communities and our nation. Jo-Ann was not just an advocate for legislation to protect and empower disabled Americans—she was the living embodiment of those efforts.

Mr. President, it is difficult to accept that we have all lost a friend in Jo-Ann Molnar, but it is particularly difficult, I know, for Jo-Ann's family—her mother, Helen, and her two sisters, Dorothy and Ilona. They are in our thoughts and prayers.

I was comforted, though, to learn that Jo-Ann was able to enjoy life as she had always done, up until her last days. Jo-Ann's mother, Helen, let me know that she had a wonderful Christmas with her family and was able to attend a New Millennium New Year's Eve celebration, complete with the 60's rock music she loved. Just as she did throughout her life, even in her most difficult days, Jo-Ann kept on doing the things that she loved—and she moved forward in so many remarkable efforts driven by a real sense of social conscience.

Mr. President, today I remember Jo-Ann for her service, her friendship, and her kindness. All of us who knew her continue to draw strength from her courage and her faith, and Jo-Ann's life continues to inspire.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3709. An act to make permanent the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act as it applies to new, multiple, and discriminatory taxes on the Internet.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 2:24 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2412. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 South Harrison Street in Fort Wayne, Indiana, as the "E. Ross Adair Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

At 5:18 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 701. An act to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, and for other purposes.

MEASURE REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 701. An act to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 4386. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance for certain women screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer under a federally funded screening program, to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to surveillance and information concerning the relationship between cervical cancer and the human papillomavirus (HPV), and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BURNS, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Report to accompany the bill (S. 2521) making appropriations for military con-

struction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purpose (Rept No. 106-290).

By Mr. MCCONNELL, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Report to accompany the bill (S. 2522) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purpose (Rept. No. 106-291).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of committee were submitted:

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Donald W. Horton, of Maryland, to be United States Marshal for the District of Columbia for the term of four years.

E. Douglas Hamilton, of Kentucky, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Kentucky for the term of four years.

Phyllis J. Hamilton, of California, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri for the term of four years.

Donnie R. Marshall, of Texas, to be Administrator of Drug Enforcement.

Nicholas G. Garauffis, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Gerard E. Lynch, of New York, to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Steven S. Reed, of Kentucky, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Kentucky for the term of four years.

Roger L. Hunt, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

Kent J. Dawson, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

Jose Antonio Perez, of California, to be United States Marshal for the Central District of California for the term of four years.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-8926. A communication from the Auditor of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Suggested Changes to the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor's Statutory Audit Requirements"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-8927. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Imported Fire Ant; Quarantined Areas" (Docket # 00-007-1), received May 9, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-8928. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Imported

Fire Ant; Quarantined Areas and Treatment Dosage" (Docket # 99-078-2), received May 9, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-8929. A communication from the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of Pay-As-You-Go Calculations, Report Number 505, dated May 2, 2000; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-8930. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Acquisition Regulation: To Amend the EPA Acquisition Regulation Clause 1552.216-70, Award Fee" (FRL # 6606-6), received May 9, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-8931. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Antelope Valley Air Pollution Control District" (FRL # 6606-3), received May 9, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-8932. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revision to the California State Implementation Plan, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District" (FRL # 6602-7), received May 9, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-8933. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "36 CFR Part 51 Concession Contracts, Final Rule", received May 4, 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 2542. A bill to protect individuals, families, and ISPs from unsolicited and unwanted e-mail; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2543. To amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to include airplane and rail accidents within the meaning of the term "major disaster"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 2544. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide compensation and benefits to children of female Vietnam veterans who were born with certain birth defects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. KERREY):

S. 2545. A bill to provide for the enhancement of study, research, and other activities in the United States relating to information

technology and information protection technology; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOND (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ASHCROFT, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

S. 2546. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the use of methyl tertiary butyl ether, to provide flexibility within the oxygenate requirement of the reformulated gasoline program of the Environmental Protection Agency, to promote the use of renewable ethanol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL):

S. 2547. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Sand Dunes National Park and the Great Sand Dunes national Preserve in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 2548. A bill to provide that extension of nondiscriminatory trade treatment to the People's Republic of China be contingent on the United States and People's Republic of China entering into a bilateral agreement relating to enforcement; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. Res. 305. A resolution commending participant in the Million Mom March; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. Res. 306. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to Mother's Day that the United States Senate should reject the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) as it demeans motherhood and undermines the traditional family; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. Res. 307. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to Mother's Day that the United States Senate should reject the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) as it demeans motherhood and undermines the traditional family.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. Con. Res. 112. A concurrent resolution to make technical corrections in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 434.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2543. A bill to amend the Robert R. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to include airplane and rail accidents within the meaning of the term "major disaster"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

AMENDMENT TO STAFFORD ACT TO COVER AIRLINE AND RAIL ACCIDENTS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act. Senator Stafford, my Vermont colleague

whose seat in this body I am honored to hold today, authored the legislation creating FEMA more than 25 years ago. Thanks to his foresight and leadership in this area, the federal government has helped thousands of ordinary citizens recover from disasters and other incidents beyond their control.

Today we have a chance to build on the legacy of Senator Stafford by adding airline and rail accidents to the list of "major disasters" defined in the act that governs the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

While extremely rare occurrences, major airline and rail disasters place an incredible burden on the states and municipalities in which they occur. Due in part to the extraordinary level of national attention these accidents receive, states and municipalities face millions of dollars in unexpected and unbudgeted expenditures that often cripple local finances. Fees associated with initial response, security, and other health and safety measures often cost several million dollars.

This legislation standardizes procedure for federal reimbursement of affected communities. While the federal government has regularly reimbursed states and municipalities during the 1990s for their role in these most national of disasters, the process is an ad hoc one. This body has considered and approved at least three special line item appropriations for areas affected by the recent ValueJet, TWA, and COMAIR accidents. A bill to reimburse Rhode Island for its costs associated with last fall's Egypt Air disaster is currently working its way through the Congress as part of the appropriation for the National Transportation Safety Board.

This process causes needless headache and anxiety for local communities, as well as unnecessary chores for the NTSB and Congress. It forces states and municipalities to wait as reimbursement requests find their way through the complicated appropriations process while creating more work for our overburdened appropriators.

The numbers speak for themselves. States and local communities spend millions of dollars to respond to these accidents. While they are ultimately reimbursed by the federal government, the uncertainty and slow pace of the process often places affected communities in a financial bind. Money that could be spent on education, health care, or public safety is lost in an unnecessary limbo.

Under this bill, airline and rail accidents will be treated like any other disaster under the Stafford Act. Like an earthquake, blizzard or any other disaster, FEMA, upon the request of a governor, will examine the scene of such an accident and advise the President on whether federal reimbursement is appropriate.

Mr. President, this bill simply standardizes procedure for a commitment already made by the federal government. It requires to new costs or expenses

and actually saves money by streamlining a bureaucratic and complicated process. The International Association of Emergency Managers and the NTSB supports this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join these groups in supporting this bill that will bring standardization to an ad hoc process that has the potential to cause so much harm to our states and communities.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 2544. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide compensation and benefits to children of female Vietnam veterans who were born with certain birth defects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CHILDREN OF WOMEN VIETNAM VETERANS' BENEFITS ACT OF 2000

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator MURRAY, I wish to introduce a bill, the Children of Women Vietnam Veterans' Benefits Act of 2000, which would amend title 38, United States Code, to provide compensation and benefits to children born with certain birth defects to women Vietnam veterans.

This bill is essentially similar, except for minor technical corrections, to S. 2494, the Children of Female Vietnam Veterans' Benefits Act of 2000, which I introduced on May 2, 2000. Mrs. MURRAY had asked to be an original cosponsor of that bill, but through an inadvertent clerical error, she was not listed as an original cosponsor on the bill when it was printed. I wish to note, for the record, that it was her intent to be an original cosponsor of S. 2494.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2544

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Children of Women Vietnam Veterans' Benefits Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. BENEFITS FOR THE CHILDREN OF FEMALE VIETNAM VETERANS WHO SUFFER FROM CERTAIN BIRTH DEFECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 18 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER II—CHILDREN OF FEMALE VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH CERTAIN BIRTH DEFECTS

"§ 1811. Definitions

"In this subchapter:

"(1) The term 'child', with respect to a female Vietnam veteran, means a natural child of the female Vietnam veteran, regardless of age or marital status, who was conceived after the date on which the female Vietnam veteran first entered the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era (as specified in section 101(29)(A) of this title).

"(2) The term 'covered birth defect' means each birth defect identified by the Secretary under section 1812 of this title.

"(3) The term 'female Vietnam veteran' means any female individual who performed active military, naval, or air service in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era (as so specified), without regard to the characterization of the individual's service.

"§ 1812. Birth defects covered

"(a) IDENTIFICATION.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary shall identify the birth defects of children of female Vietnam veterans that—

"(1) are associated with the service of female Vietnam veterans in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era (as specified in section 101(29)(A) of this title); and

"(2) result in the permanent physical or mental disability of such children.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—(1) The birth defects identified under subsection (a) may not include birth defects resulting from the following:

"(A) A familial disorder.

"(B) A birth-related injury.

"(C) A fetal or neonatal infirmity with well-established causes.

"(2) The birth defects identified under subsection (a) may not include spina bifida.

"(c) LIST.—The Secretary shall prescribe in regulations a list of the birth defects identified under subsection (a).

"§ 1813. Benefits and assistance

"(a) HEALTH CARE.—(1) The Secretary shall provide a child of a female Vietnam veteran who was born with a covered birth defect such health care as the Secretary determines is needed by the child for such birth defect or any disability that is associated with such birth defect.

"(2) The Secretary may provide health care under this subsection directly or by contract or other arrangement with a health care provider.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, the definitions in section 1803(c) of this title shall apply with respect to the provision of health care under this subsection, except that for such purposes—

"(A) the reference to 'specialized spina bifida clinic' in paragraph (2) of such section 1803(c) shall be treated as a reference to a specialized clinic treating the birth defect concerned under this subsection; and

"(B) the reference to 'vocational training under section 1804 of this title' in paragraph (8) of such section 1803(c) shall be treated as a reference to vocational training under subsection (b).

"(b) VOCATIONAL TRAINING.—(1) The Secretary may provide a program of vocational training to a child of a female Vietnam veteran who was born with a covered birth defect if the Secretary determines that the achievement of a vocational goal by the child is reasonably feasible.

"(2) Subsections (b) through (e) of section 1804 of this title shall apply with respect to any program of vocational training provided under paragraph (1).

"(c) MONETARY ALLOWANCE.—(1) The Secretary shall pay a monthly allowance to any child of a female Vietnam veteran who was born with a covered birth defect for any disability resulting from such birth defect.

"(2) The amount of the monthly allowance paid under this subsection shall be based on the degree of disability suffered by the child concerned, as determined in accordance with a schedule for rating disabilities resulting from covered birth defects that is prescribed by the Secretary.

"(3) In prescribing a schedule for rating disabilities under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall establish four levels of disability upon which the amount of the monthly allowance under this subsection shall be based.

"(4) The amount of the monthly allowance paid under this subsection shall be as follows:

"(A) In the case of a child suffering from the lowest level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, \$100.

"(B) In the case of a child suffering from the lower intermediate level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, the greater of—

"(i) \$214; or

"(ii) the monthly amount payable under section 1805(b)(3) of this title for the lowest level of disability prescribed for purposes of that section.

"(C) In the case of a child suffering from the higher intermediate level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, the greater of—

"(i) \$743; or

"(ii) the monthly amount payable under section 1805(b)(3) of this title for the intermediate level of disability prescribed for purposes of that section.

"(D) In the case of a child suffering from the highest level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, the greater of—

"(i) \$1,272; or

"(ii) the monthly amount payable under section 1805(b)(3) of this title for the highest level of disability prescribed for purposes of that section.

"(5) Amounts under subparagraphs (A), (B)(i), (C)(i), and (D)(i) of paragraph (4) shall be subject to adjustment from time to time under section 5312 of this title.

"(6) Subsections (c) and (d) of section 1805 of this title shall apply with respect to any monthly allowance paid under this subsection.

"(d) GENERAL LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF BENEFITS AND ASSISTANCE.—(1) No individual receiving benefits or assistance under this section may receive any benefits or assistance under subchapter I of this chapter.

"(2) In any case where affirmative evidence establishes that the covered birth defect of a child results from a cause other than the active military, naval, or air service in the Republic of Vietnam of the female Vietnam veteran who is the mother of the child, no benefits or assistance may be provided the child under this section.

"(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of the administration of the provisions of this section."

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—That chapter is further amended by inserting after subchapter II, as added by subsection (a) of this section, the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER III—ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

"§ 1821. Applicability of certain administrative provisions

"The provisions of sections 5101(c), 5110(a), (b)(2), (g), and (i), 5111, and 5112(a), (b)(1), (b)(6), (b)(9), and (b)(10) of this title shall apply with respect to benefits and assistance under this chapter in the same manner as such provisions apply to veterans' disability compensation.

"§ 1822. Treatment of receipt of monetary allowance on other benefits

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, receipt by an individual of a monetary allowance under this chapter shall not impair, infringe, or otherwise affect the right of the individual to receive any other benefit to which the individual is otherwise entitled under any law administered by the Secretary.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, receipt by an individual of a monetary allowance under this chapter shall not impair, infringe, or otherwise affect the right of any other individual to receive any

benefit to which such other individual is entitled under any law administered by the Secretary based on the relationship of such other individual to the individual who receives such monetary allowance.

“(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a monetary allowance paid an individual under this chapter shall not be considered as income or resources in determining eligibility for or the amount of benefits under any Federal or Federally-assisted program.”

(c) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED MATTER.—Section 1806 of title 38, United States Code, is repealed.

(d) REDESIGNATION OF EXISTING MATTER.—Chapter 18 of that title is further amended by inserting before section 1801 the following:

“SUBCHAPTER I—CHILDREN OF VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH SPINA BIFIDA”.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Sections 1801 and 1802 of that title are each amended by striking “this chapter” and inserting “this subchapter”.

(2) Section 1805(a) of that title is amended by striking “this chapter” and inserting “this section”.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1)(A) The chapter heading of chapter 18 of that title is amended to read as follows:

“CHAPTER 18—BENEFITS FOR CHILDREN OF VIETNAM VETERANS”.

(B) The tables of chapters at beginning of that title, and at the beginning of part II of that title, are each amended by striking the item relating to chapter 18 and inserting the following new item:

“18. Benefits for Children of Vietnam Veterans 1801”.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 18 of that title is amended—

(A) by inserting after the chapter heading the following:

“SUBCHAPTER I—CHILDREN OF VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH SPINA BIFIDA”;

(B) by striking the item relating to section 1806; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—CHILDREN OF FEMALE VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH CERTAIN BIRTH DEFECTS

“1811. Definitions.

“1812. Birth defects covered.

“1813. Benefits and assistance.

“SUBCHAPTER III—ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

“1821. Applicability of certain administrative provisions.

“1822. Treatment of receipt of monetary allowance on other benefits.”

(f) APPLICABILITY.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first month beginning more than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall identify birth defects under section 1822 of title 38, United States Code (as added by subsection (a) of this section), and shall prescribe the regulations required by subchapter II of that title (as so added), not later than the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(3) No benefit or assistance may be provided under subchapter II of chapter 18 of title 38, United States Code (as so added), for any period before the effective date specified in paragraph (1) by reason of the amendments made by this section.●

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. KERREY):

S. 2545. A bill to provide for the enhancement to study, research, and other activities in the United States relating to information technology and information protection technology; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

BARRY GOLDWATER SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ENHANCEMENT ACT

● Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to increase the Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation from the current \$61 million to \$81 million. I am pleased to have the support and able assistance of the Senior Senator from Nebraska, Senator J. ROBERT KERREY in joining me to introduce this bill. This increase allows the Foundation to add another 100 young people to the 300 that they now support. This substantial increase will augment the influence the Foundation already has on American higher education.

Goldwater scholarships are awarded to college juniors and seniors in math and science. The increased funding in this legislation is set aside for information technology students. Channeling these funds through the existing Goldwater framework will maximize the amount of money directly available to students. These students are selected on the basis of academic merit from a field of approximately 1,200 mathematics, science and engineering students nominated by the faculties of colleges and universities from the fifty states and Puerto Rico. Since 1988, 2,711 scholarships have been awarded, providing about \$28 million to outstanding scholars from colleges and universities throughout the United States.

Goldwater Scholars are top notch. As evidence, I cite the large number of Goldwater Scholars who have been awarded prestigious graduate scholarships. Goldwater Scholars have won a total of 25 Rhodes Scholarships over the years. Last year alone, almost 20 percent of the awards—six out of 32—were Goldwater Scholars. Goldwater Scholars also populate the ranks of other distinguished fellowships. In the last eleven years, the scholars have won 19 Marshall, six Churchill, nine Fulbright, 23 Hughes, and 65 National Science Foundation fellowships.

These are the students we need in our economy. For the U.S. to continue to be competitive and support our growing economy, we must encourage our young men and women to enter the high technology industry. America's explosive demand for highly skilled workers is creating a new labor shortage. Under current conditions, we do not have enough U.S. workers trained in high technology fields. This forces our local businesses to resort to immigration to make up for this shortfall. Highly skilled immigrants enter the country under the H1-B visa waiver program. To help meet the growing demand, Congress raised the cap on H1-B visas from 65,000 to 115,000 in FY 1999 and 2000, and 107,500 in 2001. Unfortu-

nately, even this increase is not enough. A tight labor market, increasing globalization and burgeoning economic growth continue to increase U.S. demands for highly skilled workers. The 1999 cap on H-1B visas was reached in June of last year and it is projected we will reach the cap even earlier this year. Later this month, we expect the Senate to consider another increase of H1-B visas to raise the cap to 195,000 a year for FY 2000, 2001 and 2002.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I firmly believe that we have the responsibility to adequately train our own labor force to meet the business and industry demands of today and tomorrow. We simply cannot rely on workers from other countries to do our sensitive technology work. As we saw in the Y2K reprogram with our great dependence on foreign security workers, we are sorely in need of a domestic technology workforce.

Mr. President, I strongly encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this effort to expand the Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation and renew our commitment to educating young people in the fields of math and science. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2545

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

SECTION 1. SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS UNDER BARRY GOLDWATER SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR STUDY RELATING TO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND INFORMATION PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) AVAILABILITY.—Section 1405(a) of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Act (title XIV of Public Law 99-661; 20 U.S.C. 4704(a)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of paragraph (1), by striking “science and mathematics” and inserting “science, mathematics, and information technology and information protection technology”; and

(2) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by striking “mathematics and the natural sciences” and inserting “mathematics, the natural sciences, and information technology and information protection technology”.

(b) FUNDING.—(1) There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2001, \$20,000,000 for deposit in the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Fund established by section 1408(a) of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Act (20 U.S.C. 4707(a)).

(2) Amounts deposited under paragraph (1) in the Fund referred to in that paragraph shall be available for purposes of providing scholarships and fellowships under section 1405(a) of that Act, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, for persons pursuing study in the field of information technology and information protection technology.●

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, in today's information age, the threat of electronic attack is more likely than a

nuclear attack. Words such as “cyber-terrorism” and “hackers” have crept into everyday talk, no longer confined to the world of computer nerds and geeks. Despite being one of the most technologically-advanced countries in the world, United States technology is not capable of keeping intruders out and secrets in. Flaws have been found in the computer systems of the Pentagon, IRS, bank networks, utility companies, and telecommunications providers, among others, making all of them vulnerable to attack.

The question, then, is what can we do as a country to protect both the government and industries from electronic attack? I believe we need to start early to equip more people with technological skills needed to build and maintain secure information technology networks. Today, along with my good friend Senator ROBERTS from Kansas, I am pleased to be introducing legislation that will do just that.

The vehicle we use to achieve this is the highly reputable Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation, which currently awards scholarships to college juniors and seniors studying math and science. I doubt any of my colleagues would dispute the vast success of the Goldwater foundation. Nearly 20 percent of last year’s Rhodes Scholars were Goldwater Scholars first; and in the last eleven years, Goldwater Scholars have won 19 Marshall, 6 Churchill, 9 Fulbright, 23 Hughes, 65 NSF and numerous other fellowships.

Our bill is simple: We increase funding for the Goldwater foundation by 20 million dollars, taking it from 61 to 81 million dollars. That money will go for scholarships to a new category of students, those studying “information protection technology”. By training these young people, we can set up our technological infrastructure so it becomes safe from intruders.

Let me paint you a picture. Fifty years ago we suffered a devastating attack on Pearl Harbor. The siege lasted five hours. 2403 lives were lost, as were twenty ships and 188 aircraft. That attack catapulted the United States into World War II. As a country, however, we emerged from the war more powerful than we had been entering it. Along with the Soviet Union, the U.S. was deemed a “superpower,” and we have yet to give up that title.

A devastating attack today would take a much different form and have much more catastrophic consequences. We are not likely to be attacked by airplanes and ships. Rather, it is far more likely that we will be attacked through our technology systems. The attack can occur in as little as ten seconds, and the effects can devastate our whole industrial and governmental infrastructure. A cyber-terrorist can wipe out all financial records, plunge aircraft from the air with no warning, corrupt our entire national defense system, and render telecommunications useless. And it can happen in just sec-

onds, virtually undetected. And we were worried about Y2K.

If this scenario frightens you, good. These threats are very real, and with our growing dependence on informational systems, as a country we become more vulnerable every day. One needs to look no further than the now infamous “I love you” computer virus that swept this world last week to get a glimpse at how quickly this can occur, and how devastating such an attack can be.

The Pentagon, other government agencies, and many industries have set up departments to handle cyber-security, but we need to do everything we can to ensure that these departments can be staffed by knowledgeable information-protection experts. Without skilled staff, these departments are useless. The Information Protection Technology Scholarships will help ensure that the students in college have the opportunity to learn as much as possible about protecting technology. In turn, these students will repay the nation by putting their skills to work to make our technological infrastructure more secure. Twenty million dollars is not much to ask for to protect the entire United States from the possibility of wide-ranging cyber-terrorism.

One final note. With such a shortage of qualified American workers, America’s high tech industry is hiring people from other countries to come to the United States and fill these jobs. Highly trained immigrants enter this country under the H1-B visa program. Congress raised the cap on H1-B visas from 65,000 to 115,000 for FY ‘99, and it wasn’t enough: we reached that cap by June last year. Later this month, the Senate is expected to consider another increase of H1-B visas to 195,000 per year for FY00, 01 and 02. I support this proposed increase; however, I firmly believe we must do everything in our power to grow our own labor force. That is why I intend to offer this bill as an amendment to S. 2045 when it is considered on the Senate floor.

By Mr. BOND (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ASHCROFT, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

S. 2546. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the use of methyl tertiary butyl ether, to provide flexibility within the oxygenate requirement of the reformulated gasoline program of the Environmental Protection Agency, to promote the use of renewable ethanol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environmental and Public Works.

CLEAN AIR AND WATER PRESERVATION ACT OF
2000

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to introduce the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000 with my colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN. Our bill will accomplish the following: 1. Phases down to elimination MTBE within 3 years of enact-

ment; 2. Maintains the oxygenate standard; 3. Probably has the strongest environmental anti-backsliding provisions of any bill; 4. A temporary waiver from oxygenate standard could be granted if the USDA and DOE certify that there is an issue with supply; and 5. Highway apportionment percentages will stay the same.

Low grain prices high fuel prices, and the clean water problems associated with MTBE have highlighted the need for this bipartisan effort to protect our water, protect our air, and to protect our rural economy. Our region and the nation require a renewable, environmentally friendly alternative to MTBE that helps create local jobs, which adds value to our farmer’s product, which moves us away from an energy-hostage situation where our reliance on foreign-produced oil makes our producers, consumers and economy subject to the whims of international cartel autocrats, and protects our air and water.

My colleagues and friends on this issue, Senators DASCHLE and LUGAR, have also introduced a bill on this issue. I commend them for their involvement and look forward to working with them; however, I do not believe their bill solves all the problems. Specifically, their bill eliminates the oxygenate requirement.

The federal oxygen-content requirement was adopted for several reasons. First, Congress understood that oxygenates provide a source of clean octane-displacing toxic compounds such as benzene and reducing ozone-forming exhaust emissions of hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide. Second, Congress recognized the energy-security benefits of substituting a certain percentage of imported petroleum with domestically-produced, renewable fuels such as ethanol. Finally, the Congress hoped the Federal oxygen requirement could provide new market opportunities for farmers by stimulating new demand for ethanol. I believe each of these objectives remain as valid today as they were in 1990.

Unfortunately, the refiners’ decision to utilize MTBE, rather than ethanol, has created a serious and growing problem nationwide. The U.S. Geological Survey reports that MTBE has been detected in 21 percent of the drinking water wells in RFG areas nationwide. States with detected MTBE water contamination include Missouri, Illinois, California, Texas, Virginia, Florida, Connecticut, and many more.

It is important to recognize that the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 did not mandate the use of MTBE. Indeed, in Chicago and other areas where ethanol RFG is used, the program has been declared a huge air quality success. Replicating the Chicago ethanol RFG model in areas where MTBE is being used today would assure continued air quality progress without compromising water quality by its use. It would also provide a tremendous economic stimulus to rural America by creating value-added demand for as

much as 500 million bushels of grain. The Department of Agriculture recently reported that replacing MTBE with ethanol in RFG markets would increase net farm income \$1 billion annually, create 13,000 new jobs, enhance our balance of trade and reduce farm program costs over the next ten years. Moreover, USDA reports ethanol can replace MTBE without price spikes or shortages in supplies within three years.

Let us be very clear about this issue. The environmental problem at hand is real. However, the problem is not ethanol, the problem is MTBE.

Fortunately some States are already taking action to ban MTBE. Some are not moving fast enough. We need to make certain that all States ban MTBE to eliminate its contamination of our water supplies. To ensure that we do not have a piecemeal approach to banning MTBE it is important to pass legislation to ensure we have a national solution.

This bill is supported by the National Corn Growers, Missouri Corn Growers, Renewable Fuels Association, and the Missouri Farm Bureau. I look forward to other groups supporting this bill as well.

I am pleased that Senator DURBIN, Senator GRASSLEY, and Senator ASHCROFT have joined me in introducing this vitally important bill. I look forward to working with them and all the other members that join us in this endeavor to ensure that we have a national solution that will protect our water and still ensure that we maintain our air quality benefits produced from the Federal oxygenate requirement. In addition, we will be promoting positive energy and rural economic policy objectives, which includes ethanol.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague from Missouri, Senator BOND, in introducing the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000, a bill that will ban the gasoline additive MTBE and promote the use of renewable ethanol fuel.

By now, many of us are aware of the dangers methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE) poses to our environment, our water supply, and our communities. Although this additive has only been widely used for about five years, it is now one of the most frequently detected volatile organic chemicals in drinking water supplies across the nation. In fact, MTBE contamination has affected communities in my home state of Illinois raising many public health concerns.

This legislation addresses these problems by banning MTBE within three years and urging refiners to replace it with ethanol. The bill also increases consumer protection by requiring gasoline stations to label pumps that still sell MTBE. And the Environmental Protection Agency is directed to assist states in getting the chemical out of their groundwater.

Furthermore, the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000 includes

strict anti-backsliding provisions to ensure we do not lose the air quality benefits that we have already achieved. Protection from toxic chemicals and environmentally sound emission levels will not be compromised.

Most important, this legislation upholds the air quality benefits of the reformulated gasoline (RFG) program by maintaining the oxygenate standard. Adding oxygen to our gasoline has helped clean the air in many cities across the nation. With the use of ethanol, the Chicago RFG program has proven highly successful in improving the air quality in Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin.

I am proud to say that Illinois is the nation's largest ethanol producer and that one in every six rows of Illinois corn—280 million bushels—goes to ethanol production. But, an expanded role for this renewable fuel is more than a boost to industry; it is jobs to rural America, and it is energy security. As we look for solutions to high oil prices, we must remember that ethanol is a viable alternative fuel—domestically produced and environmentally friendly. In fact, every 23 gallons of ethanol displaces a barrel of foreign oil.

I commend the Clinton administration and Senators DASCHLE and LUGAR for their efforts aimed at solving the problems associated with MTBE and opening a dialogue on renewable fuel content standards. However, I strongly feel we need to maintain our commitment to preserving the oxygenate standard, which has proven to be integral to achieving the goals of the Clean Air Act.

The Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000 is good for our environment and public health and a boost for rural economies. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues Senator BOND and Senator DURBIN, as an original cosponsor to the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000. I commend them for their leadership in resolving a very real problem—not a phony problem.

The real problem is that MTBE is contaminating our Nation's water supplies.

The phony problem is the proposition that the Clean Air Act's oxygenate standard caused the MTBE water contamination.

Unfortunately, powerful, influential forces are trying to sucker Congress and the American public into embracing the phony problem.

Some propagandists of the phony problem may be motivated by greed. After all, if the petroleum industry gets its way, its profits will balloon. If they can get Congress or the administration to grant waivers of the oxygenate standard, big oil will be able to squeeze out the 3 to 4 percent of the market currently supplied by alternatives.

The Department of Energy has determined that even a small amount of al-

ternative fuels can save consumers billions of dollars each year by leveraging lower gasoline prices.

Petroleum companies also tell us that they can produce a gasoline just as clean for the air, but without oxygenates. Of course, they tell you that it will come at some extra cost.

Mr. President, I must ask my colleagues: Do we really need to give the petroleum industry both the ability and the excuse to jack up gasoline prices and further gouge American consumers?

Of course not. And the way to make certain this does not happen is by enacting the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000.

Other propagandists of the phony problem may be political opportunists seeking to engage in some self-serving election-year shenanigans.

The Clinton administration is facing a tough political dilemma. Chevron and other petroleum interests have convinced California's Governor that the only solution to the MTBE problem is to waive the oxygenate requirement.

California represents enormous political stakes for November's elections. Understandably, the Clinton administration does not want to say "no" to California.

But the Clinton administration does not want to say "no" to America's farmers. If the administration gives California and other states a waiver from the oxygenate standard, they will have single-handedly destroyed a \$1 billion per year market for America's farmers.

So, what's the easy political solution? Simple. Throw the hot-potato into the laps of Congress. Hold a press conference laying out quote, end-quote, legislative principles for solving the MTBE problem.

By dumping this on Congress, the administration does not have to make the tough decisions, and will be in a position to second-guess and attack anything and everything Congress does do to try to work this out.

And the irony of all of this, is that had the Clinton administration followed Congressional intent about the Clean Air Act Reformulated Fuels Program, instead of listening to the oil companies and some misguided environmentalists, other oxygenates such as ethanol could have competed with MTBE, and we would have far less MTBE water contamination today.

The Clinton administration was warned loud and clear about the health and environmental problems of MTBE. I personally sent many letters and made a lengthy floor statement in 1993 warning then about MTBE and urging that they not give Big Oil a regulation guaranteeing them a market monopoly over the oxygenated problem.

Anyone who has ever smelled MTBE, knows that had consumers been given a choice, they would have overwhelmingly chose to buy reformulated fuel made with ethanol, not MTBE.

So the Clinton administration created this MTBE problem in the first

place, and now they tell the world that the only way to correct it is for Congress to fix it.

That's just not true. But the truth sort of got lost during the administration's press conference by EPA's Carol Browner. She forgot to tell the American public the truth that each and every State has the authority to protect its water supplies from MTBE contamination. As long as the States pass laws designed to protect the water, as opposed to protecting the air, the Clean Air Act does not legally preempt the States from taking action on their own.

And I received assurances from EPA during a recent hearing that they would never attempt to stop a State from protecting water supplies from MTBE contamination.

Now, some would argue that the oil industry would try to challenge such efforts in court.

Mr. President, that proposition is ridiculous. The oil companies chose to use MTBE instead of ethanol. They are now liable for what could be billions of dollars of MTBE clean up costs. And these liability costs mount with every day that passes, that the oil companies refuse to replace MTBE with other oxygenates.

Therefore, who in their right mind could think that the oil companies are stupid enough to take court action to block a State from banning the use of MTBE?

So, why didn't EPA's Carol Browner announce to the world the States already have the authority to ban MTBE—the source of the real problem?

Well, if the administration admits the truth, and if they fail to convince Americans and Congress that only Congress can fix this problem, then the Clinton administration is stuck back at "square one" having to choose between California or America's farmers who have suffered the lowest prices in decades.

Mr. President, there are others pushing the phony problem who may simply be struggling to save face, hoping that they not suffer the embarrassment of being proven wrong—wrong in their efforts to help petroleum interests in securing a Clinton administration regulation guaranteeing that MTBE would monopolize the oxygenate market.

These environmentalists would like the public to believe that ethanol was never really a viable option—not then, not now. If they ever concede that point, then it will be clear to Americans that these environmentalists were key promoters of what has turned out to be one of the biggest environmental crises ever to face America.

Mr. President, there are some environmentalists who do not like ethanol, simply because it is something that can be made by farmers. They don't like farmers because sometimes they have to use fertilizers and chemicals. It is that simple-minded.

Mr. President, the real problem is MTBE, and the real solution to this

problem is passing the bill introduced today by our colleagues Senator BOND and Senator DURBIN.

I warn my colleagues, however, that if they buy into the phony problem, they will end up having to buy into phony solutions.

For instance, the Clinton administration suggested that Congress might want to only reduce the amount of MTBE used, as opposed to banning it altogether. Well, that's a phony solution.

No level of MTBE in gasoline can protect our water supply.

My State of Iowa is facing an MTBE water contamination disaster. First, understand, we sell no Clean Air Act reformulated gasoline in Iowa. Second, understand that for years now, no gasoline was supposed to be sold in Iowa that contained more than 1 percent MTBE unless warning labels were posted.

Nevertheless, the Iowa Department of Natural Resources recently found that 29 percent of Iowa's water supplies tested contained MTBE above the acceptable levels established by EPA.

So what does this mean? Simply this: MTBE is used in conventional fuel as an octane enhancer and will contaminate your water.

If a State is allowed to waive out of the oxygenate requirement, MTBE will still be used and will continue to contaminate our water supplies.

It is phony to argue the oxygenate requirement is the problem, and it is phony to argue waiving or eliminating the oxygenate requirement will protect our water supplies.

Mr. President, this is just one of many phony issues that we are being asked to embrace. I will be speaking further about this at a later time.

But in closing, I ask my colleagues to cosponsor our legislation. It provides real solutions to the real problem: MTBE water contamination.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL):

S. 2547. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Sand Dunes National Park and the Great Sand Dunes National Preserve in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

GREAT SAND DUNES NATIONAL PARK ACT OF 2000

• Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to establish the Great Sand Dunes National Park and the Great Sand Dunes National Preserve.

This legislation is a major step in protection and preservation of the Great Sand Dunes and San Luis Valley water. I along with Congressman MCINNIS decided to introduce companion bills at the request of valley residents, locally elected officials and the Rio Grande Water Conservation District. In an era of Presidential threats and questionable uses of the Antiquities Act, a locally driven legislative process is something I strongly support.

Anyone who has visited the Sand Dunes understands the unique feeling they offer the visitor, the dunes seem out of place—a contradiction in nature. The San Luis Valley serenely placed between the Sangre De Cristo and the San Juan Mountains is the last place one would expect to see 750 foot high sand dunes. Still, the Sand Dunes offered the early residents and explorers a unique look into the earth's geological wonders. This bill will help to ensure that future generations have that same opportunity.

Developing legislation that satisfies everyone is a difficult task, but this bill reflects compromises on all sides and puts forth a unique proposal for a complicated issue. The provisions of the bill allow for (1) establishing the Great Sand Dunes National Park; (2) establishing the Great Sand Dunes National Preserve; (3) the acquisition of the Luis Maria Baca Grant No. 4; (4) protection of San Luis Valley's water resources; (5) hunting in the new Great Sand Dunes National Preserve; (6) creation of a new National Wildlife Refuge and (7) a local advisory council.

Protection of the valley's water resources is very important to the citizens of Colorado and a primary motivation for virtually everyone's support for this measure. An integral part of the water component is the federal acquisition of the Baca Ranch. While I am usually very skeptical of additional federal ownership of land, it makes sense here to purchase the land from willing sellers and incorporate it into the combination park, wildlife refuge and forest. The legislation requires the Department of the Interior to work with the State of Colorado to protect the water dependent resources of the Sand Dunes while not jeopardizing valid existing water rights held by others. I want to assure everyone that this bill does not create a federal reserve water right.

The Great Sand Dunes National Preserve allows the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to transfer existing Forest Service lands to the Park Service and manage these lands as a Preserve. The transfer would allow the Park Service jurisdiction of the watershed affecting the Sand Dunes, while not affecting the wilderness status or existing hunting in the area. As a veterinarian I understand and recognize hunting as an important tool in game management. The bill stipulates that the Colorado Division of Wildlife will play an integral role in continued game management of the area.

The bill also creates a new National Wildlife Refuge on the western edge of the existing Baca Ranch and adjacent state trust lands. This new Refuge will provide additional hunting opportunities in an area that has been historically closed to public hunting. It has extensive wetlands and is home to an extensive diversity of plants and animals, including a large elk herd. The Refuge would also give the affected county an additional source of revenue

through the Refuge and Revenue Sharing Act as an offset to the loss of property taxes from the federal acquisition of the Baca.

President Herbert Hoover in 1932 recognized the unique characteristics of the sand dunes and wanted to protect their scenic, scientific and educational features. With the support of the local community, the Great Sand Dunes National Monument was established. Now sixty-eight years later, residents of the San Luis Valley are advocating expansion and upgrade of the national monument to a national park.

Last December, I along with Senator CAMPBELL, Congressman MCINNIS, Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt and Colorado Attorney General Ken Salazar met at the Great Sand Dunes to discuss the merits of expanding and protecting the resources of the San Luis Valley. We all recognized the significance of the meeting and vowed to work towards passage of a bill.

Our time is short in Congress this year, and soon I will be asking for a hearing in the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. This is an important issue to Coloradans, and I look forward to Senate passage of my legislation.●

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 2548. A bill to provide that extension of nondiscriminatory trade treatment to the People's Republic of China be contingent on the United States and People's Republic of China entering into a bilateral agreement relating to enforcement; to the Committee on Finance.

SECURING HEIGHTENED OPPORTUNITIES FOR WORKERS, MANUFACTURERS, AND AGRICULTURE EXPORTERS ACT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, today I want to discuss an issue that, judging from my discussions with Missourians, establishing the right trade policy with China is of increasing concern to Americans, and Missourians in particular.

Missourians want more opportunities to use their economic freedom to shape the future for their families. They want increasing opportunities to sell their products. They want reciprocity and fairness. This is why I want to ensure that Missouri businesses, farmers, and workers will get what they are promised. Access to a market that is almost one-fourth of the world's population can create higher paying jobs. But if China doesn't live up to its agreements like in the past—no new jobs will be created in Missouri.

The WTO agreement that the United States concluded with China last November could give Missourians substantial benefits. Tariffs on industrial goods could fall from 25 to 9 percent—this means that all of the parts manufacturer's for aerospace, automobiles, appliances would all face substantial "tax decrease." Also, tariffs on agricultural goods would be reduced from 31 to 17 percent. Missouri, as a leader in agricultural production,

would benefit substantially from these reductions. Cattlemen and pork producers would experience significant gains when tariffs are dropped to 12 percent. I also want Missouri farmers to have direct access to Chinese consumers instead of having to go through a bunch of middle-men. In addition, China has made commitments to eliminate eventually many of its current restrictions on services, such as distribution, banking, insurance, telecommunications, accounting, consulting, and other financial services.

But these are the promises that are on paper. Missourians in the "Show Me" state are leery of relying only on promises when they don't know whether there is adequate enforcement. I've visited many factories where the workers want to make sure that they get a fair shake. They want real opportunities. They don't want hollow promises. I've been all over the state visiting farm families, and this is what they want as well.

Several of my constituents have a fairly accurate perspective on China's record of not voluntarily living up to its agreements. Let me read from a constituent letter, from the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, District 9, Bridgeton, Mo., dated March 17, 2000:

China has a history of failing to live up to every other trade agreement it has signed with the United States (the 1992 Memorandum on Prison Labor, the 1996 Bilateral Agreement on Unilateral Property Rights, the 1994 Bilateral Agreement on Textiles, and the 1992 memorandum of Understanding on Market Access).

I think this constituent has a pretty accurate assessment of China's dismal trade record. Quite honestly, China's trade record has been poor. In a 1992 agreement, the so-called "Market Access" Agreement, Missouri farmers, ranchers, and workers weren't actually given much market access. In 1995 China eliminated 176 licensing requirements, but then imposed 400 new de facto licensing requirements. By 1999, China had removed over 1,000 quotas and licenses, but the U.S. Trade Representative reports that China is erecting new barriers to restrict imports. Also, despite the commitment not to require import substitution, China announced a new "Industrial Policy for the 1990s" which could undermine the U.S. automobile, telecommunications, transportation, machinery, electronics, and construction industries.

Another one of my constituents has additional concerns that once we approve PNTR, the U.S. will lose substantial leverage. From the International Association of Fire Fighters of Kansas City, Mo, Local Union No. 42, dated March 28, 2000:

Granting PNTR will . . . reduce our ability to use unilateral tools to respond to continued Chinese failure to live up to its commitments. Our ability to take unilateral action is our only leverage against the Chinese government. Proponents of PNTR admit that only by using unilateral actions we were able to make even modest progress on intellec-

tual property rights. The Chinese government has not lived up to the promises they made in every single trade agreement signed with the U.S. in the past ten years.

This Missourian is absolutely correct. In 1994 when we negotiated the WTO, the United States gave up the right to threaten a level of retaliation that was "appropriate in the circumstances" to get compliance. However, now we are bound to retaliate at a level that the WTO decides. We have seen where this has taken us with exporting our beef to Europe—absolutely nowhere.

We need to avoid creating an endless lawsuit with China that gets us nowhere. Missourians want some guarantees that they will in fact get export opportunities and not just a lot of litigation with no real results as with the Europeans in the beef and banana cases, where the retaliation level was reduced by the WTO body.

My goal is consistent with the "show me" state. It is straight-forward. Open China's market to Missouri goods and services. In order to do that, however, we must have enforcement that works. That is why I am proposing the "SHOW ME" Act.

My bill is simple. It would require the Administration to work out an arrangement with China whereby if the U.S. wins a WTO case but can't get compliance, China would agree not to challenge the U.S. level of retaliation. The Administration could negotiate this concession from China as a side letter to the November agreement or could negotiate as a part of the protocol of the accession phase.

There is precedent for this requirement. The Administration negotiated a 12 to 15 year phase out of special rules for safeguards and anti-dumping and countervailing duties (which are tools to protect our market), yet they did not work out a 15 year phase out of use of Section 301 (which is a foreign market opening tool). Both are needed—surge protection and market access tools. Market access is crucial to the farming community in Missouri, which gets about one-fourth of its farm income from overseas sales.

In closing, Mr. President, quite frankly, there is declining satisfaction in America's heartland with our inability to pry open foreign markets. The only way we will rebuild is with real enforcement. A lot of my constituents from the "Show Me" state want to see more assurances from us and the Administration that what happened on the EU beef and banana cases won't re-verbate through the Chinese market. They want our trade policy to create jobs in practice, not just in theory.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 74

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 74, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more

effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to provide for analysis of major rules, to promote the public's right to know the costs and benefits of major rules, and to increase the accountability of quality of Government.

S. 779

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 779, a bill to provide that no Federal income tax shall be imposed on amounts received by Holocaust victims or their heirs.

S. 890

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to facilitate the naturalization of aliens who served with special guerrilla units or irregular forces in Laos.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code, to provide for greater fairness in the arbitration process relating to motor vehicle franchise contracts.

S. 1028

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1028, a bill to simplify and expedite access to the Federal courts for injured parties whose rights and privileges, secured by the United States Constitution, have been deprived by final actions of Federal agencies, or other government officials or entities acting under color of State law, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, his name was added as cosponsor of S. 1028, *supra*.

S. 1185

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1185, a bill to provide small business certain protections from litigation excesses and to limit the product liability of non-manufacturer product sellers.

S. 1322

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1322, a bill to prohibit health insurance and employment discrimination against individuals and their family members on the basis of predictive genetic information or genetic services.

S. 1638

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, his name was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 1638, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the retroactive eligibility data for financial assistance for higher education for spouses and dependent children of Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers who are killed in the line of duty.

S. 1658

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1658, a bill to authorize the construction of a Reconciliation Place in Fort Pierre, South Dakota, and for other purposes.

S. 1691

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1691, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize programs for predisaster mitigation, to streamline the administration of disaster relief, to control the Federal costs of disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 1883

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1883, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate an inequity on the applicability of early retirement eligibility requirements to military reserve technicians.

S. 1921

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1921, a bill to authorize the placement within the site of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial of a plaque to honor Vietnam veterans who died after their service in the Vietnam war, but as a direct result of that service.

S. 2003

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2003, a bill to restore health care coverage to retired members of the uniformed services.

S. 2018

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2018, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise the update factor used in making payments to PPS hospitals under the Medicare program.

S. 2021

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2021, a bill to prohibit high school and college sports gambling in all States including States where such gambling was permitted prior to 1991.

S. 2044

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Pennsyl-

vania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2044, a bill to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for domestic violence programs through the voluntary purchase of specially issued postage stamps.

S. 2046

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2046, a bill to reauthorize the Next Generation Internet Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2071

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2071, a bill to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system.

S. 2115

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2115, a bill to ensure adequate monitoring of the commitments made by the People's Republic of China in its accession to the World Trade Organization and to create new procedures to ensure compliance with those commitments.

S. 2218

At the request of Mr. CLELAND, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2218, 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 and annuitants and members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

S. 2233

At the request of Mr. FITZGERALD, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2233, a bill to prohibit the use of, and provide for remediation of water contaminated by, methyl tertiary butyl ether.

S. 2308

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2308, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assure preservation of safety net hospitals through maintenance of the Medicaid disproportionate share hospital program.

S. 2311

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2311, a bill to revise and extend the Ryan White CARE Act programs under title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, to improve access to health care and the quality of health care under such programs, and to provide for the development of increased capacity to provide health care and related support services to individuals and families with HIV disease, and for other purposes.

S. 2330

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, his name was added as a cosponsor of S.

2330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on telephone and other communication services.

S. 2386

At the request of Mr. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2386, a bill to extend the Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act.

S. 2397

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2397, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to deny Federal educational assistance funds to local educational agencies that deny the Department of Defense access to secondary school students or directory information about secondary school students for military purposes; and for other purposes.

S. 2408

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2408, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to the Navajo Code Talkers in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2413

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2413, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify the procedures and conditions for the award of matching grants for the purchase of armor vests;

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOPE), and the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2417, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase funding for State nonprofit source pollution control programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2420

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2420, 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 other purposes.

S. 2459

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2459, a bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in

recognition of their service to the Nation.

S. 2477

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2477, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional safeguards for beneficiaries with representative payees under the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance program or the Supplemental Security Income program.

S. CON. RES. 60

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 60, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of the U.S.S. Wisconsin and all those who served aboard her.

S. CON. RES. 100

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 100, a concurrent resolution expressing support of Congress for a National Moment of Remembrance to be observed at 3:00 p.m. eastern standard time on each Memorial Day.

S. CON. RES. 107

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 107, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress concerning support for the Sixth Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference.

S. CON. RES. 109

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 109, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the ongoing persecution of 13 members of Iran's Jewish community.

S.J. RES. 44

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 44, a joint resolution supporting the Day of Honor 2000 to honor and recognize the service of minority veterans in the United States Armed Forces during World War II.

S. RES. 296

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Sen-

ator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB), and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 296, a resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each calendar year as "National Child's Day."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 112—TO MAKE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF THE BILL H.R. 434

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. MOYNIHAN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 112

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 112(b)(1), insert "(including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and are wholly formed and cut in the United States)" after "yarns wholly formed in the United States."

(2) In section 112(b)(2), insert "(including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and are wholly formed in the United States)" after "yarns wholly formed in the United States".

(3) In section 112(b)(3), strike "countries, subject" and insert "countries (including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States and are wholly formed and cut in 1 or more beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries), subject".

(4) In section 112(b)(5)(A), insert "apparel articles of" after "to the extent that".

(5) In section 213(b)(2)(A) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill—

(A) in clause (i), strike "in a CBTPA beneficiary country" and insert "in 1 or more CBTPA beneficiary countries"; and

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) strike "cut in a CBTPA beneficiary country" and insert "cut in 1 or more CBTPA beneficiary countries"; and

(ii) strike "assembled in such country" and insert "assembled in 1 or more such countries".

(6) In section 213(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, insert "(including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the HTS and are wholly formed and cut in the United States)" after "yarns wholly formed in the United States."

(7) In section 213(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, insert "(including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading

5602 or 5603 of the HTS and are wholly formed in the United States)" after "yarns wholly formed in the United States".

(8) In section 213(b)(2)(A)(iii)(I) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, strike "United States, in an amount" and insert "United States (including fabrics not formed from yarns, if such fabrics are classifiable under heading 5602 or 5603 of the HTS and are formed in 1 or more CBTPA beneficiary countries), in an amount".

(9) In clause (v) of section 213(b)(2)(A) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill—

(A) strike "fibers, fabric, or yarn" each place it appears in the heading and the text and insert "fabrics or yarn";

(B) strike "fibers, fabric, and yarn" and insert "fabrics and yarn"; and

(C) insert "apparel articles of" after "to the extent that".

(10) In section 213(b)(2)(A)(vii)(IV) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, strike "entered" and insert "classifiable".

(11) In section 213(b)(2)(A) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as contained in section 211(a) of the bill, strike "(vii) TEXTILE LUGGAGE.—" and insert "(viii) TEXTILE LUGGAGE.—".

(12) Strike section 412(a)(2) and insert the following:

(2) in the flush paragraph at the end, by striking "and (G)" and inserting "(G), and (H) (to the extent described in section 507(6)(D))".

(13) In the article description for subheading 9902.51.13 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, as added by section 502(a) of the bill, strike "of 64's and linen worsted wool count wool yarn".

(14) In section 505(d), insert "to the United States Customs Service" after "appropriate claim".

SENATE RESOLUTION 305—COM-MENDING PARTICIPANTS IN THE MILLION MOM MARCH

Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 305

Whereas, on Mother's Day—May 14, 2000—Americans from all walks of life will unite for the Million Mom March on the National Mall in Washington, DC and in communities across the country to call for meaningful, common sense gun policy, and these families, citizens, members of religious congregations, schools, community-based organizations, businesses, and political and cultural groups will join together as a local and national community to recognize the violence committed against our children from guns; and

Whereas, 4,223 young people ages 19 and under were killed by gunfire—one every two hours, nearly 12 young people every day—in the United States in 1997, and

Whereas, American children under 15 are 12 times more likely to die from gunfire than children in 25 other industrialized countries combined, and

Whereas, the one year Anniversary of the Columbine High School tragedy passed on April 20, 2000, without any action by Congress on the reasonable gun safety measures that were sent to a House-Senate conference more than nine months ago, and

Whereas protecting our children from gun violence is a top priority for our families, communities and nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) The organizers, sponsors and participants of the Million Mom March shall be welcomed to Washington and commended for rallying their communities to demand sensible gun safety legislation, and

(2) Congress should pass a conference report to accompany H.R. 1501, the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act before the Memorial Day Recess, which includes the Lautenberg-Kerrey gun show loophole amendment and the other Senate-passed provisions designed to limit access to firearms by juveniles, convicted felons, and other persons prohibited by law from purchasing or possessing firearms.

SENATE RESOLUTION 306—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO MOTHER'S DAY THAT THE UNITED STATES SENATE SHOULD REJECT THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (CEDAW) AS IT DEMEANS MOTHERHOOD AND UNDERMINES THE TRADITIONAL FAMILY

Mr. HELMS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 306

Whereas motherhood is a God-given right of women to bear and rear children;

Whereas, since 1914, the United States has officially observed the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day to display public expression of love and reverence for all American mothers;

Whereas Mother's Day is recognized by the United States and many other countries in affirmation of the invaluable role mothers play in providing a family upbringing for children;

Whereas the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women integrates a derogatory sentiment toward motherhood as manifested in the Convention's January 3, 2000 Committee Report on Belarus specifically condemning symbols such as Mother's Day;

Whereas the Senate affirms its commitment that the United States should work with other nations to enhance the protection of the fundamental right of motherhood, including the condemnation of coercive population control programs where expectant mothers are forced to undergo abortions or sterilizations;

Whereas the Convention's agenda to promote abortion worldwide invades the laws of countries that hold a religious or moral belief that abortion is the destruction of innocent human life and that it subjects expectant mothers to physical and emotional trauma;

Whereas the Convention seeks to supplant the primary care and nurturing provided by stay-at-home mothers with institutionalized daycare facilities as advocated in the Convention's August 12, 1997 Committee Report on Slovenia, which stated that children cared for at home are deprived of "educational and social opportunities offered in formal daycare institutions"; and

Whereas more than a hundred United States-based family, religious, and educational organizations representing countless millions of Americans strongly oppose United States ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the tenets of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women are incompatible with the tradition and policy of the United States to uphold motherhood and to regard motherhood with the highest degree of honor and respect;

(2) the Convention would create negative perceptions toward motherhood; and

(3) the Senate should not give its advice and consent to ratification of the fundamentally flawed Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, mothers across America will be showered with love and appreciation this Sunday as an annual expression of love and gratitude for the selfless acts mothers make for their families every day. Sunday is one of the truly special days of the year. It is Mother's Day.

Americans have a tradition of honoring mothers, dating back to 1914, when the second Sunday of May was first recognized as "Mother's Day"

It is especially significant in this year 2000 because of the irony that a number of high-profile women in the Clinton Administration—and in Congress—are so vocally supportive of the so-called U.N. Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, which they call CEDAW—which rhymes with hee-haw.

In any case, the point is this, Mr. President, the radical feminists groups around the country have gone to extreme lengths with incessant declarations, shouting, and even rudely disrupting at least one congressional hearing in their futile efforts to convince American women that the CEDAW Treaty somehow protects the rights of women, which it absolutely would not do—even in the highly unlikely event that the Senate ever gives CEDAW a second glance.

The problem for the radical feminists is that the truth has been circulated across the land that the proposed treaty fails to offer increased opportunities for women. All the same, the radical feminists have tried to turn the proposed treaty into a feminist manifesto, and the militant women have fallen on their faces in the process.

Mr. President, one needs only to examine the reports of the various CEDAW committees, and it is clear that motherhood is not favorably viewed by the CEDAW advocates.

For instance, Mr. President, earlier this year, one such committee solemnly warned the nation Belarus that there was great "concern [over] the continuing prevalence of such [stereotypical] symbols as a Mother's Day." Now get that—"the continuing prevalence of such [stereotypical] symbols as a Mother's Day." The nation Armenia was lectured about the need to "combat the traditional stereotype of women in the noble role of mother."

Another CEDAW committee warned Slovenia that too many Slovenian mothers (that's right, too many mothers) were staying home (in the opinion of the CEDAW ladies) to raise their children. Think of that bad situation,

mothers staying home to raise their children. The CEDAW crowd also warned that because only 30 percent of children in Slovenia were in day-care centers, the other 70 percent were in grave danger of “miss[ing] out on educational and social opportunities offered in (the) formal day-care institutions.” One can surmise they mean that all this is more important and more effective than motherhood in the home.

So, in spite of CEDAW's noisy advocates, Mr. President, the so-called Convention of Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women—and that is a jawbreaker within itself—has been left at the starting gate simply because this unwise proposed treaty was clearly negotiated by radical feminists with the intent of enshrining their radical anti-family agenda into international law.

That is why this CEDAW mishmash has been collecting dust in the Senate for 20 years. And when I say Senate, I mean the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was sent to the Senate by President Carter in 1980—since which the Democratic Party was in control of the Senate for 10 years. But the treaty is so obviously bad that the Democrats never brought it up for a vote, and if I have anything to do with it—and I think I do—it will never see the light of day on my watch.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of more than 100 U.S. groups, representing countless millions of Americans who oppose the CEDAW, be printed in the RECORD.

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

OVER 100 ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTING COUNTLESS MILLIONS WHO OPPOSE CEDAW

The Alliance of Catholic Women, Providence, RI.

VCY America, Milwaukee, WI

Leola Area Right to Life, Forbes, ND.

Baby Humans Foundation, Cedar Park, TX.

The New Jersey Coalition for Marriage, Mendham, NJ.

Our Lady of the Rosary, Library, Louisville, KY.

Eutopia: A Lay Journal of Catholic Thought, Washington, DC.

Voice For Life, Springfield, MO.

Northwest Catholic Family.

Education Conference.

Concerned Roman, Catholics of America, Anaheim, CA.

Holy Innocents Reparation Committee, Anaheim, CA.

Corpus Christi Parish, East Sandwich, MA.

Men's Health America, Rockville, MD.

The Way, The Truth, The Life, Forestport, NY.

National Federation of Republican Assemblies, Simi Valley, CA.

John Paul II Institute of Christian Spirituality, Woodstock, VA.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison, Pro-Life Action League, Madison, WI.

Women for Faith & Family, St. Louis, MO.

Jesus House Ministries.

ABC Pregnancy Help Center, Pratt, KS.

Rock for Life of Columbus & Central Ohio, Columbus, OH.

The American Family Association of NY, Port Washington, NY.

The Crush—Birmingham, Oneonta, AL.

Concerned Women for America of NJ, Glen Rock, NJ.

Knights of Columbus St Raphael Council, #11884, Belmont, WI.

Eagle Forum, Washington, DC.

Expectant Mother Care, New York, NY.

Legal Center for the Defense of Life.

New York, NY, Illinois Right to Life Committee, Chicago, IL.

Catholic Citizens of Illinois, La Grange, IL.

CSRA Family Network, Augusta, GA.

Catholics for Just Choice, San Antonio, TX.

Voice For Life, Springfield, MO.

Catholic Alliance, Washington, DC.

The Society for the Promotion of Celtic Virtues, Brewster, NY.

Vision Youth Ministries, Inc., Knox, IN.

A Woman's Hope, Champaign, IL.

St. Joseph, Guardian of the Redeemer Chapter: TORCH of the East Bay, Walnut Creek, CA.

Life Coalition International, Melbourne, FL.

Roe No More Ministry.

Capitol Resource Institute, Sacramento, CA.

Family Action Council International, Fredericksburg, VA.

World Family Policy Center, Provo, UT.

Life Advocates, Houston, TX.

Population Research Institute, Front Royal, VA.

Guild of the Holy Spirit, Front Royal, VA.

Couple to Couple League International, Cincinnati, OH.

Coalitions for America.

Knights of Columbus Council #765, Cuba City, WI.

Knights of Columbus Council #1386, Platteville, WI.

Knights of Columbus Council #1762, Hudson, WI.

Knights of Columbus Council #7370, Hazel Green, WI.

Knights of Columbus Council #1080, Darlington, WI.

Knights of Columbus Council #605, Beloit, WI.

Knights of Columbus Council #839, La-Crosse, WI.

Knights of Columbus Council #1909, Highland, WI.

Villanovans for Life, Villanova, PA.

Rock For Life, Owings Mills, MD.

National Congress for Fathers and Children, Kansas.

Rockford Area RomanCatholic Home Educators, Capron, IL.

NFP Outreach, Oklahoma City, OK.

ABCs of Faith, The Woodlands, TX.

Rock For Life, Quad Cities Illinois.

Torch, Montgomery County.

New Jersey Physician's Resource Council, Mountainside, NJ.

Life Savers Ministries, Inc., Bakersfield, CA.

Rock for Life, Elkton, Maryland.

Rock For Life, Richmond, TX.

Rock For Life, Manchester, NH.

The National Right to Life Committee, Washington, DC.

TLM Youth Group, Cajon, CA.

Rockland County Catholic Coalition, Nyack, NY.

Rock For Life, Elgin, Illinois.

Rock For Life, Lane County, Oregon.

Upper Michigan Christians United, Ishpeming, MI.

New Hampshire ProLife Council, Manchester, NH.

The Family Foundation, Richmond, VA.

Rock For Life, Fort Wayne, IN.

St. Thomas More Society of Notre Dame Law School, Notre Dame, IN.

Notre Dame Right to Life, Notre Dame, IN.

Concerned Women for America, Washington, DC.

Praise Assembly of God, Wayne, NE.

Christ in the Workplace, Chicago, IL.

Save the Baby Humans Foundation, Cedar Park, TX.

Our Lady of the Rosary Library, Louisville, KY.

The New Jersey Family Policy Council, Parsippany, NJ.

The Family Foundation, Richmond, VA.

William and Mary Alternatives to Abortion, Williamsburg, VA.

Holy Family Medical Specialties, Lincoln, NE.

Rock for Life, McLean, VA.

United Families Int'l, Salt Lake City, UT.

Pro-Life Wisconsin, Brookfield, WI.

Catholic Pro-Life Committee of the Diocese of Dallas, Dallas, TX.

Cincinnati Rock For Life, Hamilton, OH.

Family Research Council, Washington, D.C.

The White Rose Women's Center, Dallas, TX.

Focus on the Family, Washington, D.C.

SENATE RESOLUTION 307—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO MOTHER'S DAY THAT THE UNITED STATES SENATE SHOULD REJECT THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (CEDAW) AS IT DEMEANS MOTHERHOOD AND UNDERMINES THE TRADITIONAL FAMILY

Mr. HELMS submitted the following resolution; which was ordered to lie over, under the rule:

S. RES. 307

Whereas motherhood is a God-given right of women to bear and rear children;

Whereas, since 1914, the United States has officially observed the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day to display public expression of love and reverence for all American mothers;

Whereas Mother's Day is recognized by the United States and many other countries in affirmation of the invaluable role mothers play in providing a family upbringing for children;

Whereas the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women integrates a derogatory sentiment toward motherhood as manifested in the Convention's January 3, 2000 Committee Report on Belarus specifically condemning symbols such as Mother's Day;

Whereas the Senate affirms its commitment that the United States should work with other nations to enhance the protection of the fundamental right of motherhood, including the condemnation of coercive population control programs where expectant mothers are forced to undergo abortions or sterilizations;

Whereas the Convention's agenda to promote abortion worldwide invades the laws of countries that hold a religious or moral belief that abortion is the destruction of innocent human life and that it subjects expectant mothers to physical and emotional trauma;

Whereas the Convention seeks to supplant the primary care and nurturing provided by stay-at-home mothers with institutionalized daycare facilities as advocated in the Convention's August 12, 1997 Committee Report on Slovenia, which stated that children cared for at home are deprived of “educational and social opportunities offered in formal daycare institutions”; and

Whereas more than a hundred United States-based family, religious, and educational organizations representing countless millions of Americans strongly oppose United States ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the tenets of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women are incompatible with the tradition and policy of the United States to uphold motherhood and to regard motherhood with the highest degree of honor and respect;

(2) the Convention would create negative perceptions toward motherhood; and

(3) the Senate should not give its advice and consent to ratification of the fundamentally flawed Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a two-part hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

This hearing will take place on Thursday, May 18, 2000, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the first part of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 2439, a bill to authorize the construction of the Southeastern Alaska Intertie system. The purpose of the second part of the hearing is to consider the nomination of Mildred Dresselhaus, to be Director, Office of Science, Department of Energy.

Presentation of oral testimony is by Committee invitation only. However, those who wish to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information regarding S. 2439, please contact Dan Kish. For further information regarding the Dresselhaus nomination, please contact David Dye.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 11, 2000, to conduct a hearing on pending nominations.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet

on Thursday, May 11, 2000, at 9:30 a.m. on reauthorization of the Pipeline Safety Act.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to conduct a hearing Thursday, May 11, 2000, at 9:30 a.m. and 2:00 p.m., to receive testimony on the Administration's legislative proposal on the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 11, 2000, at 10:00 a.m. to hold a hearing.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a markup on Thursday, May 11, 2000, at 10:00 a.m. The markup will take place in Dirksen Room 226.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 11 at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing. The subcommittee will receive testimony on S. 1367, a bill to amend the Act which established the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, in the State of New Hampshire, by modifying the boundary and for other purposes; S. 1617, a bill to promote preservation and public awareness of the history of the Underground Railroad by providing financial assistance, to the Freedom Center, in Cincinnati, Ohio; S. 1670, a bill to revise the boundary of Fort Mantanzas National Monument, and for other purposes; S. 2020, a bill to adjust the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, Mississippi, and for other purposes; S. 2478, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a theme study on the peopling of America, and for other purposes; and S. 2485, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance in planning and constructing a regional heritage center in Calais, Maine.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege

of the floor be granted to the following Appropriations Committee detailees during floor consideration of the Senate appropriations bills and appropriations conference reports: Brian Wilson and Leslie Kalan.

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mike Daly, a fellow in the office of Senator ABRAHAM, be granted floor privileges for the period of the consideration of S. 2521, military construction fiscal year 2001 appropriations bill.

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

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that John Underminer, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this afternoon.

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

PERMISSION TO FILE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL AND REPORT

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the recess of the Senate, the Armed Services Committee be permitted to file the Department of Defense authorization bill and report at 10 a.m. on Friday, May 12, 2000.

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

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO MOTHER'S DAY THAT THE UNITED STATES SENATE SHOULD REJECT THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (CEDAW) AS IT DEMEANS MOTHERHOOD AND UNDERMINES THE TRADITIONAL FAMILY

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 307, submitted earlier by Senator HELMS, which expresses the sense of the Senate with respect to Mother's Day, that the U.S. Senate should reject the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women as it demeans motherhood and undermines the traditional family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I object to my own request on behalf of the other side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will lie over under the rule.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d-276g, as amended, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group during the Second Session of the 106th Congress, to be

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMENDING THE ANN ARBOR
HURON HIGH SCHOOL MUSIC DE-
PARTMENT

HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, today I commend the Ann Arbor Huron High School Music Department for being named as a Grammy Award Signature School. Their hard work and commitment to excellence has made this achievement possible and it brings me great pleasure to have the opportunity to share this day with them.

As a former member of the Ann Arbor School Board, I know the special significance of such an achievement for a high school music program and I look forward to future accomplishments from the department.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL EDWARD
OWSLEY

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to honor a very special constituent on his day of retirement. Colonel Edward Owsley, a native of Missouri, is retiring after 10 years on the Rolla City Council. I have known Colonel Ed for twenty years and he has been a great inspiration to me as well as the city of Rolla. Colonel Ed has been a true leader for the City of Rolla, always searching for new opportunities and challenges. He has served on the service academy review board for both Bill and me, and has served as chairman of this group for the last 10 years. He has done a remarkable job in helping me select the finest individuals to serve our country in the service academies. Ed's love of the military has made him a tremendous resource for Rolla and the surrounding area in his official duties as liaison for Fort Leonard Wood and the U.S. Army. He is over 80 years old, yet he continues to remain on the cutting edge of knowledge about his community and Fort Leonard Wood.

At the age of 18, Colonel Owsley joined Company I, 138th Infantry, Missouri National Guard and was First Sergeant of the Company when it was called to active duty on December 23, 1940. He served overseas during World War II as Second Lieutenant of Infantry on various troop and staff assignments in the Far East Campaigns. After he returned from the war, he served at Headquarters, Seventh Corps Area, Omaha, Nebraska as Executive for U.S. Army Recruiting for a five state area. He was promoted in 1948 to Lt. Colonel and assigned to the Missouri Military District as Deputy for recruiting, and Field Representative to the Selective Service System. He served at

Fort Leonard Wood as the Assistant Chief of Staff during the Korean build-up and was promoted to Colonel. After serving in the Pentagon, Colonel Ed returned to Fort Leonard Wood for his final years of service.

In addition to serving his country, this dedicated man has served Rolla, Missouri in so many ways, since he retired the U.S. Army in 1966. After serving as the Executive Director for the Rolla Area Chamber of Commerce from 1967 to 1989, he helped form the Rolla Community Development Corporation. This non-profit organization aims at providing jobs and industrial development opportunities for the area. Col. Owsley still serves the RCDC as treasurer. While the City Council will miss Col. Ed, I doubt he is truly retiring. In his first 85-plus years, he has brought so much to those who have crossed his path. With his outgoing spirit and enthusiasm for life, I am sure he will continue to serve his community as long as he is able.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE HON-
OREES OF THE 2000 ANNUAL
BROTHERHOOD AWARDS DINNER

HON. ROBERT MENEDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. MENEDEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the honorees of the 2000 Annual Brotherhood Awards Dinner. The National Conference for Community and Justice (NCCJ) has selected Alan J. Apfelbaum, James Jackson and Dr. Patricia L. McGeehan for their outstanding contributions to the promotion of understanding and respect among all races and religions.

These three exceptional individuals have demonstrated a dedication to community that transcends our simple desire to belong. They not only promote tolerance, but embrace diversity, and that is why they are being honored by NCCJ this year; they understand and exemplify American ideals—the very ideals that make our nation great.

With tremendous compassion and selfless determination Alan Apfelbaum, James Jackson, and Dr. Patricia McGeehan have shown the degree of compassion and guidance that ensures a better future for their communities, a better future for America's communities.

I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the 2000 Annual Brotherhood Awards Dinner Honorees as well—they are truly great community leaders.

CHINESE INTENTIONS

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, recently the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) released an

unclassified report concerning Chinese espionage activities against the United States. The report is very insightful and I therefore urge every Member to read the report.

Additionally, I have received the CIA's classified briefing concerning Chinese espionage operations. Needless to say, the briefing was more detailed about the activities of our "most favored" trading partner. The classified briefing not only solidified my opinion that we need to do more to dissuade the Chinese government from acting against our country, but gave me at least thirteen more reasons to continue advancing my opinion toward developing a national missile defense capability for the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have sought clarity to the unclassified report and the unaddressed issues of the report. Those points, are outlined in a letter addressed to CIA Director George Tenet, which I hereby submit for the RECORD.

April 27, 2000.

GEORGE TENET, Director,
Central Intelligence Agency,
Attention: Public Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. TENET: Please consider my concerns on the joint CIA/FBI Report to Congress on Chinese Espionage Activities Against the United States, unclassified version. The report omits pertinent items that would otherwise clarify the issue of Communist Chinese espionage, propaganda, and penetration of U.S. political affairs, government, and armed forces. Rather than leading the reader to an understanding of the threat and purpose behind Communist China's acts of espionage against the United States, the report fails to interrelate Communist China's intelligence operations, military build up, and political opportunism.

One of the chief roles of intelligence is to provide information to a country engaged in or about to engage in war. In view of the remarkable penetration by the Communist Chinese People's Liberation Army (PLA) of U.S. military capabilities, the wholesale theft of advanced U.S. technology by the PLA, and the burgeoning interference of Communist Chinese agents with U.S. political affairs, it must be stated that Communist China is engaged in undeclared war against the United States. There is no other purpose for the magnitude and focus of Communist Chinese espionage against the United States.

One of the classical uses of espionage and networks of spies, agents, saboteurs, and "friends" is to provide a "fifth column" attacking the will and sensibility of an opponent. Adolph Hitler demonstrated the effectiveness of "fifth column" elements in his overthrow of Czechoslovakia in 1938. Such is the activity of Communist China inside the United States today. Indeed, classical military strategy would call for directed efforts at breaking the will of an opponent, regardless of the means. The report would do well to note this.

The driving force and purpose behind Communist China's espionage against the United States has been stated by Communist China. In 1999 Communist China's Defense Minister, General Chi Haotian, stated that war with the United States "is inevitable." The doctrine of the Communist Chinese PLA plans

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

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

for war against the United States as a threat to Communist Chinese hegemony in the Far East and a threat to the oppressive nature of Communist China's regime which rules by brutality and the repression of human freedom. The report would do well to note this, and is striking for its paucity of references and omission of Communist Chinese thinking.

One of the lessons learned by Communist China from the 1991 Persian Gulf War was the effectiveness of advanced military technology. Following the 1991 Persian Gulf War, Communist China began to aggressively acquire Western and U.S. military technology wholesale, whether by theft, trade, or espionage, noted in the report. "Chinese attempts to obtain U.S. military and military-related technology—reflecting recognition of the overwhelming technological superiority enjoyed by the Western alliance in the Gulf War and Kosovo—have increased since the early 1990s."

What would have been helpful in such a report, however, is an explanation of the relationship between Communist China espionage and intelligence operations, Communist China's efforts to "ascend the technology ladder," and the modernization program of the Communist Chinese PLA focused on the acquisition of a U.S.-type military replete with a blue water Navy and air power projection capabilities, and the rapid, aggressive acquisition and development of advanced ballistic missile technology, nuclear weapons, and manned space operations. The driving force behind Communist China's economic modernization is the PLA, seeking to acquire advanced military weapons. The report should note this, and could prove helpful by including a description of the PLA's military modernization program, a link with DIA (Defense Intelligence Agency) may be appropriate on this point.

Intelligence is a key adjunct to successful military operations. Noting the acquisition by Communist China of a global space tracking network, including its ship-based satellite tracking systems, the agreement of the Republic of Kiribati to let Communist China use the island of Tarawa for satellite tracking would be helpful. The report would also be helpful in providing information on Communist Chinese plans to establishing an intelligence gathering station in Cuba, and in the Bahamas, both close to home, and impinging upon our space program based at Cape Canaveral. An update would also be appropriate on Communist Chinese activity in Panama, which affects U.S. economic interests in the Panama Canal, and in the control of drug trafficking and regional stability.

The report would provide valuable information by noting specific examples and activities of Communist Chinese companies and "front operations" such as Cosco, which serve as conduits for Communist Chinese espionage. In particular, Communist Chinese activity in California should be revealed, especially in regard to their purchase or leasing of commercial property for trade (ports, warehouses, and airports). The magnitude of the Communist Chinese penetration of the United States needs clear explanation even beyond the classified version of the report which I have read. It needs to be understood. The contents of the report need to be expanded and brought to light so that the American people can see and understand the magnitude, comprehensiveness, and diffuseness of Communist Chinese intelligence operations against the U.S.

On March 9, The Washington Times said of the report that "professional military and civilian intelligence officers play a small part in the China's spying efforts" (Bill Gertz, "China Boosts Spy Presence in U.S., CIA, FBI Report"). This needs further expla-

tion. In addition, the United States has adopted a policy of giving away advanced military training and tactics to the PLA. These military contacts need to be delineated and described to Congress and the American people. The American people need to understand the closeness of the PLA in grasping and being able to combat U.S. military doctrine and tactics.

The report would also provide valuable background information describing Communist China's acquisition of new territory in Southeast Asia: Communist China's forcible takeover of the Parcel Islands in 1974; Communist China's forcible expulsion of the Philippines from Mischief Reef in the Spratly Islands in 1995; Communist China's propaganda against Taiwan, and its territorial claims for the Natuna Island oil and gas reserves owned by Indonesia are aspects of Communist Chinese belligerence that beg for description. It is also worth noting the military weakness of the many nations in Southeast Asia compared to Communist China.

I am encouraged that the report describes Communist Chinese intelligence operations against the United States. I am anxious to hear of recommendations from the CIA and FBI on the steps Congress should take to combat and defeat Communist China's intelligence, espionage, and propaganda campaign against the United States.

I look forward to your response. Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.

CENTRAL NEW JERSEY CONGRATULATES TIMOTHY COPELAND, EWING KIWANIS POLICE OFFICER OF THE YEAR

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Timothy Copeland of Ewing Township, who is being honored by the Ewing Kiwanis Club as the Police Officer of the Year on Tuesday, May 16, 2000.

This award is bestowed upon him by his peers in recognition of his constant willingness to go above and beyond the call of duty.

In March of 1993, Officer Copeland began his employment with the Ewing Police Department and graduated from the Trenton Police Academy Basic Training Course in August of 1993.

After being sworn into office, Officer Copeland was assigned to the Patrol Division where he rose to become a Field Training Officer. Officer Copeland is also a mentor for the D.A.R.E. student education program. He has excelled with many letters of commendation for his outstanding work as an officer.

Mr. Speaker, Officer Timothy Copeland is a great example for Central New Jersey. I ask all my colleagues to join me in recognizing him.

MICHAEL R. BRENTANO

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend Michael R. Brentano, a

court reporter from Georgia, on his appointment this July as the 92nd President of the National Court Reporters Association. The NCRA, a professional organization founded in 1899, represents over 38,000 court reporters from around the world.

For those of us who know Mike, this announcement is welcome, but hardly surprising. Throughout his professional life, he has consistently created new opportunities for himself, his employees, his customers, his profession, and our judicial system.

Following his graduation from Emory University in Atlanta, Mike trained to become a court reporter, and began working for Judge Harold Murphy in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. A few years later, he became a freelance reporter for Brentano Reporters, where he serves as Vice President and General Manager today.

Mike and his wife, Judy, have played an invaluable role in pioneering new reporting technologies and methods, that have led their profession into the 21st century. Under the leadership of Mike, Judy, and others, many court reporters have moved beyond their traditional role as recorders of events, and become all-purpose support systems for litigation and other public events. For example, he has become an expert in real-time reporting, advanced litigation support, and data retrieval.

Mike's service to his community goes far beyond the walls of the courtroom. He has testified in the Legislature about his profession, and has supported the State Bar of Georgia pro bono reporting program.

Based on his many past achievements, and his great prospects for more successes in the future, I join court reporters around America in saluting Mike on his appointment as President of the National Court Reporters Association.

**IN SUPPORT OF NATIONAL
TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK**

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, in honor of National Teacher Appreciation Week I pay tribute to some of the outstanding teachers that serve in the Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts.

In Belmont, Massachusetts, several teachers have received local and national accolades for their outstanding dedication to their jobs: Janice Rosenberg was selected to join the National Science Foundation's Teachers Experiencing Antarctica and the Arctic; Kimberley Mayer received a Teacher Award in the 2000 Space Settlement Design Contest sponsored by the NASA Research Center; and Eleanor Palais was honored by the Belmont School Committee for the success of 15 students in B.C. Calculus, all of whom received a perfect score of 5 on the AP Exam.

In Somerville, Massachusetts, two teachers, John O'Keefe and Barbara Marder, were recognized by the Department of Education for completing the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification; and Alice Comack was recently honored by the Massachusetts Teachers Association for her work in the area of human rights.

Since becoming a Member, I have visited schools all over my district. In Watertown,

Massachusetts, I toured the Cunniff Elementary School and viewed how they are wiring their school and upgrading their computers. In Boston, Massachusetts, I visited the Winship Elementary School and discussed the Constitution with fifth graders. I am always amazed at the warm greeting I receive from students, and from teachers. For them, it does not matter who the visitor is, but rather that someone cares and recognizes the hard work they do.

Mr. Speaker, almost 5,000 teachers in over 176 schools educate approximately 86,000 students in the 8th district; far too many teachers to mention everyone by name. However, I would like to take a moment to thank all the teachers in Belmont, Boston, Somerville, Cambridge, Chelsea and Watertown for tirelessly giving of themselves to educate our future leaders.

Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to debate the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I hope each Member of Congress will reflect upon the valuable contributions of teachers in their respective districts, and work to pass legislation that helps our nation's teachers provide the best possible education for our children.

EQUAL PAY DAY

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, today is equal pay day. We should recognize women and pay them equally. They are our grandmothers, mothers, wives, colleagues, teachers, caregivers, citizens and leaders.

Women's role in the home and work place is critical. That's why I am pleased to co-sponsor H.R. 541, the Paycheck Fairness Act, and H.R. 1271, the Fair Pay Act. And I am pleased to sponsor the 8th annual women's event on August 4th at Cal Sate University San Bernardino.

Many working women lack the basic benefits they need to care for their families. So we have kids with illnesses going to school; kids who have not eaten breakfast; and kids hanging out on the street because their mothers work two or three jobs.

We need laws to improve child care and after-school care. On the job, working women are looking for higher pay, better benefits and most of all the "3-R's": respect, recognition and reward for a job well done. Working women want a stronger voice—not only in decisions on the job but in the policy making area.

Women deserve our support.

TRIBUTE TO THE 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY SCHOOL HOUSE

HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in honor of H. Con. Res. 310—which was passed by the House last week—to Commend the Charter School Movement, I rise to pay tribute to a

new PUBLIC charter high school in Salem, Oregon, the heart of my district.

The 21st Century Community Schoolhouse is a small high school where no student is anonymous. With a curriculum that integrates ALL subjects, it is founded on the belief that students' work must be relevant to them, incorporate high academic standards, and include extensive community service.

These students, who formerly have been alienated because of whatever differences make them special, will now become connected to each other, to their teachers, and to adult mentors in the community. I believe that we cannot afford to let one high school student slip through the cracks in the public school system, and the 21st Century Community Schoolhouse provides a model for school districts across the country to follow.

This resolution represents a national commemoration of the charter school movement and the contribution charter schools have made to improving the nation's public school system. But we are not only here to applaud charter schools today—this resolution will continue to express our appreciation of charter schools by designating a National Charter Schools Week.

Often times, we forget to celebrate the parts of our education system which are working. The 21st Century Community Schoolhouse in my district works and I wish to celebrate them.

NATIONAL TEACHER APPRECIATION DAY—RECOGNIZING THE REMARKABLE ACHIEVEMENTS OF LOCAL EDUCATORS

HON. BRIAN BAIRD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate National Teacher's Appreciation Day, and today I personally recognize some of the remarkable educators who have had a profound affect on the lives of children throughout my district. I have had the opportunity to visit over 200 classrooms in my district since my election to Congress, and I can tell you the teachers I recognize today are just a small sampling of the innovative teaching, academic leadership, energy, and enthusiasm I have seen from educators in so many of the schools in my Southwest Washington district.

For educators, teaching at a small, rural, and often underfunded school poses particularly difficult challenges. In the case of 5th and 6th grade teacher Timothy Davis, he has worked tirelessly for sixteen years at Mount Pleasant School in Washougal to overcome the obstacles faced by the school district. During two years when the school district faced financial difficulties and could not afford to keep a full staff, Mr. Davis stepped forward to serve in a dual role of teacher, principal, and superintendent. Tim Davis never puts in less than 12 hours a day, devoting his free time to applying for grants and creating a challenging curriculum for his students. Mr. Davis is praised by his peers for his patience, consideration, and good judgment.

Students at Centralia High School are truly lucky to have an enthusiastic science teacher by the name of Henri Weeks. After graduating from Centralia High School, Mr. Weeks re-

turned in 1989 to take the job of his former science teacher. Since that time, Henri Weeks has worked tirelessly to make science fun and interesting for his students. In his spare time, Mr. Weeks has taken part in summer internships at Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center and has incorporated DNA testing in the schools science lab projects. His students are currently involved in the human genome project (DNA mapping) which is being coordinated by the University of Washington. Henri Weeks is described by his peers a self-less educator that cares a great deal about inspiring his students to achieve greatness.

At South Bend High School, Mr. Steve Lazelle is credited for being an outstanding teacher who is in high demand as a presenter on his unique Aquaculture curriculum locally, regionally, and nationally. In 1990, the district was chosen as one of six test sites in the nation to pilot an aquaculture curriculum provided by the National Council for Agricultural Education. Mr. Lazelle is one of the original teaching team members to infuse aquaculture into Agricultural education beginning in a one-room facility with ten students. Today, thanks to Steve's leadership, the program is located at the Port of Willapa Harbor's Port Dock facility with Steve as the only instructor and manager whose enrollment topped out at 83 students. The program raises and sells tilapia fish to the markets of Seattle, and works with the local gill-netters association to raise and release salmon into the Willapa River. Steve Lazelle is acknowledged by his peers as a man who has changed the lives of many of the students who come into contact with him.

Jim Van Fleet, a former skilled millwright who worked for Reynolds Aluminum Company in Longview for nearly twenty years, now devotes his life to school children. Mr. Van Fleet has been a volunteer coach for kids in various levels of softball and basketball for all of his life, but recently returned to school and earned a masters in teaching. In 1997, Jim began his teaching career at Caste Rock Middle School where he teaches math and science. Mr. Van Fleet is very popular with his students because of his innovative, stimulating lessons. He has developed several games that are used as lessons in his classes. Mr. Van Fleet is at the forefront in the use of technology for improvement of student learning and has been a mentor to other teachers in development of technology augmented instruction. Jim is respected by staff and parents for his ability, dedication to improvement, and for his approachable demeanor.

Since 1972, George Simonsen has instilled a love of music in hundreds of students at all levels in the Kelso School District. Under George's direction, The Kelso High School Chamber Orchestra has won three gold medals at international music competitions. In addition, George's orchestras have performed at numerous competitions and events throughout the state and Northwest. Several years ago they performed before an audience of 20,000 school board members at a national convention in Anaheim, California. In addition to being a gifted teacher, Mr. Simonsen is the director of the Southwest Washington Symphony—one of the truly fine small symphony orchestras in the country. Mr. Simonsen is an important part of the Kelso team, using music as a tool to support learning, willingly accepting extra work, and bringing enthusiasm to all of the activities in which he participates.

Mary Holmberg masterfully teaches a sixth grade classroom at Meadows Elementary School in Lacey. Besides her exceptional work in her own classroom with diverse students, Ms. Holmberg has been a key leader in implementing new math and science curriculums in the school district. Mary devotes numerous hours of her free time to working with math and science teachers throughout the school district and to helping lead after school programs for students. Mary teaches a double class of math students every day in order to help out a visually impaired teacher. Additionally, Ms. Holmberg is always available both before and after school hours to help students with their work.

A teacher at Elma Elementary School for seventeen years, Carol Boyer believes in relevant, exciting, and fun learning experiences for her fifth grade students. A study of astronomy includes a sleep over to view the heavens. A study of the Oregon Trail includes the construction of a wagon train, formation of families, and a simulation of the life along the trail. To bring animal life close to her students, Carol is working with a master birder to create an environment that attracts species of birds at the school site. She is currently creating a unit of study on the Osprey for student research to answer the question, "Why are the eggshells of the Osprey becoming thinner and how does it affect their survival?" In the midst of school reforms, Carol teaches to the Essential Academic Learning Requirements in a way that is engaging, thought provoking, and hands-on.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for hours about the remarkable teachers who are impacting students throughout my district every day. Today, however, I can only highlight a few of the amazing, generous individuals who are giving selflessly of themselves to help our children succeed. As Teacher Appreciation Day comes to a close, I would implore residents in my district and parents throughout America to thank their child's teacher for providing the most valuable gift their child will ever receive, the gift of knowledge.

CELEBRATING TAIWANESE-AMERICAN HERITAGE WEEK

HON. PETER DEUTSCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, this month I join with citizens across the nation in celebrating Pacific American Heritage Month. The Pacific American community represents an important foundation of America's future and I commend the proud celebration of its heritage.

Taiwanese-American Heritage Week, the part of Pacific American Heritage Month held from May 7 to May 14, celebrates the unique and diverse contributions of the more than 500,000 Taiwanese-Americans in the United States. This portion of the population has made countless significant achievements in our country and their accomplishments can be found in every facet of American life. Taiwanese-Americans have succeeded as successful and notable artists, Nobel Laureate scientists, researchers, human rights activists, and business leaders.

In addition to recognizing these contributions, Taiwanese-American Heritage Week

also provides an excellent opportunity to celebrate the success of democracy on the island of Taiwan. Since 1987, the Taiwanese people have freely selected their own leaders, practiced the religion of their choice, and expressed their thoughts openly and freely. Taiwan has become a vibrant and democratic participant in the family of nations. The recent election of Mr. Chen Shui-bian as the new president of Taiwan should be considered a reaffirmation of their dedication to democratic ideals.

However, despite Taiwan's many accomplishments, significant political challenges still remain. With all that the Taiwanese people and Taiwanese-Americans have accomplished, there can be no complete satisfaction until Taiwan's sovereignty, status and global contributions are respected and appreciated. Gaining worldwide recognition of the legitimacy of Taiwan's government is paramount. It is crucial that the voice of the 22 million people of Taiwan be heard in international organizations such as the United Nations, the World Health Organization and other international organizations.

Mr. Speaker, Taiwanese-American Heritage Week recognizes and celebrates the longstanding friendship between the United States and Taiwan. I hope my colleagues will join with me in commending the accomplishments and contributions of the Taiwanese American community.

INTRODUCTION OF MOTOR CARRIER FUEL COST EQUITY ACT OF 2000

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to address a crisis which threatens to severely reduce competition in the trucking industry.

To the hundreds of independent truckers who in an orderly and proper fashion came to their Nation's capitol earlier this year, let me say, we heard you. This gentleman from West Virginia, at least, heard what you had to say.

Everyone is concerned over the effect high fuel costs are having on our economy. But in particular, high diesel fuel prices are hitting the independent small trucker the hardest. These individuals, who own and operate their own rigs, are faced with financial ruin. Simply put, they cannot afford sharp increases in diesel fuel prices and they are not in the position to pass these increased costs on to shippers. The result is that many are going out of business and an important segment of the trucking industry is being lost.

What does this mean? Aside from the very real and pressing personal hardships these independent truckers and their families face, we are also losing competition in the trucking industry. Many shippers are concerned over consolidations in the railroad industry. Situations where due to the lack of competition, they believe they are held hostage to a single railroad. These shippers could face a similar situation in trucking as the owner-operators succumb to rising fuel costs, thinning the ranks of trucking alternatives.

Indeed, last month in testimony before the Resources Committee the head of the Amer-

ican Trucking Associations, Walter McCormick, noted: "If we start to see bottlenecks, shippers who today object to a fuel surcharge will have to scramble to get their freight delivered at any cost. It's easy to see where that leads: Consumer prices rise and inflation snuffs out our country's economic expansion."

This statement echoes what the president of the Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association, James Johnston, said before the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on March 21st: "If we don't fix this problem soon, and truckers continue to lose their businesses or refuse to drive unprofitably, we are going to see greater disruptions in our economy as goods do not get to market and just-in-time deliveries to manufacturers cease to arrive 'just-in-time.'"

To address this situation, we are introducing the "Motor Carrier Fuel Cost Equity Act of 2000." This legislation would require that a mandatory fuel surcharge be put into place for truckload carriers, and that the surcharge actually be passed through to the motor carrier, or as the case may be, the broker or freight forwarder, who is providing the transportation service in situations where diesel fuel prices are the subject of sudden and exorbitant increases. Further, the bill provides that if existing transportation contracts or agreements already contain fuel surcharges, nothing in the legislation would affect those arrangements.

To be sure, this is not unique response to fuel crises. There are situations where existing contracts between shippers and motor carriers contains fuel surcharges. Further, in response to past fuel crises, the Interstate Commerce Commission first mandated them during the 1970s. However, once the filed rate doctrine was abolished, federal authority in this matter lapsed.

The question could be asked, why now mandate a fuel surcharge if some transportation contracts already provide for them. The answer lies in the type of environment in which independent truckers operate. In those instances where they are under lease to a motor carrier to provide the transportation service, there is no guarantee that a surcharge will be passed on to them. The transportation contract is between the motor carrier and the shipper, and the owner-operator has no role in the types of rates charged.

In addition, where the independent trucker has his or her own operating authority and deals directly with shippers, they usually do not have the leverage to obtain a fuel surcharge from them. In effect, the independent trucker, being a small businessman, is put in a position of either having to accept the offered rate or losing the business.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation represents a fair and reasonable approach to addressing this situation. It does not solve the fuel crisis, but it would bring relief to an important sector of the transportation industry.

EQUAL PAY DAY RESOLUTION

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the significance of May 11th, as Equal Pay Day. Today is the day

when women's wages for the period beginning January 1, 1999, will equal the amount earned by a man during calendar year 1999.

Since the passage of landmark legislation like the Equal Pay Act and the Civil Rights Act, women's participation in the labor market has increased dramatically. Unfortunately, their pay has not.

Women continue to earn less than men for comparable work. U.S. Census data from 1998 shows that women earn only 73 cents for every dollar earned by men.

Equal pay is a problem for all working women. For example, the 95 percent of nurses who are women earn \$30 less each week than the 5 percent of nurses who are men.

Unequal pay doesn't just affect women, it affects our entire economy.

I had hoped that I would be able to bring forward the resolution that Representative Morella and I introduced recognizing Equal Pay Day. Unfortunately, the Republican Leadership in the House refuses to acknowledge the significant effects of unequal pay on working women and their families.

This Congress can do more than rest on the laurels of equal pay legislation that passed over 30 years ago. I urge all Members of Congress to commemorate Equal Pay Day. Let women in your district know that you will pursue the passage of equal pay legislation in the 106th Congress.

IN HONOR OF OLDER AMERICANS
MONTH

HON. JUDY BIGGERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Older Americans Month.

For more than 35 years, the President of the United States has designated May as Older Americans Month—the month when we honor our 34 million older Americans whose contributions helped to make the 20th century the American century.

This year's theme—"In the New Century . . . The Future is Aging"—highlights the impact that those extraordinary contributions had on nearly every aspect of society for future generations of Americans. It also gives us a chance to draw attention to aging issues that policy makers will face as the ranks of older Americans swell in the coming decades.

The next century is expected to be a golden age for seniors, with life expectancy increasing and predictions that older people will outnumber children for the first time in history.

The least we can do is assist those who have given all they can and want to continue to live healthy, active lives.

We started on the right path when we repealed the Social Security Earnings Limit. No longer will the tax code penalize those seniors who choose to stay in the workforce during their golden years.

But there is more to do. For one, we can renew the Older Americans Act, which has not been reauthorized since 1995. Since that time, our nation's seniors and the programs established to serve them have faced an uncertain future.

The Older Americans Act has been a special program for over 34 years. Using a small

slice of the federal budget, the Act has provided hot meals, legal assistance, employment for seniors, and services for the homebound. Because these programs help our seniors to remain active, healthy, and a part of their communities, we must make the Act's reauthorization a priority.

And there are other challenges to face—ensuring that Social Security will be viable for this generation and others, finding a way to furnish long-term care security, and providing a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

But let's not get lost in the minutiae of policy—May is about honoring our seniors, not advancing an agenda.

So, on Friday, I will travel to Darien, Illinois, in my congressional district to celebrate their Older Americans Day. We will honor those who contribute to our communities as grandparents, parents, workers, volunteers, and role models. We will honor those who are the keepers of our traditions and teachers of our values.

I urge all my colleagues to follow Darien's led and to use the month of May to celebrate the great gifts older Americans bring to our lives. And let's help our older friends, parents and grandparents make their lives and our lives more rich and rewarding for many years to come.

IT'S ONLY FAIR

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today is Equal Pay Day, a day that symbolizes the financial struggles that women must endure because of the ever-present wage gap.

In the workforce, women are at a clear disadvantage. They are paid less than their male counterparts for doing the same job. Women are paid on average 74 cents for every dollar men received of \$148 less each week. Women of color are faced with an even worse prospect. African American women earn 64 cents for every dollar men earn or \$210 less each week. Hispanic women fare the worst. They earn only 54 cents for every dollar men earn.

This pay inequity is hurting families in every part of our country. A working woman's family loses on average \$4,000 each year due to this inequity. And in Illinois, the numbers are even worse. Women in my home state lose on average \$4,913 a year.

The inequity compounds over the years. A 25-year-old working woman will lose \$523,000 during her lifetime as a result of this wage gap. And when she retires, she'll collect a smaller pension and less Social Security.

There is no denying that a pay gap exists today. When comparing the wages of women and men who have the same job, qualifications, education and background, men win.

As we begin the 21st Century, we must eliminate inequities in the workplace. We must do this for the sake of our next generation of women leaders. When my granddaughters Isabel and Eve are ready to enter the workforce, I want to make sure that they earn the same as their male counterparts. It is only fair.

IN HONOR OF THE WOMEN'S DIVISION 2000 SPRING LUNCHEON JOURNAL OF THE UNITED JEWISH APPEAL FEDERATION OF BERGEN COUNTY AND NORTH HUDSON

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the honorees of the Women's Division of the United Jewish Appeal (UJA) Federation of Bergen County and North Hudson.

Today, the UJA Federation of Bergen County and North Hudson holds its Women's Division 2000 Spring Luncheon Journal, an event that proudly celebrates the heritage and solidarity of the Jewish community, while honoring the women who have tirelessly worked to preserve Jewish identity.

This year's honorees are Dr. Adrienne Greenblatt, Lilo Ollendorf, and Susan Shaw. These three exceptional women represent the life-blood of community service—their contributions to the Jewish community will long endure.

The UJA Federation serves more than 70,000 Jewish people living in 65 Bergen County and North Hudson communities. The 2000 Spring Luncheon will raise money to help the elderly, people with developmental disabilities, and families in crisis. Funds will also be used to help integrate Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union into American society.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. Adrienne Greenblatt, Lilo Ollendorf, and Susan Shaw for their extraordinary contributions to the Jewish community.

TRIBUTE TO JIM NICHOLSON

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, each year the Horatio Alger Association of Distinguished Americans honors outstanding citizens who, overcoming humble or adverse circumstances, become leaders who dedicate themselves to others and serve as role models for youth.

I am proud to report that Jim Nicholson has been chosen as a 2000 Horatio Alger Award recipient.

He was a child raised in bitter poverty, who won an appointment to West Point, led troops in Vietnam, practiced law, built a successful homebuilding and land development company, and served as a volunteer leader to help numerous community and charitable organizations. His faith, family, and commitment to education have been the foundation for his success.

Jim Nicholson now serves as chairman of the Republican National Committee, a post he has held since 1997. His tireless efforts, his optimism, his courage, and his integrity have contributed markedly to restoring public confidence in the ethics of American political leadership.

CENTRAL NEW JERSEY RECOGNIZES THE PLAINSBORO VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANY'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Plainsboro Volunteer Fire Company's 40th anniversary.

Over the last forty years, the members of this organization have made a tremendous contribution to their community by protecting their residents and assisting other local departments.

In the days when there were more cows than people in the Township of Plainsboro, a handful of farm workers and American Cyanimid employees decided to erect a fire station. In the first full year of operation, the Plainsboro Volunteer Fire Company responded to 30 calls for service.

In the early days of the fire company, the alarm was sounded by the stationary fireman on duty at a local farm who would blow the farm's steam whistle when a fire was reported. Firefighters living in the village section of the township could hear the alarm easily. Their family members then relayed the alarm by telephone to members living in outlying areas of the community.

The first truck used was a 1940 American LaFrance with a 640 gallon per minute pump—which stands in contrast to the current 1750 gallon per minute pump that the department uses today. The department has continued to update its fleet of vehicles, purchasing the newest and most efficient fire-fighting equipment.

Over the years, the Plainsboro Fire Company has drawn financial and moral support from Princeton University, one Fire District, and many appreciative citizens. These groups have aided the Plainsboro Fire Company by raising the funds to keep the department running smoothly.

What has not changed about the Plainsboro Fire Company is its dedication and commitment to serving the needs of its community. The 40th anniversary of the department is being celebrated tomorrow at an Anniversary Dinner. The dedication and hard work that is continually demonstrated by the members of the Company is to be admired. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing the accomplishments of the Plainsboro Volunteer Fire Company.

**KID DAY AMERICA/
INTERNATIONAL**

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday May 20, 2000, the Wilbert Family Chiropractic office will be the official Chiropractic office representing the 6th annual "Kids Day America/International" event in Austell, Georgia. This event will focus on health, safety and environmental issues which affect children, their families and the communities in which

they live. This will be done with the help and support of the Austell Police Department, whose D.A.R.E. program will directly benefit from the event. The Austell Police Department will be on hand to fingerprint ID children, and the Wilbert Family Chiropractic will donate photos of the children. This information will be used to produce ID cards for the children. "McGruff" the Crime Dog will make an appearance and be joined by Leo the Lion of the D.A.R.E. program. The Austell Fire Department will be participating also, with their Fire Safety House, which helps teach children and their parents about fire safety.

I want to congratulate and commend Dr. Marci Wilbert and the Wilbert Family Chiropractic for sponsoring "Kids Day America/International." This program is a positive, grass-roots, community based effort which will help to strengthen our community, and have a positive impact on children and their families.

**RESOLVING THE CONFLICT IN SRI
LANKA**

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following editorial from the Boston Globe on April 29, 2000, for the RECORD. The editorial was brought to my attention by Mr. Shri Srithilliamapalam, president of the Eelom Tamil Association of America and an activist in the Boston area that continues to call for observance of human rights in Sri Lanka and a peaceful settlement to the 17-year ethnic conflict. We must encourage the parties involved to stop the terror and negotiate a peaceful and immediate end to this war.

[From the Boston Globe, April 29, 2000]
PUSHING PEACE IN SRI LANKA

The long, lethal civil war in Sri Lanka receives little attention here, but for sheer senseless blood-letting it is comparable to the Balkan conflicts. The need for a cease-fire and mediated peace talks became more evident than ever this week when the separatist Tamil Tigers chased 17,000 Sri Lankan army troops from their key strategic position in Elephant Pass, straddling the narrow isthmus that links the south of the country of Jaffna, capital of the Tamil area in the north.

Both sides in this merciless war have committed atrocities, both have suffered terrible losses, and both have sought revenge for past outrages. When government forces recovered bodies of soldiers killed in the fall of Elephant Pass this week, they discovered to their horror that many of the corpses had been mutilated.

The Tamil fighters were taking vengeance for the desecration of their cemeteries four years ago and for acts of ethnic cleansing visited upon the civilian population of their northern province.

The Tigers have often sent terrorist packing suicide bombs into crowds of civilians. This past December they wounded Prime Minister Chandrika Kumaratunga in one eye and killed 25 people in such an attack. To overcome the army's base in Elephant Pass this week they blew up wells, cutting off the troops' water supply in a dry climate where the heat surpassed 100 degrees. Senior officers dying of dehydration were airlifted out of their trap.

For their part, government forces have been denounced by Doctors Without Borders and the Red Cross for denying medicines to everyone in the north, civilians and fighters alike.

The United States has had little to do with this war except to sell some weapons to the government and provide some military training. Many of the weapons have fallen into the hands of the Tigers, and the training has done little good. To save the lives that are being squandered on both sides, Washington should now counsel Kumaratunga and her government to accept a cease-fire supervised by international monitors and to pursue to peace talks that Norway has offered to mediate.

HONORING THUNDER BOY

HON. HEATHER WILSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to your attention the heroism displayed by Thunder Boy, the masked superhero of Albuquerque. Thunder Boy recently saved the city of Albuquerque from the clutches of the Evil Grouch. Though slow to anger, Thunder Boy does not suffer villains gladly. He rescued Weatherdog, turned the city's fountain back on, and recovered stolen toys for many sick children at Carrie Tingley Hospital.

Through his deeds, Thunder Boy has become Albuquerque's preeminent super hero. Time and again, through all adversity, he has proven himself a true hero, capable of whatever bravery and self-sacrifice are necessary to right a wrong or save a life. But, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget the joy that Thunder Boy brings to those around him daily, even when villains and evil-doers are on vacation.

Thunder Boy's generous heart is what makes him a true hero. He saved Albuquerque because he cares about our city and our neighbors. But his heroism shows in other ways as well. When he sees people who are sad, he smiles to brighten their day. He relishes the peace he finds in others' happiness and wants to spread joy to the world. Thunder Boy shows us that the most important superpower is the ability we all have to make someone else's life better simply by being kind.

Thunder Boy shows us that heroes are not only found in comic books or on television, but are here around us every day if we only look hard enough. Today we honor his strength and kind heart. His fight to help mankind will not be soon forgotten, and neither will his smile. May he teach us all the friendship and kindness that we may all become better people in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the newspaper in Albuquerque, formerly the Daily Planet but now known as the Albuquerque Journal, has been on the trail of Thunder Boy, trying to reveal his true identity. The paper has unconfirmed reports that Thunder Boy, when not battling the Evil Grouch, is a 4-year-old boy name Isaiah Perea, son of Alex Perea and Tanya Larranga, who is fighting another kind of battle—against Leukemia. His wish, through Make-A-Wish Foundation, was to be a superhero. On May 16, 2000, the Foundation arranged for him to save Albuquerque from the Evil Grouch. This report, of course, is still unconfirmed.

Whatever his true identity, the people of Albuquerque are grateful for all he has done for us.

Mr. Speaker, let us wish Thunder Boy God-speed in all the battles he faces.

A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 TO PROVIDE THAT ANCESTORS AND LINEAL DESCENDANTS OF PAST OR PRESENT MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES SHALL BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN DETERMINING WHETHER A VETERANS' ORGANIZATION IS EXEMPT FROM TAX

HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from New York, Mr. RANGEL, in introducing our bill to fix a current problem in the Internal Revenue Code regarding use of American Legion Post facilities by members and their families. That is, who qualifies as a "member" versus a guest, for purposes of unrelated business income and the exempt status of the Legion Posts. We do not believe Congress intended or contemplated that use of the facilities by families of the member would result in unrelated business income, or worse yet, the possibility of losing the Post's tax exemption under Section 501(c)(19).

By congressional charter, only veterans who served during specifically designated wars may become "members" of the American Legion. Section 501(c)(19) requires only that 75 percent of the members be current or former members of the Armed Forces, and substantially all the other members are cadets, spouses, widows or widowers of past or present members. The IRS says substantially all is 90 percent. The Legion requires internally that 100 percent of its members be qualifying veterans. However, the Legion has many programs, such as the Sons of the American Legion (SAL), as well as programs involving youth and family support groups. All are designed to further the purposes for which the exemption was granted.

The Post is a family gathering place for many social and patriotic activities. As a result, many family members of numerous generations attend these events. At the present time, the regulations provide that certain relatives related to the war veteran qualify. These include grandparents, brother, sister, and grandchildren. Questions have been raised whether SALs count for the 100 percent or 90 percent test, or might be considered "associate or social members." The same questions arise regarding auxiliary members and relatives beyond the position of the regulation, i.e. great grandparents, great grandchildren, etc. The answers could determine the extent of unrelated business taxable income as well as exempt status. This is not an issue regarding true guests, i.e. unrelated individuals who are, and must be, accompanied by a member. Nor is any substantive change contemplated regarding the sale of life and health insurance to members as provided in Section 512(a)(4). That section would be

amended to conform the definition to Congressional charter members and their dependents.

Our bill would eliminate these potential issues by providing that the definition of "member" for purposes of the exemption status and unrelated business income would be expanded to include "ancestors or lineal descendants of the member" (i.e. past or present member of the Armed Services meeting the congressional charter definition).

We believe this change is not only fair, but recognizes the original intent of Congress, and the fact that more distant relatives of the member will come into existence over time. We hope our colleagues will join us in cosponsoring this legislation.

THE 3M SALUTE TO SCHOOL LIBRARIES

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, today I congratulate 3M, in partnership with the American Association of School Librarians, for their donation of \$1 million in detection systems to school library media centers in 2000.

In an effort to help school libraries maintain their valuable resource, 3M, a leader in library security, has launched "3M Salute to Schools," a program which will donate up to \$1 million in 3M detection systems for up to 100 schools in the United States. The American Association of School Librarians (AASL) will be responsible for receiving applications and selecting recipients for the donations.

The program is open to middle and high schools in the United States. Schools selected will be awarded a 3M Detection System for the entrance/exit of their media center, a supply of 3M Tattle-Tape security strips for marking items in their collection and necessary materials processing accessories. Individual donations will vary depending upon the size of the collection and the physical layout of the media center. To receive the donation, a school must meet eligibility requirements, including demonstrating a need for a security system.

Schools must apply by May 31, 2000, applications are available by calling the AASL Fax on Demand at 1-800-545-2433, then press 4 and request document No. 802. Recipients will be announced at the AASL Annual Conference, July 8-11.

For more information about "3M Salute to Schools," contact the AASL awards program at 1-800-545-2433 ext. 4383 or cattenh@ala.org.

This important award program reflects 3M's and AASL's shared commitment to education and investing in our nation's schools.

It is with this outstanding award, Mr. Speaker, that I offer this tribute in honor of 3M and their contribution to our nation's school libraries.

REGARDING: MR. B AND SOUTHMOST COLLEGE

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in commending one of the pillars of my South Texas community, Mr. Raul Besteiro, as he is recognized by the University of Texas at the Brownsville (UT-B) Texas Southmost College as a "Distinguished Alumni" on Friday, May 12.

Mr. B, as Raul Besteiro is affectionately known throughout South Texas, is an educator with the biggest heart I have ever known. We have known each other nearly 20 years. He is a gentle and respected friend who shares my love for all things in South Texas. First as an educator, then in a second career as the Chief Executive Officer and Director of the Port of Brownsville, Mr. B has energetically served the people in the Rio Grande Valley over the course of his life. His work at the Port brings an enormous volume of trade through the Valley, bringing jobs to our area.

It is entirely appropriate that Mr. B be chosen for the honor of Distinguished Alumnus, for he has dedicated his life to the education of young people. He spent the first 33 years of his career in the service of the Brownsville Independent School District (BISD), first as a teacher, then later as Superintendent. He has remained committed to education while in his career as Port Director, offering advice to the school district and employees, and even had a school named after him in 1994. He is a unique educator for the community of Brownsville with the example of his life's work.

The community of Brownsville is lucky to have Raul Besteiro in it. He taught us all the meaning of courage and the remarkable nature of human will when he faced down cancer in the early 1990s. His most recent educational legislative interest, the Brownsville Wetlands Center Act, was signed into law in 1994. This important coordination of industry and UT-B teaches students how to protect, restore, and maintain the fragile ecosystems of the Gulf of Mexico region.

This project—in which Raul Besteiro was a prominent and influential player—combines his love of this community, his dedication to education, and his vision of a future in which the environmental concerns of industry and NAFTA are solved by the people who live in a community inspired ever forward by free trade.

Mr. B is a unique patriot, citizen, and family man, respected by so many people because he offers respect to everyone he meets. I ask the colleagues to join me in commending Raul Besteiro for the honor of indeed being a distinguished alumni of the Brownsville (UT-B) Texas Southmost College.

TRIBUTE TO DR. BRIAN CRAM

HON. SHELLEY BERKLEY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize a man who has

dedicated his life to improving education for the children in the Las Vegas community.

Dr. Brian Cram has spent over 34 years as an educator, serving our children as a teacher, as a principal, and as the superintendent of the Clark County School District. It is with great sadness that we say farewell to an educator who has touched the lives of thousands of students, but it is with great happiness that we wish him a joyous retirement.

Affectionately known by the students in his district as the "Supernintendo," Dr. Cram's tenure will be remembered by his strong personal relationships, and his ability to bring the "human side" to the needs of the school district.

As a principal, Dr. Cram was not satisfied sitting behind a desk, and was happiest during the times when he was actively involved with the students' education. As a superintendent, Dr. Cram would actively participate in the educational needs of the students by traveling to as many schools possible to read to classes during the district's "reading weeks."

Dr. Cram was witness to the enormous growth of Las Vegas, as the Clark County School System expanded from 111,000 students, to over 215,000 students. As a self-proclaimed "poster boy for school bonds," Dr. Cram supported the building of 100 new schools, and championed voter approval of billions of dollars in school construction bonds for the students, teachers, and staff of the Clark County School District.

Driven by the fundamental principle that education is the "great equalizer" in life, Dr. Cram endorsed the School to Work program that was sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce, enabling students with the necessary tools to excel in the workforce.

Dr. Cram should be very proud of his accomplishments, as he has been successful in achieving his greatest challenge to meet the growth needs of the 8th largest school district in the country. His commitment and dedication is unmatched, and will be truly missed. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Cram on behalf of the Clark County community, and wish him every success in future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VITO FOSSELLA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded on rollcall No. 154 for the rule to provide for consideration of H.R. 3709, the Internet Nondiscrimination Act. I was unavoidably detained due to inclement weather, and therefore, was not present to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the rule.

HONORING WILLIAM G. SHEEHAN UPON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take a few minutes to

honor a special constituent of mine who after 30 years of providing senior citizens with dedicated service at the Social Security Administration has decided to retire on June 2 of this year.

William G. Sheehan, who presently serves as the District Manager of the Springfield, MA, regional office of the Social Security Administration, has decided that the time has come for him to hang up his hat and retire from a long and meritorious career.

Bill Sheehan's commitment to seniors, the poor and the disabled in western Massachusetts is well known, and his day to day input and dedication in the Springfield regional SSA office will surely be missed.

Bill started his career with the Social Security Administration in 1967 as a Claims Representative in SSA's Springfield office. In 1971, he became an Operations Supervisor, working out of the Hartford, CT, office. He continued to climb the ranks within the Social Security Administration, moving from office to office, when in June of 1980, he became the District Manager of the Springfield Regional Social Security office. He has served in this position for more than 20 years.

There is common and collective praise for the job Bill Sheehan has done during his tenure in Springfield. The usual comments I hear about Bill go something like: "Oh, Bill Sheehan—he's the nicest man," or "Bill Sheehan, he's been so helpful." Surely his friendly face and his cordial demeanor will be greatly missed.

In addition to his brilliant service record, Bill has had a very rich public life in the community outside of his office. He serves on the Career Advisory Board at Springfield College, and was a Board member at Independence House, a shelter for men. He currently serves on the Boards of Independence House, the Galaxy Council, and the Consumer Credit Council of western Massachusetts, as well as the Greater Springfield Senior Services Inc., where he has also served as past President and Treasurer. He is also a retired United States National Guard Lieutenant Colonel and Squadron Commander.

Most noteworthy to mention today is Bill Sheehan's commitment to his family. He is married to the former Madelyn Ferrero, his former schoolmate at Cathedral High School in Springfield. Madelyn is a graduate from Elms College and is a teacher at Forest Park Middle School.

Together, Bill and Madelyn have two children, Bill and Mark. Mark is married to Jennifer Doyle, lives on Cape Cod, and works for State Street Bank in Boston. His son Bill lives in Boston and is Vice President for an Internet company, Suppliermarket.

Bill Sheehan is a graduate of Western New England College, doing it the hard way, at night, while working during the day. Bill also sold advertising for the Springfield newspapers prior to coming to the Social Security Administration.

Bill enjoys his life in Wilbraham, keeping a meticulously groomed yard and house. He plans to spend much of his retirement at his summer home at the Rhode Island shore.

I would like to take a moment to thank Bill Sheehan for a life of public and community service. Social Security beneficiaries in the Springfield area, and all of us who have worked with him throughout the years, will miss him very much.

HONORING NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is a well established fact that non-commissioned officers are the backbone of our nation's military. Today's NCO's are given dual roles as leaders and technicians. In addition to providing operational support for their superiors and their organizations, these men and women are duty bound to provide for the health, welfare and safety of the troops under their care. An effective NCO must be mentally and physically dedicated as well as technically and tactically proficient in his or her field of expertise. Such qualities are inherent in Command Sergeant Major Benjamin C. Palacios.

Widely known as Ben, CSM Palacios was born on November 11, 1950, on the island of Saipan in the Northern Marianas. He later moved to Guam where he graduated from George Washington High School. Initially enlisting with the Army on October, 1969, he underwent Basic Training at Fort Ord, CA.

Ben was destined to serve in the Army. He took a 2-year hiatus from military life in 1972 only to re-enlist in 1974 as a Specialist Four. He is now one of the Army's most senior NCO's.

All through his many years of military service Ben served both in the Continental United States and overseas with the 1st Infantry Division, the 9th Infantry Division, the 1st Cavalry Division, and the 2d Armored Division. His assignments include serving in all enlisted leadership positions within the Armor Career Management Field—from Tank Commander to Command Sergeant Major. He also served as an Operations Sergeant in several Armor Battalions. In 1988, he was assigned as the Senior Enlisted Advisor for the 50th Armored Division, New Jersey Army National Guard.

From March 1994 through February 1996, Ben served as the Division Command Sergeant Major for the 24th Infantry Division at Fort Stewart, GA. While serving as the Brigade Command Sergeant Major for the 2nd Vanguard Brigade from May 1994 through January 1996, he participated in several deployments with the Brigade. These included tours of duty with the National Training Center and Bright Star '94 in Egypt. In addition, he was also deployed to Saudi Arabia in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm as the 3-69 Armor Battalion Command Sergeant Major. Ben served as the Command Sergeant Major for the Third Mobile Armored Corps at Fort Hood in Texas for 2½ years prior to assuming duty as the United States Army Forces Command Command Sergeant Major on July 27, 1998.

Ben sought further development through professional military education. He attended the Fifth Army Noncommissioned Officer Academy and the Sergeant Major Academy. He also completed the First Sergeants Course in addition to obtaining an Associate's Degree from Fort Steilacoom Community College.

Among his decorations are the Legion of Merit (1OLC), the Bronze Star, the Meritorious Service Medal (2OLC), the Army Commendation Medal (3OLC), the Army Achievement Medal, the Good Conduct Medal (9th Award),

the National Defense Medal with Bronze Star, the Southwest Asia Service Medal with two Bronze Stars, the NCDOP Ribbon (#4), the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Ribbon (#2), and the Kuwaiti Liberation Medal. CSM Palacios has also been a member of the elite Sergeant Morales Club since 1979.

On Guam and the Marianas, the personal accomplishments and success of native sons and daughters are celebrated and adopted as triumphs for everyone in the community. Through his illustrious service in the United States Army, Ben has attained respect and admiration of many. He has brought recognition, not only to himself, but also to the people of the Marianas. On their behalf, I commend Command Sergeant Major Benjamin C. Palacios for his outstanding achievements.

COMMITTING TO EQUAL PAY

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, today more women are working than ever before. The number of working women has grown from 18.4 million in 1950 and to 63 million in 1997. Women made up 29.6 percent in 1950 and 46.2 percent in 1997. Our nation depends on the contributions of working women. And equal pay has been the law of the land since 1963. Yet today is Equal Pay Day—the day when women's earnings from January 1999 to May 11, 2000 will finally equal what men earned in 1999 alone. 37 years later after the enactment of the Equal Pay Act, women are still paid less than men—even with similar education, skills and experience. It's time we ensure women can make ends meet and find respect and opportunity on the job.

In 1996, women were paid 74 cents for every dollar men received. That's \$26 less to spend on groceries, housing, child care and other expenses for every \$100 worth of work. Over a lifetime of work, the 26 cents-on-the-dollar adds up. The average working woman will lose \$523,000 to unequal pay during her working life.

Ensuring equal pay for equal work is about improving the lives of families. In the United States, 99 out of every 100 women will work for pay at some point in their lives. 71.9 percent of women with children younger than 18 are in the labor force. This means the wage gap doesn't just shortchange women. It hurts children and families because many working women are the primary breadwinners in their households. In fact, nearly two-thirds of working women provide half or more of their household income, and forty-one percent are the sole source of income. Many families need two full paychecks to get by every month. One full paycheck and one three-quarters paycheck just doesn't cut it.

That's one of the reasons I am a proud cosponsor of the Paycheck Fairness Act. This legislation will help us to better enforce the Equal Pay Act. It will put wage discrimination on the basis of gender on the same footing as wage discrimination on the basis of race or ethnicity.

The Paycheck Fairness Act will toughen the remedy provisions of the Equal Pay Act. It will strengthen enforcement of the Equal Pay Act

by committing more resources to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. It will improve education and outreach on differentials between women and men in the workplace, and lift the gag rule imposed by many employers who forbid employees to discuss their wages with co-workers.

I believe most employers want to treat their workers fairly. But for those employers who reward the hard work and loyalty of women with a partial paycheck, we need such measures as the Paycheck Fairness Act to put a stop to their wrongdoing.

Mr. Speaker, 37 years is long enough to wait for equity. It's time we join together and end the wage gap.

THE OCCASION OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE S.H.A.P.E. COMMUNITY CENTER

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize Self-Help for African People Through Education, Inc., more commonly known as the S.H.A.P.E. Community Center, of Houston, Texas, on the occasion of its 30th anniversary. On Saturday, May 13, 2000, S.H.A.P.E. will celebrate 30 years of commitment and service to strengthening Black families, the community and the nation.

S.H.A.P.E.'s successful growth is a result of the exemplary services the center provides and offers to area residents. Founded in 1969, chartered by the State of Texas in 1971, and classified by the IRS as a 501(c)(3) organization, S.H.A.P.E. started as a summer enrichment program for youth promoting knowledge of, pride in, and respect for their African heritage. Since its inception, S.H.A.P.E. has been involved in the creation, implementation and operation of education, cultural enrichment, employment, economic development, and crime/juvenile delinquency prevention programs.

In the spring of 1974, S.H.A.P.E. purchased what was once its main building, located at 3815 Live Oak. Remodeled in 1993, this building is now called the S.H.A.P.E. Family Center. It has an art gallery, cafe, small classrooms/meeting areas, a library, and performance space for cultural, educational and other community events. In 1993, S.H.A.P.E. purchased a building at 3903 Alameda called the S.H.A.P.E. Harambee Building which houses the business office and economic development programs. The Harambee Building has a major community space that can seat up to 500 people. Public events from town hall meetings to plays to Kwanzaa Celebrations have been held at both locations over the years.

S.H.A.P.E. has two major programs: the Family Strengthening & Empowerment Program (FSEP) and the Community Empowerment Program (CEP). The major components of the FSEP include After-School and Summer Enrichment programs for children and a Parents Rites of Passage program for adults. Forming the core of the CEP are the Cultural Arts Program (Community Festivals, Celebrations and Ceremonies), Annual Events, Economic Development, and Community Organizing, Outreach & Partnership activities.

S.H.A.P.E. Community Center has been able to provide these services over the past 30 years because of in-kind contributions and volunteers. Throughout the years, many diverse organizations, groups, businesses and governmental agencies have helped S.H.A.P.E. in its efforts to meet the community needs, and I commend each and every one of them who, over the past 30 years, has helped to make S.H.A.P.E. a model community center.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask my colleagues to join me in saluting the spirit of service that has flourished at S.H.A.P.E. Community Center over the past 30 years, and to join me in congratulating Self-Help for African People through Education, Inc., on its 30th anniversary.

THE RETIREMENT OF BRIAN HUNTER

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the retirement of Mr. Brian Hunter from the California Department of Fish and Game. Mr. Hunter has served the state of California in the Department of Fish and Game for 39 years. For the past 20 years he has managed the Department's 15 county Central Coast Region.

Brian Hunter was born in 1940 in Berkeley, CA. He was raised on a sheep and cattle ranch near Lincoln, California. During his youth, Brian was involved in 4H and the Future Farmers of America. He received his A.A. degree from Sacramento City and American River Colleges in 1961. In 1963 Brian received a B.A. degree in Microbiology and Biochemistry from Sacramento State University. Three years later in 1966, Brian received his Masters Degree from Sacramento State in Microbiology and in Wildlife diseases. He was later certified as a Wildlife Biologist and deputized peace officer by the Wildlife Society.

In July of 1963, Brian began his career with the Department of Fish and Game working in the Wildlife Laboratory in Sacramento, CA. He held several positions including Laboratory Technician to Wildlife Pathologist in charge. In January 1978, Mr. Hunter became the Wildlife Management Supervisor and Big Game Coordinator for the Sacramento office, a position he held until 1980. In 1980, Brian was promoted to Regional manager of the Central Coast region of the California Department of Fish and Game.

During his tenure with the Department of Fish and Game, Brian was instrumental in developing numerous policies and projects. He established cooperative relations with CalTrans, Pacific Gas and Electric and many other entities to help them accomplish their public works projects while maintaining and protecting natural resources. He also provided leadership for interagency coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Army National Guard. It was Brian who made the initial agreement that led to the Wildlife Conservation Board's acquisition of property at Moss Landing and the creation of the Elkhorn Slough National Estuarine Research in Monterey County, CA. Brian

also had oversight and acted as the media contact for the 1998 Shell Oil Spill in Carquinez Strait of Northern California which ultimately led to a \$19 million settlement. He was instrumental in the \$1 million settlement agreement with Browning Ferris Industries to help restore Pilarcitos Creek in San Mateo County, CA.

Throughout his life, Brian Hunter has been an ardent supporter of recreational fishing and hunting programs throughout northern California. He has encouraged, supported and participated in numerous youth hunting and fishing programs. He developed animal capture and restraint protocols and wrote the handbook for animal capture as well as developing the training class. He has served as the associate editor of TRACKS and on the editorial advisory board of the Outdoor California magazine which is regularly published by the Department of Fish and Game. Perhaps Brian's greatest accomplishment has been in the hiring, training and mentoring of numerous successful Fish and Game Employees.

Brian is a devoted family man as well. He is married and two children, ages 33 and 35. In his spare time Brian prides himself as a hunter, angler, observer of nature and a purveyor of common sense.

Clearly Brian Hunter has been a valuable asset to the people and the wildlife of northern California. His distinguished career record speaks for itself. It has been my honor to represent Brian as both a State Senator and now as a Congressman. For these reasons I move that we recognize and honor Brian Hunter for his outstanding achievements and service to the State of California.

INTERNET NONDISCRIMINATION
ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3709) to make permanent the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act as it applies to new, multiple, and discriminatory taxes on the Internet.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address H.R. 3709, The Internet Non-discrimination Act. The Internet transformed business and commerce in a revolutionary fashion. Congress now must face the daunting task of shaping policy concerning its taxation.

Mr. Chairman, I come from East Texas, a region that has a heavy concentration of small businesses. Under law, these businesses are required to collect sales tax. In 1992, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that states cannot require businesses without a physical presence in their geographic area to collect and remit sales taxes. Small businesses were essentially rendered uncompetitive under this ruling. These "brick and mortar" stores now face extinction because they are forced to compete with online businesses who do not have to collect state and local taxes.

As things stand, state and local governments lose about \$5 billion annually in uncollected sales taxes on mail order purchases

and are expected to lose about \$15 billion annually in uncollected sales taxes on Internet purchases by the year 2003. I am aware that the Internet is the engine driving current economic growth and am in no way trying to jeopardize its growth. The Internet provides access to products that my rural constituents would not otherwise be able to purchase. However, I believe that electronic commerce and small business should exist on a level playing field with regard to taxation. It is time that Congress begins to address the task of creating a fair tax code for online retailers and their brick and mortar counterparts.

I urge my colleagues to work toward a technology neutral, simplified, sales tax system which guarantees that buyers and sellers are treated equally. It is important that Congress be given and appropriate period of time to build a consensus on the long-term solution to Internet taxation issues. We must be careful to avoid a hasty, ill-conceived tax system that places unnecessary tax burdens on our consumers and sellers.

I stand in support of H.R. 3709, The Internet Nondiscrimination Act. It is my hope that, in the future, Congress will go one legislative step further and address the issues surrounding e-commerce taxation.

SAMUEL B. MOODY BATAAN
DEATH MARCH ACT

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation in the name of a special and dear friend who valiantly served in World War II and survived the treacherous Bataan Death March. The "Samuel B. Moody Bataan Death March Compensation Act" would provide compensation to those individuals who were forced to partake and held imprisoned following the ruthless procession.

Last year, Sam Moody passed away in Central Florida. I first met Sam in my civic activities in central Florida some years ago. However, I never really knew much about his background until some years ago when I invited Sam and several other veteran leaders to a small luncheon gathering.

As we sat together, I asked each of the veterans to relate some of their military service recollections after lunch to our group. Sam Moody started off rather hesitantly but he began telling an incredible story.

In 1942, American and Filipino troops fought bravely against the Japanese army during the Second World War on the Bataan Peninsula in the Philippines. Due to the low supplies and no hope of reinforcements, these men fought valiantly until they were forced to surrender to the enemy.

Within six days, the troops were corralled in the Mariveles, just south of Bataan. Little did they know, they were in for the journey of their lives—the Bataan Death March. In April of 1942 they began their march from Mariveles to their yet unknown destination of San Fernando—more than 60 miles away. The tropical temperatures in the Philippines during this season were excruciating, many men dying from dehydration and some from exhaustion. Treatment by their Japanese captors was bru-

tal and often fatal as those who could not continue marching were summarily beaten or executed on the spot.

Many marchers attempted to escape into the jungles and some succeeded, however, most were forced to continue on their journey. Once they reached the railroad sidings, the troops were crammed into railroad cars like cattle. They continued to feel the torture of the tropical sun and their 30 mile train journey took close to 4 hours with long stops at various points.

After reaching camp O'Donnel in the jungles of Arlac Province, these soldiers were held as prisoners of war for over 3½ years.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the "Samuel B. Moody Bataan Death March Compensation Act" is to illustrate that while food and clothing allowances existed for our soldiers the United States failed to pay these benefits to the Bataan Death March survivors during their time spent in captivity.

In fact, those who survived to see their liberation in 1945 also did not receive the promotions or pay grade increases given to their counterparts who were not held as POWs. Pay increases and benefits were a standard part of military service, however, these brave individuals have yet to receive their lost payment.

In an effort to give these brave men their just benefits, I am introducing this legislation to compensate those survivors who were held captive after the Bataan Death March with their earned pay and benefits.

I would like to invite each member of this body to join me in this effort by cosponsoring this legislation. For those who gave so much in service to our Nation deserve to be duly compensated for their sacrifice and valor.

EULOGY FOR GRACE DIEHL

HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a remarkable woman, Grace Diehl, who passed away last month. Grace was the wife of Leo Diehl, the former assistant and close friend of Speaker "Tip" O'Neill. I am inserting the eulogy delivered at Grace's mass by Tom O'Neill, the speaker's son. It is obvious in reading the eulogy that Grace and Leo shared a love and devotion that we all should emulate. I submit this eulogy not only to pay my respect to Grace and her memory, but to share with my colleagues a true love story.

EULOGY FOR GRACE DIEHL

Good Morning to each of you . . . Father . . . Grace's family and friends . . . and especially to you Leo. It is a great honor and a significant responsibility . . . to offer some remembrances about Grace whose long life spanned most of the last century and who . . . thanks in large part to an enviable but mysterious mix of great genes, determination and the constant care and concern of an equally determined husband . . . managed to also celebrate the dawn of this new century.

Grace's life is a remarkable saga, best told in two parts. . . . The years before "My Leo" as she liked to call him and the years with Leo, which I know she would agree were her best.

Most good stories begin at the beginning which is where I should start. The problem is

that no one is exactly sure, in Grace's case, exactly where the beginning is. A variety of educated guesses put her date somewhere between 1904 and . . . 1910. And since Grace was an avid believer in the old saying that "a lady never tells her age", I will leave it to you to "do the math".

In any case, we do know that Grace Shaunessy was both in North Cambridge on August 1st.

Like so many of her generation, the major markers of Grace's life included two World Wars and a Great Depression. But thanks to entrepreneurial parents . . . her father, owned a chain of variety stores and, later her mother ran a popular neighborhood tavern . . . Grace's prospects were a lot better than most of the young women of her generation.

She was able to graduate from Cambridge High and Latin and further her education at The Chandler School.

Grace, like her parents, had a good head for business and in many respects was ahead of her time. She was for many years a career woman holding down positions in the foreign exchange department at Jordan Marsh, working for the government distributing those all-important rationed stamps . . . so much a hallmark of the Depression era . . . and working in the Tax Department of Cambridge City Hall.

It was there, in Cambridge City Hall, that Leo Diehl, himself a "tax man" met and began courting Grace Shaunessy. Leo and my father were both happily employed in the Assessor's Office until the Assessor decided he didn't like politicians and summarily fired both of them.

Leo and Grace began a whirlwind . . . and some would say . . . over-extended courtship that lasted over ten years and included trips to New York . . . properly chaperoned of course by a respectable, married couple . . . my parents! I'm not entirely sure what finally convinced Leo to "pop the question" but my hunch is that it had something to do with his feeling the need to settle in to a saner life after helping to run my father's first and notoriously difficult first race for Congress against LoPresti in 1952? In any case, Grace and Leo finally married in 1953, and remarkably, although they both began the married years well into mid-life, their marriage last for almost fifty years.

Grace gave up her career and happily settled into a new life, eventually adjusting to another contemporary twist . . . a commuter marriage. She and Leo bought a house in Belmont and, after a while, built their dream house, complete with a newly-dredged Harbor in Harwichport. Together with their many friends and neighbors . . . the McGuires, the Does, the Maloneys, the Roes . . . and, finally, after a long period impinging on Leo and Grace's hospitality and repeated use of the spare bedroom . . . the O'Neill's finally scraped up enough money to join the rest of the gang.

Those were fun times for Grace and Leo and for my parents and their friends. . . . Saturday nights at the Club, card games and songfests. Grace loved a good party and was always willing to endure Leo and my father's duets. She even enjoyed listening to Leo's famous and often repeated rendition of "Ten Baby Fingers". But, after a while, she drew the line on "I met a Lemon in the Garden of Love Where They Said Only Peaches Grow".

Beside her business know-now, Grace had many other interests and talents . . . gardening, painting and needlework to name a few. She was always the lady with high standards and excellent taste . . . beautifully dressed . . . the creator of comfortable surroundings. But the center of her universe was, without question, Leo. He doted on her and she enjoyed being doted on. In their later years, when Grace's health

began to fail, Leo made sure, with considerable effort, that she got to go out for a ride every day. He handled her every need without complaint and with a patience and devotion that is remarkable and rare. Leo, we know that you have suffered a great loss and that you will miss Grace. I hope that you will rely on the love and support of your family and friends . . . and on the knowledge that you were at Grace's side ministering to her every need until the very end.

Godspeed to you, Leo . . . and to you, Grace.

THE "BANKING EQUAL
TREATMENT ACT", H.R. 4427

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the "Banking Equal Treatment Act" to ensure that all American families have access to basic financial services. It is hard to believe that in this age of Internet banking, online stock trading and embedded options, millions of American families lack the basic passport to the broader economy—a bank account. But, it is true.

According to the Federal Reserve, more than 8.4 million low- and moderate-income families do not now have access to a checking or savings account at a mainstream financial institution. As a consequence, their financial condition, and ability to fully participate in the nation's current economic prosperity, suffers greatly.

For some time now, I have been concerned that we are seeing the development of a dual financial services structure in this country—one for middle and upper income individuals that involves traditional regulated and insured financial institutions; a second for lower-income households that involves higher cost services from lesser-regulated entities check-cashers, pawn shops and other quasi-financial entities.

A 1998 survey found that among Earned Income Tax Credit Claimants who used volunteer tax preparation services in Chicago, 44 percent used a check cashing service to cash their EITC refund check. Some estimate that low-income families may pay more than \$15,000 in fees over a lifetime for check-cashing and bill-paying services from less-regulated financial institutions, such as check-cashers and payday lenders. This legislation addresses this inequity in the financial marketplace in a positive way that benefits both consumers and banks.

First, the bill permits the Federal Reserve Banks to pay interest on the so-called sterile reserves that banks, thrifts and credit unions are required to maintain in the Federal Reserve Banks as part of the monetary control apparatus of the Federal Reserve Board. The Federal Reserve Board has testified that paying interest on sterile reserves would be a helpful tool in the conduct of monetary policy. Understandably, many in the industry view the combination of required reserves and the inability to receive interest on those reserves as a tax on the industry and support a repeal of the prohibition.

Second, before the Federal Reserve banks can pay interest on sterile reserves, the Fed-

eral financial regulators must require that all banks, thrifts and credit unions offer their customers affordable transaction accounts. Under the bill, an affordable transaction account holder would be permitted a minimum of 8 withdrawal transactions or checks per month for a low monthly service fee. Banks could charge a reasonable fee for other additional transactions, but all fees charged for using these accounts would be capped at amount established by the Federal banking and credit union regulators. The bill gives institutions flexibility. With regulatory approval, a financial institution could offer alternative accounts that are as advantageous to consumers as the low-cost transaction accounts.

This legislation is fair to financial institutions. The Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office estimate that permitting the Federal Reserve Banks to pay interest on sterile reserves will return to the banking industry between \$600 million and \$700 million, after taxes, in the first five years. It would only take a portion of those funds—probably in the \$100 million range—to defray the costs to banks of establishing low-cost transaction accounts for the millions of unbanked Americans.

Mainstream financial institutions will benefit in another way. They will find that the low-cost account holders will become good customers. A Federal Reserve study indicates that many low-income families with bank accounts used other bank products, including credit cards, automobile loans, first mortgages and certificates of deposits. This legislation also represents sound economic policy. Research indicates that once "unbanked" families enter the doors of depository institutions as regular account holders, they are likely to become savers and begin to accumulate assets.

Another important provision of the bill preserves state laws that provide more advantageous low-cost accounts for consumers. The bill amends the Bank Enterprise Act of 1991 to provide the same protection for stronger state laws. This last provision resolves an alleged conflict between the Bank Enterprise Act and New Jersey's Consumer Checking Account Act, which requires financial institutions to offer low-cost accounts similar to the bill's low-cost transaction accounts. In 1992, the Comptroller of the Currency opined that national banks did not need to comply with the New Jersey statute because the Bank Enterprise Act, as clearly indicated in the report on the bill, preempted that state statute. In 1996, the New Jersey Department of Banking asked the Comptroller to reconsider that opinion. That request is still under consideration. Although Congress did not intend to preempt state law when it adopted the Bank Enterprise Act, this bill effectively resolves the preemption question in favor of the New Jersey statute.

This legislation will work. For a successful example, you can look to my home state of New York, where we do a lot of banking. Since 1994, the State of New York has been requiring all financial institutions within its borders to offer low-cost basic banking accounts to consumers. New York financial institutions are complying with the law to the benefit of all involved.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to follow the example of New York and New Jersey and adopt the Banking Equal Treatment Act, so that the millions of American families who have been left out of the financial mainstream

will have an opportunity to receive basic financial services at a reasonable cost.

HONORING NADINE MILFORD

HON. HEATHER WILSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to your attention a woman who exemplifies the courage and love of a mother, even under circumstances that no parent should ever have to face. Nadine Milford has become a symbol of motherhood in my District, and throughout the state of New Mexico. Today, I would like to join American Mothers, Inc. in honoring Nadine as Mother's day approaches.

On Christmas Eve, 1992, Nadine's daughter, Melanie, and her three granddaughters, Kandyce, Kacee, and Erin, were hit and killed by a drunk driver in one of New Mexico's worst DWI accidents. Only Nadine's son-in-law, Paul Cravens, survived the wreck. This compelled her to dedicate her life to others. She has become a supporter and a comforter to the families of DWI victims, sometimes driving hundreds of miles to comfort a grieving mother.

Nadine is powerful and courageous. She lives life with a commitment to herself and to others to make this world better, gaining strength and balance from her deep faith. She remains dedicated, even through the most trying times, and will take her message as far as it will reach. Complimenting her dedication is her patience. Her son, Lance, has said of her, "Mom's persistence has moved mountains one grain of sand at a time."

Mr. Speaker, we know that laws are difficult to change, and our legislative system works slowly. More so, it takes a desire to be involved, whether you're a legislator or a caring mother who has experienced the effects of a nationwide problem—DWI—on the most personal of levels. Since that fateful holiday night so many years ago, Nadine has become New Mexico's most active and visible DWI lobbyist and activist. And she has been a significant factor in historic DWI reform throughout the years in New Mexico.

Nadine's personal philosophy has earned her respect from state legislators and friends alike: "Persistence wears resistance." In a world of chaos and unjustifiable tragedies, Nadine found the courage to forgive and to help. Today we gather to honor her mind and her will to make change as well as her courage, her strength, her commitment, and her involvement in our community. She encompasses what it is to be a woman and a mother: She is reverent, strong, caring, and willing to fight for a better world.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that no mother will ever have to face what Nadine Milford has faced. But for those who do, I pray that they will have the strength and character that Nadine Milford has.

IN HONOR OF THE PANASONIC-SPONSORED KID WITNESS NEWS PROGRAM AND THIS YEAR'S "NEW VISION" AWARD WINNERS

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the Panasonic-sponsored Kid Witness News program (KWN) and this year's "New Vision" award winners.

KWN began 17 years ago in Weehawken, New Jersey. Panasonic adopted the program in 1990, and has expanded it to include more than 200 schools in 117 cities across the nation. This is KWN's 10th anniversary with Panasonic.

KWN is an exceptional educational tool, allowing young people to express their feelings and share their perceptions of our world. With this program, our youth can tell us what they value—what is important to them. In addition, students gain valuable experience in news gathering and video production.

This Program is especially important because it provides public school students with education, professional development, instruction, and access to technology—essential ingredients for future success, at a time when these young people have the potential to be anything they aspire to be.

The great success of KWN would not have been possible without the hard work and dedication of Panasonic, its staff, and numerous volunteers; and congratulations to the talented students and dedicated teachers who have contributed as well—you are all an asset to our communities and our schools.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Panasonic-sponsored Kids Witness News program on its 10th anniversary; and congratulations to this year's "New Vision" award winners.

MARCIA WAGNER, CHAMPION OF CHILDREN

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise now during Teacher Appreciation Week to honor a devoted teacher from my Congressional district. Mrs. Marcia Wagner has taught music to thousands of students in Sterling, Colorado over her thirty-year career. After teaching at several of Sterling's grade schools, Mrs. Wagner completed her career on a high note at Sterling Middle School as a recipient of the Francis Gillespie Excellence Award—an award honoring her commitment to children.

In Sterling, Colorado, like many places in the West, there is a reliance on family and community. Mrs. Wagner embodies these values which are so prevalent throughout the district I represent. She has been a role model and has profoundly influenced thousands of students by putting children first and looking to parents and the local community for support.

During Teacher Appreciation Week, which recognizes a first-rate education system and properly functioning democracy requires a

partnership between educators, parents, and children; let us look to Marcia Wagner, a champion of children and community.

TRIBUTE TO WILBUR J. HENRICHS

HON. THOMAS W. EWING

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Wilbur J. Henrichs of Danforth, Illinois. For the last 64 years, Mr. Henrichs has served farmers in his feed store, the Danforth Hatchery. I am sad to say that on March 25th, Mr. Henrichs retired at the age of 87 and the Danforth Hatchery closed for business.

The Danforth Hatchery opened for business in 1936 with Mr. Henrichs managing the store. It was a feed and supply store and at one point served as a poultry hatchery. After managing the store for a few years, Mr. Henrichs took ownership and has operated the store ever since. Over time, his local suppliers have closed forcing him to drive over 200 miles to pick up his inventory, never once passing his increased delivery charges onto his customers. He is well known to farmers throughout the area for his reliability and willingness to lend a helping hand.

In addition to running the Hatchery, Mr. Henrichs has made outstanding contributions to the community through various civic activities. He has been active in his church and served as Village Clerk for over 40 years. In addition, Mr. Henrichs devotes his time and money to the 4-H and FFA groups in support of local youth and their involvement in agriculture.

As a life long resident of Danforth, Mr. Henrichs is known for his quiet, unselfish leadership. Over the years, he has touched countless lives in his daily routine. He continues to serve as a role model through his leadership, sense of humor and humanitarian attitude. On behalf of the citizens of Danforth and those he has served, I thank him for his dedication.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the distinguished service to agriculture and the Danforth Community of Mr. Henrichs; for his leadership and professional commitment to stewardship of the land and providing food and fiber to the world.

DANFORTH HATCHERY CLOSES AFTER 64 YEARS

(By Mike Lyons)

DANFORTH—Time was this place reverberated with the "cheeps" of a thousand newly hatched chicks and sparked with the animated chatter of newlyweds placing orders' for the family coop.

Time was the heavy front door of Danforth's downtown hatchery swung wide as grade school classes trooped in to witness life making its tenuous beginning beneath the "hen warm" lights of the incubator trays.

And time was proprietor Wilbur Henrichs welcomed such "intrusions" in his business day, including the daily visits of village kibitzers, curious kids and connoisseurs of that cutthroat card game called "Pepper."

In the process he became an indelible fixture in the lives of the rural community of Danforth and beyond—the matrix of hometown memory. A man they respectfully call "a treasure."

On Saturday generations of Wilbur's friends, and a sizable contingent of family, dropped by to help him end an era.

At 88, Wilbur elected to end business Saturday and close his cavernous 19th Century landmark on Danforth's main downtown intersection.

But if one supposed Wilbur's quitting business after having provided "quality chicks since 1936," would somehow escape to notice the organs of modern agricultural communication, one would be dead wrong.

Late Friday no less a luminary than WGN radio's Max Armstrong, phoned to wish Wilbur well in retirement.

Wilbur accepts the unexpected tribute with hallmark humility, his eyes twinkling just beneath the bill of a Golden Sun Feeds cap, its visor characteristically tilted just a bit to the right.

"It was fascinating to come in here in the spring, being a little kid, and seeing all these things," says Danforth native John Tammen, a farm manager in the Kankakee office of Soy Capital Ag Services.

But youngsters could observe far more than the mysteries of life unfolding at the hatchery.

They could observe the basics of small town business—Wilbur style.

"When Wilbur wasn't here—when he was making a delivery, or something—you could go over to the feed store (across the street), pick up what you wanted then come back over here and write it on the bill and sign you're name to it."

That accounting—called the "honor system" in some quarters—was good enough for Wilbur, who'd send his bill in due course.

Just outside, the seven foot tall fiberglass rooster townsmen doubled "Big Wilbur," stands his last watch on main street.

Ranks of Wilbur's well wishers use the fiberglass fowl as backdrop for farewell pictures with their favorite businessman.

And everywhere, "Wilbur recollections" are being offered by those whose lives he has some way touched.

Take Ashkum's David Trout, who along with his wife Virginia, have operated the petting zoo at the Iroquois County Fair for the past 15 years.

According to Trout, "Wilbur style" because dealings helped ensure the zoo could survive its early financial challenges.

"When we first started, we'd run some big feed bills and he'd never say anything to us. We were young and just trying to get started," notes Trout.

Just outside, village board member Denny Johnson stands near "Big Wilbur," recalling his own youthful visits to the hatchery.

"Classes would come up on little field trips," notes Johnson, 54, adding that he too was a "field trip" participant some three and a half decades ago.

"He's great guy," says Johnson a village board member.

None here would dispute that assessment, least of all Randy Johnson, Denny's brother, also a member of the village board.

"He doesn't have an enemy in the world!"

But what's Wilbur plan for retirement?

That fact is, Wilbur's not certain.

"I guess I'll have to think of something," he says, a grin quickly growing.

Maybe he'll join the ranks of the Pepper players he's hosted over the years.

As he says, "it keeps seniors off the streets and hold down senior delinquency."

But the Pepper gang will have to find new digs before that can happen. Wilbur just laughs when it's suggested that the Pepper crew might want to buy his building—a bit of a salty investment, even for this seasoned crew of card players.

Rumor has it that the Pepper players may find temporary quarters at a local church. A convenient venue given that many have likely prayed for better hands a time or two.

Saturday will mark a new chapter in Danforth's history when Wilbur Henrichs closes

the Danforth Hatchery. An open house is being held in Wilbur's honor from 8:30 to 12:30 and we would urge you to go.

Wilbur is one of those guys who has made life a little more interesting. When you're talking to him you can't afford to relax, because about the time you do, Wilbur, with tongue firmly in cheek, will come through with one of those one-liners he likes to slip in.

Wilbur went back in time with us Monday and told us he started working at the hatchery in 1936 and bought the store from Edgar Brockman in 1955. During the war years Wilbur said the hatchery produced thousands of chicks. Wilbur continued to turn out chicks until last year when he had to start turning orders down for the first time in 64 years.

The times when the hatchery ran 24 hours per day was nerve wracking, Wilbur said. You'd never know when a fuse might blow as it did one night, resulting in the loss of 4,000 chickens.

There's a lot of history attached to the building that houses the hatchery. The building has housed a grocery store and barbershop and Wilbur says he can remember coming uptown to see the toys in the window around Christmas.

Wilbur is a little concerned about what he's going to do when he retires. He says he has some things he has to dispose of and the hatchery has been the home to a number of card players for years and Wilbur feels a responsibility to "keep them off the streets".

BILL TO ESTABLISH OFFICE OF CORRECTIONAL HEALTH

HON. TED STRICKLAND

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would establish an Office of Correctional Health within the Department of Health and Human Services.

According to the Department of Justice (DOJ), the United States is second only to Russia among industrialized nations in incarceration rates with nearly 2 million people in jail or prison. The fuel that feeds this prison population explosion is comprised of several components. Mandatory minimum and "three-strikes" sentencing laws have resulted in longer sentences and more frequent incarcerations. A look at the changing demographics in American prisons and jails sheds light on the challenges correction facilities face at the beginning of the 21st century.

According to DOJ, 57 percent of state prisoners and 45 percent of federal prisoners surveyed in 1997 said they had used drugs in the month before their offense. A whopping 83 percent of state prisoners and 73 percent of federal prisoners had used drugs at some time in the past. It is estimated that about three-quarters of all inmates can be characterized as being involving in alcohol or drug abuse in the time leading to their arrest.

In the first comprehensive report on mental illness in correctional facilities, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) found that seven percent of federal inmates and 16 percent of those in state prisons or local jails or on probation said they either had a mental condition or had stayed over night in a mental hospital unit or treatment program. The highest rate of mental illness was among white females in state prisons at 29 percent. For white females

age 24 or younger this level rose to almost 40 percent. When compared to other inmates, mentally ill inmates and probationers reported higher rates of prior physical and sexual abuse. According to BJS, nearly 6 in 10 mentally ill offenders reported they were under the influence of alcohol and drugs at the time of their current offense. Many people do not know that the Los Angeles City jail is now the largest mental institution in the United States, holding 3,300 seriously mentally ill inmates on any given night.

The increased incarceration rate of women also presents new health care challenges to correctional facilities. According to BJS, in 1998 an estimated 950,000 women were under custody, care or control of correctional agencies. Nearly 6 in 10 women in state prisons had experienced physical or sexual abuse in the past. This statistic, coupled with the reality that 7 in 10 women under correctional sanction have minor children, points to the acute need for counseling services. Women inmates utilize health care services at higher rates than men. Because of their need for reproductive health care, including sexually transmitted diseases, and the possibility of pregnancy either upon entry into the correction system or during, women's special health care needs must be addressed in a comprehensive fashion.

The health care needs of inmates have expanded as the incarcerated population has aged. As inmates grow old in prison they succumb to the same ailments which afflict the elderly in the outside world—diabetes, heart disease and stroke. These geriatric health care needs represent another challenge to correctional agencies in providing adequate care.

In 1996, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Center for HIV, STD, and TB Prevention formed an ad hoc working group, the Cross Centers Correctional Work Group made up of health professionals from across CDC. The purpose of the group is to focus attention on the complex health needs of incarcerated men, women, and youth in the United States. I commend the work of this group and the fine efforts of CDC in addressing the very complex health issues associated with correctional facilities.

According to CDC, in 1994 AIDS diagnoses were almost six times more prevalent among the incarcerated population than among the general U.S. population. Further, inmates coming into correctional facilities are increasingly at risk for HIV infection through risk behaviors such as needle sharing and unprotected sex. Also, tuberculosis (TB) is another important public health issue in prisons and jails according to CDC. TB infection rates are substantially higher among inmates because conditions associated with TB (poverty, drug use, HIV infection, etc.) are more common in the incarcerated population than the general U.S. population.

Rates of infectious disease are known to be higher among inmates than in the general population and because most inmates are released after they've served their time, without treatment, these infected inmates threaten the public health of the community upon release.

All of these alarming statistics contribute to the need for the establishment of an Office of Correctional Health with HHS. Such an office would coordinate all correctional health programs within HHS; provide technical support to State and local correctional agencies on

correctional health; cooperate with other Federal agencies carrying out correctional health programs to ensure coordination; provide outreach to State directors of correctional health and providers; and facilitate the exchange of information regarding correctional health activities.

Mr. Speaker, with a growing diverse and medically complex population in America's prisons and jails, we must ensure that inmates are provided the health care they need, that staff members operate in a safe working environment, and as a result, public safety is enhanced.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to official business at the White House, I was unable to record my vote on rollcall No. 154, raising a point of order against the consideration of H.R. 3709 as an unfunded mandate. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay"—against consideration of H.R. 3709.

CONGRATULATING THE COMMUNITY HEALTHCARE NETWORK OF THE COLUMBUS, GEORGIA, REGIONAL HEALTHCARE SYSTEM

HON. MAC COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, today, during National Hospital Week, I honor accomplishments of the Community Healthcare Network. Earlier this week, the American Hospital Association presented its prestigious NOVA award to the Community Healthcare Network, which was established by Columbus Regional Healthcare System of Columbus, Georgia. This award recognizes hospitals' innovative and collaborative efforts to improve the health of their communities. I congratulate the dedicated health care workers of the Community Healthcare Network for achieving this important recognition.

The Community Healthcare Network—a collaboration of public and private entities serving 19 counties in west Georgia and east Alabama—exemplifies the dedication of health care workers, professionals, and volunteers who are there 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, curing and caring for their neighbors in need. Using the results of each county's baseline health status surveys, the Community Healthcare Network developed programs to meet each community's specific health needs. For example, primary health care centers were opened to serve children and adults in three rural counties. To increase accessibility, fees are based on the patients' abilities to pay.

The Community Care Mobile Unit travels throughout the service area providing primary care services to the homeless and indigent. Once a week, the unit visits locations selected by teens to provide teen health services. In other collaborative projects, the network has led the way to establish a children's dental

clinic, child health screenings at schools, and free transportation for prenatal visits.

Mr. Speaker, the Community Healthcare Network embodies the theme of this year's National Hospital Week—"Touching the Future with Care." I congratulate the Columbus Regional Healthcare System for its award-winning program, and I look forward to its future contributions to the communities of Georgia and Alabama.

HONORING THE LAMAR UNIVERSITY ALUMNI ASSOCIATION'S AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. NICK LAMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, today I congratulate the Lamar University Alumni Association's Distinguished Alumni Award recipients. I am particularly proud of these recipients for two reasons, one—I am a Lamar University Graduate myself, and two—one of the recipients is my sister. This year's proud award winners are Mary Jo Lampson Ford, W.S. "Bud" Leonard and Joe V. Tortorice, Jr. The Alumni Award recipients are all people who have gone on to great success and have made outstanding commitments to their alma mater and communities.

Mary Jo Lampson Ford, my sister, became a quadriplegic after contracting polio when she was 14. Through therapy she regained some use of her arms and decided to go to college. Mary Jo earned a bachelor's degree in social sciences and art from Lamar State College of Technology in 1956.

When Mary Jo attended Lamar it was prior to the days of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the buildings were not accessible to wheelchairs. Mary Jo found the students and teachers accepting and helpful, often times carrying her up and down stairs and across campus because of the lack of accessibility. Mary Jo taught for seven years at South Park High School and went on to become a well known artist.

The second recipient, W.S. "Bud" Leonard, was an organizing member and officer of the LU Cardinal Club, Cardinal Hall of Honor Council and Friends of the Arts. Bud earned an associate degree in 1950 and a bachelor's degree in health education in 1953 as a member of Lamar's first four-year graduating class. He returned to earn a master's degree in speech in 1976.

Bud began 20 years of service to Lamar in 1975 as vice president of university relations and assistant chancellor for development, during which Lamar received almost \$45 million in donations. He also volunteered before and after his tenure, offering 25 years of support. Bud was awarded the Golden Cardinal for exceptional service to the alumni association in 1985.

Joe V. Tortorice, Jr. is the third recipient and earned a master's degree in business administration from Lamar in 1971. Joe developed the Jason's Deli chain of restaurants, which now has 80 locations. In 1976 he opened his first restaurant, with his family serving as its employees and managers. The family connection has remained throughout the years, extending from his mother and fa-

ther to his cousins. Joe and three of his cousins later became partners in Deli Management Inc., which operates in Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Kansas, Arizona, Tennessee, and Florida.

Mr. Speaker, the three recipients of the Lamar University Alumni Association's Distinguished Alumni awards are all exceptional people. As a graduate of Lamar, I found my time there exhilarating—a time of rising expectation and rising confidence in the future and in myself. Lamar gave me the opportunity to try new things and meet people from diverse backgrounds, expanding my horizons both intellectually and socially. I have great admiration for Lamar, and I strongly believe that what I learned there has been an important factor in what I've been able to do since, and I know it was an important factor in the award recipients' accomplishments. I offer my congratulations to Mary Jo Lampson Ford, W.S. "Bud" Leonard and Joe V. Tortorice, Jr. and wish them continued success.

COMMENDING INDIANA TEACHERS FOR THEIR HARD WORK AND DEDICATION

HON. DAVID M. McINTOSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Teacher Appreciation Week, a week set aside for elected leaders, parents, administrators, and students to express their appreciation for teachers who are making a difference. Every American can think of a special teacher who was an inspiration in their lives. For me, that teacher was Mrs. Daphne Richards.

I was always a pretty good student in school, except for one thing. Early on, I was a slow reader. Then in sixth grade, my teacher, Mrs. Richards, decided that she was going to turn me into a reader. She introduced me to comic books—now she didn't give me Spiderman or Superman, but classic comic books—comic-book versions of classic stories like MacBeth and Last of the Mohicans. And then I wanted to read the real versions—I was hooked! I've loved reading ever since. That great teacher, Mrs. Richards, made a difference in my life—she made me a reader.

Over the years, I have had the privilege of meeting great teachers across my home state of Indiana. Some of these teachers, like Mrs. Richards, teach children. Others, like those I have met at Ball State University, teach adults. Some are moms and dads teaching their kids at home. Some teach in public schools, others in private institutions. Some coach basketball. And some give the gift of music or art. Although they are different in many ways, good teachers have this in common: They are professionals devoted to excellence, possessing talent, patience, fortitude, and a personal love of learning and of learners.

For Teacher Appreciation Week, I would like to personally honor several teachers in Indiana with a Certificate of Special Congressional Recognition. Nominated by a principal, parent, or colleague to receive this honor, these teachers are admired and respected by those closest to them. They are dedicated, hard

working, and caring professionals who are doing a great service to our children, our communities, and our state.

Although they represent a small cross section of teachers who are making a difference in the lives of Hoosiers, I would like to list their names for the record. Teachers receiving a Certificate of Special Congressional Recognition for service to the community are as follows:

Ms. Laura Martin teaches physical education and health at Thomas Jefferson Middle School in Valparaiso, Indiana. She has been teaching for 20 years. Also at Thomas Jefferson Middle School, Ms. Janice Stanier has been teaching 27 and a half years. She teaches English. Having taught for 33 years, Mr. David Watson teaches technology at Thomas Jefferson Middle School. They each provide strong, positive leadership at this school where they have spent seventy of their combined eighty years of service to young people.

At Alain LeRoy Locke Elementary School in Gary, Indiana, Mr. Alonzo Daniels teaches fifth grade and coaches basketball. As a coach, Mr. Daniels has led Alain LeRoy Locke Elementary School to two important championships. He is known for bringing out the best in his students on the court and in the classroom. By building up his students with praise and encouragement, they are able to go far beyond expectations.

Mr. Al Remaly teaches Global Studies at Northwestern Middle School in Kokomo, Indiana where he puts in countless hours of hard work and dedication. He is innovative with technology and a strong advocate for our country and our flag. Considered an excellent role model, Mr. Remaly has earned the respect and appreciation of students and faculty.

Mr. Terry Hughes teaches English, U.S. history, and Gifted and Talented at the Signature Learning Center in Evansville, Indiana. He is a hard working teacher whose expertise in the classroom is a blessing to the school. This outstanding educator is an example of dedication, expertise, and commitment to young people.

In rural Indiana, Mr. Ken Snow teaches science at Boone Grove High School in Valparaiso where he is an inspiration to peers and students. Not only does he teach science, Mr. Snow develops curriculum, spearheads the school's science fair, is a co-sponsor of the National Honor Society, and oversees other activities. Because of his personal attention to students, he is known as someone who gives of himself so that student leave school with more than an education.

A reading specialist at the Whitney Center in Richmond, Indiana, Ms. Carolyn Gibb has taught children who have had great difficulties learning to read. Children come from neighboring states to work with Ms. Gibb. Providing the gift of reading through scientifically-based reading instruction, Ms. Gibb has given hope to so many frustrated children and parents.

At Scott Elementary School in Evansville, Indiana, Ms. Patricia Foster teaches second grade. Known for her wit, wisdom and gentleness, Ms. Foster truly understands the needs of her children. Ms. Janie Thomas, the kindergarten teacher at Scott Elementary, is also a greatly admired teacher. Her creative approach makes children excited to return to school each day.

Ms. Janet Bulcher is a teacher at Stanley Hall Enrichment Center in Evansville, Indiana

and other sites where she is an itinerant special education teacher. Known for her honesty, energy, and insight, Ms. Bulcher is deeply dedicated to the welfare of her students and their education. Ms. Bulcher works hard to improve the system of education, demonstrating to fellow adults how to work together to help children.

At Ball State University in my home town of Muncie, Indiana, Dr. Neil R. Schmottlach is the John and Janice Fisher Distinguished Professor of Wellness and Gerontology and the Director of the Fisher Institute for Wellness and Gerontology. Dr. Schmottlach promotes wellness education to thousands of kindergarten to Higher Education learners and educators. Adept at using technology, he provides learners with a rich learning environment.

Ms. Victoria Brush is a teacher and leader at Roncalli High School in Indianapolis, Indiana. Completing 52 years of teaching business courses, she has seen technology advance from old manual typewriters, to electric typewriters, to computers. Ms. Brush is also Roncalli High School's number one cheerleader who enthusiastically attends a majority of the games. According to those who know her, she is a truly humble, sincere person.

In Franklin, Indiana, Ms. Becki Biberdorf is a homeschool teacher. Deeply dedicated to her sons, she spends countless hours planning trips, developing lesson plans, and searching out exciting things to teach. She greets the awesome responsibility of teaching her own children, molding their character, and setting them on life's path with grace and wisdom.

Retired teacher Mr. Gene Aurand taught English at Reitz Francis Joseph High School in Evansville, Indiana. He also served on various legislative committees for the Evansville Teachers Association and has been active with the town board in Newburgh, Indiana. Having dedicated his life to teaching, he has earned the respect of his peers and students.

Mr. Speaker, these caring and talented teachers are of immeasurable worth to Indiana. They serve day in and day out, teaching our children and helping them grow to adulthood. They are the pride of our community and essential to our quality of life. In the words of Historian Henry Brooks Adams "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops."

MEMBERS OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY BEING UNJUSTLY IMPRISONED IN THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I submit for the RECORD a statement that I issued yesterday concerning the plight of the 13 Jews in Iran who have unjustly been imprisoned on unfounded charges of spying for the State of Israel. I am pleased that this statement was read yesterday at a rally in support of the imprisoned Iranian Jews that was held at the Jewish Community Center in Tenafly, New Jersey. I am encouraged that the rally, which was sponsored by the UJA Federation of Bergen County & North Hudson, the Rabbinical

Council of Bergen County, the North Jersey Board of Rabbis, the JCC on the Palisades and the YJCC of Bergen County, served to raise the public's awareness of the plight of the 13 imprisoned Iranian Jews.

May 10, 2000.

DEAR FRIENDS: I want to express my solidarity with each and every person who has gathered at the JCC tonight to show their support for the "Iran 13." Your presence at this community meeting sends a clear message to the political leaders of Iran that the eyes of the American people are strongly focused on the plight of Jews who are being imprisoned unjustly in the Islamic Republic of Iran. Just as importantly, tonight you are also sending a message to the Iran 13 that they have not been forgotten.

I regret that Congressional business requires me to be in Washington tonight, but I do want to share with you my full support to the leaders and members of the UJA Federation of Bergen County & North Hudson, the Rabbinical Council of Bergen County, the North Jersey Board of Rabbis, the JCC on the Palisades and the YJCC of Bergen County for sponsoring and arranging this community-wide gathering.

When fanatics within the Iranian Government first moved last year to arrest Jews living in the southern Fars province of Iran, on trumped up charges of spying for the "Zionist regime," I promptly wrote to the President of Iran, Mohammed Khatami, to demand that they immediately be released. Not surprisingly, to this day, I have yet to receive the courtesy of a reply to my letter. And truthfully, I do not expect the Iranian authorities to respond to my letter, because that would force them to put on paper a case that is based solely on anti-Israel rhetoric and bolstered by lies, mistruths and fabrications.

More recently, I have cosponsored legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 128, that calls on the Clinton Administration to condemn the arrest of members of Iran's Jewish minority and urges their immediate release. The bill also calls on all nations that have relations with Iran to condemn the treatment of religious minorities in Iran and to call for the release of all prisoners, including the Iran 13, who are being held in prison solely on the basis of their religious beliefs.

Today, my fear for the physical safety of the Iran 13 is very real and predicated on the fact that five Jews have been executed by the Iranian government in the past five years without ever having been tried. These executions help explain why over half of the Jews in Iran have fled since 1979, many of them leaving to escape the state sponsored religious persecution orchestrated by supporters of the late Ayatollah Khomeini.

I urge each and every person present tonight to be vigilant and continue your demand that the Government of Iran immediately release the Iran 13. The fact is, our voices can be heard by the Jewish community in Iran and we owe that beleaguered community no less than to work diligently and tirelessly for the freedom of those innocent people.

Again, I commend those in attendance tonight. I commend the organizers of this community meeting and I commend those public officials and members of the clergy who this evening have come forward to shine the public's spotlight on a terrible injustice occurring within Iran.

I look forward to working with all of you in the days ahead to seek the immediate release of the Iran 13.

Sincerely,

STEVEN R. ROTHMAN,

Member of Congress.

REGARDING SECTION 110 OF THE
ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM
AND IMMIGRANT RESPONSIBILITY
ACT OF 1996

HON. DOC HASTINGS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I am in support of repealing Section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. While I certainly support the goal of enhanced immigration enforcement through better record-keeping at our nation's borders, implementing Section 110 prior to the establishment of a speedy automated entry-exit system will cause serious problems on the borders. Specifically, mandatory documentation will create massive traffic delays that would clog both the Northern and Southern borders, and obstruct trade and tourism nationwide.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service does not have the technology in place to carry out the entry-exit system required by Section 110 without unacceptable delays at all border crossings. As a representative from the State of Washington, my constituents will be adversely affected by the implementation of Section 110. In 1999, Washington State alone exported close to \$3 billion worth of goods to Canada. Applying Section 110 without adequate technology in place will create lines of waiting vehicles stretching several miles that would severely cripple trade, travel, and tourism between Washington State and Canada.

Likewise, in 1999, Washington State had close to 5.5 million border crossings at its 5 border stations. Of this, over 300,000 crossings were at the border station in Oroville, Washington, which is in my district. Oroville is a relatively small community in Central Washington that is not equipped to handle the extensive traffic jams that would be caused by Section 110. The City of Oroville recently adopted Resolution 391, and I submit the resolution to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In the Resolution, the City of Oroville requests that Congress delay the implementation of Section 110 until the United States Attorney General has addressed and resolved the issues and concerns relating to implementation.

Until technologies are developed to allow for extensive record-keeping at our border stations while ensuring timely border crossings, it is simply unreasonable to try and implement Section 110.

RESOLUTION NO. 391

A resolution to urge the United States Congress ("Congress") to repeal or delay the implementation of Section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act of 1996 ("Act").

Whereas, Section 110 of the Act requires the establishment of an automated entry-exit control system at all airports, seaports and land border crossings to "collect a record of departure for every alien departing the United States and match the records of departure with the record of the Alien's arrival in the United States";

Whereas, implementation of Section 110 will add to the congestion at international crossings and increase the size and amount of delays and holdups at border crossings;

Whereas, delays and holdups at the border crossings will limit the potential for indus-

try expansion and will have negative national and international economic impacts on efficiency, service and jobs;

Whereas, trade and tourism between the United States and its North American neighbors has grown considerably since the enactment of NAFTA;

Whereas, trade and tourism are becoming an increasingly important sector of both the local border economies and the national economy;

Whereas, the World Travel and Tourism Council predicts that travel and tourism will ultimately account for 100 million jobs in this decade;

Whereas, through steady, incremental efforts, current alien arrival and departure data collection and sharing systems at ports of entry may be improved in ways that will advance important national objectives including expanded trade, travel and tourism, enhanced national security and law enforcement;

Whereas, future advances in data collection technology will enable federal, state and local governments and the private sector to increase the flow of goods and persons across our national borders.

Whereas, the appropriate agencies within the Administration, through advances in technology over time, may be able to recommend to Congress how to improve alien arrival and departure data collection and sharing systems at land and sea ports of entry in ways that advance important national objectives, including expanded trade, travel and tourism, enhanced national security and law enforcement;

Whereas, any such recommendations from the appropriate agencies should involve cooperative efforts between the public and private sectors including federal, state and local governments to ensure appropriate realization of these objectives;

Whereas, the technology to collect the data required by Section 110 of the Act is not yet commercially feasible;

Whereas, it is of critical importance that the data collection system created pursuant to Section 110 of the Act not interfere with the ebb and flow of goods and persons across our national borders.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved by The City Council of the City of Oroville, That that City of Oroville urges the United States Congress to delay implementation of Section 110 of the illegal immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act of 1996 until the United States Attorney General has addressed and resolved the issues and concerns of this resolution in coordination with the private sector and state and local governments.

Passed this 2nd day of May, 2000.

DAVID K. REYNOLDS, *Mayor.*

KATHY M. JONES, *Clerk-Treasurer.*

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL
WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM CEN-
TENNIAL ACT

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today the National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Act. I am joined in this important effort by the distinguished chairman of the House Resources Committee, DON YOUNG, the ranking Democratic member of the Committee, GEORGE MILLER, the ranking Democratic subcommittee member, ENI

FALEOMAVAEGA, the Dean of the House of Representatives, JOHN DINGELL, and our colleague, DUKE CUNNINGHAM.

Since becoming chairman of the House Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, I have held many hearings on the operation, maintenance, and management of our nation's National Wildlife Refuge System. This unique system of Federal lands provides essential habitat for hundreds of fish and wildlife species, including more than 258 species listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act.

The first wildlife refuge was created at Pelican Island, FL, in 1903 by President Theodore Roosevelt. Today the System has 521 refuges and 38 wetland management districts, which are located in all 50 States and the 9 Commonwealths, Territories, and island possessions. These units range in size from the smallest of less than one acre, the Mille Lacs National Wildlife Refuge in Minnesota, to the largest of 19.3 million acres in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. Money for refuge land acquisition primarily comes from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Migratory Bird Conservation Fund.

During the past 5 years, my subcommittee has taken a leadership role in approving legislation to improve our National Wildlife Refuge System. Without question, the most important change was the enactment of the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997. This landmark Act, P.L. 105-57, was sponsored by Chairman DON YOUNG and, for the first time, it created a comprehensive "organic law" governing the management of the world's largest and most diverse network of lands devoted to fish and wildlife. This historic measure also created a statutory shield to ensure that hunting and fishing and other forms of wildlife-dependent recreation will continue within the Refuge System, and it facilitates these traditional activities where compatible with conservation.

The second improvement, which I was honored to sponsor, was the National Wildlife Refuge System Volunteer and Community Partnership Enhancement Act. This legislation will improve the infrastructure of the Refuge System by encouraging volunteer activities. In 1999, over 28,000 individuals volunteered more than 1.3 million hours, which was worth more than \$11 million in services. These services included staffing visitors centers, conducting hunter safety classes, landscaping, and operating heavy equipment. My bill, which was signed into law on October 5, 1998, will encourage additional volunteers by establishing up to 20 pilot projects for the purpose of hiring full-time volunteer coordinators. It also made it easier for interested individuals and groups to donate money or services to a particular refuge.

Finally, during the past 4 years, a bipartisan group of Members, including myself, DON YOUNG, GEORGE MILLER, ENI FALEOMAVAEGA, NEIL ABERCROMBIE, JOHN DINGELL, and others have vigorously lobbied the House Appropriations Committee to increase funding to reduce the Refuge System's operations and maintenance backlog. Together with the Cooperative Alliance for Refuge Enhancement (CARE), we were successful in persuading our Appropriations colleagues to increase funding for this account by \$86 million, which is a down payment on the maintenance backlog. While these increases were significant, there is

much work to be done to reach the goal of having a fully operational Refuge System by 2003.

The legislation I am introducing today recognizes the vital importance of the Refuge System and the fact that the System will celebrate its centennial anniversary in 3 years. Under the terms of this bill, a Commission will be established to promote awareness of the System; develop a long-term plan to meet the priority operations, maintenance and construction needs of the System; and to improve public use programs and facilities.

The National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Commission would be composed of 11 voting members, including the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. In addition, the chairman and ranking minority members of the House Resources and Senate Environment and Public Works Committees, plus the congressional members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, would serve as ex officio members.

The Commission would be charged with the responsibility for preparing a plan to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the System, coordinating activities to celebrate that event, and hosting a conference on the National Wildlife Refuge System. The Commission would issue annual reports and would terminate no later than September 30, 2004.

Finally, this bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to prepare and submit to the Congress a long-term plan to address priority operations, maintenance, and construction needs of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Mr. Speaker, I anticipate that my subcommittee will conduct a hearing on this legislation in the near future. The American people deserve the finest Refuge System in the world. This bill is an appropriate next step in our efforts to ensure that the legacy of Theodore Roosevelt, one of our Nation's greatest conservationists, will live on in the years ahead.

Ahead, I want to thank my distinguished colleagues for joining with me in this endeavor, and I urge enthusiastic support for the National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Act.

TRIBUTE TO MS. ELIZABETH ROSE CARROLL—CELEBRATING THE FIRST PLACE WINNER OF THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOL ART COMPETITION, AN ARTISTIC DISCOVERY

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I honor a very talented young lady from my congressional district, Elizabeth Rose Carroll of Springdale High School. Elizabeth is the top winner of the 2000 18th Congressional District High School Art Competition, An Artistic Discovery.

Elizabeth's pen and ink entitled "Petals in the Past" depicting a veiled woman of a bygone era holding a bouquet, was selected from a number of outstanding entries to this year's competition. I know that, with her obvious talent, many successes await Elizabeth.

I look forward to seeing "Petals in the Past" displayed along with the artwork of the other competition winners from across the country,

and I am pleased to be associated with Elizabeth's artistic talents.

Congratulations, Elizabeth. I wish you the very best of luck in the future.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING VIETNAMESE-AMERICANS AND OTHERS WHO SEEK TO IMPROVE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN VIETNAM

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce this House Concurrent Resolution which expresses the sense of Congress regarding Vietnamese-Americans and others who seek to improve social and political conditions in Vietnam.

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the fall of Saigon to Communist forces. The current Socialist Republic of Vietnam continues under an oppressive Communist regime that limits and denies its citizens fundamental rights, such as the right to free speech, the right to religious worship, and the right to associate with others who do not agree with the government. During the past 25 years, many people, including Vietnamese-Americans have participated in peaceful protests, freedom rallies, candlelight vigils, hunger strikes, and other demonstrations to bring awareness and attention to the social and political situation in Vietnam.

It is important that we recognize the work of Vietnamese-Americans and others who labor continuously to bring attention to the injustices and human rights conditions in Vietnam. In addition, we must never forget those who risked and gave the ultimate sacrifice—their lives—in defending and attempting to bring freedom and democracy to Vietnam.

Traditionally, the former Republic of South Vietnam and presently in Vietnamese-American communities all across America, June 19 represents a day to commemorate and honor both fallen and living heroes who have dedicated or are continuing to dedicate their lives to bringing international attention to the human rights situation in Vietnam. The Vietnamese-American community may be relatively young, but it has a consistent record of bringing issues such as human rights abuses, political and religious persecution, and labor exploitations committed in Vietnam, to the attention of the American public.

Many of my own constituents have shared with me the horrors and their own personal stories of how they and their families have endured living under Vietnam's Communist regime without fundamental human rights. While many of them were lucky enough to escape from Vietnam, many more people have not been as fortunate.

It is my strongest hope that the citizens of Vietnam will one day be free: free to elect their own leaders and government, free to worship as they please, free to speak and print their own opinions without fear of persecution or harassment, and simply free to live their lives without government intrusion. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this

important resolution because it reaffirms Congress' commitment to Vietnamese-Americans and others whose work keeps the spirit of freedom alive for those still living in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MYRA (CASIMIRA) LENARD

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today I have a heavy heart. It is in great sadness that I honor my dear friend, Myra (Casimira) Lenard, who fought her courageous and long bout with grave illness so valiantly. On Monday afternoon, May 1, Myra passed from this life after having served as the long time Executive Director of the Washington Office of the Polish American Congress. For nearly 20 years, she became the much revered force representing Polish Americans here in our Nation's Capital. Her fortitude was to be admired as she guided the Congress through the tumultuous times of Solidarity and Martial Law. What a gift that she lived to witness the fall of the Berlin Wall, and then saw the fulfillment of a life-long quest as Poland left the Warsaw Pact and became a member of NATO. She may be best remembered, though, for leading the charge to convert proceeds of the Polish American Enterprise Fund into the Polish American Freedom Foundation. It was Myra who worked tirelessly with the White House and Members of Congress ensuring that voices of Polish Americans in our country would be heard. It was Myra who sacrificed so much to fight for those unable to do it themselves.

Born in Poland, she emigrated to the United States as a small child, where she spent many years involved in Chicago's Polonian organizations. There she met the love of her life, Casimir I. Lenard, whom she married and then moved with him to Washington, DC in 1962. Once here, she immediately began volunteering her time to needy, worthy causes. Her talents were recognized as she ultimately achieved a leadership position at the Polish American Congress. Myra was the worthy recipient of numerous awards, including the Commander's Cross of the Order of Merit—the highest civilian award granted by Poland, presented by Polish Foreign Minister Wladslaw Bartoszewski in 1995. At a meeting of the Supervisory Council of the Polish National Alliance in December 1998, she and her husband were enrolled in the PNA's Legion of Merit. The list of her accomplishments cannot fully capture the fullness of this dynamic, gracious, dedicated and politically brilliant woman. Truly she was a freedom-lover.

Mr. Speaker, may we gain some small comfort in knowing the spirit and fire that Myra carried through her life that helped bring freedom to her first homeland inspired thousands who have been touched with her light and love. May peace bless her always. And may the work to which she dedicated her life—with family and career—stand as a living testament to this regal and loving woman. America is fortunate indeed that she chose this nation as her permanent homeland.

THE E-COMMERCE ENHANCEMENT
ACT OF 2000

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Electronic Enhancement Act of 2000, a bill that will identify the continuous challenges facing small and medium-sized businesses and will assist them in overcoming these obstacles when they enter the world of e-commerce. I developed this legislation after recently hosting an E-Commerce Forum in my District, which was designed to ensure that small and medium-sized businesses have access to the booming e-commerce industry. With more than 300 business people in attendance, it was obvious to me that while there is great interest from small and medium-sized businesses for going online, these businesses face a number of challenges as they enter the world of e-commerce.

Specifically, this bill will establish an outside Advisory Panel made up of representatives from the Technology Administration, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, the Small Business Administration, the Modernization Forum, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, along with other relevant parties, to determine the needs of small and medium-sized businesses. Based on the assessment of the Advisory Panel the Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) will establish a pilot program for assisting small and medium-sized businesses in e-commerce. Competitive grants would be awarded to existing MEP centers that submitted e-commerce assistance proposals. The e-commerce needs of businesses will vary between regions of the country and along industry lines. Therefore, the needs of the community can be best served by relying upon the local expertise of current MEP centers rather than establish a national "one size fits all" program.

E-commerce is a facet of our economy that will enable numerous businesses to experience strong growth. Last year, e-commerce was a 100 billion dollar a year industry. In the next three years that number is expected to be 3 trillion dollars—a full 1/3 of our current 9 trillion dollar economy. The power of the Internet is the power to overcome the social, geographic and economic disparities that have traditionally stifled growth for all types of businesses. No longer is the small manufacturer in Michigan limited to buying his raw materials from one or two distributors or supplying his product to only nearby clients. Such business to business e-commerce will increase the efficiency of supply chains and even allow manufacturers to find new markets online. The same situation applies to the retailer. Up until a few years ago, the Main Street shop owner was limited to selling her goods to walk-in traffic. With the advent of online commerce, any retailer can sell to anyone in the United States and to almost anyone in the world.

These are the kinds of advantages that e-commerce can bring to business owners across the country. We must be sure that we do not leave any business behind, especially America's small and medium-sized businesses who are the backbone of our economy and the realization of the American dream for so

many. This legislation will allow small and medium-sized businesses to overcome the hurdles they face as they enter the e-commerce arena.

I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join in supporting this important legislation.

INTERNET NONDISCRIMINATION
ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. KAREN MCCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3709) to make permanent the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act as it applies to new, multiple, and discriminatory taxes on the Internet.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express concerns about HR 3709, the Internet Nondiscrimination Act, a bill which extends the moratorium contained in The Internet Tax Freedom Act of 1998 for five additional years until 2006.

As a former Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the Missouri state house and former president of National Council of State Legislators (NCSL), I believe we need to address this issue with an eye toward creating a win-win situation for our states and localities, our mom and pop retailers on Main Street and the technology sector. I am not convinced that this bill has balanced all interests in a manner which achieves that goal.

I want electronic commerce to prosper and I support eliminating discriminatory taxes on this type of commerce. However, I also support finding a way to ensure Main Street businesses and state and local governments are not penalized by competitive advantages enjoyed by internet commerce companies. We need a level playing field and I am committed to finding one.

Not leveling the playing field could result in billions of dollars in lost revenue to states. By 2003 states will lose a total of approximately \$20.1 billion in revenue if businesses are not required to collect the use taxes that are owed by purchases on electronic commerce. My state of Missouri will lose a projected \$395 million—how will Missouri make up that revenue stream to ensure adequate funds for public education, critical infrastructure needs and other important state programs?

The piecemeal approach in HR 3709 prevents comprehensive solutions to the subject of taxes on the Internet. The existing moratorium does not expire until October 21, 2001. Merely extending the moratorium does not address the main issue of providing a level playing field for sales tax collection. In the coming 17 months which remain in the existing moratorium, we must consider comprehensive solutions.

Without a measured and thoughtful approach to addressing this complex issue we jeopardize the basic services which our constituents rely upon from our states and localities. We must sustain growth of the Internet and e-commerce with an appropriate revenue collecting structure built upon a foundation of fairness and equity to Main Street merchants.

MORE ANTI-CHRISTIAN ACTIVITIES
IN INDIA

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 2000

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I was distressed to read some recent articles showing that the repression of Christians in India continues. The RSS, the parent organization of the ruling BJP, has apparently published a booklet on how to besmirch Christians.

According to an article in the May 5 issue of India Abroad, the RSS has published a booklet on how to implicate Christians and other minorities in false criminal cases. It cites a Hindustan Times report that says the booklet, entitled "Save Hindus—Attacks and Laws," contains "guidelines for framing charges, false as well as genuine, against minorities." The booklet has been in circulation for three months, according to the article.

If India cannot learn religious tolerance, it is not deserving of the support of the free countries of the world. It is time to declare India a violator of religious liberty and other human rights until the situation improves. India should allow Amnesty International into Punjab and other troubled states to conduct an independent human-rights investigation. This has not happened since 1978. What is "the world's largest democracy" hiding? India should also hold a free and fair plebiscite on the question of independence for Khalistan, Kashmir, Nagaland, and the other states seeking their freedom from India.

I would like to introduce the article from India Abroad that I mentioned earlier into the RECORD for the information of the House and the public.

[From India Abroad, May 12, 2000]

ATTACK ON CHRISTIANS

New Delhi—A group of Christians who were distributing copies of the Bible and other evangelical literature in Vivekanandnagar, Ahmedabad, were reportedly attacked by activists of the right-wing Bajrang Dal on May 5.

The Christians were attacked with lathis (canes) and sharp-edged weapons, the reports said, adding that three persons were injured in the incident.

Samson C. Christian, executive member of the All India Christian Council, alleged that the attack was pre-planned as the Bajrang Dal was aware that members of the Operation Mobilization Association of Christians (OMAC) had been preaching in the area.

In a related development, reports stated that the Sangh Parivar, comprising Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh, the ideological parent of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), and its affiliate organizations, have brought out a booklet in Gujarat, containing guidelines on how to implicate minorities in court cases, The Hindustan Times reported.

The 12-page booklet, titled "Hinduno Bachao—akraman ane kayedo" (Save Hindus—attacks and laws), contains guidelines for framing charges, false as well as genuine, against minorities under existing laws, the report said, adding that the booklet has been in circulation for the past three months.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to the Conference Report on African Trade/Caribbean Basin Initiative.

The House passed H.R. 701, Conservation and Reinvestment Act

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3857–S3929

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2542–2548, S. Res. 305–307, and S. Con. Res. 112. **Page S3916**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:
Report to accompany S. 2521, making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (S. Rept. No. 106–290).

Report to accompany S. 2522, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (S. Rept. No. 106–291). **Page S3915**

Measures Passed:

Technical Corrections: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 112, to make technical corrections in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 434. **Page S3928**

African Trade/Caribbean Basin Initiative—Conference Report: By 77 yeas to 19 nays (Vote No. 98), Senate agreed to the conference report on H.R. 434, to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Sahara Africa, expand trade benefits to the countries in the Caribbean Basin, renew the generalized system of preferences, and reauthorize the trade adjustment assistance programs, clearing the measure for the President. **Pages S3858–80**

During consideration of this measure, the Senate also took the following action:

By 76 yeas to 18 nays (Vote No. 97), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the conference report on H.R. 434 (listed above). **Pages S3860–61**

Military Construction Appropriations: Senate began consideration of S. 2521, making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001. **Pages S3880–82, S3887–93**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill on Tuesday, May 16, 2000. **Pages S3862–63**

Senate will continue debate only on the bill on Monday, May 15, 2000.

Committee Authority: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that, notwithstanding the recess of the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to file the Department of Defense Authorization bill and report at 10 a.m., on Friday, May 12, 2000. **Page S3927**

Appointment:

Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d–276g, as amended, appointed the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group during the Second Session of the 106th Congress, to be held in Mississippi and Louisiana, May 19–22, 2000: Senators Grassley, DeWine, Grams, Collins, Voinovich, Leahy, Breaux, and Akaka. **Pages S3927–28**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Barry Edward Carter, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

John W. Darrah, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Joan Humphrey Lefkow, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Ricardo Morado, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Michael J. Reagan, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois, vice an additional position created December 10, 1999.

George Z. Singal, of Maine, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maine.

Mark S. Wrighton, of Missouri, to be a Member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 2006.

2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

5 Army nominations in the rank of general.

1 Marine Corps nomination in the rank of general.

2 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Foreign Service. **Pages S3928–29**

Messages From the House: **Page S3915**

Measures Referred: **Page S3915**

Measures Placed on Calendar: **Page S3915**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S3915**

Communications: **Pages S3915–16**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S3916–22**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3922–24**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S3927**

Authority for Committees: **Page S3927**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3911–15**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S3927**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—98) **Pages S3861, S3874**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:32 a.m., and adjourned at 6:31 p.m., until 1 p.m., on Monday, May 15, 2000. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3928.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded hearings on the nominations of Richard Court Houseworth, of Arizona, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal De-

posit Insurance Corporation, and Nuria I. Fernandez, of Illinois, to be Federal Transit Administrator, Department of Transportation, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf. Mr. Houseworth was introduced by Senator Kyl and former Senator DeConcini, and Mr. Fernandez was introduced by Senator Sarbanes.

PIPELINE SAFETY IMPROVEMENT

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded hearings on proposed legislation reauthorizing funds for programs of the Pipeline Safety Act, focusing on the natural gas and hazardous liquid pipeline transportation industry safety, federal regulation adequacy, and additional safeguards, after receiving testimony from Senator Murray; Representatives Metcalf and Inslee; Kelley S. Coyner, Administrator, Research and Special Programs Administration, and Kenneth M. Mead, Inspector General, both of the Department of Transportation; John A. Hammerschmidt, Member, National Transportation Safety Board; William J. Haener, CMS Gas Transmission and Storage, Dearborn, Michigan, on behalf of the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America; Phillip D. Wright, Williams Energy Services, Tulsa, Oklahoma, on behalf of the Association of Oil Pipe Lines and the American Petroleum Institute; Charles R. Kenow, Minnesota Department of Public Safety, St. Paul, on behalf of the National Association of Pipeline Safety Representatives; Richard Reiten, Northwest Natural, Portland, Oregon, on behalf of the American Gas Association; James M. Pates, City of Fredericksburg, Fredericksburg, Virginia, on behalf of the National Pipeline Reform Coalition; and Mayor Mark Asmundson, Frank King, Mary King, Marlene Robinson, Bruce Brabec, and Katherine Dalen, all of Bellingham, Washington.

NATIONAL PARKS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION, AND RECREATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation concluded hearings on S. 1367, to amend the Act which established the Saint-Gaudens Historic Site, in the State of New Hampshire, by modifying the boundary, S. 1617, to promote preservation and public awareness of the history of the Underground Railroad by providing financial assistance, to the Freedom Center in Cincinnati, Ohio, S. 1670, to revise the boundary of Fort Matanzas National Monument, S. 2020, to adjust the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, Mississippi, S. 2478, to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a theme study on the peopling of America, and S.

2485, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance in planning and constructing a regional heritage center in Calais, Maine, after receiving testimony from Senators Cochran, DeWine, and Collins; Denis P. Galvin, Deputy Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Nancy Foner, State University of New York, Purchase, on behalf of the American Anthropological Association; and Arnoldo Ramos, Council of Latino Agencies, and Dorothy I. Height, National Council of Negro Women, on behalf of the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center, both of Washington, D.C.

COMPREHENSIVE EVERGLADES RESTORATION PLAN

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded hearings on S. 2437, to approve the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan by providing for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and authorizing the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, after receiving testimony from Joseph W. Westphal, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works; Gary S. Guzy, General Counsel, Environmental Protection Agency; Mary Doyle, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Science; Florida Governor Jeb Bush, Tallahassee; Patricia Power, Seminole Tribe of Florida, Hollywood, Florida; Dexter Lehtinen, Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, Miami, on behalf of the Governor's Commission on the Everglades and the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force; Michael Collins, South Florida Water Management District, Islamorada; Ken Keck, Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland; David E. Guggenheim, Conservancy of Southwest Florida, Naples, on behalf of the Everglades Coalition.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded hearings on the nominations of Edward William Gnehm, Jr., of Georgia, to be Ambassador to Aus-

tralia, John R. Dinger, of Florida, to be Ambassador to Mongolia, Douglas Alan Hartwick, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Susan S. Jacobs, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Papua New Guinea, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to Solomon Islands, and as Ambassador to the Republic of Vanuatu, and Michael J. Senko, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Kiribati, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf. Mr. Gnehm was introduced by Senators Enzi and Hollings.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Kent J. Dawson, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada, Nicholas G. Garaufis, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, Phyllis J. Hamilton, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, Roger L. Hunt, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada, Gerard E. Lynch, to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Donnie R. Marshall, of Texas, to be Administrator of Drug Enforcement, Department of Justice, Audrey G. Fleissig, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, Steven S. Reed, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Kentucky, Donald W. Horton, of Maryland, to be United States Marshal for the District of Columbia, E. Douglas Hamilton, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Kentucky, and Jose Antonio Perez, to be United States Marshal for the Central District of California.

Also, Committee approved a resolution for issuance of a document subpoena to the Department of Justice regarding Loral Hughes pursuant to Rule 26.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 20 public bills, H.R. 4423–4424, 4426–4443; 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 322–325, were introduced. **Page H2966**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 4425, making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001 (H. Rept. 106–614). **Pages H2965–66**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Rev. Robert Rosenberg of Oshkosh, Wisconsin. **Page H2907**

Conservation and Reinvestment Act: The House passed H.R. 701, to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people by a recorded vote of 315 ayes to 102 noes, Roll No. 179. **Pages H2907–52**

Agreed to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order by the rule. **Page H2946**

Agreed to the DeFazio motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Resources with instructions to report it back with an amendment that restricts funding if it diminishes the benefit obligations of Social Security and Medicare by a recorded vote of 413 ayes to 3 noes, Roll No. 178. Subsequently, the Committee on Resources reported the bill back with an amendment that prohibits funding that would diminish Social Security and Medicare benefit obligations. **Pages H2946–51**

Agreed To:

Hill amendment, as modified, that requires the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to develop a plan for the acquisition and disposal of lands in Montana; **Pages H2916–18**

Buyer amendment that disallows wildlife conservation organizations from using Federal funds for the purchase of conservation easements;

Pages H2918–20

Udall of Colorado amendment that allows funding for the Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program (agreed to by a recorded vote of 306 ayes to 116 noes, Roll No. 174); **Pages H2921–23, H2929–30**

Rejected:

Peterson of Pennsylvania amendment that sought to restrict Federal acquisition of lands to designated boundaries within USDA administered recreation areas or units of the National Park, Wilderness Preservation, Wildlife Refuge, Forest, Trails, or Wild and Scenic Rivers systems (rejected by a recorded vote of 108 ayes to 310 noes, Roll No. 166);

Page H2908

Chambliss amendment that sought to shift the beginning date that mandatory spending for programs in the bill begins from fiscal year 2002 to fiscal year 2006 (rejected by a recorded vote of 142 ayes to 281 noes, Roll No. 167); **Pages H2908–09**

Chenoweth-Hage amendment that sought to strike language dealing with a coastal subdivision in the State of California (rejected by a recorded vote of 166 ayes to 259 noes, Roll No. 168);

Pages H2909–10

Hastings of Washington amendment that sought to require that at least 50 percent of the Federal portion be used for maintenance operations of Federal lands (rejected by a recorded vote of 169 ayes to 256 noes, Roll No. 169); **Pages H2010–11**

Sweeney amendment that sought to prohibit a State from acquiring land if the local government has disapproved the acquisition (rejected by a recorded vote of 187 ayes to 238 noes, Roll No. 170);

Page H2911

Simpson amendment that sought to require that the Federal government either dispose of an equal amount of land or obtain legislative approval from the State when acquiring land in a state in which 50 percent or more of the land is owned by the Federal government (rejected by a recorded vote of 157 ayes to 266 noes, Roll No. 171); **Pages H2911–12**

Calvert amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds for adverse condemnation of property (rejected by a recorded vote of 158 ayes to 261 noes, Roll No. 172); **Pages H2913–16, H2928**

Chenoweth-Hage amendment that sought to strike Wildlife Conservation and Restoration definitions in the bill (rejected by a recorded vote of 107 ayes to 317 noes, Roll No. 173);

Pages H2920–21, H2928–29

Gibbons amendment that sought to allow the Bureau of Land Management to auction public land identified for disposal in Land Management Plans (rejected by a recorded vote of 170 ayes to 250 noes, Roll No. 175); **Pages H2923–26, H2930**

Ose amendment, as modified, that sought to restrict the use of funds to grants that provide assistance to incorporated cities and counties with populations of 100,000 or more (rejected by a recorded vote of 56 ayes to 365 noes, Roll No. 176); and

Pages H2926–27, H2930–31

Thornberry amendment in the nature of a substitute that sought to strengthen private property rights, payment in lieu of taxes (PILT) programs, maintenance in public parks, and makes funding discretionary for the first five years the bill is enacted (rejected by a recorded vote of 126 ayes to 291 noes, Roll No. 177).

Pages H2931–46

H. Res. 497, the rule that is providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to on May 10. Pursuant to the rule, the text of H.R. 4377, was made in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

Pages H2821–26

Late Reports: The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence received permission to have until midnight on Friday, May 12 to file a report on H.R. 4392, Intelligence Authorization; and the Committee on Appropriations received permission to have until midnight on Friday, May 12 to file a report on a bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch.

Page H2952

Legislative Program: The Majority Leader announced the Legislative Program for the week of May 15.

Pages H2952–53

Meeting Hour—Monday, May 15: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, May 15 for morning hour debate.

Page H2953

Meeting Hour—Wednesday, May 17: Agreed that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, May 16, 2000, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Wednesday, May 17, for the purpose of receiving former Members of Congress.

Page H2953

Receiving Former Members of Congress in the Chamber: Agreed that it may be in order on Wednesday, May 17, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving former Members of Congress in the House Chamber.

Page H2953

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed that the business in order under the calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, May 17.

Page H2953

Quorum Calls—Votes: Fourteen recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H2908, H2909, H2909–10, H2910–11, H2911, H2912, H2928, H2928–29, H2929–30, H2930, H2930–31, H2945–46, H2951, and H2951–52. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Committee Meetings

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense met in executive session and ordered reported the Defense appropriations for fiscal year 2001.

CHINA—PERMANENT NORMAL RELATIONS

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Held a hearing on Permanent Normal Relations for China: Impact on U.S. Financial Community. Testimony was heard from Lawrence H. Summers, Secretary of the Treasury; Charlene Barshefsky, U.S. Trade Representative; and public witnesses.

NEW ELECTRONIC MARKET COMPETITION

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials continued hearings on Competition in the New Electronic Market: Part II. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HEALTH CARE FAIRNESS ACT

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Health and Environment held a hearing on H.R. 3250, Health Care Fairness Act of 1999. Testimony was heard from Representatives Lewis of Georgia, Watts of Oklahoma, Jackson of Illinois, Hayworth, Underwood and Rodriguez; David Satcher, U.S. Surgeon General, Department of Health and Human Services; E. Anne Peterson, M.D., Health Commissioner, State of Virginia; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORIZATIONS

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth, and Families held a hearing on Authorization of the National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress, and National Assessment Governing Board. Testimony was heard from Michael E. Ward, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Public Instruction, State of North Carolina; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—2000 CENSUS

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on the Census held an oversight hearing of the 2000 Census: Non-Response Follow-up and Other Key Operations. Testimony was heard from J. Christopher Mihm, Associate Director, Federal Management and Workforce Issues, GAO.

DRUG SENTENCING POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources held a hearing on Drug Sentencing Policies and Practices. Testimony was heard from John Steer, Commissioner, U.S. Sentencing Commission; the following officials of the Department of Justice: John Roth, Chief, Narcotics and Dangerous Drug Section; and Thomas Kane, Assistant Director, Information Policy and Public Affairs, Bureau of Prisons; George Allen, former Governor, State of Virginia; and public witnesses.

STATE DEPARTMENT SECURITY

Committee on International Relations: Held a hearing on Current Challenges to State Department Security. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of State: Jacquelyn L. Williams-Bridgers, Inspector General; David Carpenter, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Diplomatic Security; and Stapleton Roy, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Intelligence and Research; and Tim Breznay, National Security Division, FBI, Department of Justice.

MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SOURCING ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 4391, Mobile Telecommunications Sourcing Act.

MILITARY EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION ACT; VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime approved for full Committee action, as amended, the following bills: H.R. 3380, Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act of 1999; and H.R. 1248, Violence Against Women Act.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 894, No Second Chances for Murderers, Rapists, or Child Molesters Act of 1999; H.R. 4045, Matthew's Law; H.R. 4047, Two Strikes and You're Out Child Protection Act; and H.R. 4147, Stop Material Unsuitable for Teens Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Cunningham, Green of Wisconsin, Salmon and Tancredo; Mike Lawlor, Representative, Assembly, State of Connecticut; and public witnesses.

VALLES CALDERA PRESERVATION ACT

Committee on Resources: Held a hearing on H.R. 3288, Valles Caldera Preservation Act. Testimony was heard from James Lyons, Under Secretary, Natural

Resources and the Environment, USDA; Larry Finfer, Assistant Director, Communications, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; the following officials of the State of New Mexico: Jeannette Wallace, Representative; and Robert Gibson, County Councilor, Los Alamos; and a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 3118, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue regulations under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act that authorize States to establish hunting seasons for double-crested cormorants; H.R. 4070, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to correct a map relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit P31, located near the city of Mexico Beach, Florida; and H.R. 4318, Red River National Wildlife Refuge Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives McCrery, McHugh, Peterson of Minnesota, Boyd and Dickey; Daniel M. Ashe, Assistant Director, Refuges and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

LAKE TAHOE RESTORATION ACT; COMMUNITY FOREST RESTORATION ACT

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 3388, Lake Tahoe Restoration Act; and S. 1288, Community Forest Restoration Act. Testimony was heard from Representative Gibbons; Randy Phillips, Deputy Chief, Programs and Legislation, Forest Service, USDA; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; COLORADO UTE SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power approved for full Committee action the following bills: H.R. 3023, amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, to convey property to the Greater Yuma Port Authority of Yuma County, Arizona, for use as an international port of entry; H.R. 4132, to reauthorize grants for water resources research and technology institutes established under the Water Resources Research Act of 1984; and S. 1211, to amend the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act to authorize additional measures to carry out the control of salinity upstream of Imperial Dam in a cost-effective manner.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on H.R. 3112, Colorado Ute Settlement Act Amendments of 1999. Testimony was heard from David Hayes, Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS MILLENNIUM EDUCATION ACT

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Ordered reported H.R. 4268, Veterans and Dependents Millennium Education Act.

VETERANS AFFAIRS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on the Department of Veterans Affairs Information Technology (IT) program. Testimony was heard from Joel C. Willemssen, Director, Civil Agencies Information Systems, Accounting and Information Management Division, GAO; and the following officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs: Richard J. Griffin, Inspector General; Harold F. Gracey, Jr., Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Information Technology; Dan L. Marsh, Associate Chief Information Officer, Implementation and Training; Veterans Health Administration; K. Adair Martinez, Chief Information Officer and Charles R. DeCoste, Director, Data Management Office, both with the Veterans Benefits Administration; and Vincent L. Barile, Director, Operations Support, National Cemetery Administration.

ADMINISTRATION'S PRESCRIPTION DRUG PROPOSAL

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on the Administration's prescription drug proposal. Testimony was heard from Nancy-Ann Min DeParle, Administrator, Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; Dan L. Crippen, Director, CBO; and William J. Scanlon, Director, Health Financing and Public Health Issues, GAO.

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS—INCREASING USE AND MISUSE

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security concluded hearings to examine the increasing use and misuse of Social Security numbers. Testimony was heard from Representatives McDermott, Kleczka, Markey, Hostettler and Paul; and public witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 12, 2000

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings on the nomination of Amy L. Comstock, of Maryland, to be Director of the Office of Government Ethics, 10 a.m., SD-342.

House

No Committee meetings are scheduled.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of May 15 through May 20, 2000

Senate Chamber

On *Monday*, Senate will resume debate on S. 2521, Military Construction Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001.

On *Tuesday*, Senate will resume consideration of S. 2521, Military Construction Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001 at 2:15 p.m.

During the remainder of the week, Senate expects to consider any other cleared legislative and executive business, including appropriations bills when available.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Armed Services: May 16, to hold hearings on the nomination of the following named officer for appointment as Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy, and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5033: Adm. Vernon E. Clark, to be Admiral, 10 a.m., SR-222.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: May 16, Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation, to hold oversight hearings on HUD's single family management and marketing contracts, 9:30 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: May 16, to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Maritime Administration, 9:30 a.m., SR-253.

May 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine global warming issues, 9:30 a.m., SR-253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: May 16, Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management, to hold oversight hearings on the United States Forest Service's proposed transportation policy, 3 p.m., SD-366.

May 17, Full Committee, business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., SH-216.

May 17, Subcommittee on Water and Power, to hold oversight hearings on the operation, by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, of the Flathead Irrigation Project in Montana, 2:30 p.m., SD-366.

May 18, Full Committee, to hold hearings on S. 2439, to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of the Southeastern Alaska Intertie system; and the nomination of Mildred Spiewak Dresselhaus, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Office of Energy Research, 9:30 a.m., SD-366.

May 18, Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, to hold hearings on S. 1584, to establish the Schuylkill River Valley National Heritage Area in the State of Pennsylvania; S. 1685, to authorize the Golden Spike/Crossroads of the West National Heritage Area; H.R. 2932, to authorize the Golden Spike Crossroads of the West National Heritage Area; S. 1998, to establish the Yuma Crossing National Heritage

Area; S. 2247, to establish the Wheeling National Heritage Area in the State of West Virginia; S. 2421, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing an Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area in Connecticut and Massachusetts; and S. 2511, to establish the Kenai Mountains-Turnagain Arm National Heritage Area in the State of Alaska, 2:30 p.m., SD-366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: May 16, Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to hold hearings on the Army Corps of Engineer's backlog of authorized projects and the future of the Army Corps of Engineer's mission, 10 a.m., SD-406.

May 17, Subcommittee on Clean Air, Wetlands, Private Property, and Nuclear Safety, to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Clean Air Act, focusing on an incentive-based utility emissions reduction approach, 9:30 a.m., SD-406.

May 18, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Drinking Water, to hold hearings on S. 2417, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase funding for State nonpoint source pollution control programs, 10 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Finance: May 17, business meeting to mark up proposed legislation extending Permanent Normal Trading Relations to China, 10 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: May 16, to hold hearings to examine the U.S. Commission for International Freedom's findings on Russia, China, and Sudan, 10 a.m., SD-419.

May 17, Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion, to hold oversight hearings to examine satellite export controls, 2:30 p.m., SD-419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs: May 16, Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, to hold hearings to examine long term care insurance for federal employees, 10 a.m., SD-342.

May 18, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia, to hold hearings on issues relating to training Federal employees, focusing on Federal agency's programs to train and educate employees throughout their careers to maintain their skills and productivity, 10 a.m., SD-342.

May 19, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to hold hearings to examine the extent to which fraud and criminal activities are affecting commerce on the internet, focusing on the widespread availability of false identification documents and credentials on the internet and the criminal uses to which such identification is put, 9:30 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: May 18, to hold hearings to examine mental health parity, 10 a.m., SD-430.

Committee on Indian Affairs: May 17, to hold oversight hearings on Indian arts and crafts programs, 9:30 a.m., SR-485.

May 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings on S. 1148, to provide for the Yankton Sioux Tribe and the Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska certain benefits of the Missouri River Basin Pick-Sloan project; and S. 1658, to authorize

the construction of a Reconciliation Place in Fort Pierre, South Dakota, 2 p.m., SR-485.

Committee on the Judiciary: May 16, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice Oversight, to hold hearings to examine threats to Federal Law Enforcement Officers, 2 p.m., SD-226.

May 17, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine internet security and privacy, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Committee on Rules and Administration: May 17, to hold hearings on pending business, 9:30 a.m., SR-301.

House Chamber

To be announced.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, May 17, hearing to review the Administration's proposal for permanent normal trade relations with China, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, May 16, to mark up the Transportation appropriations for fiscal year 2001, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, May 16, Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing on improving regulation of the housing Government Sponsored Enterprises, focusing on H.R. 3703, Housing Finance Regulatory Improvement Act, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

May 17, full Committee, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1161, Financial Contract Netting Improvement Act of 1999; and H.R. 4209, Bank Reserves Modernization Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, May 18, Health Task Force, hearing on "Medicare's Regulatory Burden on Providers", 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Commerce, May 16, Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing on Consumer Safety Initiatives: Protecting the Vulnerable, focusing on the following bills: H.R. 4145, Child Passenger Protection Act of 2000; H.R. 2592, to amend the Consumer Products Safety Act to provide that low-speed electric bicycles are consumer products subject to such Act; and H.R. 3032, National Amusement Park Ride Safety Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, May 16, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth, and Families, hearing on Ritalin Use Among Youth: Examining the Issues and Concerns, 2 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, May 16, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, hearing on the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

May 18, Subcommittee on the Census, oversight hearing of the 2000 Census: Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation—Still More Questions than Answers, 10 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

May 18, Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans' Affairs, and International Relations, oversight hearing of the State Department: Is Management Getting Results? 1 p.m., 2203 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, May 16, Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade,

hearing on Conducting Business in Latin America: Challenges and Opportunities, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

May 17, full Committee, hearing on the Status of Embassy Security Enhancements, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

May 17, Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing on the U.S. and the Caribbean in the New Millennium: What is the Agenda? 1:30 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

May 18, full Committee, hearing on Looming Famine in Ethiopia, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, May 17, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on H.R. 4267, Internet Tax Reform and Reduction Act, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

May 18, Subcommittee on the Constitution, hearing on H.R. 3590, ADA Notification Act, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

May 18, Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, oversight hearing on Privacy and Electronic Communications, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, May 16, to mark up H.R. 3605, San Rafael Western Legacy District and National Conservation Act; followed by a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 946, Graton Rancheria Restoration Act; H.R. 2671, Yankton Sioux Tribe and Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska Development Trust Fund Act; and H.R. 4148, Tribal Contract Support Cost Technical Amendments of 2000, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

May 16, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 3657, to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of public domain land in the San Bernardino National Forest in the State of California; H.R. 3817, to redesignate the Big South Trail in the Comanche Peak Wilderness Area of Roosevelt National Forest in Colorado as the "Jaryd Atadero Legacy Trail"; H.R. 4226, Black Hills National Forest and Rocky Mountain Research Station Improvement Act; S. 439, to amend the National Forest and Public Lands of Nevada Enhancement Act of 1988 to adjust the boundary of the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; H.R. 3388, Lake Tahoe Restoration Act; S. 1374, Jackson Multi-Agency Campus Act of 1999; and S. 1288, Community Forest Restoration Act, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

May 16, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, hearing on H.R. 3632, Golden Gate National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Act of 2000; H.R. 4063, Rosie the Riveter-World War II Home Front National Historical Park Establishment Act of 2000; and H.R. 4125, to provide a grant under the urban park and recreation recovery program to assist in the development of a Millennium Cultural Cooperative Park in Youngstown, Ohio, 9:30 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

May 17, full committee, hearing on H.R. 3999, Virgin Islands and Guam Constitutional Self-Government Act of 2000, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

May 17, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, oversight hearing on Assessing future needs and uses of the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund established under Title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

May 18, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, to continue oversight hearings to examine the

laws, policies, practices, and operations of the Department of the Interior, Department of Energy, and other agencies pertaining to payments to their employees, including payments relative to mineral royalty programs and policies from public lands and Indian lands, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

May 18, Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife, and Oceans, to mark up pending business; followed by a hearing on H.R. 2798, Pacific Salmon Recovery Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

May 18, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 2267, Willing Seller Amendments of 1999 to the National Trails System Act; H.R. 2409, El Camino Real de los Tejas National Historic Trail Act of 1999; H.R. 2833, Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area Act of 1999; H.R. 2919, National Underground Railroad Freedom Center Act; H.R. 3661, General Aviation Access Act; followed by a hearing on Examining the laws, policies, practices, and operations of the Department of the Interior, Department of Energy, and other agencies pertaining to payments to their employees, including payments relative to mineral royalty programs and policies from public lands and Indian lands; and H.R. 4115, to authorize appropriations for the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum; followed by a hearing on H.R. 4275, Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area and the Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, May 15, to consider H.R. 4425, Making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending Sept. 30, 2001, 6:30 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, May 17, hearing on a Plan to Renew Science, Math, Engineering and Technology Education in Kindergarten through 12th Grade: H.R. 4271, National Science Education Act, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

May 17, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on NASA's Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Request: Space Science, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, May 16, Subcommittee on Tax, Finance, and Exports, hearing on Trade with China Helps Small Business Exporters Work, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, May 16, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing on the Future of Aviation Technology "Is the Sky the Limit?" 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, May 17, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on VA/DOD health care sharing, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

May 18, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on VA disability claims processing, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, May 16, Subcommittee on Human Resources, hearing on Health Care Coverage for Families Leaving Welfare, 10 a.m., B-318 Rayburn.

May 16, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing on Internet tax issues, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

1 p.m., Monday, May 15

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30 p.m., Monday, May 15

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the recognition of three Senators for speeches and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 3 p.m.), Senate will continue debate on S. 2521, Military Construction Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Abercrombie, Neil, Hawaii, E706	Emerson, Jo Ann, Mo., E703	Moakley, John Joseph, Mass., E712
Baca, Joe, Calif., E705	Ewing, Thomas W., Ill., E714	Neal, Richard E., Mass., E710
Baird, Brian, Wash., E705	Fossella, Vito, N.Y., E710	Ortiz, Solomon P., Tex., E709
Barcia, James A., Mich., E720	Hastert, J. Dennis, Ill., E703	Rahall, Nick J., II, W. Va., E706
Barr, Bob, Ga., E704, E708	Hastings, Doc, Wash., E718	Rothman, Steven R., N.J., E717
Berkley, Shelley, Nev., E709	Holt, Rush D., N.J., E704, E708	Sandlin, Max, Tex., E712
Biggert, Judy, Ill., E707	Hooley, Darlene, Ore., E705	Saxton, Jim, N.J., E718
Bonior, David E., Mich., E711	Jackson-Lee, Sheila, Tex., E711	Schaffer, Bob, Colo., E703, E707, E714
Capuano, Michael E., Mass., E704, E708	Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E719	Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E707
Collins, Mac, Ga., E716	Kilpatrick, Carolyn C., Mich., E716	Strickland, Ted, Ohio, E715
Davis, Thomas M., Va., E719	LaFalce, John J., N.Y., E713	Thompson, Mike, Calif., E711
Deutsch, Peter, Fla., E706	Lampson, Nick, Tex., E716	Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E709
Doolittle, John T., Calif., E720	McCarthy, Karen, Mo., E720	Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E710
Doyle, Michael F., Pa., E719	McIntosh, David M., Ind., E716	Wilson, Heather, N.M., E708, E714
	Menendez, Robert, N.J., E703, E707, E714	
	Mica, John L., Fla., E712	



Congressional Record

The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512-1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access*, contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512-1262; or by calling Toll Free 1-888-293-6498 or (202) 512-1530 between 7 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$179.00 for six months, \$357.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$141.00 per year, or purchased for \$1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954, or phone orders to (202) 512-1800, or fax to (202) 512-2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.