United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *106th* CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 10, 2000 *No. 87*

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 10, 2000.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 2071. An act to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system.

S. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent Resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the importance and value of education in United States history.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for 5 minutes.

THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

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

Mr. WELLER. Madam Speaker, over the last several years many of us have asked a question that we hear back at home time and time again. I represent the South Side of Chicago, the south suburbs, Cook and Will Counties, communities like Joliet, bedroom communities like Morris, Frankfort, a lot of farm towns.

I find whether I am in the city, the suburbs, or the country people often ask a pretty basic, fundamental question. That is, they ask a question: Is it right, is it fair that under our tax code 25 million married working couples pay on average $1,400 more in taxes just because they are married? They ask that fundamental question of fairness: Is it right, is it fair, that under our Tax Code if one chooses to get married, their taxes are going to go up?

We call that the marriage tax penalty, and it occurs where we have a husband and wife who are both in the work force, a two-earner household who, when they choose to join together in holy matrimony, one of our society's most basic institutions, they end up paying higher taxes than if they stayed single or got divorced. The vast majority of folks back home tell me they believe that is wrong.

The marriage tax penalty essentially works this way. Let me introduce a couple here, Shad and Michelle Hallihan, two public school teachers from Joliet, Illinois. They just had a baby this year and are starting a family. But because they are both in the work force, they suffer on average the average marriage tax penalty of almost $1,400.

Back home in Joliet that $1,400, that is 3 months of day care for their child at the local day care center while they both teach. That is a year's tuition at Joliet Junior College. The marriage tax penalty on average is real money to real people.

For some here in this House and some over in the Senate, particularly the folks down at the White House, they want to spend that money here in Washington rather than letting good folks like Shad and Michelle Hallihan keep what they suffer in the marriage tax penalty, money they could spend on their newborn baby.

Madam Speaker, Shad and Michelle's marriage tax penalty occurs because when we are married, we file jointly, we combine our income. So Shad and Michelle with their current income, if they stayed single or just chose to live together, they would each pay in the 15 percent tax bracket. But because they combine their income when they file jointly, they are forced to pay in a higher tax bracket, which causes them to pay $1,400 more in higher taxes.

I am proud to say as a key part of the Republican agenda this year this House passed overwhelmingly the Marriage Tax Elimination Act, H.R. 6. Every Republican and thankfully 48 Democrats broke ranks with their leadership and said they, too, wanted to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. We passed it out of the House with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Unfortunately, I guess I should congratulate the Senate Democrats because they prevented the Marriage Tax Elimination Act from moving through the Senate. Of course, we are now moving it through the budget process to get around their parliamentary procedure that they are using to prevent us from eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

Later this week we are going to be voting on an agreement between the House and Senate which essentially wipes out the marriage tax for 25 million couples. In fact, the legislation we will be voting on later this week is

identical to what the House passed earlier this year, doubling the standard deduction for joint filers to twice that of singles. That will help those who do not itemize their taxes who suffer the marriage tax penalty, essentially wiping it out for every one of them.

We also widen the 15 percent bracket so joint filers can earn twice as much as single filers in the 15 percent tax bracket. The benefit of that is that means if one is an itemizer, someone who owns a home, and most middle class family do, that is why they itemize their taxes, they, too, will see their marriage tax penalty eliminated.

There are some on the other side and those at the White House who say, well, maybe we will do a little marriage tax relief, and we will just help those who do not itemize. So they are saying if one owns a home and is married and suffers the marriage tax penalty, that is tough. Bill Clinton, AL GORE, want them to continue suffering the marriage tax penalty.

Madam Speaker, I believe there is a need to help everyone who suffers the marriage tax penalty, whether they own a home or not, whether they itemize their taxes or not.

We have a great opportunity this week, Madam Speaker. I invite every Democrat to join with every Republican in voting to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Think what it means to young couples like Shad and Michelle Hallihan, two hard-working public school teachers from Joliet, Illinois, who, because they chose to live together in holy matrimony and chose to join together in marriage, now suffer the marriage tax penalty. We are going to help them by eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

Madam Speaker, I want to invite everyone in this House to join together in helping good people like Shad and Michelle Hallihan. Let us do it. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Let us do it in a bipartisan way. I hope this time the President will sign it into law.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, source of all authority under the heavens, and true Spirit who governs the world, renew us in Your image and make us a holy Nation.

Help young and old alike to comply to the laws of this land and offer respect to all who hold positions of rightful authority.

May Your Spirit stir in each human heart a gracious freedom that chooses to obey. May people everywhere embrace laws which assure good order and protect the life and liberty of all.

Give all lawmakers, this day, prudence and wisdom so that citizens may see Your holy will in true governance, both in good times and in bad times. For You live and govern now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 30, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 30, 2000 at 1:25 p.m.

S. 148: That the Senate Agreed to House amendment.

H.R. 4425: That the Senate Agreed to conference report.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill on Friday, June 30, 2000:

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.

And the Speaker pro tempore signed the following enrolled bill on Tuesday, July 4, 2000:

S. 148, to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to provide assistance in the conservation of neotropical migratory birds.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to Section 5(a) of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission Act (36 U.S.C. 101 note) and the order of the House of Thursday, June 29, 2000, the Speaker on Friday, June 30, 2000, appointed the following member on the part of the House to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission to fill the existing vacancy thereon:

Ms. Lura Lynn Ryan, Kankakee, Illinois.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find copies of resolutions approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on June 21, 2000, in accordance with 40 U.S.C. §606.

With warm regards, I remain
Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

There was no objection.

GAS PRICES SKYROCKET BECAUSE OF ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, every American with a car cannot help but notice how gas prices are skyrocketing out of control. Before summer began, the Clinton-Gore administration released a report showing that Americans could be paying as much as $1.80 a gallon for gas by this summer.

But, lo and behold, the Clinton Administration is no better at predicting gas prices than they are at protecting our Nation's most classified nuclear secrets. In many Midwest and Western States, prices so far are higher than $1.80; how about $2.35 a gallon and rising?

Vice President GORE, now touting his risky scheme to cut gas taxes, seems to forget that in 1993 he cast the tie-

breaking vote to increase gas taxes, adding to the tax burden of seniors and working families in this country.

When it comes to keeping gas prices reasonable, the Clinton-Gore administration has failed the American people; and now, unfortunately, the American people are paying at the pump for this administration's mistake.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS CONFUSING AMERICA

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, the courts have struck again. First, it is now perfectly legal to jab scissors into the brain of a full-term baby being delivered until the baby dies; second, Internet pornography is now perfectly legal, even for kids.

Think about it. The courts have ruled Communists can work in our defense plants, full-term babies can be killed, pornography, even for kids, is legal; but you cannot pray in school.

Beam me up. No wonder America is confused and screwed up.

I yield back the brains of these judges that evidently they have been sitting on for a long time.

TAX RELIEF FOR MARRIED AMERICANS

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

Mr. WELLER. Madam Speaker, let me ask a basic question of fundamental fairness: Is it right, is it fair, that under our Tax Code, 25 million married working couples on average pay $1,400 more in taxes just because they are married?

Is it right that under our Tax Code that a husband and wife who are both in the workforce are forced to pay higher taxes if they choose to get married and the only way to avoid the marriage tax penalty is either to get divorced or just not get married?

Madam Speaker, that is wrong, and I am so proud this House of Representatives passed overwhelmingly legislation to wipe out the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married working couples. This week we are going to pass legislation, agreement with the House and Senate, which will wipe out the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married working couples. I was proud to see that every House Republican supported H.R. 6, and 48 Democrats broke with their leadership to support our efforts.

I want to extend an invitation to my Democratic friends on other side of the aisle to join with us and make it a bipartisan effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. It is unfair; it is wrong. It is wrong to tax marriage. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING IMPORTANCE AND VALUE OF EDUCATION IN UNITED STATES HISTORY

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 129) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the importance and value of education in United States history.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 129

Whereas basic knowledge of United States history is essential to full and informed participation in civic life and to the larger vibrancy of the American experiment in self-government;

Whereas basic knowledge of the past serves as a civic glue, binding together a diverse people into a single Nation with a common purpose;

Whereas citizens who lack knowledge of United States history will also lack an understanding and appreciation of the democratic principles that define and sustain the Nation as a free people, such as liberty, justice, tolerance, government by the consent of the governed, and equality under the law;

Whereas a recent Roper survey done for the American Council of Trustees and Alumni reveals that the next generation of American leaders and citizens is in danger of losing America's civic memory;

Whereas the Roper survey found that 81 percent of seniors at elite colleges and universities could not answer basic high school level questions concerning United States history, that scarcely more than half knew general information about American democracy and the Constitution, and that only 22 percent could identify the source of the most famous line of the Gettysburg Address;

Whereas many of the Nation's colleges and universities no longer require United States history as a prerequisite to graduation, including 100 percent of the top institutions of higher education;

Whereas 78 percent of the Nation's top colleges and universities no longer require the study of any form of history;

Whereas America's colleges and universities are leading bellwethers of national priorities and values, setting standards for the whole of the United States' education system and sending signals to students, teachers, parents, and public schools about what every educated citizen in a democracy must know;

Whereas many of America's most distinguished historians and intellectuals have expressed alarm about the growing historical illiteracy of college and university graduates and the consequences for the Nation; and

Whereas the distinguished historians and intellectuals fear that without a common civic memory and a common understanding of the remarkable individuals, events, and ideals that have shaped the Nation, people in the United States risk losing much of what it means to be an American, as well as the ability to fulfill the fundamental responsibilities of citizens in a democracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the historical illiteracy of America's college and university graduates is a serious problem that should be addressed by the Nation's higher education community;

(2) boards of trustees and administrators at institutions of higher education in the United States should review their curricula and add requirements in United States history;

(3) State officials responsible for higher education should review public college and university curricula in their States and promote requirements in United States history;

(4) parents should encourage their children to select institutions of higher education with substantial history requirements and students should take courses in United States history whether required or not; and

(5) history teachers and educators at all levels should redouble their efforts to bolster the knowledge of United States history among students of all ages and to restore the vitality of America's civic memory.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. Con. Res. 129.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 129, which is identical to House Concurrent Resolution 366, a resolution introduced in the House before the Independence Day recess.

I would like first to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the House majority leader, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), chairman of the House Committee on Education and Workforce, whose cooperation has expedited the consideration of this resolution. I would also like to thank Senators LIEBERMAN and GORTON for their support of this resolution and commend the Senate for passing it on the Friday before the 4th of July holiday.

I am pleased to be here today with my colleague from California as cosponsor to offer this resolution to draw attention to the troubling historical illiteracy of our Nation's next generation of leaders. Senate Concurrent Resolution 129 expresses the sense of Congress regarding the importance and value of education in American history.

The need for this resolution is demonstrated by a Roper Center survey commissioned by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni. The Roper Center surveyed college seniors from the Nation's best colleges and universities as identified by the U.S. News & World Report's annual college rankings.

Specifically, the top 55 liberal arts colleges and research universities were sampled during the month of December 1999. The results of this survey revealed that seniors from America's elite colleges and universities received a grade of D or F on history questions drawn from a basic high school exam. Seniors could not identify Valley Forge, words from the Gettysburg Address, or even the basic principles of the United States Constitution.

Despite this lack of knowledge, according to reports by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, many of today's colleges and universities no longer demand that their students study U.S. history. Students can now graduate from all of the top colleges and universities without taking a single course in U.S. history. At 78 percent of the institutions, students are not required to take any history at all.

Madam Speaker, I believe we should be alarmed by the findings of this study. When we lose our civic memory, when we lose our understanding of the remarkable individuals, events, and values that have shaped our experiment in self-government, we are losing much of what it means to be an American. We are losing sight of the responsibilities we share as citizens in a free democracy.

Having just celebrated the 4th of July, our Nation's day of independence and freedom, a day that evokes strong emotions and feelings of pride in our country, I believe it is particularly appropriate to emphasize our need to know and to understand U.S. history.

Madam Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, June 28, 2000]

BASIC HISTORY TEST STUMPS MANY COLLEGIANS

WASHINGTON, June 27—Nearly 80 percent of seniors at 55 top colleges and universities, including Harvard and Princeton, received a D or an F on a 34-question high-school level test on American history.

More than a third of the students did not know that the Constitution established the division of power in American government, said the Center for Survey Research and Analysis at the University of Connecticut, which administered the test as part of a study to measure the teaching of American history.

Students were much more knowledgeable about popular culture—99 percent of the seniors tested identified ''Beavis and Butthead'' as ''television cartoon characters.''

But confronted with four options in a multiple-choice test, only 35 percent could name who was president when the Korean War began. And only 23 percent identified James Madison as the principal framer of the Constitution.

Asked the era in which the Civil War was fought, 40 percent did not know the correct period, 1850–1900.

Senator Joseph I. Lieberman, Democrat of Connecticut, said that he and other members of Congress would introduce resolutions calling on college and state officials to strengthen American history requirements at all levels of the educational system.

The study, sponsored by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, found that none of the 55 institutions required American history for graduation. And only 78 percent of them required students to take any history classes, said Jerry Martin, one of the report's authors.

The history test was given by telephone to 556 college seniors chosen at random. The questions were drawn from a basic high school curriculum, and many had been used in the National Assessment of Education Program tests given to high school students.

[From the New York Times, July 2, 2000]

HISTORY 101: SNOOP DOGGY ROOSEVELT

(By Scott Veale)

Listen up, class. We hate to spoil your holiday weekend, but an alarming new survey of American history knowledge—released just days before Independence Day, no less—suggests that the nation is in desperate need of summer school. The report, sponsored by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, a Washington-based nonprofit group that promotes liberal-arts study, posed 34 high-school level questions randomly to 556 seniors at 55 leading colleges and universities, including Harvard, Princeton and Brown.

Only one student answered all the questions correctly, and the average score was a sobering 53 percent—even with a couple of gimmes about cartoon characters and rap stars tossed in. But maybe it's not too surprising: according to the survey, none of the schools examined require American history courses for graduation.

So put down those tube steaks and sharpen your pencils. It's time to match wits with tomorrow's leaders.

1. When was the Civil War?
a. 1750–1800
b. 1800–1850
c. 1850–1900
d. 1900–1950
e. after 1950

2. Who said ''Give me liberty or give me death?''
a. John Hancock
b. James Madison
c. Patrick Henry
d. Samuel Adams

3. What is the Magna Carta?
a. The foundation of the British parliamentary system
b. The Great Seal of the monarchs of England
c. The French Declaration of the Rights of Man
d. The charter signed by the Pilgrims on the Mayflower

4. The term Reconstruction refers to:
a. Payment of European countries' debts to the United States after the First World War
b. Repairing of the physical damage caused by the Civil War
c. Readmission of the Confederate states and the protection of the rights of black citizens
d. Rebuilding of the transcontinental railroad and the canal system

5. Are Beavis and Butthead . . .
a. A radio show
b. Television cartoon characters
c. A musical group
d. Fictional soldiers

6. The Scopes trial was about:
a. Freedom of the press
b. Teaching evolution in the schools
c. Prayer in the schools
d. Education in private schools

7. The Emancipation Proclamation issued by Lincoln stated that:
a. Slaves were free in areas of the Confederate states not held by the Union
b. The slave trade was illegal
c. Slaves who fled to Canada would be protected
d. Slavery was abolished in the Union

8. The purpose of the authors of the Federalist Papers was to:
a. Establish a strong, free press in the colonies
b. Confirm George Washington's election as the first president
c. Win foreign approval for the Revolutionary War
d. Gain ratification of the U.S. Constitution

9. Sputnik was the name given to the first:
a. Telecommunications system
b. Animal to travel into space
c. Hydrogen bomb
d. Man-made satellite

10. The Missouri Compromise was the act that:
a. Funded the Lewis and Clark expedition on the upper Missouri River
b. Granted statehood to Missouri but denied the admission of any other states
c. Settled the boundary dispute between Missouri and Kansas
d. Admitted Maine into the Union as a free state and Missouri as a slave state

11. Which document established the division of powers between the states and the federal government?
a. The Marshall Plan
b. The Constitution
c. The Declaration of Independence
d. The Articles of Confederation

12. When was Thomas Jefferson president?
a. 1780–1800
b. 1800–1820
c. 1820–1840
d. 1840–1860
e. 1860–1880

13. What was the lowest point in American fortunes in the Revolutionary War?
a. Saratoga
b. Bunker Hill
c. Valley Forge
d. Fort Ticonderoga

14. In his farewell address, President George Washington warned against the danger of:
a. Expanding into territories beyond the Appalachian Mountains
b. Having war with Spain over Mexico
c. Entering into permanent alliances with foreign governments
d. Building a standing army and strong navy

15. The Monroe Doctrine declared that:
a. The American blockade of Cuba was in accord with international law
b. Europe should not acquire new territories in Western Hemisphere
c. Trade with China should be open to all Western nations
d. The annexation of the Philippines was legitimate

16. Who was the European who traveled in the United States and wrote down perceptive comments about what he saw in ''Democracy in America''?
a. Lafayette
b. Tocqueville
c. Crevocoeur
d. Napoleon

17. Identify Snoop Doggy Dog.
a. A rap singer
b. Cartoon by Charles Schultz
c. A mystery series
d. A jazz pianist

18. Abraham Lincoln was president between:
a. 1780–1800
b. 1800–1820

c. 1820–1840
d. 1840–1860
e. 1860–1880

19. Who was the American general at Yorktown?
a. William T. Sherman
b. Ulysses S. Grant
c. Douglas McArthur
d. George Washington

20. John Marshall was the author of:
a. Roe v. Wade
b. Dred Scott v. Kansas
c. Marbury v. Madison
d. Brown v. Board of Education

21. Who was the ''Father of the Constitution?''
a. George Washington
b. Thomas Jefferson
c. Benjamin Franklin
d. James Madison

22. Who said, ''I regret that I have only one life to give for my country?''
a. John F. Kennedy
b. Benedict Arnold
c. John Brown
d. Nathan Hale

23. What was the source of the following phrase: ''Government of the people, by the people, for the people?''
a. The speech: ''I have a Dream?''
b. Declaration of Independence
c. U.S. Constitution
d. Gettysburg Address

24. Who was the second president of the U.S.?
a. Thomas Jefferson
b. James Madison
c. John Adams
d. Benjamin Franklin

25. Who was president when the U.S. purchased the Panama Canal?
a. Theodore Roosevelt
b. Jimmy Carter
c. Franklin D. Roosevelt
d. Woodrow Wilson

26. Who was the leading advocate for the U.S. entry into the League of Nations?
a. George C. Marshall
b. Woodrow Wilson
c. Henry Cabot Lodge
d. Eleanor Roosevelt

27. Who said, ''Speak softly but carry a big stick?''
a. William T. Sherman
b. Sitting Bull
c. John D. Rockefeller
d. Theodore Roosevelt

28. The Battle of the Bulge occurred during:
a. The Vietnam War
b. World War II
c. World War I
d. The Civil War

29. Which of the following was a prominent leader of the Abolitionist Movement?
a. Malcolm X
b. Martin Luther King Jr.
c. W.E.B. Du Bois
d. Frederick Douglass

30. Who was the president of the United States at the beginning of the Korean War?
a. John F. Kennedy
b. Franklin D. Roosevelt
c. Dwight Eisenhower
d. Harry Truman

31. When the United States entered World War II, which two major nations were allied with Germany?
a. Italy and Japan
b. Italy and Poland
c. Italy and Russia
d. Russia and Japan

32. Social legislation passed under President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society program included:
a. The Sherman Antitrust Act
b. The Voting Rights Act
c. The Tennessee Valley Authority
d. The Civilian Conservation Corps

33. Who was ''First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen?''
a. George Washington
b. Woodrow Wilson
c. Dwight Eisenhower
d. Abraham Lincoln

34. Who was the leader of the Soviet Union when the United States entered World War II?
a. Peter Ustinov
b. Nikita Khrushchev
c. Marshal Tito
d. Joseph Stalin

[From the Washington Post, July 2, 2000]

NEGLECTING HISTORY . . .

(By David S. Broder)

A question for you before you set off your fireworks: Who was the American general at Yorktown? You have four guesses: William Tecumseh Sherman, Ulysses S. Grant Douglas MacArthur or George Washington.

When that question was asked late last year of 556 randomly chosen seniors at 55 top-rated colleges and universities, one out of three got it right. Stunningly, more of those about to graduate from great liberal arts colleges such as Amherst and Williams and Grinnell and world-class universities such as Harvard and Duke and the University of Michigan named Grant, the victorious general in the Civil War, than Washington, the commander of the Continental Army, as the man who defeated the British in the final battle of the Revolutionary War.

That was not the worst. Only 22 percent could identify the Gettysburg Address as the source of the phrase ''government of the people, by the people, for the people.'' Most thought it came from the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution.

The results of this survey, using 34 questions normally asked of high school students, not elite college and university seniors, justify the term ''historical illiteracy.'' That is what four members of Congress called the situation in a joint resolution they introduced last week warning that ''the next generation of American leaders and citizens is in danger of losing America's civic memory.''

Congress can do nothing but decry the situation. As Sen. Joe Lieberman of Connecticut, one of the sponsors, said, ''We are not here to establish a national curriculum.'' But the challenge to parents and to educators is not to be ignored.

The college student poll was taken for a private group, the American Council of Trustees and Alumni. Its report makes two points: If these high school questions were used as a college test, 65 percent of the college students would flunk. Equally troubling, it said, none of the 55 elite colleges and universities (as rated by U.S. News & World Report) requires a course in American history before graduation.

This, I would add, despite the fact that it has been known for a long time that high school students aren't learning much about our history from their teachers. The most recent report from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) was in 1994, and it too was devastating. That massive survey found that even though most students reported having taken American history in the eighth and 11th grades, little of it stuck. ''Few students (11 percent) reached the proficient achievement level—defined as solid grade-level performance—and only 1 or 2 percent reached the advanced achievement level,'' the report said. Fully 57 percent of the high school seniors failed to demonstrate a basic level of understanding of American history and institutions—the lowest category in the test.

The Council of Trustees and Alumni, whose chairman is Lynne V. Cheney, is engaged in an ongoing debate with academics over a range of curriculum issues. But on this one, I found the heads of the major historical groups largely in agreement.

Dr. Arnita Jones, executive director of the American Historical Association told me, ''Of course, students should be taking American history, and I would extend that to world history as well.'' But she said that on too many campuses, ''resources are being pulled away from history and given to areas that seem to be more practical.''

The reaction of Kenneth T. Jackson, the president of the Organization of American Historians and a professor at Columbia University, one of the elite schools whose students were surveyed, was more skeptical. He said, ''The best colleges and universities have strong history departments and high enrollments. The smarter you are and the better college you attend, the more likely you are to take history.''

But he said that in his first message to his fellow academics as association president, ''I said we don't take our teaching seriously enough. We may be too free to teach our own speciality, rather than what students need to know. If you have a big department, it usually works out, but sometimes the only course that's open may be a history of 19th-century railroads in Tennessee.''

As Lieberman said, ''With the Fourth fast approaching, I can think of no better way to celebrate the anniversary of America's independence than for us to remember what moved a determined band of patriots to lay down all for liberty, and then to promise never to forget.'' Of course, you can't forget what you never learned.

[From World News Now, July 3, 2000]

A HISTORY SURVEY TAKEN AT 55 TOP COLLEGES IN U.S.

ANDERSON COOPER. A new survey shows that most college seniors don't know jack about American history. Jim Sciutto here was an American history major but we'll talk to him about that later. Seniors at 55 top colleges and universities including Harvard and Princeton, almost 80 percent of them got a D or an F on a high school level history test. Apparently only 23 percent knew that James Madison was a principle framer of the Constitution. But on the upside, 99 percent knew who Beavis and Butthead were. Don't worry, sleep safely.

GEORGE WILL. Yes, Beavis—'Identify Beavis and Butthead.' That was one of the questions.

DEREK MCGINTY. Three percent missed that, though, which I was wondering who they were.

GEORGE STEPHANOPOULOS. I'll—I'll—I'll confess. I took the test and I got—I got two wrong. But I think George is on to something. I actually taught at—at Columbia the last couple of years, and they have a core curriculum which helps. What I saw among the students now is they're in some ways very—so much smarter than students in the past. Their SAT scores are through the roof, but they don't necessarily know as much because they're not getting this concentrated teaching in history and other subjects.

SAM DONALDSON. Derek, a lot of white Americans look at some courses that introduce African history at the expense of US history and they say, 'They got it wrong.'

Mr. MCGINTY. Well, I mean, you're acting like there's only room for one. I think you have to have an inclusive view of history . . .

Mr. DONALDSON. I'm not acting any way, but I'm asking you about that because what I told you is correct. A lot of white Americans look at these courses and say, 'Well, I should be studying Texas history.'

Mr. MCGINTY. Well, I think they should be studying history as it—as it goes. It shouldn't be African or anything else. It—it never was that before, you know. Just when it was—to began to become—become more inclusive, suddenly it was African or whatever. I think that there is room to have a wide-ranging knowledge without leaving out anybody's history.

Mr. COOPER. And that was some of ''This Week'' from yesterday.

JIM SCIUTTO. We have the quiz right here. And Anderson has not taken it, so I'm going to take this opportunity to ask him a couple of questions.

Mr. COOPER. Uh-huh, Do you know what they teach you in your first year of correspondence—of anchor school, by the way?

Mr. SCIUTTO. Never be quizzed on air, right.

Mr. COOPER. Exactly.

Mr. SCIUTTO. George W. Bush should have learned that lesson.

Mr. COOPER. Do you want to know what other questions you're never suppose to . . .

Mr. SCIUTTO. See, he's stalling so I can't ask him a single question.

Mr. COOPER. I'm using up time is what I'm doing.

Mr. DONALDSON. I want to now come to something that has nothing to do with politics. It has to do with education. Published in the New York Times is an interesting History 101 quiz. It was not given by the Times, but someone gave this to 55 universities. These are college seniors and Harvard and other prestigious schools were included. Here were some of the questions and some of the percentages of right answers.

Number one. Folks, play along. Who was the American general at Yorktown? William T. Sherman, Ulysses S. Grant, Douglas McArthur, George Washington. Derek:

Mr. MCGINTY. George Washington.

Mr. DONALDSON. Well, only 34 percent—34 percent—got that right.

Number two. John Marshall was the author of Roe vs. Wade, Dred Scott and Kansas, Murbury vs. Madison, Brown vs. the Board of Education. George:

Mr. WILL. Marbury vs. Madison.

Mr. DONALDSON. That's correct. I mean, the great chief justice. Twenty-one percent of college seniors got that right.

Number three. The Battle of the Bulge occurred during the Vietnam War, World War II, World War I, the Civil War. I could add the Peloponnesian War. George Will:

Mr. WILL. World War II.

Mr. DONALDSON. World War II.

Mr. WILL. Sam . . .

Mr. DONALDSON. Well, let me just tell them—only 37 percent got that right. But what do you make of this?

Mr. WILL. Well, all of these seniors at some very prestigious schools, I don't know all of them, but they included Harvard, Princeton and Brown. All these schools had one thing in common: none of them have an American History prerequisite requirement for graduation.

Mr. DONALDSON. Why not?

Mr. WILL. Well, that's an excellent question, having seen that.

Mr. MCGINTY. If we're fair, though, some of those questions that had the lower percentages—because some of the answers 70 and 80 percent did get correct—some of the more obscure questions were . . .

Mr. SCIUTTO. Who said ''Give me liberty or give me death?''

Mr. COOPER. And my options are?

Mr. SCIUTTO. Patrick Henry, James Madison, John Hancock, or Samuel Adams.

Mr. COOPER. Patrick Henry.

Mr. SCIUTTO. Right on. You're watching World News Now.

[From CNN Late Edition With Wolf Blitzer
July 2, 2000]

WOLF BLITZER. Time now for Bruce Morton's ''Last Word,'' On this holiday weekend, when we celebrate America's past, some, it seems, may have to go back and hit the history books.

BRUCE MORTON, CNN correspondent. Independence Day is coming up—a good time to think about U.S. history, a subject America's young adults may not have a very good grasp of these days. A new survey asked randomly selected seniors from the country's top colleges and universities, among them Amherst, Harvard, Stanford, 34 multiple choice questions about American history.

Ninety-nine percent knew that Beavis and Butthead were TV cartoon characters. Eighty-nine percent knew that Sputnik was the first man-made satellite. Just one in four, 26 percent, knew that the emancipation Proclamation said that slaves in Confederate territory were free. Just 60 percent knew that the Constitution was the document which established the division of powers between the states and the federal government.

Thirty-eight percent correctly said Valley Forge was the lowest point in America fortunes during the Revolutionary War. Twenty-four percent said Bunker Hill was. Asked who was the American general at Yorktown, where the British surrendered ending the Revolutionary War, 34 percent correctly said George Washington, but 37 percent picked Ulysses Grant, a Union general in the Civil War.

Only 23 percent, correctly picked James Madison as the father of the Constitution. Fifty-three percent Thomas Jefferson, who instead wrote the Declaration of Independence, signed 224 years ago this week.

Forty percent knew it was accused spy Nathan Hale who said, ''I regret that I have only one life to give for my country,'' Just 22 percent knew that the phrase ''government of the people, by the people, and for the people'' came from Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Thirty-one percent said the U.S. Constitution, 43 percent the Declaration of independence.

One student of the 556 surveyed got all 34 questions right. Two students tied for worst—two questions right, the score of 6 percent. Overall, the average was 53 percent right. Put another way, if this had been a regular college test, 65 percent would have flunked, 16 percent gotten Ds, and 19 percent C or higher. Why such poor scores? Maybe because 100 percent of the colleges and universities in this survey, require no American history courses; 78 percent require no history at all.

A philosopher named George Santayana once wrote, ''Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it.'' What if he was right?

Happy Independence Day.

I'm Bruce Morton.

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 2, 2000]

JEFFERSON, NOT ''THE JEFFERSONS''

(By William Hageman)

Another wave of college graduates is heading off into the real world, armed with degrees and eager to make their mark. Just don't ask them anything about history.

The American Council of Trustees and Alumni recently commissioned a survey of more than 500 college seniors from some of the top colleges and universities in the U.S. According to the results, four out of five seniors quizzed received a grade of D or F on history questions drawn from a basic high school curriculum. How bad was it?

—Only 34 percent of the students surveyed could identify George Washington as an American general at the Battle of Yorktown, the culminating battle of the American Revolution.

—Only 22 percent knew the line ''Government of the people, by the people, for the people'' came from the Gettysburg Address.

—Only 26 percent were familiar with the Emancipation Proclamation.

But all is not lost. Ninety-nine percent of the students knew who the cartoon characters Beavis and Butt-head are, and 98 percent could identify the rap singer Snoop Doggy Dogg.

On second thought, maybe all is lost.

[From the Boston Herald, July 2, 2000]

HISTORY'S GREEK TO THEM

''Don't know much about history,'' goes the refrain to an old pop tune. According to a survey by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, it should be the theme song at America's elite institutions of higher education.

In the survey of seniors at 55 of the nation's top schools, including Harvard and Princeton, nearly 80 percent received a ''D'' or ''F'' grade on a 34-question, high-school level American history exam.

Most didn't know that the U.S. Constitution establishes a division of power in the national government—a real brain-teaser.

While 99 percent were familiar with the foul-mouthed cartoon characters Beavis and Butthead, only 23 percent identified James Madison as the principal framer of the Constitution.

None of these colleges has an American history graduation requirement, and 78 percent have no history requirement at all.

Public schools share responsibility for this tragedy. American history is too often relegated to minor league status, squeezed in amid the trendy programs du jour.

Sen. Joseph Lieberman, (D–Conn.), and others have introduced a resolution calling on administrators, trustees and state officials to strengthen the teaching of American history at all levels. When you're starting with next to nothing, there's nowhere to go but up.

[From the Dayton Daily News, July 5, 2000]

INFO-AGE STUDENTS MISSING IT

(By Mary McCarty)

Welcome back to work. If we can believe our daily newspapers—and of course we can, every blessed word—we spent this extravagant gift of a four-day weekend in style: traveling, barbecuing, ooh-ing and aah-ing over dozens of area fireworks displays.

But not, apparently, teaching our young anything about the significance of the holiday.

Sunday's New York Times raised the question: What in Bunker Hill do our college seniors know about history?

The Times reported that a Washington-based nonprofit, the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, conducted a survey of 556 seniors at 55 ''leading colleges,'' including Harvard and Brown. They asked 32 high school-level history questions, throwing in a couple of pop-culture gimmes.

One student scored 100 percent. The average score was 53 percent.

Ninety-nine percent could identify Beavis and Butthead as cartoon characters.

But, given four multiple-choice answers—with the answers staring them in the face as expectantly as Regis Philbin—a mere 22 percent could place the phrase ''Government of the people, by the people, for the people'' in the Gettysburg Address.

Ninety-eight percent knew that Snoop Doggy Dog is a rap artist; 28 percent knew the Battle of the Bulge took place in World War II.

Thirty-eight percent guessed that the ''lowest point in the Revolutionary War'' was Valley Forge.

Yikes! These are the scions of the Information Age. An unprecedented amount of

knowledge is literally at their fingertips, only a mouse click away. Miles and miles and miles of memory. Yet their cultural memory banks appear to be running alarmingly low.

Is that their fault or ours?

How long has it been since American history was truly part of the national conversation?

Over the four-day weekend, we did Fourth of July with all the trimmings: Fireworks, hot dogs and mustard, cookouts. Only once, during that time, did any or our friends mention the significance of the holiday. That was Zafar Rizvi of Butler Twp. He was born in Pakistan.

He brought us an essay making the Internet rounds, ''Remembering Independence Day.'' ''Have you ever wondered what happened to the 56 men who signed the Declaration of Independence?'' the essay begins, and proceeds to elaborate, in gruesome detail.

At Zafar's insistence, we reluctantly turned our attention away from the grill. ''I didn't know any of these things!'' he exclaimed.

He wanted to know. ''I think a lot of times people take for granted the freedom that they have—the right to vote, freedom of religion, the right to change the system,'' be said. ''I never voted until I became an American citizen.''

Zafar hasn't missed a change to vote in 15 years. He brings his 9-year-old son with him. He wears an ''I voted'' sticker back to the office.

He thinks it's important not only that we exercise our present-day freedoms, but also that we remember and celebrate our past. ''A lot of people don't know the sacrifices made by their grandparents and great-great-grandparents,'' he said. ''The Fourth of July is always a great feeling. I'm proud to be an American.''

Maybe Harvard should appoint him honorary professor. We seem to be in danger of raising future generations with gigabytes of information instantly at their disposal.

And none of it engraved in their hearts.

[From the Hartford Courant, July 2, 2000]

HISTORY IS A MYSTERY TO MANY

Maybe it's not surprising that far more college seniors can identify Beavis and Butthead than can describe James Madison's role in framing the Constitution. But it's disconcerting nevertheless.

A test to measure the teaching of American history was given to seniors at 55 top colleges and universities, including Harvard and Princeton. Administered by the Center for Survey Research and Analysis at the University of Connecticut, the 34-question test revealed a depressing dearth of knowledge about the United States. Nearly 80 percent of this country's best and brightest got a D or an F. More than a third of the students didn't know, for example, that the Constitution established the division of powers in American government.

Thomas Jefferson, who understood better than most that democracy depends on an educated public, must be tossing in his grave. Those who have knowledge about the nation's past are more likely to be invested in its future and to participate in its democratic processes. Sen. Joseph I. Lieberman quoted the sage of Monticello as saying, ''If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects that never was and never will be.'' The United States seems ''well on its way to testing this proposition,'' Mr. Lieberman said.

Across the years, students have always been more familiar with the popular culture of their own era than with history. But perhaps never during the life of the Republic have so many known so little about the past.

One of the reasons is the weakening of curriculums. The UConn study found that none of the 55 colleges taking part in the survey require American history for graduation. Only 78 percent of the schools require students to take any history classes. Course catalogs are filled with too much politically correct drivel.

Mr. Lieberman is part of a bipartisan group in Congress that has introduced resolutions in the Senate and House calling on boards of trustees, college administrators and state education officials to strengthen American history requirements at all levels of the educational system. Ordinarily politicians should keep their hands off curriculums, but somebody has to speak up about the sorry state of history instruction today.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, July 4, 2000]

UNHAPPY COURSE OF HUMAN EVENTS

Today is Independence Day, the day we observe the July 4, 1776, signing of the Declaration of Independence. Oh, for you college kids out there? That's . . . independence . . . from . . . England.

We feel compelled to make that clear after reading the other day about a recent history quiz given to seniors at 55 top universities and colleges. The results of the 34-question American history test—high school level, at that—revealed that nearly 80 percent of the students received a D or an F.

The sorry showing revealed that college students—our, gulp, future leaders—are rather illiterate, history-wise. Beavis and Butthead? Ninety-nine percent knew those cartoon miscreants. James Madison? the ''Father of the Constitution'' was accurately identified by only 23 percent.

The survey was commissioned by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, which used it to bemoan the back seat that history courses have taken in many of the nation's universities. ''Students are allowed to graduate as if they didn't know the past existed,'' said one of the study's authors. That is a damning indictment of the nation's colleges and schools. Surely, one of the functions of education is to pass on the responsibilities of citizenship. Too many kids leave high school unable to read; now we have evidence that too many leave college unable to answer the most fundamental of history questions.

Those who do not remember the past are doomed to repeat it, was the warning of philosopher George Santayana. But we don't have to wait long to see the consequences of being disconnected from our history. Every election it becomes more and more apparent as voter turnout declines. Too many Americans have forgotten—or never learned about—the blood, sweat and tears that have been shed in the past for the freedoms we enjoy—and take for granted—in the 21st century. Young people have a particularly disappointing level of non-involvement at the ballot box. They are ignorant of this country's tradition of representative democracy, its record of expanding liberty and the duty of responsible adults to participate in our republic's political life.

Is it any wonder so many young people see no relevance in politics?

[From the Detroit News, July 2, 2000]

BEAVIS MEETS ''THE PATRIOT''

The new Mel Gibson movie, The Patriot, a historical epic about the American Revolution, opened on this most patriotic of weekends to generally upbeat reviews. If the results of a recent survey are considered, however, one wonders where its audience may be.

The survey indicated that 80 percent of college seniors, tested at some of this nation's most prestigious schools, could not pass a very basic quiz on American history.

Only 23 percent, for example, correctly identified James Madison as the principal framer of the U.S. Constitution. However, 99 percent knew who Beavis and Butthead were. So they certainly wouldn't be expected to know much about how the War for Independence was conducted in South Carolina 220 years ago.

The survey results are hardly a surprise, given the way that history has been watered down, politically cleansed or eradicated for an entire generation of students. The universities chosen for the study were, in fact, selected on the basis of not requiring any American history course for graduation.

The English critics, who tend to take history a good deal more seriously, have complained that Mr. Gibson's film is perfectly beastly to the Brits. And in fact the Revolution, for all its glorification in American folklore, was a nasty, vicious war on both sides. It wasn't pretty, but it's a real part of U.S. history.

Mr. Gibson is, or course, a major star who turned Braveheart, a film about the 13th-century struggle of Scots under William Wallace to be free of English rule, into a box office success. One of its big scenes featured the hero's soldiers baring their backsides in a gesture of defiance.

Not much of that went on in the Revolutionary War. If it had, Mr. Gibson may have found a way to bring in the Beavis and Butthead crowd.

[From Newsday (New York, NY), July 4, 2000]

LIFE, LIBERTY AND PURSUIT OF BARBECUE

(By James P. Pinkerton)

July 4 was once known as Independence Day, but now it's simply ''The Fourth of July.'' The sense of history that once motivated parades and patriotic displays is gone, maybe forever.

So today those who know that the Fourth commemorates the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence, who risked all for ''life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,'' are joined by those who see the holiday as an opportunity for barbecue, fireworks and party-heartying. And, although there is nothing wrong with revelry, remembrance is even better.

A new survey of 556 college seniors conducted by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni finds that, while 99 percent can correctly identify the cartoon characters Beavis and Butt-head, only 45 percent know even vaguely when Thomas Jefferson, principal author of the Declaration, served as president.

And, while 98 percent can identify the rap singer Snoop Doggy Dog, only 34 percent know that George Washington was the commander at the Battle of Yorktown, which settled the question of American independence.

To be sure, there's often an element of snobbery in polls that show Americans don't know much about history. No doubt many of the heroes of Yorktown, Gettsburg or the Battle of the Bulge had little or no formal education (although surviving veterans of that last Nazi offensive in late 1944 might be dismayed to know that just 37 percent of college seniors recognize the Battle of the Bulge took place during World War II).

But this poll was different: It wasn't directed toward ordinary students but rather toward students at 55 leading liberal-arts colleges, including Harvard and Princeton.

George Santayana, an Ivy Leaguer, once wrote that ''those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.'' But just the opposite can be argued, too: Those who don't remember the past are doomed, or perhaps destined, never to repeat it.

It's possible that the United States has reached such a high plateau of economic

prosperity and technologically based military superiority that the old values of heroism and sacrifice are no longer deemed necessary.

As evidence, consider the most useful look at the state of the union in print today: a new book, ''Bobos in Paradise: The New Upper Class and How They Got There,'' by David Brooks. Bobos—a neologism combining ''bourgeois'' and ''bohemian''—are defined as ''the new information-age elite'' for whom ''self-cultivation is the imperative, with the emphasis on self.''

So much, then, for the dying words—''I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country''—of Revolutionary patriot Nathan Hale (whom just 40 percent of the college seniors could identify).

Freely identifying himself as a Bobo, Brooks writes, ''We're not so bad. All societies have elites, and our educated elite is a lot more enlightened than some of the older elites, which were based on blood or wealth or military valor.''

It would be easy to dismiss Bobos as selfish hedonists with no larger interests beyond themselves, but that wouldn't tell the whole story.

It's more accurate to assert that the Bobos, and all other less-well-off Americans who follow their politico-cultural leadership, are developing loyalties to newer ideas and institutions that seem more relevant to them than the American heritage.

For example, while the Stars and Stripes are as scarce as chewing tobacco in Bobo neighborhoods, it's easy to find environmentally-themed bumper strips, window decals, even flags and banners. Similarly, other cultural and political beliefs—from abortion rights to gay rights to gun control—are visibly represented in Bobo enclaves.

If patriotism can be defined as loyalty to the group, then Bobos are patriotic in their own fashion. Their loyalties are tilted away from the nation–state and toward new categories that often transcend national boundaries.

But even Brooks, bard of the Bobos, worries that Americans have drifted away from patriotic moorings.

''The Bobo task,'' he writes, ''is to rebuild some sense of a united polity, some sense of national cohesion.''

That's what ''Independence Day'' was once all about.

But today ''interdependence'' seems to many to be a more useful concept. If so, then maybe history, with all its bloody memories, really can be a thing of the past.

But, if not, the Bobos of today will have a hard time summoning up old-fashioned patriotism out of the fog of forgetfulness.

[From the Roanoke Times & World News, July 3, 2000]

DON'T LET AMERICA'S HISTORY FADE AWAY

Suppose you had to pass a pop quiz on America's history before you could eat a hot dog or take in a fireworks display tomorrow in celebration of the nation's founding. Could you?

Or are you in the category with about 80 percent of seniors at some of the nation's top colleges and universities who—according to a survey released last week by the University of Connecticut—are more familiar with America's bad boys Beavis and Butt-head than with America's Founding Fathers and the principles that guided them?

If the answer to the last question is ''yes,'' perhaps you should skip the hot dogs and fireworks and instead attend one of the many naturalization ceremonies that will be held tomorrow for immigrants to become American citizens.

Those immigrants must pass a test about U.S. history and government, and often, say some officials of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, they are more knowledgeable on the subjects than many folks born, bred and educated in the USA.

OK, pretend the game isn't ''Who Wants to Be a Millionaire'' but ''Who Wants to Be an American?'' Pretend the stakes are—more valuable than money—the freedoms and privileges that most Americans consider their birthright. Could you, as immigrants must, correctly answer such questions as:

Why did the Pilgrims come to America? Name the 13 original states. What did the Emancipation Proclamation do? How many amendments are there to the Constitution? Why are there 100 members of the U.S. Senate? Who has the power to declare war? Who was Martin Luther King Jr.? Who is the commander in chief of the U.S. military? Which countries were our enemies during World War II? What are the two major political parties in America today? Who selects Supreme Court justices? What is the basic premise of the Declaration of Independence?

Granted, many immigrants participating in naturalization ceremonies tomorrow might think Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. (rather than Abraham Lincoln) freed the slaves. But few would confuse Jerry Springer with Patrick Henry, and almost all would know that the basic premise of the Declaration of Independence is that ''all Men are created equal'' and ''are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights.''

Any American born-and-bred college senior who doesn't know that should be flogged around the ears and jowls with a raw wiener.

[From the Ledger (Lakeland, FL), July 2, 2000]

GIVE ME LIBERTY OR GIVE ME . . . BEAVIS?; OPINION

(By Thomas Roe Oldt)

They say the kiddies don't know much about history. And we're not talking little kiddies, either. We're talking college seniors from the nation's allegedly top universities.

''They'' are the Center for Survey Research and Analysis at the University of Connecticut, which recently conducted a review of what those seniors know about American history.

Turns out, not much. Given a 34-question multiple-guess high school exam on the subject, 80 percent received a D or F.

More than a quarter couldn't pick the leader of the Abolitionist Movement when given a choice among four people, three of whom weren't even alive prior to the Civil War.

Defining ''Abolitionist'' doubtless would have been a problem, but the kiddies were saved the embarrassment of being subjected to an exam even moderately comprehensive.

When asked to select the time frame of the Civil War in 50-year increments from 1750 to 1950 and beyond, 40 percent were stymied.

When it came to Supreme Court Justice John Marshall, 67 percent couldn't pick him as the author of Marbury v. Madison. The other choices included two 20th century picks, Roe v. Wade and Brown v. Board of Education.

Asked under whose administration the Korean War began, 65 percent thought it was someone other than Harry Truman.

The source of the phrase ''Government of the people, by the people, for the people'' was misidentified by 78 percent of respondents.

Only 26 percent knew that the Emancipation Proclamation freed slaves only in areas of the Confederacy not held by the Union. Reconstruction was believed by all but 29 percent to refer to something other than readmission of the Confederate states and protection of the rights of former slaves. Almost 60 percent thought it referred to repairing physical damage caused by the Civil War.

While 72 percent knew that Joseph Stalin was leader of the Soviet Union when the United States entered World War II, some picked Peter Ustinov, the actor. Too bad for the millions who died under Stalin, a very bad actor, that Ustinov wasn't head honcho. Thomas Jefferson was thought by 53 percent to be ''Father of the Constitution'' and 23 percent believed John F. Kennedy uttered the words, ''I regret that I have only one life to give for my country.''

Thirteen percent identified Sitting Bull as the phrase-maker who came up with ''Speak softly but carry a big stick.''

Basic cultural stuff, all in all.

But take heart! Speaking of base culture, all but 2 percent could identify Beavis, Butthead and Snoop Doggy Dog. It's a good thing Our Future Leaders weren't asking about world history. If the Magna Carta posed problems for them—only 56 percent got it right—imagine what the Hundred Years War would do?

So as an Independence Day weekend public service exercise, here is a simple quasi-world history exam sent in by a friend. Try this out on your college senior.

1. How long did the Hundred Years War last?
2. Which country makes Panama hats?
3. Where do we get catgut?
4. In which month do Russians celebrate the October Revolution?
5. What is a camel's hair brush made of?
6. The Canary Islands are named after what animal?
7. What was King George VI's first name?
8. What color is a purple finch?
9. What country do Chinese gooseberries come from?
10. How long did the Thirty Years War last?

While it's highly tempting to stretch this out over two columns in order to fill the greatest possible space with the least imaginable effort, it doesn't seem fair. So here are the answers?

1. 116 years, from 1337 to 1453.
2. Ecuador.
3. From sheep and horses.
4. November, since the Russian calendar was 13 days behind ours in 1917.
5. Squirrel fur.
6. The Latin name was Insularia Canaria, ''Island of the Dogs.''
7. Albert.
8. Distinctively crimson.
9. New Zealand.
10. At last! Thirty years, from 1618 to 1648.

On the advice of counsel, there will be no disclosure as the columnist's grade. Suffice it to say that the American history exam offered much less resistance.

Thomas Roe Oldt is a Winter Haven-based columnist for The Ledger. His opinion column appears on Sunday.

[From the Times-Picayune, July 4, 2000]

STUDENTS SHOULD AT LEAST KNOW GEORGE

(By James Gill)

''The Patriot'' is released at the same time as the latest survey to conclude that young Americans don't know squat.

What they are ignorant of on this occasion is American history, ''they'' being seniors at such tony schools as Harvard, Princeton and Brown. If they catch the flick, they may learn a thing or two about the Revolutionary War, which appears to be a closed book right now.

If your kid's an Ivy League hot shot who hasn't yet seen ''The Patriot,'' please do not spoil it by revealing how that war turned out. Since Mel Gibson is the star, they will probably have their money on Australia.

Ok, let us not exaggerate, for it is not necessary. The American Council of Trustees

and Alumni asked 556 students 34 easy questions. Although multiple choice made them even easier, only one kid got them all right, and the average score was 53 percent.

But the students are not so savvy as the numbers suggest. Two of the questions were gimmes, with only 1 percent failing to identify Beavis and Butthead as television carton characters and 2 percent laboring under the misapprehension that Snoop Doggy Dog was either a Charles Schultz cartoon, a mystery series or a jazz pianist.

Some of the answers suggested to serious questions, moreover, were too outlandish for consideration. Anyone not knowing who was leader of the Soviet Union at the outbreak of World War II, for instance, should not have had much trouble ruling out the English actor Peter Ustinov or the late Yugoslavian premier Marshal Tito. The fourth option was Khrushchev. The students did better on that question than on most, with 72 percent plumping for Stalin.

For 32 of the questions, four possible answers were suggested—five for each of the other two. A troglodyte asked to complete the survey might therefore expect to score close to 25 percent with the aid of a pin.

If the survey is to be trusted, the most privileged and educated of American kids are worth two troglodytes. Perhaps it is best if we do not know what the ratio is in Louisiana public colleges.

Today's students have such a shaky grasp of the revolutionary era that even George Washington is quite a mystery to them. Only 34 percent identified him as the American general at Yorktown, and 42 percent as being ''first in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen.''

One suspects that these kids must have been in puckish mood, deliberately giving wrong answers. It is hard to believe, for instance,that anyone could get through grade school without knowing that Patrick Henry said, ''Give me liberty or give me death.'' Yet there we have 34 percent of college seniors who purportedly do not know.

It is not that these kids have anything against the revolution. They are just as ill-informed about everything else.

A stock question in these surveys seems to be when the Civil War took place. Not precisely, of course, but within 50 years. The results are always shocking. This time there were five answers to choose from, starting with 1750–1800 and ending with the half-century now about to conclude. A pathetic 60 percent nailed it.

Applicants for American citizenship have to know more than plenty of these guys. A standard question for immigrants, for instance, is what the Emancipation Proclamation was all about, and there is no multiple choice. Of the students in this survey, 26 percent chose the right answer. Only 52 percent knew that the division of powers between the states and the federal government is spelled out in the Constitution.

Ask about anything—the Federalist Papers, Alexis de Tocqueville, the Scopes trial, the Monroe Doctrine—and a profound ignorance is revealed. Let us hope that Henry Ford was right when he said, ''History is more or less bunk,'' and George Santayana was wrong when he said, ''Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.''

Unfortunately, one suspects that Ford was about as good at philosophy as Santayana was at making cars.

While college seniors appear to be lacking in intellectual curiosity, today's sixth-graders, The New York Times reports, are under such pressure to excel in school that they study constantly and may ''suffer tension headaches and bouts of anxiety.''

Maybe everyone should make time to go see a movie.

[From The Reporter, July 2, 2000]

HISTORY 101: AMERICANS FLUNK WHEN IT COMES TO U.S. KNOWLEDGE

(By Amy Baumhardt)

If the words, ''Give me liberty or give me death,'' sound only vaguely familiar, you apparently have plenty of company.

According to a recent survey, nearly 80 percent of seniors at 55 top colleges and universities—including Harvard and Princeton—received a D or F on a 34 question, high school level American history test. Yet, 98 percent were able to recognize the music of recording artist Snoop Doggy Dogg and 99 percent could identify cartoon characters Beavis and Butthead.

How is this possible? Sixth District Rep. Thomas Petri, R—Fond du Lac, is asking the same question.

Petri has joined with U.S. Sen. Joseph I. Lieberman, D–Conn., to announce the introduction of a resolution expressing ''the importance and value of United States history'' and calling on boards of trustees, college administrators and state officials to strengthen American history requirements.

On June 27, the Petri-Lieberman bill was introduced, urging colleges to take seriously the need to teach American history.

Petri said, ''As we prepare to celebrate the Fourth of July, it is particularly appropriate to emphasize our need to know U.S. history.

He added, ''A basic knowledge of United States history is essential to a full and informed participation in civic life. It is also the one bond that brings together our diverse peoples into a single nation with a common purpose.''

Petri feels that ''when we lose our civic memory, when we lose our understanding of the remarkable individuals, events and values that have shaped our experiment in self-government, we are losing much of what it means to be an American.''

Local high school history teachers and college professors agree, to a point.

The consensus seems to be that history is obviously important. However, today's teachers are placing less of an emphasis on specific dates and times and more concentration on the overall impact history has on the lives of Americans.

''In my classroom, I teach my students historical concepts,'' said Lisa Steinacker, history teacher at Goodrich High School. ''I think it gives kids a better understanding of why things are the way they are today.''

At Ripon college, Professor Russell Blake shares the same philosophy.

''There needs to be an assurance that all citizens have some understanding of American history. However, I am not so much concerned that the students know exact dates but that they learn how to acquire historical knowledge.''

Acquiring the knowledge doesn't seem to be a problem in the Fond du Lac area, especially on the high school level.

Steinacker was pleased to announce that history was the highest scoring subject on standardized tests for Fond du Lac students.

''I think that speaks highly for the K–12 curriculum in this area,'' she said.

Blake has no complaints on the college-end either.

''I think as a teacher, I will always have the wish that students would know more, but I have been a professor at Ripon since 1981 and have seen no decline in my students' performances,'' he said.

Perhaps Petri is correct in assuming the problems lies in the fact that many students, once they reach the college level, are no longer required to take U.S. history courses.

At present, students can graduate from 100 percent of the top colleges and universities in the nation without taking a single course in U.S. history. At 78 percent of the institutions, students are not required to take any history at all.

''The focus always seems to be on math and science,'' said Steinacker. ''An understanding of history is important to be a well-rounded individual.''

With the Fourth of July, the day of American independence, fast approaching, the need for historical understanding seems relevant to fully appreciate the holiday. Most of us enjoy a holiday on the Fourth, but do we know why?

Here's a quick history lesson:

Independence Day is the national holiday of the United States of America, commemorating this nation's split from England and the beginning of self government.

U.S. colonists were angered with King George III, due to England's ''taxation without representation'' policy. When nothing was done to change the situation, colonists took matters into their own hands.

In June 1776, a committee was formed to compose a formal declaration of independence. Headed by Thomas Jefferson, the committee included John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Philip Livingston and Roger Sherman.

Together the men created the document that Americans still cherish and abide by today . . . the Declaration of Independence. The Continental Congress approved this document on July 4, 1776.

American history helps to define the nation's culture. It is not possible to bury the past if we hope to have a prosperous future.

Like Goodrich teacher Mike Dressler said last week. ''The purpose of learning about history is so we don't repeat it.''

EDUCATION: WHO'S BURIED IN GRANT'S TOMB? (A) BEAVIS AND BUTTHEAD, (B) LEE, (C) GRANT, (D) BRAINS OF TODAY'S COLLEGIANS

Like other Americans, many of this year's graduating seniors from the nation's top colleges and universities celebrated Independence Day with fireworks and barbecues. But according to a recent survey sponsored by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, a Washington-based non-profit organization that promotes academic excellence in higher education, those graduates would have better spent the day learning what the Fourth of July means in history.

In the survey, the Roper organization last fall asked 556 seniors at the 55 highest-rated colleges and universities to complete a test on 34 high-school-level questions about American history. What do they know about their own country's past? Not much. Only one-third of the students could correctly answer more than 60 percent of the questions, even with a couple of pop-culture gimmes thrown in; just one correctly answered all of them. Overall, the average score was an appalling 53 percent.

How badly ignorant are the nation's young best and brightest about American history? Match yourself against the elite from Stanford, UC-Berkeley, UCLA, Harvard and other top colleges by taking the same test. Find out who are the real Yankee Doodle Dandies.

1. When was the Civil War?
   a. 1750–1800
   b. 1800–1850
   c. 1850–1900
   d. 1900–1950
   e. after 1950

2. Who said ''Give me liberty or give me death''?
   a. John Hancock
   b. James Madison
   c. Patrick Henry
   d. Samuel Adams

3. What is the Magna Carta?
   a. The foundation of the British parliamentary system

b. The Great Seal of the monarchs of England
c. The French Declaration of the Rights of Man
d. The charter signed by the Pilgrims on the Mayflower

4. The term Reconstruction refers to:
a. Payment of European countries' debts to the United States after the First World War
b. Repairing of the physical damage caused by the Civil War
c. Readmission of the Confederate states and the protection of the rights of black citizens
d. Rebuilding of the transcontinental railroad and the canal system

5. Are Beavis and Butthead . . .
a. A radio show
b. Television cartoon characters
c. A musical group
d. Fictional soldiers

6. The Scopes trial was about:
a. Freedom of the press
b. Teaching evolution in the schools
c. Prayer in the schools
d. Education in private schools

7. The Emancipation Proclamation issued by Lincoln stated that:
a. Slaves were free in areas of the Confederate states not held by the Union
b. The slave trade was illegal
c. Slaves who fled to Canada would be protected
d. Slavery was abolished in the Union

8. The purpose of the authors of the Federalist Papers was to:
a. Establish a strong, free press in the colonies
b. Confirm George Washington's election as the first president
c. Win foreign approval for the Revolutionary War
d. Gain ratification of the U.S. Constitution

9. Sputnik was the name given to the first:
a. Telecommunications system
b. Animal to travel into space
c. Hydrogen bomb
d. Man-made satellite.

10. The Missouri Compromise was the act that:
a. Funded the Lewis and Clark expedition on the upper Missouri River
b. Granted statehood to Missouri but denied the admission of any other states
c. Settled the boundary dispute between Missouri and Kansas
d. Admitted Maine into the Union as a free state and Missouri as a slave state

11. Which document established the division of powers between the states and the federal government?
a. The Marshall Plan
b. The Constitution
c. The Declaration of Independence
d. The Articles of Confederation

12. When was Thomas Jefferson president?
a. 1780–1800
b. 1800–1820
c. 1820–1840
d. 1840–1860
e. 1860–1880

13. What was the lowest point in American fortunes in the Revolutionary War?
a. Saratoga
b. Bunker Hill
c. Valley Forge
d. Fort Ticonderoga

14. In his farewell address, President George Washington warned against the danger of:
a. Expanding into territories beyond the Appalachian Mountains
b. Having war with Spain over Mexico
c. Entering into permanent alliances with foreign governments
d. Building a standing army and strong navy

15. The Monroe Doctrine declared that:
a. The American blockade of Cuba was in accord with international law
b. Europe should not acquire new territories in Western Hemisphere
c. Trade with China should be open to all Western nations
d. The annexation of the Philippines was legitimate

16. Who was the European who traveled in the United States and wrote down perceptive comments about what he saw in ''Democracy in America''?
a. Lafayette
b. Tocqueville
c. Crevecoeur
d. Napoleon

17. Identify Snoop Doggy Dog.
a. A rap singer
b. Cartoon by Charles Schultz
c. A mystery series
d. A jazz pianist

18. Abraham Lincoln was president between:
a. 1780–1800
b. 1800–1820
c. 1820–1840
d. 1840–1860
e. 1860–1880

19. Who was the American general at Yorktown?
a. William T. Sherman
b. Ulysses S. Grant
c. Douglas McArthur
d. George Washington

20. John Marshall was the author of:
a. Roe v. Wade
b. Dred Scott v. Kansas
c. Marbury v. Madison
d. Brown v. Board of Education

21. Who was the ''Father of the Constitution''?
a. George Washington,
b. Thomas Jefferson
c. Benjamin Franklin
d. James Madison

22. Who said, ''I regret that I have only one life to give for my country''?
a. John F. Kennedy
b. Benedict Arnold
c. John Brown
d. Nathan Hale

23. What was the source of the following phrase: ''Government of the people, by the people, for the people''?
a. The speech: ''I have a Dream''
b. Declaration of Independence
c. U.S. Constitution
d. Gettysburg Address

24. Who was the second president of the U.S.?
a. Thomas Jefferson
b. James Madison
c. John Adams
d. Benjamin Franklin

25. Who was president when the U.S. purchased the Panama Canal?
a. Theodore Roosevelt
b. Jimmy Carter
c. Franklin D. Roosevelt
d. Woodrow Wilson

26. Who was the leading advocate for the U.S. entry into the League of Nations?
a. George C. Marshall
b. Woodrow Wilson
c. Henry Cabot Lodge
d. Eleanor Roosevelt

27. Who said, ''Speak softly but carry a big stick''?
a. William T. Sherman
b. Sitting Bull
c. John D. Rockefeller
d. Theodore Roosevelt

28. The Battle of the Bulge occurred during:
a. The Vietnam War
b. World War II
c. World War I
d. The Civil War

29. Which of the following was a prominent leader of the Abolitionist Movement?
a. Malcolm X
b. Martin Luther King Jr.
c. W.E.B. Du Bois
d. Frederick Douglas

30. Who was the president of the United States at the beginning of the Korean War?
a. John F. Kennedy
b. Franklin D. Roosevelt
c. Dwight Eisenhower
d. Harry Truman

31. When the United States entered World War II, which two major nations were allied with Germany?
a. Italy and Japan
b. Italy and Poland
c. Italy and Russia
d. Russia and Japan

32. Social legislation passed under President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society program included:
a. The Sherman Antitrust Act
b. The Voting Rights Act
c. The Tennessee Valley Authority
d. The Civilian Conservation Corps

33. Who was ''First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen?''
a. George Washington
b. Woodrow Wilson
c. Dwight Eisenhower
d. Abraham Lincoln

34. Who was the leader of the Soviet Union when the United States entered World War II?
a. Peter Ustinov
b. Nikita Khruschev
c. Marshal Tito
d. Joseph Stalin

The answers, along with the percentage of respondents who answered correctly:

1. C/60; 2. C/66; 3. A/56; 4. C/29; 5. B/99; 6. B/61; 7. A/26; 8. D/53; 9. D/89; 10. D/52; 11. B/60; 12. B/45; 13. C/38; 14. C/52; 15. B/62; 16. B/49; 17. A/98; 18. E/44; 19. D/34; 20. C/33; 21. D/23; 22. D/40; 23. D/22; 24. C/73; 25. A/53; 26. B/69; 27. D/70; 28. B/37; 29. D/73; 30. D/35; 31. A/67; 32. B/30; 33. A/42; 34. D/72.

WE IGNORE HISTORY AT OUR OWN PERIL

Is it really surprising that 99 percent of college students can identify ''Beavis and Butthead'' as television cartoon characters but fail to identify key figures and concepts in American history?

The only eye-raising revelation in the study by the Center for Survey Research and Analysis at the University of Connecticut was that the students surveyed were seniors at the nation's top 55 top colleges and universities, including Harvard and Princeton.

Nearly 80 percent of the students received a D or F on a 34-question, high school level American history test. They had trouble identifying Valley Forge, words from the Gettysburg Address or the basic principles of the U.S. Constitution.

During this Independence Day weekend, this apparent ignorance takes on a greater significance as we ponder the words of Thomas Jefferson.

No. Not because Jefferson's DNA is being analyzed on Court TV over that nasty paternity battle. He was the principal author of the Declaration of Independence. Remember, ''We the people . . .''

Naw. That guy Adams came up with the ''We the people . . .'' slogan. ''We the people . . . in order to brew a tastier beer.'' That's Samuel Adams. We are talking about James Madison, the president and lead author of the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Rep. Tom Petri, R-Fond du Lac, was among the four members of Congress last week that promises to introduce a resolution calling on boards of trustees, college administrators and state officials to strengthen American history requirements in all levels of the educational system.

A high percentage of colleges and universities don't require a single U.S. history class for graduation—lending an unusual understanding to the phrase ''higher education.'' Even so, high school graduates should not get a degree unless they know the basics of American history.

''As we prepare to celebrate the Fourth of July, it is particularly appropriate to emphasize our need to know U.S. history,'' Petri said. ''Without that familiarity, we lack an understanding and appreciation of the democratic principles which define and sustain us as a free people—namely liberty, justice, tolerance, government by the consent of the governed, and equality under the law.''

Although the most a Congressional resolution can do is raise awareness, we were glad to see Petri help bring this troubling information to light.

Is it any wonder that we cannot get people to vote or involved in civic life?

We are not teaching our children why it is so absolutely important.

The final thought: Americans should be ashamed that so many young people are ignorant about U.S. history.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 129, and I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) for bringing this to the floor.

We frequently hear concerns regarding the adequacy of education our children are receiving in the areas of math, science, and technology. Indeed, our committee, Congress, and the community as a whole currently focuses a great deal of attention on improving programs aimed at increasing the literacy of students in these subjects. We should, of course, continue to pursue excellence in the areas of math, science and technology, if we intend for the United States to remain a world leader in the increasingly competitive global economy.

However, is it not just as important that our citizens understand and appreciate the history of this great Nation, the democratic principles that define and sustain this Nation, such as liberty, justice, tolerance and equality under the law? For in the words of the third President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, ''If a Nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be.''

However, as my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), has already stated, according to a recent study commissioned by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, knowledge of American history in today's students is sorely lacking.

According to this study, which surveyed students from the top colleges and universities of this Nation, less than 20 percent of today's students could pass a high school level American history exam. Barely half possess the basic knowledge about American democracy and the Constitution.

We are not talking here about very difficult subjects, but we are talking about the great history of this country, the great history of the documents and theories of government that govern this Nation. We are talking about the roles of Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, George Washington, about the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. These are basic fundamental tenets of this Nation. They are also basic and fundamental tenets that so many other nations aspire to, and yet we find out that knowledge of these documents and of this Nation's history is sorely lacking.

1415

The purpose of this resolution is to call attention to that problem and to try and get people to understand the need to pursue the knowledge of history in this country and the history of this Nation to better serve the Nation as we govern it.

I would like to thank the involvement of John Patrick Diggins, one of my former professors, at that time at San Francisco State who is now at the State University in New York, and I want to thank again my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator GORTON for introducing this legislation in the Senate, and I would hope that all of my colleagues would support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SKEEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the House for the expedited consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 129, Expressing the sense of Congress regarding the importance and value of education in United States history. In the House of Representatives I had the honor of cosponsoring, along with four other members of Congress, Congressman PETRI's House Concurrent Resolution 366, our companion resolution.

In many ways this resolution could be one of the most important legislative efforts this Congress makes this year. What we are asking is for America's colleges and universities to review their curricula and add requirements in United States history. Many of us were shocked to find out that 100 percent of the nation's top institutions of higher learning no longer require United States history as a prerequisite to graduate. Almost as shocking is the 78 percent of schools that have eliminated any history requirements.

Related to this news was the fact that the Roper organization conducted a study of students from these institutions and found a shocking level of history illiteracy. In fact many could not answer history questions that are found on 8th grade tests. This is not good news for our nation. Our next generations deserve more guidance from us and that what this resolution calls for.

Our citizens, to fully participate in our government and in our civilization need to understand where this nation has been. They need to know the sacrifices our parents and grandparents made for our democracy. They need to be able to fully celebrate the historical successes we have had and they also need the knowledge to beware of the mistakes we have made as a nation. Many will say that history is cyclical. We still have much to learn as individuals and even more to learn as a nation. History education can teach us much. It will provide us with the information we need to pass on to the future generations. It will provide the road map for a great future. I am extremely proud to be a cosponsor of this important resolution.

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, this great country has an incredibly rich history. From the great Native American civilizations to the current era of global engagement, American history describes an incredible, sometimes turbulent journey toward the greatest democracy in the world. If the statistics cited in this bill are accurate, it is a shame so many of our college graduates know so little about that history.

I am proud to sit on the subcommittee on Higher Education, particularly since six universities are located in my district. It is important that we promote U.S. history in our colleges and universities to ensure that our future generations know we developed as a society and a culture. For example, the Constitution embodies our most cherished beliefs of democracy, liberty, justice, and equality. The fact that scarcely half of the college students recently tested knew even general information about the principles and institutions that make up the backbone of our country is sadly unacceptable. We cannot afford to have our colleges graduate historically illiterate citizens.

I admit I have a personal passion for history, and for me I benefit from working in Washington and city's close proximity to so many historical treasures. In particular I truly enjoy visiting the sites of the Civil War to pay homage to the men and women. Such opportunities have allowed me to actually experience parts of our history, and the excitement and interest of these places are only enhanced by reading about them and studying them beforehand.

I am also a student of European history, in particular, the history of 20th Century Europe. In this information age and new economy I would like to point out to college students that world history also remains important to their education. Learning the history of other cultures will greatly prepare them for their future in this rapidly changing world.

Improvement of education remains one of my top priorities in Congress. Therefore, I support this bill in order to encourage our college students to learn the history of their nation; a history that laid the foundation for their current and future opportunities.

Ms. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. Con. Res. 129, which recognizes the importance of education in U.S. History. Last week, we celebrated the 224th birthday of the United States. Within this historic context, this resolution is particularly fitting because throughout American history, education has enabled Americans to embrace opportunity.

For African-Americans, literacy was key to ending the bondage of slavery. For Americans of every background, education has been the key to escaping poverty. For this reason, we in Congress bear significant responsibility for

increasing support to educational programs, such as Head Start, Title I, Pell Grants and other aid to college students, particularly students who are the first in their families to attend college. We know that disadvantaged students are more likely to drop out of high school and college without completing a degree. Yet, most jobs that pay a living wage now require knowledge of technology and training beyond high school. It is our responsibility as a wealthy nation to provide students with the support needed to graduate, join the economic mainstream and contribute to our national success story.

Moreover, in our current consideration of welfare reform, we have seen that targeted education and training can provide a leg up for working poor families to raise earnings and escape poverty. In the Eleventh Congressional District of Ohio, Cuyahoga Community College has done an excellent job of reaching out to adults in transition, and in preparing high school students for careers in technology. Around the country, community colleges enable disadvantaged people to realize their own potential and prepare to move into the economic mainstream.

The last seven years of prosperity we have enjoyed have not benefited everyone in our society. Education and training are the keys that will fling wide the portals of opportunity. America was founded on the principles of ''Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.'' I salute our American history, and the key role of education to ensure opportunity for all.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise to address two shortcomings of S. Con. Res. 129. I am certainly in agreement with the sentiments behind this resolution. The promotion of knowledge about, and understanding of, American history are among the most important activities those who wish to preserve American liberty can undertake. In fact, I would venture to say that with my work with various educational organizations, I have done as much, if not more, than any other member of Congress to promote the study of American history.

Unfortunately, while I strongly support efforts to increase the American public's knowledge of history, I cannot support a resolution claiming to encourage Americans to embrace their constitutional heritage, while its very language showcases a fundamental misunderstanding of the beliefs of America's founders and the drafters of the United States Constitution. Popular acceptance of this misunderstanding of the founders' thought is much more dangerous to American liberty than an inability to name the exact date of the Battle at Bunker Hill.

In particular, the resolution refers to American ''democracy'' and the ''democratic'' principles upon which this country was founded. However, this country was founded not as a democracy but as a constitutional republic. Madam Speaker, the distinction between a democracy and a republic is more than just a matter of semantics. The fundamental principle in a democracy is majority rule. Democracies, unlike republics, do not recognize fundamental rights of citizens (outside the right to vote) nor do they limit the power of the government. Indeed, such limitations are often scored as ''intrusions on the will of the majority.'' Thus in a democracy, the majority, or their elected representatives, can limit an individual's right to free speech, defend oneself, form contracts, or even raise ones' children. Democracies recognize only one fundamental right: the right to participate in the choosing of their rulers at a pre-determined time.

In contrast, in a republic, the role of government is strictly limited to a few well-defined functions and the fundamental rights of individuals are respected. A constitution limiting the authority of central government and a Bill of Rights expressly forbidding the federal government from abridging the fundamental rights of a people are features of a republican form of government. Even a cursory reading of the Federalist Papers and other works of the founders shows they understood that obtaining the consent of 51 percent of the people does not in any way legitimize government actions abridging individual liberty.

Madam Speaker, the confusion over whether America is a democracy, where citizens' rights may be violated if the consent of 51 percent of the people may be obtained, or a republic, where the federal government is forbidden to take any actions violating a people's fundamental rights, is behind many of the flawed debates in this Congress. A constitutionally literate Congress that understands the proper function of a legislature in a constitutional republic would never even debate whether or not to abridge the right of self-defense, instruct parents how to raise and educate their children, send troops to intervene in distant foreign quarrels that do not involve the security of the country, or even deny entire classes of citizens the fundamental right to life.

Secondly, it is not the proper role of the United States Congress to dictate educational tenets to states and local governments. After all, the United States Constitution does not give the federal government any power to dictate, or even suggest, curriculum. Instead the power to determine what is taught in schools is reserved to states, local communities, and, above all, parents.

In conclusion, by mistaking this country's founding as being based on mass democracy rather than on republican principles, and by ignoring the constitutionally limited role of the federal government, this resolution promotes misunderstanding about the type of government necessary to protect liberty. Such constitutional illiteracy may be more dangerous than historical ignorance, since the belief that America was founded to be a democracy legitimizes the idea that Congress may violate people's fundamental rights at will. I, therefore, encourage my colleagues to embrace America's true heritage: a constitutional republic with strict limitations on the power of the central government.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, in 1988, National Endowment for the Humanities issued a report concluding that more than 80 percent of colleges and universities permitted students to graduate without taking a course in American history. Now, thirteen years later, standards have fallen even further with 78 percent of America's elite college and universities not requiring their student to take any history course at all. The results of this lackadaisical approach to learning and understanding our own country's history is devastating.

In a survey conducted by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, only 23 percent of the students surveyed correctly identified James Madison as the ''Father of the Constitution'' while 54 percent incorrectly identified Thomas Jefferson. Unfortunately, the final results of the survey are equally embarrassing, with 65 percent of the students receiving a 59 percent or an ''F'' grade. This is unacceptable.

The poor performance of these students from America's top universities and colleges should serve as a wake-up call to Members of Congress that the academic quality of our history education programs is deteriorating to the point of no return.

But rather than take steps to improve these horrendous statistics with actual education reforms, the majority voted to slash teacher-training and student loan programs and recently rejected my amendment to moderately increase funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities, one of the only agencies that strives to preserve our nation's history through education.

I am a proud co-sponsor of S. Con. Res. 129 and I wholeheartedly agree that Congress needs to eradicate the profound historical illiteracy that currently plagues our nation's young people, but we can do better than to pass a ''feel-good, do-nothing'' resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 129.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESCHUTES RESOURCES CONSERVANCY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1787) to reauthorize the participation of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Deschutes Resources Conservancy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1787

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 ''Deschutes Resources Conservancy Reauthorization Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PARTICIPATION OF BUREAU OF RECLAMATION IN DESCHUTES RESOURCES CONSERVANCY.

Section 301 of the Oregon Resource Conservation Act of 1996 (division B of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–534) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and up to a total amount of $2,000,000 during each of fiscal years 2002 through 2006''; and

(2) in subsection (h), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2006''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1787.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and his staff in helping me to bring forward H.R. 1787, the Deschutes Resources Conservancy Reauthorization bill. I also appreciate the support of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for this important bill.

The DRC is one of the best examples of a win-win program that I have ever seen. Because it is a consensus-based mission, it brings together central Oregonians from diverse backgrounds and should be the model for other resource management programs across our great country.

The DRC has brought together interests who have historically, at times, been at odds in competing for the limited supply of our resources. Board members include ranchers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Warm Springs Tribes, the Forest Service, timber companies, developers and environmentalists, all working together and doing exceptional projects on the ground in central Oregon to improve water quality and water quantity.

The beauty of the DRC model is that they are taking scarce Federal dollars and then leveraging them with other grants to obtain the greatest impact. In 1999, the DRC leveraged its $450,000 appropriation to complete more than $2.1 million in on-the-ground restoration projects, more than a 4 to 1 ratio. These projects include piping irrigation district delivery systems to prevent water losses; securing in-stream water rights to restore flows to Squaw Creek; providing riparian fences to protect water banks; working with private timber landowners to restore riparian and wetland areas; and seeking donated water rights to enhance in-stream flows in the Deschutes River Basin.

Madam Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the reauthorization of this sound conservation program for another 5 years and support the increase of its reauthorization level. If the authorization level is increased as requested in this legislation, I do not have any objections to including the Department of Agriculture as an additional funding source.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this sound environmental legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Oregon for explaining this legislation. He has done more than an adequate job explaining the values of the Deschutes Resources Conservancy and I urge Members to support this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1787.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4132) to reauthorize grants for water resources research and technology institutes established under the Water Resources Research Act of 1984.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4132

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

SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT OF 1984.

(a) WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAM GRANTS.—Section 104(f)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(f)(1)) is amended by striking ''$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, $7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 and 1998, and $9,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000'' and inserting ''$9,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and $12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 and 2005''.

(b) GRANTS FOR RESEARCH FOCUSED ON WATER PROBLEMS OF INTERSTATE NATURE.—The first sentence of section 104(g)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 10303(g)(1)) is amended by striking ''$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2000'' and inserting ''$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, $4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and $6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 and 2005''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4132.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in partnership with the U.S. Geological Survey, the Water Resources Research Institutes have the capability to provide important support to the States in their long-term water planning, policy development and resources management efforts. The state water resources research institutes, under the authority of the Water Resources Research Act, have established an effective Federal-State partnership in water resources, education, and information transfer. These institutes are located in each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam/Federated States of Micronesia. They have worked with State and Federal agencies and water resources stakeholders in their home States for more than 3 decades while acting as a network for the exchange of water resources research and information transfer among States.

This legislation will reauthorize the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 for the fiscal years 2001 through 2005. It will provide increased funding for the water resources research program grants and provide an increase in the authorization for grants for research focused on water problems of an interstate nature.

We recognize the important role of these institutes and the role they play in our understanding of water policy and planning throughout the United States, and I urge passage of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 4132, a bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984. This legislation extends the authorization's important program for 5 years and provides a modest increase in the authorization of appropriations. The water research program has provided us with extraordinary benefits for many years, and I would ask that all Members support the legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4132.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAHABA RIVER NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE ESTABLISHMENT ACT

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4286) to provide for the establishment of the Cahaba River National Wildlife Refuge in Bibb County, Alabama, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4286

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 ''Cahaba River National Wildlife Refuge Establishment Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Cahaba River in Alabama is recognized nationally for its unique biological diversity which includes providing habitat for 131 species of fish (more than any other river its size in North America).

(2) The Cahaba River is home to 64 rare and imperiled species of aquatic plants and animals, including fishes, freshwater turtles, mussels, and snails.

(3) The Cahaba River is home to 12 species of fish, mussels, and snails listed as endangered or threatened species.

(4) The Cahaba River is home to 6 terrestrial species of plants and animals listed as endangered or threatened species.

(5) The Cahaba River harbors the largest population in the world of the imperiled shoals lily, known locally as the Cahaba Lily.

(6) The Cahaba River watershed contains extremely rare plant communities that are home to 8 species of plants previously unknown to science and a total of 69 rare and imperiled species of plants.

(7) The Cahaba River is home to at least a dozen endemic aquatic animals that are found nowhere else in the world.

(8) The Cahaba River is the longest remaining free-flowing river in Alabama, flowing through 5 counties in central Alabama.

(9) The Cahaba River is recognized as an Outstanding Alabama Water by the Alabama Department of Environmental Management.

(10) The Cahaba River has high recreational value for hunters, anglers, birdwatchers, canoeists, nature photographers, and others.

(11) The Cahaba River Watershed supports large populations of certain game species, including deer, turkey, and various species of ducks.

(12) The Cahaba River area is deserving of inclusion in the National Wildlife Refuge System.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) REFUGE.—The term ''Refuge'' means the Cahaba River National Wildlife Refuge established by section 4(a).

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

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF REFUGE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in Bibb County, Alabama, the Cahaba National Wildlife Refuge, consisting of approximately 3,500 acres of Federal lands and waters, and interests in lands and waters, within the boundaries depicted upon the map entitled ''Cahaba River National Wildlife Refuge–Proposed'', dated April 10, 2000.

(2) BOUNDARY REVISIONS.—The Secretary may make such minor revisions of the boundaries of the Refuge as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of the Refuge or to facilitate the acquisition of property within the Refuge.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The Secretary shall keep the map referred to in paragraph (1) available for inspection in appropriate offices of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The establishment of the Refuge under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall take effect on the date the Secretary publishes, in the Federal Register and publications of local circulation in the vicinity of the area within the boundaries referred to in that paragraph, a notice that sufficient property has been acquired by the United States within those boundaries to constitute an area that can be efficiently managed as a National Wildlife Refuge.

SEC. 5. ACQUISITION OF LANDS AND WATERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, subject to the availability of appropriations, may acquire up to 3,500 acres of lands and waters, or interests therein, within the boundaries of the Refuge described in section 4(a)(1).

(b) INCLUSION IN REFUGE.—Any lands, waters, or interests acquired by the Secretary under this section shall be part of the Refuge.

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATION.

In administering the Refuge, the Secretary shall—

(1) conserve, enhance, and restore the native aquatic and terrestrial community characteristics of the Cahaba River (including associated fish, wildlife, and plant species);

(2) conserve, enhance, and restore habitat to maintain and assist in the recovery of animals and plants that are listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.);

(3) in providing opportunities for compatible fish- and wildlife-oriented recreation, ensure that hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation are the priority general public uses of the Refuge, in accordance with section 4(a)(3) and (4) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668ee(a)(3), (4)); and

(4) encourage the use of volunteers and to facilitate partnerships among the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, local communities, conservation organizations, and other non-Federal entities to promote public awareness of the resources of the Cahaba River National Wildlife Refuge and the National Wildlife Refuge System and public participation in the conservation of those resources.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary—

(1) such funds as may be necessary for the acquisition of lands and waters within the boundaries of the Refuge; and

(2) such funds as may be necessary for the development, operation, and maintenance of the Refuge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4286, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4286, introduced by our colleagues, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. RILEY) would establish the 3,500 acre Cahaba River National Wildlife Refuge in Bibb County, Alabama.

The Cahaba is the longest free-flowing river in Alabama and it may have the greatest concentration of fish biodiversity per mile of any river in the United States. It has been called ''Alabama's rain forest'' because it contains essential habitat for 69 rare and imperiled species and 131 species of fish. There are 13 species found nowhere else in the world but in the Cahaba River.

During the hearing on this bill, the subcommittee learned that only those landowners who are interested in selling their property were included within the proposed boundaries of the refuge. Furthermore, one of our witnesses, Ms. Wendy Allen of the Alabama Nature Conservancy testified that ''This refuge represents an outstanding opportunity to protect some of the rarest species in the world via a remarkable public/private partnership.''

The goals of this refuge would be to conserve native aquatic species, assist in the recovery of listed plants and animals, provide opportunities for wildlife-dependent recreation, and encourage partnerships and volunteers to assist in the operation of this refuge.

The Cahaba River is a unique, beautiful and pristine area that is worthy of refuge designation. I urge an ''aye'' vote on this important conservation measure, and I compliment the authors of this legislation for their outstanding leadership.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to take the time for the minority to speak in support of this legislation. This legislation is an important effort to establish a new National Wildlife Refuge in central Alabama along a 3½ mile reach of the Cahaba River.

The Cahaba River is a remarkable river in its biological diversity and concentration of rare endangered species. As examples, the Cahaba River Watershed provides habitat for 69 rare and imperiled aquatic species and 32 animal and plant species that are protected under the Endangered Species Act, including 13 endemic species that are found nowhere else in the world. This section of the Cahaba River should be added to the national wildlife refuge system to ensure its long-term protection.

H.R. 4286 was improved and clarified during its consideration by the Committee on Resources. I had the opportunity to sit in on the presentation of this bill by its sponsors. I am told the administration fully supports the enactment of H.R. 4286, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''aye.''

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. RILEY).

Mr. RILEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4286, a bill that would establish the Cahaba River national wildlife refuge. I also wish to acknowledge efforts by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), my good friend and colleague who has worked very hard to make this bill a reality.

The Cahaba River bill provides a rare opportunity for Congress to do something that is finally supported by environmentalists, industry groups, and all of our local municipalities. The Cahaba River runs through five counties in central Alabama, but as it meanders its way south of metropolitan Birmingham, water quality and habitat are adversely affected due to water degradation, siltation, and habitat destruction. Fortunately for all of us, this damage is not irreparable.

Right now, the Piper Bridge area of the third district of Alabama's Bibb County is used largely for silvaculture. In purchasing the land, the Federal Government would agree to maintain the area for public use and would ensure access.

The Cahaba River National Wildlife Refuge will conserve, enhance, and restore one of the most distinct and threatened rivers in the world. In its main stem, the Cahaba River is one of the most diverse rivers in North America, containing over 130 species. Of these species, 13 are found only in this river, and another 22 are believed to be seriously imperiled in this and other ecosystems.

1430

These 3,500 acres are currently owned by four different landowners. All four have agreed to sell or convey the land, and all four have expressed their support for the national wildlife refuge. The approximate cost of $7 million, which will come out of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, is a relatively small sum for what we stand to gain.

Furthermore, it can be expected that this magnificent area will generate ecotourism revenue, which still remains a priority for many of us that represent rural districts.

Madam Speaker, I suggest that the return on investment for the wildlife refuge makes this one of the best deals before Congress this session. I would also like to invite all of my colleagues on either side of the aisle to view this river for themselves. There are few sites as moving, as stunningly beautiful, as the Cahaba River when it is covered by the Cahaba Lily in full bloom. It looks to be like a sheet of pure white over the river, while a multitude of creatures flourish beneath.

In closing, Madam Speaker, we must protect this most beautiful of rivers while we still have the opportunity, so I ask for the support of all my colleagues in the House in helping to preserve what I truly believe is a national treasure.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, the Cahaba River has 131 species of fish, fresh water fish. That may not mean a lot, we have heard that figure twice today, but let me put that in comparison. That is more species of fresh water fish than the entire State of California. It has more mussels, more species of mussels, than Europe. It has, as the gentleman has already said, more endangered species among those 131 of any river in the United States.

But it goes beyond that. It has eight plants which had never been discovered. They were discovered on an expedition in 1992. It has more species of crayfish than any other river in the United States. So we are talking about a national treasure. We are talking about a national treasure that will not be here for our grandchildren unless we pass this bill.

The reason for that is that this river has been preserved along its lower course in its natural state until the past 5 or 10 years, as metropolitan Birmingham began to encroach on its watershed, and there was a tremendous amount of development in the upper watershed. In fact, today during the dry season as much as 99 percent of the water flow is diverted from the Cahaba River. That has had a tremendous negative impact on the lower stretches of the river.

Also, as this river becomes more and more known for its beauty, it has the largest stand of what is called aquatic lilies in the world. That has been advertised in the past 4 or 5 years. People have come down by the hundreds to view these lilies. Unfortunately, when they have come, they have actually gotten into the river and used crowbars and ripped some of these bulbs from the river, because this stand of lilies is in an area of the river that is owned by private landowners.

This has disturbed the people of Bibb County, who have enjoyed this beautiful river for years. The Bibb County Commission, the cities along the lower stretches of the river, and the landowners themselves all uniformly agreed that something needed to be done.

The Nature Conservancy, this is the national Nature Conservancy, they published a book in 1998, and in that they said, and I think this is something that all of us in Congress probably do not realize, and I know I did not, it said, ''Few of us realize that the diversity of life in fresh water systems in the United States is exceptional, even when compared to the tropics. However, two centuries of dam construction, water withdrawals, land use alterations, pollution, and introduction of non-native species have led to the acceleration and in many cases irreparable losses of fresh water species.''

They then went on to identify some watersheds that contain these endangered species. Unfortunately, this publication points out that Alabama leads the Nation in the number of species which are now extinct. Eight percent of the fresh water in the United States flows through Alabama. We have more passable rivers, more navigable rivers in miles, over 1,400, than any other State, but we have the dubious distinction of having the most extinct species.

We also have 69 that are endangered. Fortunately, almost all of those reside in this river. Almost all of those reside within this 15-mile stretch, so this piece of legislation is the first step in preserving this river and these species not only of fish but also of mussels and crayfish and other animals in the river from extinction. I would urge a ''yes'' vote.

Madam Speaker, in addition to my remarks, I would also like to express my sincere thanks to several people who have made this legislation a success.

Wendy Allen and the Members of The Nature Conservancy of Alabama.

Beth Stewart and the Members of the Cahaba River Society.

U.S. Alliance—Coosa Pines and the other private landowners who have been extremely supportive and patient throughout this entire process.

The Bibb County Commission and local Cahaba River Authority.

Commissioner Riley B. Smith of the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, as well as, Majority Leader ARMEY for scheduling the bill on the Suspension Calendar today and Chairman DON YOUNG and Subcommittee Chair Mr. SAXTON for their support of this bill.

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

I think the Members obviously have made a compelling case, the case that we heard in committee for the protection of the Cahaba River. I would hope that all Members would support this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4286, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM CENTENNIAL ACT

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and

pass the bill (H.R. 4442) 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, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4442

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 ''National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) President Theodore Roosevelt began the National Wildlife Refuge System by establishing the first refuge at Pelican Island, Florida, on March 14, 1903.

(2) The National Wildlife Refuge System is comprised of more than 93,000,000 acres of Federal lands managed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in more than 520 individual refuges and thousands of waterfowl production areas located in all 50 States and the territories of the United States.

(3) The System is the only network of Federal lands dedicated singularly to wildlife conservation and where wildlife dependent recreation and environmental education are priority public uses.

(4) The System serves a vital role in the conservation of millions of migratory birds, endangered species and threatened species, fish, marine mammals, and the habitats on which these species depend.

(5) Each year the System provides millions of Americans with opportunities to participate in wildlife-dependent recreation, including hunting, fishing, and wildlife observation.

(6) Public visitation to National Wildlife Refuges is growing, with more than 35,000,000 visitors annually. It is essential that visitor centers and public use facilities be properly constructed, operated, and maintained.

(7) The National Wildlife Refuge System Volunteer and Community Partnership Enhancement Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–242) significantly enhances the ability to incorporate volunteers and partnerships in refuge management.

(8) The System currently has an unacceptable backlog in critical operations and maintenance needs.

(9) The centennial anniversary of the System in 2003 offers an historic opportunity to appreciate these natural resources and expand public enjoyment of these lands.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are the following:

(1) 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.

(2) To develop a long-term plan to meet the priority operations, maintenance, and construction needs of the System.

(3) To require each fiscal year an annual report prepared in the context of—

(A) the budget submission of the Department of the Interior to the President; and

(B) the President's budget request to the Congress.

(4) To improve public use programs and facilities of the System to meet the increasing needs of the public for wildlife-dependent recreation in the 21st century.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM CENTENNIAL COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established the National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Commission (in this Act referred to as the ''Commission'').

(b) MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

(A) The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(B) Up to 10 persons recommended by the Secretary of the Interior and appointed by the President.

(C) The chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, the congressional representatives of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, and the Secretary of the Interior, who shall be ex-officio members.

(2) APPOINTMENTS.—Members of the Commission shall be appointed no later than 90 days after the effective date of this Act. Persons appointed by the President as members of the Commission may not otherwise be officers or employees of the Federal Government and shall, in the judgment of the President, represent the diverse beneficiaries of the System and have outstanding knowledge or appreciation of wildlife, natural resource management, or wildlife-dependent recreation. In making such appointments, the President shall make every effort to ensure that the views of the hunting, fishing, and wildlife observation communities are represented on the Commission.

(3) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission—

(A) shall not affect its power or functions; and

(B) shall be expeditiously filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) CHAIRPERSON.—The President shall appoint one of the members as the Chairperson of the Commission.

(d) BASIC PAY.—The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their service on the Commission.

(e) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—

(1) LEGISLATIVE BRANCH MEMBERS.—Members of the Commission from the legislative branch of the Government shall be allowed necessary travel expenses otherwise authorized by law for official travel.

(2) EXECUTIVE BRANCH MEMBERS.—Members of the Commission from the executive branch of the Government shall be allowed necessary travel expenses in accordance with section 5702 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) OTHER MEMBERS AND STAFF.—Members of the Commission appointed by the President and staff of the Commission may be allowed necessary travel or transportation expenses as authorized by section 5702 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) FUNCTIONS.—The Commission shall—

(1) prepare, in cooperation with Federal, State, local, and nongovernmental partners, a plan to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the beginning of the National Wildlife Refuge System on March 14, 2003;

(2) coordinate the activities of such partners undertaken pursuant to such plan; and

(3) plan and host, in cooperation with such partners, a conference on the National Wildlife Refuge System, and assist in the activities of such a conference.

(g) STAFF.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Commission may employ staff as necessary to carry out its functions.

(h) DONATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may, in accordance with criteria established under paragraph (2), accept and use donations of money, personal property, or personal services.

(2) CRITERIA.—The Commission shall establish written criteria to be used in determining whether the acceptance of gifts or donations under paragraph (1) would—

(A) reflect unfavorably upon the ability of the Commission or any employee of the Commission to carry out its responsibilities or official duties in a fair and objective manner; or

(B) compromise the integrity or the appearance of the integrity of any person involved in those programs.

(i) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.—Upon the request of the Commission—

(1) the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, may provide to the Commission the administrative support services necessary for the Commission to carry out its responsibilities under this Act, including services related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement; and

(2) the head of any other appropriate Federal department or agency may furnish to the Commission such advice and assistance, with or without reimbursement, to assist the Commission in carrying out its functions.

(j) REPORTS.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Congress an annual report of its activities and plans to Congress.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2004, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a final report of its activities, including an accounting of all funds received and expended by the Commission.

(k) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall terminate upon the submission of its final report under subsection (j).

(2) DISPOSITION OF MATERIALS.—Upon termination of the Commission and after consultation with the Archivist of the United States and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Secretary of the Interior—

(A) may deposit all books, manuscripts, miscellaneous printed matter, memorabilia, relics, and other similar materials of the Commission relating to the 100th anniversary of the National Wildlife Refuge System in Federal, State, or local libraries or museums or otherwise dispose of such materials; and

(B) may use other property acquired by the Commission for the purposes of the National Wildlife Refuge System, or treat such property as excess property.

SEC. 4. FULFILLING THE PROMISE OF AMERICA'S NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM: LONG-TERM PLANNING AND ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS REGARDING THE OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE BACKLOG.

(a) UNIFIED LONG-TERM PLAN.—No later than March 1, 2002, the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare and submit to the Congress and the President a unified long-term plan to address priority operations, maintenance, and construction needs of the National Wildlife Refuge System, including—

(1) priority staffing needs of the System; and

(2) operations, maintenance, and construction needs as identified in the Refuge Operating Needs System, the Maintenance Management System, the 5-year deferred maintenance list, the 5-year construction list, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service report entitled ''Fulfilling the Promise of America's National Wildlife Refuge System'', and individual refuge comprehensive conservation plans.

(b) ANNUAL SUBMISSION.—Beginning with the budget request for fiscal year 2003, the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare and submit in the context of each annual budget submission, a report that contains—

(1) an assessment of expenditures in the prior, current, and upcoming fiscal years to

meet the operations and maintenance backlog as identified in the long-term plan under subsection (a); and

(2) transition costs in the prior, current, and upcoming fiscal years, as identified in the Department of the Interior analysis of newly acquired refuge lands, and a description of the method used to determine the priority status of these needs.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall become effective on January 20, 2001.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today we are considering H.R. 4442. This is the National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Act. This legislation was introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), along with a list of distinguished cosponsors, including the committee chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and the ranking member, my colleague and friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

This legislation recognizes a great achievement in conservation, 100 years of the National Wildlife System. While this is an important milestone, H.R. 4442 recognizes that we still have work ahead of us to reduce the operations and maintenance backlog within the refuge system. H.R. 4442 establishes a commission to plan activities to commemorate the 100th anniversary of this system. The bill also requires the Secretary to submit a comprehensive plan for addressing the maintenance and operations backlog within the refuge system.

This bill is supported by the administration and is noncontroversial. The American people deserve the finest refuge system in the world. I urge an aye vote on this important measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to join my colleague from Oregon in calling for the support of this legislation to establish the Centennial Committee to coordinate the 100th anniversary of the refuge system.

Our National Wildlife Refuge system is one of the most magnificent land systems that we have in this country. It is the only system that we have where lands are set aside exclusively for the protection and conservation of fish, wildlife, and their habitats, and it is something that we can be very proud of as a nation. It is envied by countries all over the world for the foresight that so many people in different locations had to try and protect these available ecosystems and the refuge systems to protect fish and wildlife.

I also want to recognize that the workload of the Fish and Wildlife Service to manage these refuges has continued to soar as the public has continued to want to enjoy them, as they become outdoor schoolrooms for children to learn about fish and wildlife, for communities to learn about the interaction of fish and wildlife and our environment.

I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), the Audubon Society, and others for working out an amendment to the legislation with the Department of the Interior.

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased that today the House is considering H.R. 4442, the National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Act. I am joined in this important effort by 17 cosponsors, including 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, Florida, 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 five 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, and 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 four 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 we are considering today recognizes the vital importance of the Refuge System and the fact that the System will celebrate its Centennial Anniversary in three 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.

Madam Speaker, the American people deserve the finest Refuge System in the world. This bill is supported by the Administration and is noncontroversial. It 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.

Again, 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.

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I wish to voice my strong support for H.R. 4442, The National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Act. My congressional district in western Wisconsin has more miles along the Mississippi River than another other district in the basin. My district is also home to the Upper Mississippi

River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge, a refuge whose 200,000 acres extend 261 miles southward from Wabasha, Minnesota to just north of Rock Island, Illinois.

The Upper Mississippi Refuge lies at the heart of an area that serves as a migratory flyway for 40 percent of North America's waterfowl. It provides habitat for some 292 species of birds, 57 species of mammals, 37 species of amphibians and reptiles, and 118 species of fish. Moreover, it is the most widely used of all our National Wildlife Refuges, attracting roughly 3.5 million visitors a year—more than Yellowstone National Park.

Despite this fact, the Upper Mississippi Refuge currently lacks a full-time refuge manager. The nation's busiest refuge does not have a visitor center and there is only one handicapped boat landing along the entire border of the refuge.

I support Mr. SAXTON's National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Act of 2000 because it will draw much needed public attention to the rich resources and the serious needs of Region 3 refuges as well as others across the nation. H.R. 4442 endorses Secretary Babbitt's directive to the Fish and Wildlife Service to develop a long-term plan to address the priority operations, maintenance, and construction needs of the Refuge System. This legislation goes a long way toward ensuring that the Refuge System will remain strong and vital for many years to come.

I urge my colleagues in the House to vote in favor of H.R. 4442.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, March 14, 2003 will mark a milestone in the history of wildlife in America—the centennial anniversary of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

When President Theodore Roosevelt set aside tiny Pelican Island on Florida's East Coast for birds nearly a century ago, he began a conservation legacy that now spans 93 million acres across the United States and its territories.

The National Wildlife Refuge System is America's only network of federal lands dedicated specifically to wildlife conservation, representing a steadfast commitment to protecting our wildlife heritage.

This vast network of strategically located habitats protect hundreds of endangered species, serves as stepping stones for millions of migratory birds and conserves our premier fisheries.

Incredibly, one of these stepping stones lies just 26 miles west of New York City's Times Square. The Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge in Morris County, New Jersey, which is just north of my district, was established in 1960.

This 7,500-acre refuge consists of swamp woodland, hardwood ridges and cattail marsh. In the heart of one of the most densely populated areas in the world, the Refuge is home to more than 220 species of birds, as well as white tail deer, mink, beaver, river otter and coyote.

As development and sprawl continue to swallow more and more of our nation's critical wildlife habitat, we need to ensure that refuges like the Great Swamp continue to thrive. I have worked with my colleagues in Congress to protect our irreplaceable ecosystems by reinstating full state funding in Land and Water Conservation Fund. We are now setting aside proceeds from offshore oil drilling to protect our open spaces.

H.R. 4442, the National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Act would greatly help improve the operations, maintenance and expansion of the refuge system to ensure that wildlife gets the protection it deserves. The refuge system currently has a $1 billion operations backlog and a $800 million maintenance backlog. H.R. 4442 would require the Secretary of the Interior to prepare and submit to Congress a long term plan to address these deficiencies and outline system expansion

Maybe most importantly, however, this legislation would establish a commission to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the refuge system. This would be instrumental in broadening public understanding and appreciation of protecting our wildlife heritage.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I urge support for this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4442, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL OCEAN DAY

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 415) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National Ocean Day to recognize the significant role the ocean plays in the lives of the Nation's people and the important role the Nation's people must play in the continued life of the ocean, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 415

Whereas the oceans cover 71 percent of the Earth's surface and are key to the life support systems for all creatures on this planet;

Whereas the oceans contain a wondrous abundance and diversity of life, from the smallest microorganism to the mammoth blue whale;

Whereas ⅔ of the world's people live within 50 miles of a coast and 1 out of 6 American jobs are in fishing, shipping, or tourism;

Whereas the oceans provide almost limitless opportunities for exploration and discovery, and could supply a key source of life-saving medicines and treatments;

Whereas oceanography has contributed to an understanding of global climate change and the effects of the ocean on climate and weather, which inevitably has an impact on safety and quality of life;

Whereas efforts are underway to develop a new ocean monitoring system that will give us a better understanding of the critical relationship between oceans and global climate change;

Whereas a deepened understanding of the seas will enable us to track marine mammals, predict deadly storms such as those associated with El Nino, detect illegal fishing, and gain new insights into the complexities of climate change;

Whereas the oceans and coastal areas supply vital sources of food upon which people depend and that could be deteriorated by poor stewardship;

Whereas decades of pollution from industrial waste, sewage, and toxic runoff have taken their toll on the health of the oceans and on the marine life in them;

Whereas recent studies suggest that nearly 60 percent of the world's coral reefs, the ''rainforests of the sea'', are being degraded or destroyed by human activities and ten percent of the reefs may already be degraded beyond recovery;

Whereas fisheries and the food and products they produce are essential to the world's economy and steps should be taken to ensure that they do not become overexploited;

Whereas in the 21st century, people will look increasingly to the oceans to meet their everyday needs;

Whereas the oceans' resources are limited, and nations must work together to conserve them;

Whereas the oceans are the core of our own humanity, a treasure shared by all nations of the world, and our stewardship of this resource is our responsibility to our children, grandchildren, and all of Earth's inhabitants;

Whereas June 8th was declared Oceans Day at the Earth Summit Conference in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 and similar declarations have been made by individual nations;

Whereas the State of Hawaii has designated the first Wednesday of June as Ocean Day, in recognition of the very significant role the ocean plays in the lives of Hawaii's people, as well as Hawaii's culture, history, and traditions; and

Whereas the establishment of a National Ocean Day will raise awareness of the vital role oceans play in human life and that human beings must play in the life of the ocean: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Ocean Day should be established to recognize the significant role the ocean plays in the lives of the Nation's people, and the important role the Nation's people must play in the continued life of the ocean.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 415, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased today that the House is considering House

Resolution 415. This is a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a National Oceans Day should be established to recognize the significant role the ocean plays in our lives, that the ocean's resources are limited, and therefore, nations must work together to conserve them.

The oceans will continue to play an important role in the lives of our Nation's people, especially as the population grows. Currently, more than 50 percent of the Nation's population lives in the coastal areas of the United States, and one out of six American jobs is in fishing, shipping, or tourism. Yet, we do not have a full understanding of the oceans and their resources, upon which we rely so heavily.

Declaring a National Oceans Day would draw the public's attention to the importance of their relationship to the ocean, and more importantly, to the need for responsible stewardship. Internationally there has been recognition of the importance of the oceans, and the State of Hawaii has led the way in this country by declaring a day in June as Ocean Day.

Madam Speaker, I believe we should as a nation join in celebrating the significance of our oceans. I urge the House to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 415, a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National Oceans Day to recognize the significant role the oceans play in our lives today and in the years to come.

I certainly want to thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) for introducing this legislation. I also want to thank the committee chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and our ranking Democrat member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), for their support of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, as we toil away in our offices today in Washington, D.C., it is quite easy to forget just how dependent we are on the world's oceans. With two-thirds of the Earth's surface covered with water, mostly oceans, they have a significant impact on our daily lives and everyone on this planet. The oceans' ability to retain heat longer than land masses provides a steady influence on daily temperature changes, and the energy generated by hurricanes and cyclones is felt throughout the equatorial regions, as well as through the subtropical zones.

Small increases in temperature could melt large amounts of ice at the poles. This will have an impact on coastal areas and an enormous impact on some small island countries in the Pacific, as well as in the Atlantic region, possibly totally submerging some of these atolls.

1445

Madam Speaker, the ocean also provides substance to much of the world's population through seafood and shellfish. In 1999, and for the 10th consecutive year, and for the information of my colleagues, the value of the volume of fish and shellfish imported into the United States now is at a record of over $9 billion, approximately 3.9 billion pounds.

The recreation and employment provided by the world's oceans are also significant. Coming from a small island community, Madam Speaker, I am intimately familiar with the ocean and am constantly reminded of the influence it has upon all of us. Passage of this resolution can serve as an annual reminder to all of us as to the important role the oceans play in our lives.

Madam Speaker, as the world's population develops in further appreciation of this important role, we can hope that the human race will treat the oceans with more respect, thereby maintaining this most important, valuable resource in our planet today.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the blance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I have no one else to speak on this, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure and honor to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), who is the chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 415 which expresses the sense of Congress that a National Ocean Day should be established in recognition of the vital role that the ocean plays in the lives of our Nation's people and the significant impact our people have on the health of this essential resource.

I want to take this time to thank the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG); the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) of the Committee on Resources; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON); the ranking member, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans for their efforts in bringing this bill to the floor today.

The oceans cover 71 percent of the Earth's surface and are key to the life support systems for all creatures on our planet. The oceans contain a wondrous abundance and diversity of life, and two-thirds of the world's people live within 50 miles of a coast and one out of six American jobs are marine related.

On June 8, the Earth's Summit Conference convened in Rio de Janeiro on 1992 and declared Oceans Day as part of the recognition of the importance of this resource and similar declarations have been made by other countries.

My own State followed suit shortly afterwards and declared the first Wednesday of June as Oceans Day in recognition of the significant role that oceans play in the lives of the people of my State.

So the adoption of this resolution will encourage the declaration of Oceans Day for the United States, and I hope that this resolution will pass.

The support of human existence by the oceans goes well beyond fisheries and other coastal resources. Oceanic research has contributed greatly to our understanding of global warming and of the effects of the ocean on climate and weather. Sea surface temperatures have a major effect on atmospheric circulation, warming and cooling trends brought on by the ocean currents like El Nino and La Nina have significant effects on the amount of rainfall, severity of storms and global temperatures. The warming caused by greenhouse gas emissions also affects the temperatures of the ocean.

We take the riches of the ocean for granted at our peril. This incredibly rich resource is neither inexhaustible nor immune to the actions of humankind. Poor stewardship of the oceans pollutes beaches, contaminates the food supply and robs people of a precious resource that they depend upon.

More than two-thirds of the world's fisheries are over exploited and more than a third of the world's fisheries are in a state of decline. Nearly 60 percent of the oceans' coral reefs, the rain forests of the sea, are degraded and destroyed by human activities.

In the 21st century, people will look increasingly to the resources of the oceans to meet its need. It is vital that the United States take the lead in ensuring that the oceans are recognized for its importance and protected so that its riches can be enjoyed and available for future declarations.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I support H. Res. 415 and urge all Members to do the same. The oceans are vital to the welfare of this Nation and its people. The idea of taking one day annually to remind people why they need to appreciate our oceans and coasts should attract broad bipartisan support.

Much of today's public awareness in the environment is attributed to the establishment 30 years ago of the first Earth Day. But as much as I applaud the success of Earth Day, it is my impression that we can and should do more to inform the public about the many threats confronting our oceans and coasts.

I have been encouraged by recent efforts of the Clinton administration that have focused public attention on ocean issues such as the International Year of the Reef in 1997, and the International Year of the Ocean in 1998. But it appears to me that an annual event to rally

public support and interest in the oceans is needed if we are to sustain long-term public awareness.

H. Res. 415 would be a very helpful step in that direction, and I commend our colleague from Hawaii, Congresswoman PATSY MINK, for proposing this resolution. I also commend the Chairman of the Fisheries Subcommittee, Mr. SAXTON, and the ranking Democrat, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for their support and cooperation in fine-tuning the resolution while it was under consideration by the Resources Committee. I urge all Members to support this bipartisan resolution.

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 415, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GRIFFITH PROJECT PREPAYMENT AND CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 986) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Griffith Project to the Southern Nevada Water Authority.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 986

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 ''Griffith Project Prepayment and Conveyance Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term ''Authority'' means the Southern Nevada Water Authority, organized under the laws of the State of Nevada.

(2) The term ''Griffith Project'' means the Robert B. Griffith Water Project, authorized by and constructed pursuant to the Southern Nevada Water Project Act, Public Law 89–292, as amended, (commonly known as the ''Southern Nevada Water Project Act'') (79 Stat. 1068), including pipelines, conduits, pumping plants, intake facilities, aqueducts, laterals, water storage and regulatory facilities, electric substations, and related works and improvements listed pursuant to ''Robert B. Griffith Water Project (Formerly Southern Nevada Water Project), Nevada: Southern Clark County, Lower Colorado Region Bureau of Reclamation'', on file at the Bureau of Reclamation and all interests in land acquired under Public Law 89–292, as amended.

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

(4) The term ''Acquired Land(s)'' means all interests in land, including fee title, right(s)-of-way, and easement(s), acquired by the United States from non-Federal sources by purchase, donation, exchange, or condemnation pursuant to Public Law 89–292, as amended for the Griffith Project.

(5) The term ''Public Land'' means lands which have never left Federal ownership and are under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

(6) The term ''Withdrawn Land'' means Federal lands which are withdrawn from settlement, sale, location of minerals, or entry under some or all of the general land laws and are reserved for a particular public purpose pursuant to Public Law 89–292, as amended, under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, or are reserved pursuant to Public Law 88–639 under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF GRIFFITH PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In consideration of the Authority assuming from the United States all liability for administration, operation, maintenance, and replacement of the Griffith Project and subject to the prepayment by the Authority of the Federal repayment amount of $121,204,348 (which amount shall be increased to reflect any accrued unpaid interest and shall be decreased by the amount of any additional principal payments made by the Authority after September 15, 1999, prior to the date on which prepayment occurs), the Secretary shall, pursuant to the provisions of this Act—

(1) convey and assign to the Authority all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to improvements and facilities of the Griffith Project in existence as of the date of this Act;

(2) convey and assign to the Authority all of the right, title, and interest of the United States to Acquired Lands that were acquired for the Griffith Project; and

(3) convey and assign to the Authority all interests reserved and developed as of the date of this Act for the Griffith Project in lands patented by the United States.

(b) Pursuant to the authority of this section, from the effective date of conveyance of the Griffith Project, the Authority shall have a right of way at no cost across all Public Land and Withdrawn Land—

(1) on which the Griffith Project is situated; and

(2) across any Federal lands as reasonably necessary for the operation, maintenance, replacement, and repair of the Griffith Project, including existing access routes.

Rights of way established by this section shall be valid for as long as they are needed for municipal water supply purposes and shall not require payment of rental or other fee.

(c) Within twelve months after the effective date of this Act—

(1) the Secretary and the Authority shall agree upon a description of the land subject to the rights of way established by subsection (b) of this section; and

(2) the Secretary shall deliver to the Authority a document memorializing such rights of way.

(d) REPORT.—If the conveyance under subsection (a) has not occurred within twelve months after the effective date of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the status of the conveyance.

SEC. 4. RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING CONTRACTS.

The Secretary and the Authority may modify Contract No. 7–07–30–W0004 and other contracts and land permits as necessary to conform to the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 5. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS AND FUTURE BENEFITS.

(a) If the Authority changes the use or operation of the Griffith Project, the Authority shall comply with all applicable laws and regulations governing the changes at that time.

(b) On conveyance of the Griffith Project under section 3 of this Act, the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391 et seq.), and all Acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto shall not apply to the Griffith Project. Effective upon transfer, the lands and facilities transferred pursuant to this Act shall not be entitled to receive any further Reclamation benefits pursuant to the Act of June 17, 1902, and all Acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto attributable to their status as a Federal Reclamation Project, and the Griffith Project shall no longer be a Federal Reclamation Project.

(c) Nothing in this Act shall transfer or affect Federal ownership, rights, or interests in Lake Mead National Recreation Area associated lands, nor affect the authorities of the National Park Service to manage Lake Mead National Recreation Area including lands on which the Griffith Project is located consistent with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), Public Law 88–639, October 8, 1964 (78 Stat. 1039), or any other applicable legislation, regulation, or policy.

(d) Nothing in this Act shall affect the application of Federal reclamation law to water delivered to the Authority pursuant to any contract with the Secretary under section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

(e) Effective upon conveyance of the Griffith Project and acquired interests in land under section 3 of this Act, the United States shall not be liable for damages of any kind arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence based on its prior ownership of the conveyed property.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 986.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, S. 986 was introduced by Senator REID of Nevada and a companion bill was introduced by our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) on May 5 of 1999.

This legislation provides for the Southern Nevada Water Authority to accept responsibility for administration, operation and maintenance of the Griffith Project and to pay the net present value of the remaining repayment obligation. In addition, the bill directs the Secretary to convey and assign to the authority all right, title and interest of the United States in and to the Griffith Project.

The Griffith Project forms an integral part of a much larger water delivery system built separately by the Southern Nevada Water Authority and its constituent agencies. It consists of the intake facilities, pumping plants, et cetera required to provide water from Lake Meade for distribution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I fully support the passage of S. 986. I note that the Department of the Interior has raised concerns regarding the effect of the bill on the Lake Meade National Recreation area. It is my understanding that the rights of way provisions in S. 986, while generous, are intended to provide the Southern Nevada Water Authority with reasonable access to project facilities across Federal lands.

The Secretary of the Interior has responsibility for protecting and managing the Lake Mead National Recreation area, and I would expect the Secretary's participation in negotiations involving rights of way over Federal lands which provide ample opportunities to ensure that those resources are fully protected.

Madam Speaker, I would like to say that I want to commend the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), my good friend, and the good senator from Nevada for his bipartisan support of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), the author of the House companion bill to S. 986.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased today to rise in support of S. 986, the Griffith Project Prepayment and Conveyance Act.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) for yielding me the time with which to speak and to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for their leadership and assistance with this bill and also to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for his courtesies and assistance in this bill as well.

The Griffith Project, formerly known as the Southern Nevada Project, was first authorized in 1965, and directed to Secretary of Interior to construct, operate and maintain the project in order to deliver water to Clark County, Nevada.

With the phenomenal growth of the Las Vegas Valley over the past several decades, and the associated need for additional water, the Griffith Project has become but a small part of the overall system used to deliver water to the Las Vegas metropolitan area.

With the strong support of the State and local government to increase and improve the water delivery and treatment system for the Las Vegas Valley, it is projected that the federally funded share of the overall system will decrease to approximately 6 percent when completed.

The time has come, Madam Speaker, for the title of the Griffith Project to be transferred to the local ownership, and this is the goal of S. 986. S. 986 will convey to the Southern Nevada Water Authority all right, title and interest of the United States in and to the Griffith Project.

This conveyance is subject to the payment by the Southern Nevada Water Authority of the net present value of the remaining repayment obligation.

This repayment obligation will be determined under financial terms and conditions that are similar to other title transfer laws which have been enacted on other projects.

The repayment obligation will also be governed by the guidance from the Department of Interior and the office of Management and Budget. This conveyance will simplify the overall operation of the system for the Southern Nevada Water Authority by removing some of the duplicative efforts required by having dual owners.

For example, a pump station in the Griffith Project portion of the system requires repairs or maintenance, then Project employees must notify the Bureau of Reclamation that a repair is needed.

Madam Speaker, then they must describe the exact nature of the work to be performed, obtain permission for a crew to perform the work and schedule the work to be done at such a time when the Bureau of Reclamation employees can be present just to watch or oversee the repair or maintenance being performed by the Project employees.

When the Project work is completed, the Bureau of Reclamation then sends a local bill to the water authority for the time spent by its personnel simply watching the work being done by the Project employees.

Madam Speaker, we should note that this could be as simple as replacing just a valve handle, even though there are no leaks or any technical problems with the system. Truly, Madam Speaker, this is a tremendous waste of Bureau of Reclamation time and an unnecessary and expensive cost burden for the people of Las Vegas.

In summary, this is a rather straightforward bill which will result in a much simplified and improved operation of the water supply and treatment facility for the Las Vegas Valley.

Madam Speaker, I, along with the senior Senator from Nevada, have worked with the Bureau of Reclamation to resolve their concerns, and we believe this is the right approach for Southern Nevada.

I do understand the right of way issues that remain and will work with the administration and those concerned with that right of way issue to resolve those problems, and I would ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill and pass S. 986.

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 986.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

1500

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING VIETNAMESE AMERICANS AND OTHERS WHO SEEK TO IMPROVE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 322) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding Vietnamese Americans and others who seek to improve social and political conditions in Vietnam, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 322

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States and the Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam fought together for the causes of freedom and democracy in the former Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas the Armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam suffered enormous casualties, including over 250,000 deaths and more than 750,000 wounded between 1961 and 1975 for the cause of freedom;

Whereas many officers and enlisted personnel suffered imprisonment and forcible reeducation at the direction of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas on June 19 of each year, the Vietnamese American community traditionally commemorates those who gave their lives in the struggle to preserve the freedom of the former Republic of Vietnam;

Whereas June 19 serves as a reminder to Vietnamese Americans that the ideals and values of democracy are precious and should be treasured; and

Whereas the Vietnamese American community plays a critical role in raising international awareness of human rights concerns regarding the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) commends the sacrifices of those who served in the Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam; and

(2) applauds the contributions of all individuals whose efforts have focused, and continue to focus, international attention on human rights violations in Vietnam.

Amend the title so as to read: ''Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the sacrifices of individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the former Republic of Vietnam.''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 322.

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

There was no objection.

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

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, this Member rises in strong support of H. Con. Res. 322, a resolution that recognizes the sacrifices made by Vietnamese Americans who served in the armed forces of the former Republic of Vietnam. This Member congratulates the efforts of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) to recognize the Vietnamese who fought bravely side by side with U.S. forces in Vietnam and to applaud all those whose efforts focus international attention on human rights violations in Vietnam. This Member is pleased to be a cosponsor of the legislation.

Each year on June 19, the Vietnamese-American community traditionally commemorates those who gave their lives in the struggle to preserve the freedom of the former Republic of Vietnam. During the war, the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam suffered enormous casualties including over 250,000 killed and more than 750,000 wounded. They continued to suffer after the fighting ended when many were imprisoned and forced to undergo so-called reeducation. They continue their efforts even now playing an important role in raising international awareness of human rights violations in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Moreover, Vietnamese Americans, many of whom arrived as refugees with little but the clothes on their backs, have made tremendous achievements and have contributed greatly to this country.

Earlier this year, this body approved H. Con. Res. 295 on Human Rights and Political Oppression in Vietnam. There was inevitably some duplication in the two initiatives. Therefore this Member, with the concurrence of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), the sponsor of the resolution, amended H. Con. Res. 322 only to eliminate duplication. The resolution now focuses on commemorating the service and sacrifices of the former members of the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam.

This Member urges all his colleagues to support this laudable resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I would like to strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I certainly want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of our committee, for bringing this resolution to the floor. I also want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, for making the proper changes to this resolution that is now before us.

Madam Speaker, while Vietnam has made a bit of progress in the past few years in opening up its society, we need to maintain pressure on the Vietnamese government to move more aggressively towards democracy.

This resolution recognizes the important role that the more than 1 million Vietnamese Americans in our nation play in raising the awareness of the Vietnam human rights record.

The resolution also recognizes the sacrifices made by the armed forces of the United States and the former Republic of Vietnam in fighting to bring democracy and freedom to that nation. We are right to get the Congress on record on all of these issues.

I want to note also, Madam Speaker, the tremendous contributions 1 million Vietnamese Americans make to the betterment of our Nation becoming mainstream Americans. They are such an industrious people in education, business, and all walks of life. I want to commend the 1 million Vietnamese Americans that we have who are members of our Nation.

Yet with all this, I think we can also recognize that their hearts are still with the mother country, hopefully, in some way, and somehow that the greater sense of democracy will come about with the current administration of Vietnam in that country.

Madam Speaker, I do urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Again, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for managing this legislation on the floor.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), who has followed Vietnamese-American relations very carefully and has a direct knowledge of the contributions of the Vietnamese-American community to this country in his part of the Nation.

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 322. I want to publicly thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN), but most importantly, because he is here today, the gentleman from Nebraska (Chairman BEREUTER) for allowing this resolution to come to the floor.

Madam Speaker, many of us from all over the country know about the problems and the trials and tribulations of individuals who immigrated to this country from the Republic of Vietnam.

I think that it's appropriate to repeat why so many Vietnamese fought and died for freedom and democracy in their country. Over 250,000 Vietnamese from the Republic of Vietnam died in this struggle. Let me say this sincerely, they not only died for themselves, but also in the struggle against tyrannies, against oppression.

Frankly, I think too often we talk about a lot of inconsequential issues, but we need to remember that there is a long black wall down at the other end of the Mall. Many Americans and Vietnamese Americans walk that wall and trace out names. I think too often that, when we talk about that long black wall, we think about it as something that is in the past, something that is over, something that somebody else did or another generation did.

Madam Speaker, I am here to remind us all that the war may be over; but the struggle for what that wall symbolizes, the struggle for what the Vietnamese people in the Republic of Vietnam were fighting for, the struggle for what American men and women fought and died for is still going on today.

There are still individuals in Vietnam who are being tagged as ''hard core'', and who are in reeducation facilities. Now I think we all know what kind of catch word ''reeducation'' means. It basically means, if one does not think like the government, the government will teach one how to rethink so one thinks only their way.

Madam Speaker, I think that, as we address this resolution today, we should commit ourselves to the fact that the men and women that are symbolized on our wall at the other end of the Mall and the men and women who died from the Republic of Vietnam will be remembered by our constant quest to make sure that this struggle for freedom does continue.

I want to say, though, too, I guess too often we talk about ''hyphenated Americans'', and maybe being a son of a so-called ''hyphenated American'', I am always reminded that we are really not talking about Vietnamese. We are talking about Americans who came from Vietnam. We are talking about

people that have made, not only a great struggle in Vietnam fighting Communism, but also a great struggle and great success at becoming new Americans, at becoming what this country has always promised the rest of the world: that if one works hard, one studies hard, one strives to do their best, if one is willing to make a contribution to this free society, this free society will reward one through one's own sweat of one's own brow.

I think that we all need to remind ourselves that these immigrants who came from the Republic of Vietnam, and as an example to all of us no matter what our race, what our creed, what our gender, that there still is the opportunity for those who are willing to work hard, to strive, and to contribute.

In closing, in San Diego County, we have a very large population of individuals who emigrated from the Republic of Vietnam, and their children now are as American as anyone who has been here for 200, 300 years. I am very proud that, when I go to review ROTC units, when we see the military young men and women lining up in San Diego, we will see the sons and the daughters of men and women who fought for their homeland and emigrated from the Republic of Vietnam in the worst of circumstances, but have learned the best of lessons both from their country of the past and their newly adopted country of the future.

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

Madam Speaker, I also want to compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) for his comments on this piece of legislation.

I should also note the fact that 58,000 American lives were lost in that terrible conflict. I think, if we are to assess what lesson our Nation has learned from Vietnam, I can say that, if we are ever to commit our men and women in uniform to engage in a war against enemy forces, our Nation's political and military leaders must all be committed to one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to win the war, nothing less, nothing more.

There is no such thing as a half-baked war, Madam Speaker. We are there to win, or do not waste the resources or the valuable blood of the men and women in uniform. That is probably the lesson I learned from Vietnam, Madam Speaker.

I think more important, in essence, is the fact we have 1 million Vietnamese Americans who believe in democracy, who believe in our form of government, who believe in the system where everybody is given better treatment, that no one is above the law. That is what America is about.

I want to commend again the many Vietnamese Americans who have made tremendous sacrifice, not only for their country, but their willingness to come here and make tremendous contributions for the betterment of our own Nation.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for managing this piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for his insightful statement. As a Vietnam-era veteran, I certainly appreciate the wisdom of what he has just said regarding appropriate foreign and security policy.

I would also like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) for his insightful statement, very much focused on the many contributions that Vietnamese, who happen now to be American citizens, are making to this country and to all of those who are striving for citizenship.

Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Madam Speaker, I have on two occasions seen the rapport and the attention that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) gives to Asians who are living in his district, immigrants, refugees, and to those many who have become citizens actively participating in the economy and the politics of California.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska (Chairman BEREUTER) is the author of this particular legislation, of this approach, of which I am a cosponsor. I want to thank him for introducing this bill.

It is important that we honor those in the Armed Forces in the United States and in the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam who fought together. These brave individuals risked their lives for liberty, and their actions should be honored 25 years now after the fall of Saigon. We must remember their deeds while working for increased political and economic freedom in the socialist Republic of Vietnam.

I recently visited Vietnam. During my trip there, I paid a visit to the Venerable Thich Quang Do, who is the 72-year-old leader of the banned Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam.

Because of his peaceful protests, those protests that he engaged in in support of political freedom and religious freedom, Thich Quang Do has been imprisoned and exiled. Even though he was under surveillance, Thich Quang Do welcomed my visit.

My private visits to him and Le Quang Liem, another dissident, were quickly denounced by the government. It is obvious the Vietnamese government is sensitive to international criticism. This obligates the United States to speak out constantly against the Vietnamese government's human rights violations. We may not always realize it, but protests by the American government and by the American people do help the cause of freedom in Vietnam. Silence is no alternative.

This international criticism has come about in large part due to the tireless work of the Vietnamese-American communities. Their efforts to raise awareness about human rights and about the violations of basic freedoms of Vietnam have a critical, critical effect.

It is imperative that we continue pressuring for increased openness in Vietnam. A two-track policy of engaging the Vietnamese government on economic reform on one hand while pressuring it on its political and religious repression, that approach requires diplomatic finesse. But if done right, it promises to bring long-sought freedom to the Vietnamese people, freedom for which many Americans have sacrificed.

I want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Chairman BEREUTER) for his authorship of this two-pronged approach. We all hope that it is successful in engaging and changing Vietnam.

1515

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), who just spoke, for focusing on the policy implications and the direction that we should take in our relationship with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. Certainly all of us want to work closely with our distinguished former colleague, Ambassador Pete Peterson, and we have been doing that on a variety of programs and votes in this effort here.

We would hope that our policies and actions regarding the government of Vietnam might bring some better results. We have at the current time trade negotiations ongoing in this city, and we hope that, in fact, the kind of response from the Vietnamese will be forthcoming and will result in a better human rights record in Vietnam and an opportunity, therefore, to improve our relationship with that country.

I thank my colleague for his outstanding statement, I thank the gentleman from American Samoa for his role, and I particularly wish to thank my staff director from the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, Mike Ennis, for his outstanding work in this effort, in working with the staff of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

Madam Speaker, I urge support of the resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution commending the Vietnamese American Community for its work in bringing democratic principles and practices to the people of Vietnam. Social equality is the backbone of the American government and a fundamental principle in every democratic government.

As the leading democratic country in the world, the United States should take care to

applaud the efforts of all people who have worked to spread democracy throughout the earth including the contributions of the Vietnamese American people.

After the fall of Saigon, the Vietnam's government punished those Vietnamese who had allied with the U.S. North Vietnam forces placed hundreds of thousands of southerners in prisons, re-education camps and economic zones in efforts to remove subversion and to consolidate the country.

The Communists created a society of suspicion that hounded prisoners even after their release. The men were treated as second class citizens. Families were deprived of employment and their children could not attend college. Police interrogated families if ex-prisoners were not seen for more than a day.

Prisoners were considered expendable, worked to death and forced to walk in rows down old minefields to find out where they were. Daughters of South Vietnamese military men were sometimes forced by destitution to become prostitutes.

The re-education camps remained the predominant devise of social control in the late 1980s. Considered to be institutions where rehabilitation was accomplished through education and socially constructive labor, the camps were used to incarcerate members of certain social classes in order to coerce them to accept and conform to the new social norms.

Sources say that up to 200,000 South Vietnamese spent at least a year in the camps, which range from model institutions visited by foreigners to remote jungle shacks were inmates died of malnutrition and disease. As late as 1987, Vietnamese officials stated that about 7,000 people remained in re-education camps.

The first wave of refugees, in 1975, had no established Vietnamese American communities to rely upon for help. Assistance came from government programs, private individuals, nonprofit organizations and churches. Vietnamese men who held high positions in their homeland took whatever jobs they could get. Vietnamese woman became full-time wage earners, often for the first time.

Most refugees in the first wave were young, well-educated urban elites, professionals and people with technical training. Despite the fact that many first wave arrivals were from privileged backgrounds, few were well prepared to take up new life in America. The majority did not speak English and all found themselves in the midst of a strange culture.

The refugees who arrived in the US often suffered traumatic experiences while escaping Vietnam by sea. Those caught escaping after the fall of Saigon, including children, were jailed. Almost every Vietnamese American family has a member who arrived as a refugee or who died en route.

Many Vietnamese Americans still refuse to accept the current communist government of their former homeland. For many, the pain, anger and hatred felt toward the communist regime that forced them into exile remains fresh. Fiercely proud of their heritage, yet left without a homeland, many Vietnamese Americans have vowed never to acknowledge that Vietnam is now one communist country.

The story of Le Van Me and wife Sen is a typical one of many refugees. Me was a lieutenant colonel in the South Vietnamese Army when they came to the U.S. They spent time in a refugee camp in Fort Chaffee, Arkansas, until the government found a church in Warsaw, Missouri, to sponsor them. In the small rural town, Me worked as a janitor for the church and all the parishioners helped the family in any way they could—giving them clothes, canned preserves, even working together to renovate a house where the family could live.

Me took classes at the community college. After 11 months, the family moved to California, drawn by the jobs rumored to be there. Me got a job as an electronic technician and started attending a neighborhood community college again. Sen was determined not to use food stamps for longer than two weeks. Within three years, they bought a three bedroom house in north San Jose. As Me explained ''You really don't know what freedom is until you nearly die fighting for it.''

Saigon fell 25 years ago, but the memories are still raw for many Vietnamese people. The exodus from Vietnam since 1975 has created a generation of exiles. The efforts of everyone, especially Vietnamese-Americans, to bring democracy must be recognized. We should hesitate no longer to make it known that the United States Congress proudly recognizes these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge each of my colleagues to support this Resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 322 expressing the sense of Congress regarding the sacrifices of individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the former Republic of Vietnam.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. DAVIS, for introducing this resolution and for his continuing commitment to human rights and democracy in Vietnam.

I want to thank the chairman of the Asia-Pacific Subcommittee, Mr. BEREUTER, for his work in crafting the final language in this measure.

Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that 10 years after the end of the cold war, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is still a one-party state ruled and controlled by a Communist Party which represses political and religious freedoms and commits numerous human rights abuses.

It is appropriate that we recognize those who fought to oppose this tyranny which has fallen across Vietnam and those who continue the vigil of struggling for freedom and democracy there today.

Accordingly, I urge Hanoi to cease its violations of human rights and to undertake the long-overdue liberalization of its moribund and stifling political and economic system. The people of Vietnam clearly deserve better.

Finally, I call upon the Vietnamese government to do all it can—unilaterally—to assist in bringing our POW/MIAs home to American soil.

I want to praise this resolution for pointing out the injustice that tragically exists in Vietnam today and those who have—and are—still opposing it.

Once again I want to commend Mr. DAVIS for introducing this resolution and his abiding dedication to improving the lives of the people of Vietnam.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this measure and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it and send a strong signal to Hanoi that it is time to free the minds and spirits of the Vietnamese people.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 322, which honors the wonderful contributions of our nation's Vietnamese-Americans in raising awareness of human rights abuses in Vietnam. I thank my colleagues Mr. DAVIS and Ms. SANCHEZ for their hard work on this issue. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important resolution, and urge my colleagues' overwhelming support today.

I represent San Jose, California, a community greatly enriched by the presence of immigrants. Quite a few of my constituents came to San Jose as refugees, escaping the brutal and oppressive political regime in Hanoi. I worked with those refugees as a Santa Clara County Supervisor, and many of those people have become my friends throughout the years. I believe that they have a unique perspective on the state of our country's relationship with Vietnam that is of immense value.

A quarter century after the fall of Saigon, the Communist government continues to oppress its citizens and violate their basic human rights. Stories of political repression, religious persecutions and extra-judicial detentions are all too common. Many Vietnamese-Americans have worked tirelessly to bring these violations to light, here in the United States and to the international community. As a result of their extraordinary dedication, awareness of the abuses of the Vietnamese government is growing exponentially.

I applaud their continued effort to bring democratic ideals and practices to Vietnam. This resolution is a small token of our gratitude for the hard work of the 1 million Vietnamese-Americans living in our country. I am proud to support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 322, as amended.

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

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: ''Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the sacrifices of individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the former Republic of Vietnam.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4 p.m.

1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) at 4 o'clock and one minute p.m.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks during further consideration of H.R. 4461, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 538 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. 4461.

1602

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. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. NUSSLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Thursday, June 29, 2000, the bill was open for amendment from page 57, line 12, to page 58, line 8.

Are there further amendments to that portion of the bill?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a series of discussions with the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN).

Mr. Chairman, as we know, the Senate bill provides direct payments to dairy farmers estimated at $443 million to offset the record low prices we have seen for much of the past year.

I would simply ask the chairman if he would be willing to work with me to ensure that direct payments for dairy farmers are included in the bill when it emerges from conference.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to work with the gentleman from Wisconsin. I find that we agree more often than not on the specifics of dairy policy, and would point to the last 2 years of economic assistance payments we have jointly inserted into the agriculture appropriations conference report as proof.

Accordingly, I will be pleased to carry out our tradition of working together on dairy producer assistance, when and if we ever get to conference.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Let me turn to another subject, that of ultrafiltered milk. It seems there is always some new issue popping up in the dairy area. There are growing fears about the damaging impact on domestic dairy producers from imports of dry ultrafiltered or UF milk.

Ultrafiltration is an important technology widely used in cheese plants for about 15 years to remove water, lactose, and minerals and allow manufacturers to manipulate the ingredients in cheese to arrive at the desired finished product.

The use of liquid UF milk from another location has been approved by FDA on a case-by-case basis, but there is another problem. The problem is the threat of unlimited imports of dry UF milk from places like New Zealand following a petition to FDA earlier this year by the National Cheese Institute to change the standards of identity for cheese.

I understand that there are no quotas or tariffs on this product, which is currently used in bakery mixes, ice cream, and other products that do not have the strict standards of identity that cheese has. There have also been newspaper reports suggesting that dry UF milk is already being imported for use in American cheese plants, in violation of FDA regulations.

We need to know what the facts are so we can develop an appropriate response. At a minimum, we need to understand first how much UF milk is coming into the country and what it is used for. I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he would be willing to work with us to get answers to those questions through the GAO and other sources.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, have an interest in ultrafiltered milk. I believe it is prudent to have empirical facts in order to understand the specifics of a somewhat muddled portion of the dairy production and cheese-making process.

I would offer to the gentleman that we will jointly direct either the GAO or the committee S&I staff to conduct a factual investigation into how much UF milk is produced in this country and how much is being imported and what it is used for. At that time, and with the facts on our side, I am confident that we will be able to address the issue in an intelligent and productive manner.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

Now I would like to turn to another subject, Mr. Chairman. That is the Dairy Export Incentive Program.

I am concerned that the USDA is not being aggressive enough in encouraging dairy exports through the Dairy Export Incentive Program, or DEIP, which allows us to compete in world markets with highly subsidized exports in the European Union.

About 10 percent of DEIP contracts are apparently canceled, I understand due mainly to price undercutting by our competitors. For whatever the reason, we apparently have about 40,000 metric tons of canceled nonfat dry milk contracts dating back to June of 1995. This canceled tonnage can be reprogrammed for export by allowing exporters to rebid for them, but the Foreign Agricultural Service appears reluctant to do that, perhaps fearing that it may be taken to the WTO court by the European Union.

Mr. Chairman, as we know, DEIP saves money. It is cheaper to export surplus nonfat dry milk than it is for USDA to buy it and store it. Removing this product from the domestic market would have a beneficial impact on dairy prices. As such, again, I would ask the chair of the subcommittee to help me convince USDA to propose a solution to resolve the problem by the time we have reached conference on this bill, one that might include establishing a procedure for automatic rebidding of canceled tonnage.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, again, I would be pleased to work with the gentleman to address his concerns, as they are shared by myself and many others. It seems the administration has been entirely too willing to roll over to our competitors without looking to the interests of America's farmers and ranchers first, and anything we can do to reverse the trend will be a step forward.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise the question of cranberries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, with respect to that product, cranberry growers, as we know, like all farmers today, it seems they are in dire straits due to overproduction, massive overproduction and lower prices. It costs about $35 per barrel to produce cranberries. Some growers in my district are getting as little as $9 or $10 a barrel for their crop.

The USDA recently announced its support for industry-proposed volume controls that are desperately needed to get a handle on overproduction. That is part of the solution, but will add to the farm income problems those cranberry growers are facing, so it seems to me we have to look for more things that can be done.

Another part of the solution might be for USDA to purchase surplus products. USDA has been very responsive so far looking for opportunities to purchase surplus product, but much more needs to be done if we are to restore balance to supply and demand.

As we know, cranberries are among the specialty crops eligible for purchase by the Secretary, with $200 million provided from the recently-passed crop insurance bill.

Would the chairman work with me to urge USDA to aggressively use the authority it has to purchase surplus cranberry products in a way that will make a significant difference to the industry?

Mr. SKEEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I will be glad to work with the gentleman towards that end.

Mr. OBEY. I would also appreciate it if the chairman would also help us to explore the possibility of helping growers through the current difficult times with direct payments.

The Cranberry Industry estimates that $20 million will improve income by about $3 to $4 per barrel for each grower. This bill already includes $100 million direct assistance to apple and potato growers. We have helped pork farmers, dairy farmers, wheat, corn, cotton, rice, oilseeds, and many others.

Would the chairman of the subcommittee be willing to work with me to ensure that America's cranberry growers receive the same kind of consideration in this respect that many other farmers have received?

Mr. SKEEN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, again, I would be very happy to work with the gentleman, as I, too, believe that specialty crops do not receive the support and attention that they deserve. Cranberries would definitely fall into that category.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the chairman, and I appreciate his consideration.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, recently I introduced H.R. 4652, the Quality Cheese Act of 2000. This bipartisan bill would prohibit the FDA from allowing the use of dry ultrafiltered milk in the making of natural cheese.

My reason for introducing the bill was simple. Dry ultrafiltered milk, which is a milk derivative, can come in the United States virtually duty-free. It can take the place of domestically produced milk in cheese vats and the consumer cannot tell the difference. Using imported dry ultrafiltered milk would also undercut our domestic dairy farmers' market for their milk. My Wisconsin dairy farmers are already receiving the lowest price for their milk in over 20 years. We cannot allow their market to be further eroded.

There have been reports in farm publications that there are large volumes of dry ultrafiltered milk currently being imported. That is perfectly legal, but we do not know what the dry ultrafiltered milk is being used for. If this dry ultrafiltered milk is being used in natural cheese-making, it is being used illegally, to the detriment of consumers and the dairy farmers I represent.

It is my hope that the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, will work with myself and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to find an answer to this important question.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentlewoman knows, I also have an interest in ultrafiltered milk, as I recently discussed with the gentlewoman's colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I believe it is wise to understand the specifics of a somewhat muddled segment of the dairy production and cheese-making production.

Accordingly, we have to agree to jointly direct either the GAO or the subcommittee's S&I staff to conduct a factual investigation into how much UF milk is produced in this country and how much is being imported and what is it used for, and at that time, with the facts on our side, I am confident that we will be able to address the issue in an intelligent and productive manner.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's concerns, and look forward to working with her on behalf of the Nation's dairy industry.

Ms. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Chairman.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF OHIO

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

Page 58, line 4, insert after the colon the following: ''*Provided further*, That $3,000,000 may be for activities carried out pursuant to section 512 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to new animal drugs, in addition to the amounts otherwise available under this heading for such activities:''.

1615

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment concerns antibiotic resistance from the use of antibiotics in livestock.

I would like to start with a story. Imagine your 7-year-old daughter is very sick from food poisoning. You take her to the hospital and antibiotics do not help. In a week, she dies a painful death. The autopsy shows that her body is riddled with *E. coli* bacteria which ate away at her organs from her brain down. This is a true story, and it happened to a family in northeast Ohio 2 years ago.

We thought we were winning the war against infectious diseases. With the introduction of antibiotics in the 1940s, humans gained an overwhelming advantage in the fight against bacteria that cause infectious diseases, but the war is not over.

Mr. Chairman, 2 weeks ago, the World Health Organization issued a ringing warning against antibiotic resistance. Around the world, microbes are mutating at an alarming rate into the new strains that fail to respond to drugs.

Dr. Marcos Esponal of the World Health Organization said, ''we already have lost some of the current good antibiotics, streptomycin for TB; it's almost lost. Chloroquin for malaria, it's lost; penicillin, nobody uses it now; if we keep the same pace, we will be losing other potent and powerful drugs. So a window of opportunity is closing, and I would say if we don't act now, in 5 to 10 years, we will have a major crisis''; words from the World Health Organization.

We need to develop, Mr. Chairman, new antibiotics but it is too soon obviously to give up on the ones we have. By using antibiotics and antimicrobials more wisely and more sparingly, we can slow down antibiotic resistance.

We need to change the way drugs are given to people to be sure, but we also need to look at the way drugs are given to animals. According to the WHO, 50 percent of all antibiotics are used in agriculture, both for animals and for plants. In the U.S., livestock producers use drugs to treat sick herds and flocks legitimately. They also feed a steady diet of antibiotics for healthy livestock so they will gain weight more quickly and be ready for market sooner.

Many of these drugs are the same ones used to treat infections in people, including tetracycline. Prolonged exposure to antibiotics in farm animals provide a breeding ground science tells us for resistance strains of *E. coli*, salmonella and other bacteria harmful to humans. When transferred to people through food, it can cause dangerous infections.

Last week, an interagency task force issued a draft Public Health Action Plan to combat antimicrobial resistance. The plan provides a blueprint for specific, coordinated Federal actions. A top priority action item in the draft plan highlights work already underway at the Food and Drug Administration's Center for Veterinary Medicine.

In December of 1998, the FDA issued a proposed framework for evaluating and regulating new animal drugs in light of their contribution to antibiotic resistance in humans. The agency proposes to evaluate the drugs on the basis of their importance in human medicine and the potential exposure of humans to resistant bacteria that come from animals.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would direct $3 million toward the Center for Veterinary Medicine's work on antibiotic resistance related to animal drugs. CVM Director Sundloff has stated that antibiotic resistance is the Center's top priority. However, the framework document states the agency

will look first at approvals for new animal drugs and will look at drugs already in use in animals as time and resources permit.

We think an additional $3 million would give a significant boost to the ability of the Center for Veterinary Medicine to move forward on antibiotic resistance. Our amendment directs FDA to shift these funds from within the agency, while leaving the decision on the sources of the offset to the agency itself.

Please note the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Chairman, has recommended a $53 million budget increase for FDA. Given this increase, we believe the agency can free up $3 million of that increase for its work on antibiotic resistance without harming other programs.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for his support, and ask for support of Members of the House for this amendment. The lives of our young children and our elderly parents, the people most vulnerable to food-borne illness, may be at stake.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it provides an additional $3 million for a particular FDA activity, presumably to be funded at the expense of other FDA priorities.

I understand the forthright interest of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) in this situation and what the gentleman wants to do. The committee has fully funded the President's fiscal year 2001 budget request for new animal drug review, as can be seen on page 60 of the committee report on this bill.

The President requested $62,761,000 for the animal drugs and feeds program, an increase of $14,048,000 over fiscal year 2000. The committee fully funded the administration's request, which is a generous 22 percent increase.

Since the request was fully funded, I oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same. Please vote no on the amendment.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and rise to support the Brown amendment to increase the antibiotic resistance funding by $3 million. Earlier this month, the World Health Organization issued a strong warning against antibiotic resistance.

If I may quote from the WHO, they said, ''the world may only have a decade or two to make optimal use of many of the medicines presently available to stop infectious diseases. We are literally in a race against time to bring levels of infectious disease down worldwide before the disease wears the drugs down first''; that is by Mr. David Heymann, executive director of the World Health Organization's communicable disease program.

Mr. Chairman, while many factors contribute to antibiotic resistance, an important cause is the overuse of antibiotics in livestock, both for treating disease and promoting faster growth. Many livestock receive a steady diet of antibiotics that are used in human medicine, especially tetracycline and penicillin.

Antibiotic-resistant microbes are then transferred from animals to humans primarily in food, causing infection from salmonella and E. coli that are difficult or impossible to treat.

Children and the elderly are most at risk for serious illness or death. The World Health Organization recommends reducing antibiotic use in animals to protect our own human health.

The Food and Drug Administration's Center for Veterinary Medicine, CVM, is taking steps to reduce the problem of antibiotic resistance from drug use in livestock. The agency's plan primarily addresses new animal drugs and will address drugs currently in use when resources permit.

That is where the Brown amendment comes in. This amendment would increase funding for the Food and Drug Administration's Center for Veterinary Medicine by $3 million for activities related to antibiotic resistance. Since the committee is recommending that the FDA receive an increase of $53 million, the Brown amendment would simply direct the agency to allocate an additional $3 million from the $53 million for this very important work.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, to support the Brown amendment and this very important program.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the Brown amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) and the body that this certainly has been described as a very serious issue in America today. I appreciate the opposition of the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) to it on the basis of the funding. We do not know exactly where the funding is coming from, and I also understand that this is an issue that was not brought to the attention of the committee or subcommittee prior to today for increased funding.

I would like to let the body know that there is some funding in the food safety initiative and the FDA has the jurisdiction, or the responsibility, of looking at these kinds of issues and monitoring this, and we are absolutely not doing a sufficient job. I think that we do need some additional resources and efforts in this area.

I would encourage, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) to try to work with us to see if we could not find some additional funding as we move into conference, but I would like to support the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, mammography user fees authorized by 42 U.S.C. 263(b) may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended.

In addition, export certification user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 381, as amended, may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of or used by the Food and Drug Administration, where not otherwise provided, $11,350,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and not to exceed $25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $69,000,000, including not to exceed $2,000 for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That for fiscal year 2001 and thereafter, the Commission is authorized to charge reasonable fees to attendees of Commission sponsored educational events and symposia to cover the Commission's costs of providing those events and symposia, and notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, said fees shall be credited to this account, to be available without further appropriation.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $36,800,000 (from assessments collected from farm credit institutions and from the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses as authorized under 12 U.S.C. 2249: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to expenses associated with receiverships.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, appropriations and authorizations made for the Department of Agriculture for the current fiscal year under this Act shall be available for the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for, of not to exceed 389 passenger motor vehicles, of which 385 shall be for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles.

SEC. 702. Funds in this Act available to the Department of Agriculture shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902).

SEC. 703. Not less than $1,500,000 of the appropriations of the Department of Agriculture in this Act for research and service work authorized by sections 1 and 10 of the Act of June 29, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 427, 427i; commonly known as the Bankhead-Jones Act), subtitle A of title II and section 302 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.), and chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available for contracting in accordance with such Acts and chapter.

SEC. 704. The Secretary may transfer funds provided under this Act and other available unobligated balances of the Department of Agriculture to the Working Capital Fund for the acquisition of plant and capital equipment necessary for the delivery of financial, administrative, and information technology services: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without the prior approval of the agency administrator.

SEC. 705. New obligational authority provided for the following appropriation items in this Act shall remain available until expended: Animal and Plant Health Inspection

Service, the contingency fund to meet emergency conditions, fruit fly program, integrated systems acquisition project, boll weevil program, up to 10 percent of the screwworm program, and up to $2,000,000 for costs associated with colocating regional offices; Food Safety and Inspection Service, field automation and information management project; funds appropriated for rental payments; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, funds for competitive research grants (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)) and funds for the Native American Institutions Endowment Fund; Farm Service Agency, salaries and expenses funds made available to county committees; Foreign Agricultural Service, middle-income country training program and up to $2,000,000 of the Foreign Agricultural Service appropriation solely for the purpose of offsetting fluctuations in international currency exchange rates, subject to documentation by the Foreign Agricultural Service.

SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 707. Not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriations available to the Department of Agriculture in this Act shall be available to provide appropriate orientation and language training pursuant to section 606C of the Act of August 28, 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1766b; commonly known as the Agricultural Act of 1954).

SEC. 708. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to pay negotiated indirect cost rates on cooperative agreements or similar arrangements between the United States Department of Agriculture and nonprofit institutions in excess of 10 percent of the total direct cost of the agreement when the purpose of such cooperative arrangements is to carry out programs of mutual interest between the two parties. This does not preclude appropriate payment of indirect costs on grants and contracts with such institutions when such indirect costs are computed on a similar basis for all agencies for which appropriations are provided in this Act.

SEC. 709. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, commodities acquired by the Department in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation and section 32 price support operations may be used, as authorized by law (15 U.S.C. 714c and 7 U.S.C. 612c), to provide commodities to individuals in cases of hardship as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 710. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to restrict the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to lease space for its own use or to lease space on behalf of other agencies of the Department of Agriculture when such space will be jointly occupied.

SEC. 711. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay indirect costs charged against competitive agricultural research, education, or extension grant awards issued by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service that exceed 19 percent of total Federal funds provided under each award: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 1462 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3310), funds provided by this Act for grants awarded competitively by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service shall be available to pay full allowable indirect costs for each grant awarded under section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638).

SEC. 712. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, all loan levels provided in this Act shall be considered estimates, not limitations.

SEC. 713. Appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans made available in the current fiscal year shall remain available until expended to cover obligations made in the current fiscal year for the following accounts: the rural development loan fund program account; the rural telephone bank program account; the rural electrification and telecommunications loans program account; the rural housing insurance fund program account; and the rural economic development loans program account.

SEC. 714. Such sums as may be necessary for the current fiscal year pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated by this Act.

SEC. 715. Notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, marketing services of the Agricultural Marketing Service; the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration; the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; and the food safety activities of the Food Safety and Inspection Service may use cooperative agreements to reflect a relationship between the Agricultural Marketing Service; the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration; the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; or the Food Safety and Inspection Service and a State or Cooperator to carry out agricultural marketing programs, to carry out programs to protect the Nation's animal and plant resources, or to carry out educational programs or special studies to improve the safety of the Nation's food supply.

SEC. 716. Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including provisions of law requiring competition), the Secretary of Agriculture may hereafter enter into cooperative agreements (which may provide for the acquisition of goods or services, including personal services) with a State, political subdivision, or agency thereof, a public or private agency, organization, or any other person, if the Secretary determines that the objectives of the agreement will: (1) serve a mutual interest of the parties to the agreement in carrying out the programs administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service; and (2) all parties will contribute resources to the accomplishment of these objectives: *Provided*, That Commodity Credit Corporation funds obligated for such purposes shall not exceed the level obligated by the Commodity Credit Corporation for such purposes in fiscal year 1998.

SEC. 717. None of the funds in this Act may be used to retire more than 5 percent of the Class A stock of the Rural Telephone Bank or to maintain any account or subaccount within the accounting records of the Rural Telephone Bank the creation of which has not specifically been authorized by statute: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer to the Treasury or to the Federal Financing Bank any unobligated balance of the Rural Telephone Bank telephone liquidating account which is in excess of current requirements and such balance shall receive interest as set forth for financial accounts in section 505(c) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

SEC. 718. Of the funds made available by this Act, not more than $1,500,000 shall be used to cover necessary expenses of activities related to all advisory committees, panels, commissions, and task forces of the Department of Agriculture, except for panels used to comply with negotiated rule makings and panels used to evaluate competitively awarded grants.

SEC. 719. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to carry out section 410 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 679a) or section 30 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 471).

SEC. 720. No employee of the Department of Agriculture may be detailed or assigned from an agency or office funded by this Act to any other agency or office of the Department for more than 30 days unless the individual's employing agency or office is fully reimbursed by the receiving agency or office for the salary and expenses of the employee for the period of assignment.

SEC. 721. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Agriculture shall be used to transmit or otherwise make available to any non-Department of Agriculture employee questions or responses to questions that are a result of information requested for the appropriations hearing process.

SEC. 722. None of the funds made available to the Department of Agriculture by this Act may be used to acquire new information technology systems or significant upgrades, as determined by the Office of the Chief Information Officer, without the approval of the Chief Information Officer and the concurrence of the Executive Information Technology Investment Review Board: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be transferred to the Office of the Chief Information Officer without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 723. (a) None of the funds provided by this Act, or provided by previous Appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in the current fiscal year, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds which: (1) creates new programs; (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity; (3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted; (4) relocates an office or employees; (5) reorganizes offices, programs, or activities; or (6) contracts out or privatizes any functions or activities presently performed by Federal employees; unless the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided by this Act, or provided by previous Appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in the current fiscal year, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for activities, programs, or projects through a reprogramming of funds in excess of $500,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that: (1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities; (2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 percent as approved by Congress; or (3) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects as approved by Congress; unless the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

SEC. 724. With the exception of funds needed to administer and conduct oversight of grants awarded and obligations incurred prior to enactment of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out section 793 of Public Law 104–127, the Fund for Rural America (7 U.S.C. 2204f).

SEC. 725. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who carry out an environmental quality incentives program authorized by chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa et seq.) in excess of $174,000,000.

SEC. 726. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Agriculture in the current fiscal year or thereafter may be used to administer the provision of contract payments to a producer under the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7201 et seq.) for contract acreage on which wild rice is planted unless the contract payment is reduced by an acre for each contract acre planted to wild rice.

SEC. 727. With the exception of funds needed to administer and conduct oversight of grants awarded and obligations incurred prior to enactment of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out the provisions of section 401 of Public Law 105–185, the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems (7 U.S.C. 7621).

SEC. 728. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to carry out any commodity purchase program that would prohibit eligibility or participation by farmer-owned cooperatives.

SEC. 729. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out a conservation farm option program, as authorized by section 1240M of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb).

SEC. 730. None of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used to carry out section 203(h) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622(h)) unless the Secretary of Agriculture inspects and certifies agricultural processing equipment, and imposes a fee for the inspection and certification, in a manner that is similar to the inspection and certification of agricultural products under that section, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided*, That this provision shall not affect the authority of the Secretary to carry out the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 451 et seq.), or the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1031 et seq.).

SEC. 731. None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who prepare or submit appropriations language as part of the President's Budget submission to the Congress of the United States for programs under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittees on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies that assumes revenues or reflects a reduction from the previous year due to user fees proposals that have not been enacted into law prior to the submission of the Budget unless such Budget submission identifies which additional spending reductions should occur in the event the user fees proposals are not enacted prior to the date of the convening of a committee of conference for the fiscal year 2002 appropriations Act.

SEC. 732. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to carry out a Community Food Security program or any similar activity within the United States Department of Agriculture without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 733. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used to carry out provision of section 612 of Public Law 105–185.

Mr. SKEEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title VII through page 72, line 4 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to this portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 734. Hereafter no funds shall be used for the Kyoto Protocol, including such Kyoto mechanisms as carbon emissions trading schemes and the Clean Development Mechanism that are found solely in the Kyoto Protocol and nowhere in the laws of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. KNOLLENBERG

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 58 offered by Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

Page 72, line 5, strike Section 734 and Insert as Section 734:

None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees, or orders for the purpose of implementation, or in preparation for implementation, of the Kyoto Protocol which was adopted on December 11, 1997, in Kyoto, Japan, at the Third Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which has not been submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification pursuant to article II, section 2, clause 2, of the United States Constitution, and which has not entered into force pursuant to article 25 of the Protocol; Provided further, the limitation established in this section not apply to any activity otherwise authorized by law.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I want to state at the outset that this amendment makes the language for this Agriculture Appropriations bill, H.R. 4461, exactly the same, word-for-word, as the language in the energy and water appropriations bill, the same, word-for-word, that will be in the foreign operations bill that will come before this body this week.

This language passed by voice vote with no opposition in about 1 minute just a few days ago. I would like to make four quick key points that are actually directed in this amendment. Number one, no agency can proceed with activities that are not specifically authorized and funded. Number two, no new authority is granted. Number three, neither the United Nations framework convention on climate control, nor the Kyoto Protocol are self-executing and specific implementing legislation is required for any regulation, program or initiative. Number four, since the Kyoto Protocol has not ratified and implementing legislation has not been approved by Congress, nothing contained exclusively in that treaty is funded.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to urge all Members to support what is a bipartisan supported amendment, and it has been our effort to strengthen through clarification and offer consistently in all of these bills and we think that is the proper approach, it simplifies things, clarifies things and I think strengthens things.

Mr. Chairman, in the morning two days ago, the House Appropriations Committee accepted my amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. That afternoon an amendment that the gentleman from Indiana Mr. VISCLOSKY offered on the Energy and Water Appropriations bill was exactly the same wording as what I offered and what was accepted in the full House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that this amendment regarding the Kyoto Protocol offered by me and then Mr. VISCLOSKY and now again by me cannot, under the Rules of the House of Representatives, authorize anything whatsoever on this Agriculture Appropriations bill, H.R. 106–4461, lest it be subject to a point of order.

This amendment shall not go beyond clarification and recognition of the original and enduring meaning of the law that has existed for years now—specifically that no funds be spent on unauthorized activities for the fatally flawed and unratified Kyoto Protocol.

Mr. Chairman, the whole nation deserves to hear the plea of this Administration for clarification of the Kyoto Protocol funding limitation. The plea came from the coordinator of all environmental policy for this Administration, George Frampton, in his position as Acting Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality. On March 1, 2000, on behalf of the Administration he stated before the VA/HUD appropriations subcommittee, and I quote, ''Just to finish our dialogue here [about the Kyoto Protocol funding limitation], my point was that it is the very uncertainty about the scope of the language . . . that gives rise to our wanting to not have the continuation of this uncertainty created next year.''

Mr. Chairman, I agree with Mr. OBEY when he stated to the Administration, ''You're nuts!'' upon learning of the fatally flawed Kyoto Protocol that Vice President Gore negotiated.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Congress for the focus on the activities of this Administration, both authorized and unauthorized.

This amendment shall be read to be a clarification that is fully consistent with the provision that has been signed by President Clinton in six current appropriations laws.

A few key points must be reviewed:

First, no agency can proceed with activities that are not specifically authorized and funded. Mr. Chairman, there has been an effort to confuse the long-standing support that I as well as other strong supporters of the provision on the Kyoto Protocol have regarding important energy supply and energy conservation program. For example, there has never been a question about strong support for voluntary programs, development of clean coal technology, and improvements in energy conservation for all sectors of our economy. Notwithstanding arguments that have been made on the floor in recent days, I have never, ever tried to undermine, eliminate, delete, or delay any programs that have been specifically authorized and funded.

Second, no new authority is granted.

Third, since neither the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change nor the Kyoto Protocol are self executing, specific implementing legislation is required for any regulation, program, or initiative.

Fourth, since the Kyoto Protocol has not been ratified and implementing legislation has not been approved by Congress, nothing contained exclusively in that treaty is funded.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Administration negotiated the Kyoto Climate Change Protocol some time ago but has decided not to submit this treaty to the United States Senate for ratification. All indications from this Administration lead to the conclusion that they have no intention of ever submitting the Kyoto Protocol to the Senate.

Pursuant to Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, the President only has the power to make treaties ''by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate.'' It is therefore unconstitutional for the President to make a treaty in contravention of the Advice of the Senate. The unanimous (95–0) advice of the Senate was given in Senate Resolution 105–98, referred to as the Byrd-Hagel Resolution.

Likewise it is therefore unconstitutional for the President to make a treaty with no intention of ever seeking the consent of the Senate.

The Protocol places severe restrictions on the United States while exempting most countries, including China, India, Mexico, and Brazil, from taking measures to reduce carbon dioxide equivalent emissions. The Administration undertook this course of action despite unanimous support in the United States Senate for the Senate's advice in the form of the Byrd-Hagel resolution calling for commitments by all nations and on the condition that the Protocol not adversely impact the economy of the United States.

We are also concerned that actions taken by Federal agencies constitute the implementation of this treaty before its submission to Congress as required by the Constitution of the United States. Clearly, Congress cannot allow any agency to attempt to interpret current law to avoid constitutional due process.

Clearly, we would not need this debate if the Administration would send the treaty to the Senate. The treaty would be disposed of and we could return to a more productive process for addressing our energy future.

During numerous hearings on this issue, the administration has not been willing to engage in this debate. For example, it took months to extract the documents the administration used for its flawed economics. The message is clear—there is no interest in sharing with the American public the real price tag of this policy.

A balanced public debate will be required because there is much to be learned about the issue before we commit this country to unprecedented curbs on energy use while most of the world is exempt.

Worse yet, some treaty supporters see this as only a first step to elimination of fossil energy production. Unfortunately, the Administration has chosen to keep this issue out of the current debate.

I look forward to working to assure that the administration and EPA understand the boundaries of the current law. It will be up to Congress to assure that backdoor implementation of the Kyoto Protocol does not occur.

In that regard I would like to include in the RECORD a letter with legislative history of the Clean Air Act reported by Congressman JOHN DINGELL who was the Chairman of the House Conference on the Clearn Air Act amendments of 1990. No one knows the Clean Air Act like Congressman DINGELL. He makes clear, and I quote, ''Congress has not enacted implementing legislation authorizing EPA or any other agency to regulate greenhouse gases.''

In closing, I look forward to the report language to clarify what activities are and are not authorized.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following letter for the RECORD:

OCTOBER 5, 1999.

Hon. DAVID M. MCINTOSH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs, Committee on Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that you have asked, based on discussions between our staffs, about the disposition by the House-Senate conferees of the amendments in 1990 to the Clean Air Act (CAA) regarding greenhouse gases such as methane and carbon dioxide. In making this inquiry, you call my attention to an April 10, 1998 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) memorandum entitled 'EPA's Authority to Regulate Pollutants Emitted by Electric Power Generation Sources' and an October 12, 1998 memorandum entitled 'The Authority of EPA to Regulate Carbon Dioxide Under the Clean Air Act' prepared for the National Mining Association. The latter memorandum discusses the legislative history of the 1990 amendments.

First, the House-passed bill (H.R. 3030) never included any provision regarding the regulation of any greenhouse gas, such as methane or carbon dioxide, nor did the bill address global climate change. The House, however, did include provisions aimed at implementing the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.

Second, as to the Senate version (S. 1630) of the proposed amendments, the October 12, 1998 memorandum correctly points out that the Senate did address greenhouse gas matters and global warming, along with provisions implementing the Montreal Protocol. Nevertheless, only Montreal Protocol related provisions were agreed to by the House-Senate conferees (see Conf. Rept. 101–952, Oct. 26, 1990).

However, I should point out that Public Law 101–549 of November 15, 1990, which contains the 1990 amendments to the CAA, includes some provisions, such as sections 813, 817 and 819–821, that were enacted as free-standing provisions separate from the CAA. Although the Public Law often refers to the 'Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990,' the Public Law does not specify that reference as the 'short title' of all of the provisions included the Public Law.

One of these free-standing provisions, section 821, entitled 'Information Gathering on Greenhouse Gases contributing to Global Climate Change' appears in the United States code as a 'note' (at 42 U.S.C. 7651k). It requires regulations by the EPA to 'monitor carbon dioxide emissions' from 'all affected sources subject to title V' of the CAA and specifies that the emissions are to be reported to the EPA. That section does not designate carbon dioxide as a 'pollutant' for any purpose.

Finally, Title IX of the Conference Report, entitled 'Clean Air Research,' was primarily negotiated at the time by the House and Senate Science Committees, which had no regulatory jurisdiction under House-Senate Rules. This title amended section 103 of the CAA by adding new subsections (c) through (k). New subsection (g), entitled 'Pollution Prevention and Control,' calls for 'non-regulatory strategies and technologies for air pollution prevention.' While it refers, as noted in the EPA memorandum, to carbon dioxide as a 'pollutant,' House and Senate conferees never agreed to designate carbon dioxide as a pollutant for regulatory or other purposes.

Based on my review of this history and my recollection of the discussions, I would have difficulty concluding that the House-Senate conferees, who rejected the Senate regulatory provisions (with the exception of the above-referenced section 821), contemplated regulating greenhouse gas emissions or addressing global warming under the Clean Air Act. Shortly after enactment of Public Law 101–549, the United Nations General Assembly established in December 1990 the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee that ultimately led to the Framework Convention on Climate Change, which was ratified by the United States after advice and consent by the Senate. That Convention is, of course, not self-executing, and the Congress has not enacted implementing legislation authorizing EPA or any other agency to regulate greenhouse gases.

I hope that this is responsive.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Ranking Member.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Knollenberg amendment. His characterization of the language is absolutely correct. It is the same as energy and water, it is the same as full committee has reported for foreign operations and essentially the same intent as Veterans Administration, HUD and Urban Development as well.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate his work in a bipartisan fashion and, again, I agree with the premise of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), Kyoto is not the law of the land, but we want to ensure that where we have authorized programs and where there is duplicate language that the law can also be followed. I do appreciate the initiative of the gentleman and would ask my colleagues to support his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 735. After taking any action involving the seizure, quarantine, treatment, destruction, or disposal of wheat infested with karnal bunt, the Secretary of Agriculture shall compensate the producers and handlers for economic losses incurred as the result of the action not later than 45 days after receipt of a claim that includes all appropriate paperwork.

SEC. 736. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Town of Lloyd, New York and the Town of Harris, New York shall be eligible for loans and grants provided through the Rural Community Advancement Program.

1630

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. BOYD

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 56 offered by Mr. BOYD:

Page 72, lines 18 and 19, strike ''Town of Harris'' and insert ''Town of Thompson''.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure that we have the amendment correct. It should be the amendment that changes the ''Town of Harris'' to the ''Town of Thompson.''

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is correct.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, it is a technical amendment. I ask support for the amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentleman's amendment and recommend that the House do so as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 737. Hereafter, notwithstanding section 502(h)(7) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1472(h)(7)), the fee collected by the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to a guaranteed loan under such section 502(h) at the time of the issuance of such guarantee may be in an amount equal to not more than 2 percent of the principal obligation of the loan.

SEC. 738. The Secretary of Agriculture may use funds available under this and subsequent appropriation Acts to employ individuals to perform services outside the United States as determined by the agencies to be necessary or appropriate for carrying out programs and activities abroad; and such employment actions, hereafter referred to as Personal Service Agreements (PSA), are authorized to be negotiated, the terms of the PSA to be prescribed and work to be performed, where necessary, without regard to such statutory provisions as related to the negotiation, making and performance of contracts and performance of work in the United States. Individuals employed under a PSA to perform such services outside the United States shall not by virtue of such employment be considered employees of the United States Government for purposes of any law administered by the Office of Personnel Management. Such individuals may be considered employees within the meaning of the Federal Employee Compensation Act, 5 U.S.C. 8101 et seq. Further, that Government service credit shall be accrued for the time employed under a PSA should the individual later be hired into a permanent U.S. Government position within FAS or another U.S. Government agency if their authorities so permit.

SEC. 739. (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 141 of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7251) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(4), by striking ''and 2000''; and inserting ''through 2001''; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking ''2000'' each place it appears and inserting ''2001''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 142(e) of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7252(e)) is amended by striking ''2001'' and inserting ''2002''.

SEC. 740. In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated or made available by this Act, $4,000,000 is appropriated for the purpose of providing Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowships through the Congressional Hunger Center.

SEC. 741. Notwithstanding section 718, title VII of Public Law 105–277, as amended, funds made available hereafter in annual appropriations acts may be used to provide market access program assistance pursuant to section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, as amended (7 U.S.C. 5623), to any agricultural commodity as defined in section 102 of the Agriculture Trade Act of 1978, as amended (7 U.S.C. 5602), except for products specifically excluded by section 1302, title I of Public Law 103–66, as amended, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order on this section restoring the eligibility of mink for MAP funds.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order that this section constitutes legislation?

The Chair finds, that this provision explicitly supersedes existing law in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the provision is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 742. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to include a flood plain determination in any environmental impact study conducted by or at the request of the Farm Service Agency for financial obligations or guarantees to aquaculture facilities pending the completion by the Secretary of Agriculture and submission to Congress of a study regarding the environmental impact of aquaculture activities in flood plains in Arkansas.

SEC. 743. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, hereafter Friends of the National Arboretum, an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code incorporated in the District of Columbia, shall not be considered a prohibited source with respect to the United States National Arboretum and its employees for any reason, including for the purposes relating to gifts, compensation, or any other donations of any size or kind, so long as Friends of the National Arboretum remains an organization described under section 501(c)(3) of such Code and continues to conduct its operations exclusively for the benefit of the United States National Arboretum.

SEC. 744. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall include the value of lost production when determining the amount of compensation to be paid to owners, as provided in Public Law 106–113, appendix E, title II, section 204, for the cost of tree replacement for commercial trees destroyed as part of the Citrus Canker Eradication Program in Florida.

SEC. 745. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations requiring, for each child nutrition program, that—

(1) alternate protein products which are used to resemble and substitute, in part, for meat, poultry, or seafood shall meet the nutritional specifications for vegetable protein products set forth in section 2(e)(3) of the matter relating to vegetable protein products in appendix A to part 210 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on April 9, 2000; and

(2) if alternate protein products comprise 30 percent or more of a meat, poultry, or seafood product, that fact shall be disclosed at the point of service.

(b) The Secretary shall require that the regulations issued pursuant to subsection (a) shall be implemented by each program participant not later than January 1, 2001, and thereafter.

SEC. 746. Effective 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and continuing for the remainder of fiscal year 2001 and each subsequent fiscal year, establishments in the United States that slaughter or process birds of the order Ratitae, such as ostriches, emus and rheas, and squab, for distribution in commerce as human food shall be subject to the ante mortem and post mortem inspection, reinspection, and sanitation requirements of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 451 et seq.) rather than the voluntary poultry inspection program of the Department of Agriculture under section 203 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622).

SEC. 747. In using funds made available under section 801(a) of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–78; 113 Stat. 1175), or under the heading ''CROP LOSS ASSISTANCE'' under ''COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND'' of H.R. 3425 of the 106th Congress (as contained in appendix E of Public Law 106–113 (113 Stat. 1501A–289)), to compensate nursery stock producers for nursery stock losses caused by Hurricane Irene on October 16 and 17, 1999, the Secretary of Agriculture shall treat the losses as losses to the 1999 nursery stock crop.

SEC. 748. Any regulation issued pursuant to any plan to eliminate Salmonella Enteritidis illnesses due to eggs (including the Action Plan to Eliminate Salmonella Enteritidis Illnesses Due to Eggs, published on December 10, 1999) which establishes requirements for producers or packers of shell eggs to conduct tests for Salmonella Enteritidis shall contain provisions to defray or reimburse the costs of such tests to producers or packers. Any requirements pursuant to any such plan to divert eggs into pasteurization shall be imposed only as a consequence of positive test results from end product testing. The number of environmental tests required pursuant to any such plan shall, to the extent practicable, not exceed the number of such tests required pursuant to existing national quality assurance programs for shell eggs.

SEC. 749. Section 321(b) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1961(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) LOANS TO POULTRY FARMERS.—

''(A) INABILITY TO OBTAIN INSURANCE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the Secretary may make a loan to a poultry farmer under this subtitle to cover the loss of a chicken house for which the farmer did not have hazard insurance at the time of the loss, if the farmer—

''(I) applied for, but was unable, to obtain hazard insurance for the chicken house;

''(II) uses the loan to rebuild the chicken house in accordance with industry standards in effect on the date the farmer submits an application for the loan (referred to in this paragraph as 'current industry standards');

''(III) obtains, for the term of the loan, hazard insurance for the full market value of the chicken house; and

''(IV) meets the other requirements for the loan under this subtitle, other than (if the Secretary finds that the applicant's farming operations have been substantially affected by a major disaster or emergency designated by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)) the requirement that an applicant not be able to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere.

''(ii) AMOUNT.—The amount of a loan made to a poultry farmer under clause (i) shall be

an amount that will allow the farmer to rebuild the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards.

''(B) LOANS TO COMPLY WITH CURRENT INDUSTRY STANDARDS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle, the Secretary may make a loan to a poultry farmer under this subtitle to cover the loss of a chicken house for which the farmer had hazard insurance at the time of the loss, if—

''(I) the amount of the hazard insurance is less than the cost of rebuilding the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards;

''(II) the farmer uses the loan to rebuild the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards;

''(III) the farmer obtains, for the term of the loan, hazard insurance for the full market value of the chicken house; and

''(IV) the farmer meets the other requirements for the loan under this subtitle, other than (if the Secretary finds that the applicant's farming operations have been substantially affected by a major disaster or emergency designated by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.)) the requirement that an applicant not be able to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere.

''(ii) AMOUNT.—The amount of a loan made to a poultry farmer under clause (i) shall be the difference between—

''(I) the amount of the hazard insurance obtained by the farmer; and

''(II) the cost of rebuilding the chicken house in accordance with current industry standards.''.

SEC. 750. Public Law 105–277, division A, title XI, section 1121 (112 Stat. 2681–44, 2681–45) is amended by—

(1) striking ''not later than January 1, 2000'' and inserting ''not later than January 1, 2001''; and

(2) adding the following new subsection at the end thereof—

''(d) ADDITIONAL DISBURSEMENT.—

''(1) COTTON STORED IN GEORGIA.—The State of Georgia shall use funds remaining in the indemnity fund established in accordance with this section to compensate cotton producers in other States who stored cotton in the State of Georgia and incurred losses in 1998 or 1999 as the result of the events described in subsection (a).

''(2) GINNERS AND OTHERS.—The State of Georgia may also use funds remaining in the indemnity fund established in accordance with this section to compensate cotton ginners and others in the business of producing, ginning, warehousing, buying, or selling cotton for losses they incurred in 1998 or 1999 as the result of the events described in subsection (a), if—

''(A) as of March 1, 2000, the indemnity fund has not been exhausted;

''(B) the State of Georgia provides cotton producers (including cotton producers described in paragraph (1)) an additional time period prior to May 1, 2000, in which to establish eligibility for compensation under this section;

''(C) the State of Georgia determines during calendar year 2000 that all cotton producers in that State and cotton producers in other States as described in paragraph (1) have been appropriately compensated for losses incurred in 1998 or 1999 as described in subsection (a); and

''(D) such additional compensation is not made available until May 1, 2000.''.

APPLE MARKET LOSS ASSISTANCE AND QUALITY LOSS PAYMENTS FOR APPLES AND POTATOES

SEC. 751. (a) APPLE MARKET LOSS ASSISTANCE.—In order to provide relief for loss of markets for apples, the Secretary of Agriculture shall use $100,000,000 to make payments to apple producers. Payments shall be made on a per pound basis on each qualifying producer's 1999 production of apples, subject to such terms and conditions on such payments as may be established by the Secretary. Payments under this subsection, however, shall not be made with respect to that part of a farm's 1999 apple production that is in excess of 1.6 million pounds.

(b) QUALITY LOSS PAYMENTS FOR APPLES AND POTATOES.—In addition, the Secretary shall use $15,000,000 to provide compensation to producers of potatoes and to producers of apples who suffered quality losses to their 1999 production of those crops due to, or related to, a 1999 hurricane.

(c) NON-DUPLICATION OF PAYMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the payments made under this section shall be designed to avoid, taken into account other federal compensation programs as may apply, a duplication of payments for the same loss. Payments made under Federal crop insurance programs shall not, however, be considered to be duplicate payments.

(d) FUNDING.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall use the funds, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out this section.

(e) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The entire amount necessary to carry out this section shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for the entire amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act.

SEC. 752. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act may be used to pay salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out section 508(k) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(k)) to reimburse approved insurance providers and agents for the administrative and operating costs that exceed 20 percent of the premium used to define loss ratio for plans currently reimbursed at 24.5 percent and a proportional reduction for the plans currently reimbursed at less than 24.5 percent.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against the provision appearing on page 85, lines 6 through 15, of H.R. 4461, the Agriculture Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001.

The provision cited above violates clause 2(b) of rule XXI of the House in that it contains legislative or authorizing language in an appropriations bill as noted below:

The provision places a limitation on expenditures of the Insurance Fund authorized under the Federal Crop Insurance Act where such limitation does not exist under current law instead of confining such limitation on expenditures to funds made available under this act. Additionally, by addressing funds in other acts, the amendment changes existing law in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Although a limitation, the section addresses funds outside the current bill and, therefore, does constitute legislation. The point of order is sustained. Section 752 is, therefore, stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VIII—TRADE SANCTIONS REFORM AND EXPORT ENHANCEMENT

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000''.

SEC. 802. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term ''agricultural commodity'' has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

(2) AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM.—The term ''agricultural program'' means—

(A) any program administered under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691 et seq.);

(B) any program administered under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431);

(C) any program administered under the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.);

(D) the dairy export incentive program administered under section 153 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (15 U.S.C. 713a–14);

(E) any commercial export sale of agricultural commodities; or

(F) any export financing (including credits or credit guarantees) provided by the United States Government for agricultural commodities.

(3) JOINT RESOLUTION.—The term ''joint resolution'' means—

(A) in the case of section 803(a)(1), only a joint resolution introduced within 10 session days of Congress after the date on which the report of the President under section 803(a)(1) is received by Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That Congress approves the report of the President pursuant to section 803(a)(1) of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, transmitted on .'', with the blank completed with the appropriate date; and

(B) in the case of section 806(1), only a joint resolution introduced within 10 session days of Congress after the date on which the report of the President under section 806(2) is received by Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ''That Congress approves the report of the President pursuant to section 806(1) of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, transmitted on .'', with the blank completed with the appropriate date.

(4) MEDICAL DEVICE.—The term ''medical device'' has the meaning given the term ''device'' in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(5) MEDICINE.—The term ''medicine'' has the meaning given the term ''drug'' in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(6) UNILATERAL AGRICULTURAL SANCTION.—The term ''unilateral agricultural sanction'' means any prohibition, restriction, or condition on carrying out an agricultural program with respect to a foreign country or foreign entity that is imposed by the United States for reasons of foreign policy or national security, except in a case in which the United States imposes the measure pursuant to a multilateral regime and the other member countries of that regime have agreed to impose substantially equivalent measures.

(7) UNILATERAL MEDICAL SANCTION.—The term ''unilateral medical sanction'' means any prohibition, restriction, or condition on exports of, or the provision of assistance consisting of, medicine or a medical device with respect to a foreign country or foreign entity

that is imposed by the United States for reasons of foreign policy or national security, except in a case in which the United States imposes the measure pursuant to a multilateral regime and the other member countries of that regime have agreed to impose substantially equivalent measures.

SEC. 803. RESTRICTION.

(a) NEW SANCTIONS.—Except as provided in sections 804 and 805 and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not impose a unilateral agricultural sanction or unilateral medical sanction against a foreign country or foreign entity, unless—

(1) not later than 60 days before the sanction is proposed to be imposed, the President submits a report to Congress that—

(A) describes the activity proposed to be prohibited, restricted, or conditioned; and

(B) describes the actions by the foreign country or foreign entity that justify the sanction; and

(2) there is enacted into law a joint resolution stating the approval of Congress for the report submitted under paragraph (1).

(b) EXISTING SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the President shall terminate any unilateral agricultural sanction or unilateral medical sanction that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EXEMPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a unilateral agricultural sanction or unilateral medical sanction imposed—

(A) with respect to any program administered under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431);

(B) with respect to the Export Credit Guarantee Program (GSM–102) or the Intermediate Export Credit Guarantee Program (GSM–103) established under section 202 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5622); or

(C) with respect to the dairy export incentive program administered under section 153 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (15 U.S.C. 713a–14).

SEC. 804. EXCEPTIONS.

Section 803 shall not affect any authority or requirement to impose (or continue to impose) a sanction referred to in section 803—

(1) against a foreign country or foreign entity—

(A) pursuant to a declaration of war against the country or entity;

(B) pursuant to specific statutory authorization for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States against the country or entity;

(C) against which the Armed Forces of the United States are involved in hostilities; or

(D) where imminent involvement by the Armed Forces of the United States in hostilities against the country or entity is clearly indicated by the circumstances; or

(2) to the extent that the sanction would prohibit, restrict, or condition the provision or use of any agricultural commodity, medicine, or medical device that is—

(A) controlled on the United States Munitions List established under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778);

(B) controlled on any control list established under the Export Administration Act of 1979 or any successor statute (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 et seq.); or

(C) used to facilitate the development or production of a chemical or biological weapon or weapon of mass destruction.

SEC. 805. COUNTRIES SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.

Notwithstanding section 803 and except as provided in section 807, the prohibitions in effect on or after the date of the enactment of this Act under section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371) on providing, to the government of any country supporting international terrorism, United States Government assistance, including United States foreign assistance, United States export assistance, or any United States credits or credit guarantees, shall remain in effect for such period as the Secretary of State determines under such section 620A that the government of the country has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism.

SEC. 806. TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.

Any unilateral agricultural sanction or unilateral medical sanction that is imposed pursuant to the procedures described in section 803(a) shall terminate not later than 2 years after the date on which the sanction became effective unless—

(1) not later than 60 days before the date of termination of the sanction, the President submits to Congress a report containing—

(A) the recommendation of the President for the continuation of the sanction for an additional period of not to exceed 2 years; and

(B) the request of the President for approval by Congress of the recommendation; and

(2) there is enacted into law a joint resolution stating the approval of Congress for the report submitted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 807. STATE SPONSORS OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the export of agricultural commodities, medicine, or medical devices to the government of a country that has been determined by the Secretary of State to have repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism under section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371) shall only be made—

(1) pursuant to one-year licenses issued by the United States Government for contracts entered into during the one-year period and completed with the 12-month period beginning on the date of the signing of the contract, except that, in the case of the export of items used for food and for food production, such one-year licenses shall otherwise be no more restrictive than general licenses; and

(2) without benefit of Federal financing, direct export subsidies, Federal credit guarantees, or other Federal promotion assistance programs.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The applicable department or agency of the Federal Government shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees on a quarterly basis a report on any activities undertaken under subsection (a)(1) during the preceding calendar quarter.

(c) BIENNIAL REPORTS.—Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every two years thereafter, the applicable department or agency of the Federal Government shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the operation of the licensing system under this section for the preceding two-year period, including—

(1) the number and types of licenses applied for;

(2) the number and types of licenses approved;

(3) the average amount of time elapsed from the date of filing of a license application until the date of its approval;

(4) the extent to which the licensing procedures were effectively implemented; and

(5) a description of comments received from interested parties about the extent to which the licensing procedures were effective, after the applicable department or agency holds a public 30-day comment period.

SEC. 808. CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURES.

(a) REFERRAL OF REPORT.—A report described in section 803(a)(1) or 806(1) shall be referred to the appropriate committee or committees of the House of Representatives and to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate.

(b) REFERRAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A joint resolution introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and a joint resolution introduced in the House of Representatives shall be referred to the Committee on International Relations.

(2) REPORTING DATE.—A joint resolution referred to in paragraph (1) may not be reported before the eighth session day of Congress after the introduction of the joint resolution.

SEC. 809. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this title shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and shall apply thereafter in any fiscal year.

(b) EXISTING SANCTIONS.—In the case of any unilateral agricultural sanction or unilateral medical sanction that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act, this title shall take effect 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and shall apply thereafter in any fiscal year.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against title VIII.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that title VIII violates clause 2 of rule XXI concerning legislating on an appropriations bill.

Title VIII is legislative in nature because it changes existing law by lifting sanctions against terrorist states in violation of a number of laws, including the Trading with the Enemy Act, the Cuban Democracy Act, and the Cuban Liberty and Democracy Solidarity Act, among other laws.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member desire to be recognized on this point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. I apologize, but I was momentarily distracted. Did the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) just raise a point of order against the Nethercutt provision on the embargo?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply say that I will not try to get into the merits of the subject, but speaking to the point of order, the gentleman from Florida is obviously correct in his point of order because the Committee on Rules did not protect this section of the bill under the agreement worked out on the majority side of the aisle, which means at this point that there is no provision in law that will protect farmers; ability to export to the countries named either in this bill or in the supplemental appropriations bill. I personally find that to be regrettable.

But because of the decision of the Committee on Rules to not protect this section of the bill and because of the agreement that was reached by the majority party caucus, farmers are left in never-never land on this subject. Because of that decision, the gentleman

is free to make the point of order, and there is no way to stop it from being stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that title VIII is entirely legislative in character. As such, it violates clause 2(b) of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained. Title VIII is stricken from the bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, since no one else seems to at the moment be prepared to address an urgent item, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply take some time right now to indicate that I think the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) has done a lot of hard work trying to essentially squeeze a small amount of dollars into an even smaller bag.

I think the problem is that because of the unrealistic limitation placed upon this subcommittee by the full committee allocation, which was made necessary by what I consider to be a misguided budget resolution which passed this place, it means that this bill falls far short in a number of areas. It certainly falls far short with respect to food safety items. It falls far short with respect to resources needed to deal with market concentration.

The average farmer is in danger of becoming a serf because of the huge concentration that we see in the poultry business, the meat packing business of all kinds, frankly. That is happening in other sectors of agriculture as well.

The problems in agriculture, pests and diseases, the bill falls very, very short of where it needs to be. The conservation programs fall some $70 million short of the budget request. If we look at other problems, rural development, especially rural housing is $180 million below the budget request. PL–480 overseas food donation program is significantly below the request. Agriculture research and extension programs are $63 million below the request.

There are a number of problems associated with this bill, including the rider restricting egg safety measures to reduce salmonella contamination in eggs.

I would also say that this bill is totally absent any solution to the price problems being faced by many farmers. We have a collapsing price as far as dairy farmers are concerned. Many other farmers are facing similar problems with the products that they produce.

1645

And this bill will not be made whole until we move to conference, where we will be faced with a number of Senate amendments that would add literally billions to try to help farmers get out from under the impact of the misguided Freedom to Farm Act that passed this body several years ago.

So I just wanted to put on record now what my reasons would be personally for opposing the bill when the time comes, although I recognize that the gentleman from New Mexico has been given virtually no maneuvering room in solving some of these problems. The fault lies not with him. The fault lies, in my view, with the budget resolution which was adopted in the first place, which makes it virtually impossible for this House to meet its responsibilities to farmers, to consumers of agriculture products, and to those interested in the issue of rural development as well.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I too wanted to compliment the chairman from New Mexico on a great job on this bill. I think we will have a few more amendments, maybe in a few minutes here, but the gentleman from Wisconsin brought up a couple of points I wanted to speak to.

This is an appropriations bill. This is not policy. We are funding the policy that has been set by the Congress. I think there are a lot of things we can do to improve the future for our farmers; work harder on conservation to continue those efforts. I also think, as far as the livestock disease center that is going to be going into central Iowa, that that is going to be very, very important funding in this bill as far as the beginning of that process.

So I think this is a good bill. Obviously, we have very tight budget constraints that we are working under. But we also have to look at the fact that 5 years ago we had projected deficits of $200 billion or more as far as the eye could see. It has been only with some fiscal restraint in this House that we have been able to talk about surpluses and talk about returning some money back to the people out there who work so hard to earn the money that we spend here every day. And it is very important that we spend that money wisely and just do not open the checkbook up or we will be back in the same kind of deficit situation we were previous to this.

We have to look, as far as farm policy, I think, with open eyes about looking at relief as far as taxes, estate taxes, for our farmers. We have to look at our trade policies, the sanctions. It is unfortunate but it is true that the language that was the authorizing language in this bill for Cuba and Libya, Iran, Iraq, and North Korea was stricken from the bill. It will be done this year. We are going to crack that door open as far as lifting sanctions. But what we have to do is look at the rest of the sanction policy that we have, not only with the administration but with the Congress itself.

We have got to learn someday that using food and medicine as weapons in foreign policy does not work. They never punish the people that they are intended to punish. What we end up doing is hurting producers who are trying to sell into those markets. We put sanctions on countries with the idea of somehow hurting them, and all we do is hurt the poor people in those countries by depriving them of the availability of food and medicine.

We have also got to look at the regulatory situation we have in agriculture. As someone who lives on a farm, I understand that in northwest Iowa we have a lot of flat lands, they call them prairie potholes, and yet the bureaucrats here in Washington somehow believe that that is wetlands like they would envision them to be along the coast of the United States. It is not. We may have an eighth of an acre in the middle of a 240-acre field, and somehow that has to be protected, yet it is farmed every year anyway.

We have somehow got to make a determination in agriculture who has jurisdiction. Farmers have to deal with four Federal agencies today as far as wetlands regulations: USDA, Fish and Wildlife, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the EPA; and it is simply not working. They never get a straight answer from anyone.

So, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of things that need to be done, we have to look at policy down the road, but again this bill is an appropriations bill. I think with the dollars we were given, the chairman did a fantastic job. And I also want to compliment the ranking member, who is not here, but compliment her also for the great cooperation. It is a real honor and privilege to serve on this subcommittee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOYD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOYD:

Page 96, after line 4, insert the following:

SEC. 753. None of the funds made available in this Act or in any other Act may be used to recover part or all of any payment erroneously made to any oyster fisherman in the State of Connecticut for oyster losses under the program established under section 1102(b) of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in section 101(a) of Division A of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Approprations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)), and the regulations issued pursuant to such section 1102(b).

Mr. BOYD (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment to right a wrong against the oyster harvesters of Connecticut.

This amendment would ensure that no funds would be used to force these men and women to return vital disaster aid back to USDA. Three years ago, the oyster fishermen who work

the Long Island Sound and their families faced tough times. By the fall of 1998, over 95 percent of the oysters on 1,750 acres of oyster beds had died, devastating the $62 million industry and the families that relied on it for survival.

The USDA provided $1.5 million in disaster assistance last year to help get these families through the crisis and to ensure the long-time survival of Connecticut's valuable oyster industry. It was the right thing to do. It helped these small businesses get through tough times. The oystermen thought that they had weathered the storm.

But after surviving the crisis, just a few weeks ago the oyster harvesters got a letter in the mail from the USDA saying it was sorry, it made a mistake, and it wanted its money back; it wanted the $1.5 million returned. That money that was invested in reseeding oyster beds so that there would be an oyster harvest in the future, and it went to pay mortgages, to repair boats, and to feed and educate children.

Mr. Chairman, these are not people that have $1.5 million to give back to the Department of Agriculture. They should not be forced to mortgage their homes and futures to pay for a bureaucratic mistake.

My amendment would simply prohibit any funds made available in this act or in any other act from being used to recover part or all of any payment erroneously made to any Connecticut oyster harvester for oyster losses in 1998.

CBO has ruled it as budget neutral, taking no essential funds out of this bill. I call on my colleagues to support the amendment and bring justice home to the oyster harvesters of Connecticut.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentleman's amendment and recommend that the House do so as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. COBURN:

Insert before the short title the following title:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Food and Drug Administration for the testing, development, or approval (including approval of production, manufacturing, or distribution) of any drug solely intended for the chemical inducement of abortion.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, we have addressed this amendment 2 years prior to now, and we have passed it each year in the House.

What this amendment does is limit and prohibit the use of funds by the Food and Drug Administration in approving any drug that's sole intended purpose is the chemical inducement of an abortion.

Why is this important? First of all, if we go and look at the authorizing language to the Food and Drug Administration what we will find is that, in fact, its charge and its mission is to provide safety and efficacy for life and health. There is nothing about the chemical inducement of an abortion that is safe, either for the mother or for the unborn child. The other reason that this is important is that it violates the very premise under which the FDA was authorized.

What this amendment would do is it would limit the expenditure of Federal funds by the Food and Drug Administration in their efforts to approve drugs whose sole purpose is to terminate life, to take the life of an unborn child.

One of the things that has come to light over the last 3 years that now cannot be disputed scientifically is that we have an ever enlarging number of women who encounter breast cancer. And although it is not politically correct in our culture today, the fact is that having an abortion markedly increases one's risk for breast cancer. There are now 10 out of 11 studies that prove that without a shadow of a doubt. An analysis of all those studies combined, plus other studies, show that there is a 30 percent increase in the risk for breast cancer.

We have funded through this Congress and many others marked research in breast cancer. We just passed a breast cancer and cervical cancer bill through this House with the whole goal to extend the life of these women. It would seem fitting to me that we would not want to allow the FDA to go down a course in which their whole intended purpose is to take the life of the unborn child.

The other thing that is important in this is that drugs that are intended solely for this purpose are intended so to take the life of a child under 9 weeks of age. We also have irrefutable evidence that now an unborn child at 19 days post conception has a heartbeat, and at 41 days post conception has brain waves.

If we look at our definition of death in this country and we say that the absence of brain waves and the absence of a heartbeat is death, then certainly the opposite of that is life. So what we are talking about is taking unborn life. Whether we fight about when life begins or not, we know it is present at 41 days. So we are talking about authorizing an agency of the Federal Government to figure out how best to provide a drug to take that life.

1700

That is not what this country is about, it is not what this bill should be about, and I would ask that the Members support this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today, once again, in opposition to the Coburn Amendment that would limit FDA testing on the drug Mifepristone or RU–486. As Congressman COBURN has tried year after year, this amendment, as drafted, would limit FDA testing on any drug that might induce miscarriage, including drugs that treat cancer, ulcers and rheumatoid arthritis.

Although this debate is truly about the FDA's ability to test, research and approve any drug based on sound scientific evidence, I find this continual assault on a women's choice and right to control her body frustrating, to put it lightly.

Just yesterday, the Supreme Court upheld a woman's right to choose whether or not an abortion is right for her, without the State enacting undue restrictions. By ruling the Nebraska ''partial birth'' ban unconstitutional, the Court reiterated that *Roe* v. *Wade* is still the law of the land and cannot be undermined with ambiguous anti-abortion language.

The Supreme Court's decision spotlights the judicial branch's role in protecting and preserving the reproductive rights of American women as the Constitution provided. In a similar vein, the Federal Drug Administration is charged with determining whether a drug is safe and effective without political interference. However, Mr. COBURN's Amendment would interject politics into this process with no regard to the health and well being of women in the country.

Mifepristone is a proven safe drug that has been used in France since 1988 after the French Minister of Health declared Ru–486 ''the moral property of women,'' thus showing the enlightened state of affairs in France that continues to elude this country.

However, Mifespristone has continually satisfied the FDA's safety requirement in 1996 based on clinical trials and after two favorable letters it is expected to receive final approval soon.

Although Mifepristone was developed as a drug that induces chemical miscarriage, I am more concerned about its other potential uses in treating conditions such as infertility, ectopic pregnancy, endometriosis, uterine fibroids and breast cancer.

The problem with characterizing this amendment as an abortion drug is that Mifepristone has the potential for so many other uses. Thus if we only highlight one use of Mifepristone, then we might as well do the same for chemotherapy drugs which can also cause miscarriage.

Yet, because of the FDA's arduous approval process, many drugs have been found to be safe and effective, notwithstanding their potential usefulness in inducing miscarriage.

Thus, if we go by the Coburn standard, most of these drugs would have not been developed, and future drugs may be jeopardized. Research of potential treatments for each of these conditions is crucial to women's health. Controversy concerning this particular drug should not be a barrier to treatment.

Science should dictate what drugs are approved by the FDA, not politics. Congress has never instructed the FDA to approve or disapprove a drug. The FDA protocol for drug approval depends upon rigorous and objective scientific evaluation of a drug's safety. Ultimately, this is a decision that should be made by the researchers and doctors.

This amendment could jeopardize the integrity of the FDA approval process. Under this

process, a company that wants to begin clinical trials on a new drug must submit an application for FDA approval. If that application has not been approved within 30 days, the company may move forward.

This amendment would prevent the FDA from reviewing any application for a drug that might induce miscarriage. No funds would be available for the FDA to even oversee any trials.

Therefore, I urge my Colleagues to oppose this amendment. We cannot afford to inhibit research on certain health conditions based upon the controversy of the particular drug. We also cannot allow the FDA to be limited in its ability to approve drugs based on politics.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Coburn amendment.

Since being elected to Congress eight years ago, I have been working with many of my colleagues for the right of all women in the United States to have safe, healthy alternatives to surgical abortions.

While we've seen RU–486 become available in Europe, we're still fighting for expanded research, development, and availability of drugs for medical abortions, like RU–486, here in the United States.

Even worse, in Congress we continue to face these outrageous efforts by the far right to block the Food and Drug Administration's approval of RU–486.

I'm sad to say it, but the Coburn amendment is the same attack that conservatives have tried every year.

Mr. Chairman, pure and simple, the Coburn amendment is an attack on a woman's right to make decisions that affect her health.

It seeks to deny a woman's right to safe medicines like RU–486 even when faced with a crisis pregnancy.

Furthermore, I ask my colleagues to realize that by prohibiting the FDA from approving these medicines—This amendment will also have a life-threatening impact on other women and men.

It harms those who have medical conditions, such as tumors, that can be treated with drugs like RU–486.

We cannot let the far right stand in the way of women's health or patients' lives.

I urge my colleagues—vote against the Coburn amendment!

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the implications on research if this amendment passes. Scientific study and preliminary evidence show Mifepristone (RU–486) has significant promise for the treatment of: Breast Cancer, Ovarian Cancer, Prostate Cancer, Cushing's Disease (a Pituitary Gland Disorder), Meningioma (benign brain tumors), and Ectopic Pregnancy.

If we block the FDA from testing or approving mifepristone, we may be penalizing thousands of Americans who have nothing to do with the abortion issue.

I feel this vote has greater ramifications than just abortion.

I am also concerned about preserving the scientific integrity of the FDA's drug approval process.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 538, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 47 offered by Mr. ROYCE:
Page 96, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. ACROSS-THE-BOARD PERCENTAGE REDUCTION.

Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by one percent.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this year's agricultural appropriations bill is below last year's level, and I applaud the chairman for his efforts on that. However, even more reductions can be made in this bill, and should be made, because, frankly, Congress should continue to cut government waste.

Just a few weeks ago, the President signed into law a $15.3 billion crop insurance and emergency farm package. That measure marks the third big bill out of the agricultural economy in the last 3 years.

Now, this emergency bill amounts to a mini-farm bill affecting most divisions of the agricultural department and sprinkling pet programs to special interest groups. In effect, Congress has been passing more than one agricultural appropriations bill each year; we have been passing two.

In fiscal year 1999, Congress passed $6.6 billion in supplemental assistance. So far in fiscal year 2000, Congress has passed four different measures amounting to $15 billion in emergency agricultural spending, and this includes the $210 million of emergency spending attached to the military construction supplemental passed by this House just before the July 4th recess. Not even into fiscal year 2001 yet, Congress has already passed $1.6 billion in emergency funding.

Mr. Chairman, Congress cannot afford to past two appropriations bills for agriculture each and every year.

Since late 1998, Congress has allotted $22 billion in disaster market loss payments to growers, roughly doubling the subsidies promised under the 1996 Freedom to Farm law. Lawmakers are beginning to use this annual ritual of emergency packages as their vehicle of choice for moving pet projects.

Under the guise of a national emergency, Congress rams through emergency spending bills full of unnecessary, unwanted, unauthorized, unmitigated pork. The emergency package for Colombia-Kosovo and disaster relief included millions for a Coast Guard jet, for instance, for Alaska. It included money for an ice breaker and other egregious pork. If we do not cut back now, our senior citizens will pay the bills when Medicare or Social Security runs dry, and that is not a legacy any one of us wants to live with.

The Department of Agriculture in its current configuration still reflects the needs of an America that existed prior to the industrial revolution. These Depression-era programs still work to prop up commodity prices.

Most agriculture spending aimed at farmers is based on a restrictive centralized planning system. Sixty percent of farm payments goes to 15 percent of the farmers with gross sales in excess of $100,000. Very little of these price supports goes to those who really need it, the small family farmers.

Attempts to manipulate markets and subsidize the economic life of a group of businessmen only harm consumers and farmers. Programs dedicated to agriculture comprise 34 percent of the Department's budget. The remainder goes to forestry, rural development, and welfare.

Back in 1862, when Abraham Lincoln created this agency, five out of 10 American workers were employed in agriculture. Well, that is no longer the case today; yet the Agriculture Department is the fourth largest agency in the President's cabinet, behind Defense, Veterans and Treasury. There is now about one bureaucrat for every six full-time farmers, and not a single one of these bureaucrats helps crops grow.

I support a gradual and consistent reduction in this appropriations bill. We have made progress in the 1996 reforms, but we need to do more; and we need to ensure that these reforms stay put. We must continue to wean agricultural special interests from their dependence on the Federal Government.

My amendment is supported by Citizens Against Government Waste. A 1 percent across-the-board reduction will save American taxpayers $750 million next year alone. It is my hope that this money will go to debt reduction.

Again, the chairman has done an admirable job, but more can be done; and saving one penny on every dollar is the very least we can do. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the process associated with the appropriation is long. It includes oversight hearings and evaluations of many proposals. The subcommittee reviewed detailed budget requests and asked several thousand questions for the record. In addition, the subcommittee received over 2,900 individual requests for spending considerations from Members of the House.

The funding presented in this year's bill represents the culmination of

many months of work by the subcommittee. The gentleman has not been specifically involved in the process.

The gentleman's amendment moves to arbitrarily cut funding without any consideration to the merit or value of the needs facing American agriculture. This approach ignores the methodical process that the committee used to fund the line items in this bill.

If the gentleman were truly interested in reducing the bill in a logical manner, he would identify the specific programs and accounts that should be reduced with his amendment. Then we could have a valuable debate on the individual merits of the funding proposal. But the gentleman's amendment simply employs the Draconian reduction approach to the discretionary portion of the bill, with little understanding as to its negative impact on vital programs funded by this bill.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is one of the best substitutes for thinking that I have seen on the floor in quite some time. The gentleman has given as one of his reasons for proposing this 1 percent cut the fact that he does not like the fact that there are some agriculture commodity supplementals that have been passed by the Congress. The fact is, those are not in this bill. They do not have diddly to do with this bill. They ought to be in this bill, because, I promise you, before the Congress is finished, it will respond to the problem on the farm with respect to prices.

The Senate has already passed $1.2 billion in additional assistance to farmers who are being crippled by low prices, thanks to the spectacular failure of the Freedom to Farm Act; and before this bill is finished, the House will have to accept some of what the Senate is talking about with respect to dairy funding, with respect to livestock funding and the rest.

But the fact is, right now the bill the gentleman is trying to cut does not contain those items, and because he does not like the fact that somewhere along the line those items might be funded, he apparently is willing to cut funding for child nutrition, to cut funding for agencies that protect the public against diseased food and items like that.

The gentleman would cut the regulation and safety of drugs and medical devices by FDA, he would cut rural water and sewer and housing and economic development, he would cut vital conservation programs on the farm, he would cut the APHIS program to help control plant and animal pests and diseases.

I just went through several national forests over the past 2 weeks and saw the incredible damage done to those forests by pests. In fact, I saw some spectacular damage in California. I would ask the gentleman whether he believes that pest control programs in California are really a waste of the taxpayers' money or not. It is destroying the timber harvests, it is destroying agricultural products of all kind, and, whether the gentleman recognizes it or not, forests are an agricultural product. At least they are seen that way by a lot of people who harvest forests for a living.

I would say that if the gentleman is comfortable in cutting USDA's Food Safety and Inspection Service, which is responsible for the inspection of meat and poultry, he may be comfortable doing that. I am not. If the gentleman is comfortable saying that 74,000 fewer low-income pregnant women and children will be served by the WIC program, he may be comfortable with that. I am not.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I think we ought to just let the chips fall where they may. I intend to oppose the amendment, and I would hope that other thoughtful Members of the House would as well.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and to just maybe clarify some of the statements made earlier.

The funding that was put in the supplemental was for hurricane damage. These are real emergencies. It has gone on now about a year, and without a vehicle to help the people out there that were so devastated last year.

I just want to remind the House also, the $15 billion bill that went through, that is spread out. The crop insurance portion of it is spread out over 5 years, and the intention is to have a crop insurance program in place policy-wise and funding-wise that is going to actually help farmers manage risk.

I think we have an extremely good product, and farmers will now have a vehicle where they can insure both price and yield risk, and hopefully the dependency for additional supplementals will be curbed dramatically in the future with that type of program in place. Also for livestock producers, it has a plan in there so that they can also cover both fatality and price risk.

So while I do not disagree with the intention of the gentleman, I think that we need to maintain fiscal sanity around here, but I have also heard over the 3 days of debate on this bill how this bill is currently underfunded to begin with. I think, like the gentleman from Wisconsin said, there are very vital services that are in this bill that would be dramatically harmed and programs that would be dramatically harmed with this type of cut.

I will say in reference to concern about the current farm policy that I do not know how one can say that our current farm bill really is responsible for the Asian financial collapse, where most of our major customers of the world have not been able to buy our products in the past few years. Fortunately, the economy in those areas is rebounding. Hopefully, the future will be better. I do not know how one can say anything about farm policy being the cause for 3 years of record worldwide production and surpluses. That simply is not the cause of what the price situation is as far as our grains are concerned, certainly.

Also when one looks at what our export policy is with the embargoes that we have on 40 percent of the world's population today, they are totally wrong and also have a great effect as far as the prices we see in agriculture.

So while I will match my record with anyone as far as being fiscally responsible here, I think this is ill conceived, will do a great amount of damage, and I would certainly hope that the House would reject it.

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

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make to the House and the point I would like to make to the gentleman is that the actual economic loss from the weather-related disasters that the gentleman has cited was $1.5 billion. Congress responded to this by adding $4.2 billion in emergency disaster relief. This is the impulse that I am trying to check with this amendment, to cut 1 percent, because I think this has been the response; and it has been overly generous in terms of what it has done with the taxpayers' funds.

1715

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I agree with the gentleman that the problem was at that time that not all of the losses in the agriculture sector were known. If we talk to the Members from North Carolina, from the South who were dramatically affected, there are additional costs, and I think there was $210 million in the supplemental to address those issues that were not addressed previously.

Again, I agree with the gentleman that we have to make sure that we keep a handle on spending, but certainly there was a real emergency and there continues to be because a lot of needs were not addressed previously.

So I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to stand in opposition to the gentleman from California's amendment. I would agree with the gentleman that ad hoc disaster assistance payments on an annual or even sometimes more than an annual basis is not the way to run a good railroad here. I think the reason we have had to do that is because we have had a failed national agricultural policy called Freedom to Farm.

However, the gentleman's amendment does not deal with that problem; what his amendment does is go after

such programs as Federal food safety programs, the APHIS programs which control the pests and diseases which we have all talked about here in the last month or two, such things as plum pox and citrus canker and glassy wing sharpshooter, and all of those sorts of invasive pests that come from other countries which the APHIS has the responsibility of keeping out of this country.

The regulation of safety and drugs and medical devices by the FDA would be cut by this gentleman's amendment; nutrition programs for children and the elderly; housing, water and sewer, and economic development programs available in rural and small town America; conservation programs of vital importance; those are the programs that the amendment cuts.

So I would implore the gentleman from California, Mr. Chairman. If he would like to work with us on improving the national agricultural policy of this Nation, I would very much like to do that, but I do not believe that this amendment is the right way to go, and I urge its defeat.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California is rightly concerned about expenditures growing. I have mixed emotions on how to cut Federal spending.

In this case, if I could call on the gentleman from California, I would inquire, does he have an idea of the millions of dollars that this is going to cut from some important programs. The answer is roughly $145 million. $145 million that is going to come out of the Food and Drug Administration, that is going to come from food safety programs, that is going to come out of reductions to the farm service agencies that already are having difficulty serving farmers like they should. All the regulations that we have developed in this country are now overwhelming those county offices. So I am particularly concerned about the ability of farmers to receive help in keeping up with all of the rules and the regulations. This amendment would cut other farmer assistance programs.

Mr. Chairman, we are faced with a serious situation where other countries of the world are helping and subsidizing their farmers 5 times as much as we are; for example, in Europe. So how, when they subsidize their farmers to that level, can we cut spending, even by the one percent suggested.

We are going to have to make a decision. Do we want to keep agricultural production and the agriculture industry in this country alive and well, or are we going to let that industry fade. I say that we better think very carefully, not just this Congress, but the American people better think very carefully about whether we want to produce our own food and fiber in this country; whether we want to know that it is produced in a safe way; whether we want the freshness and reliable supply.

In this case, I speak very strongly against the amendment. We do need to increase the efficiency of U.S. Department of Agriculture operations, however it is a disservice to farmers to take $145 million out of the discretionary spending of the agriculture budget.

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 538, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 36 offered by Mr. CROWLEY:

Insert before the short title the following title:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the amounts made available in this Act for the Food and Drug Administration may be expended to enforce or otherwise carry out section 801(d)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, working with the House Committee on Government Reform's minority office and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and myself conducted a study of the cost that seniors in our congressional districts pay for their prescription drugs versus the cost paid by their counterparts in Canada and Mexico for the exact same drugs. Both the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and I were startled by the results, to say the least.

We found that seniors in our districts in New York pay, on average, 91 percent more than seniors in Canada and 89 percent more than seniors in Mexico for the exact same drugs; twice as much for the exact same drugs, same dosage, same in every way, expect price. We did not study arcane drugs not used in the real world to skew our data, but rather the 5 most popular prescription drugs sold to seniors in the U.S. today: Zocor, Prilosec, Procardia, Zoloft, and Norvasc.

Let me put it in perspective. I have a constituent in Long Island City, New York who has to purchase 100 capsules of Prilosec every 3 months for his wife. He pays almost $400 for these drugs. I have a letter from the gentleman who writes, ''Isn't it an outrage for us to pay this price for medication my wife will have to take on a regular basis.''

Well, my answer to that gentleman is yes, it is an outrage, especially in light of the fact that this same drug that costs $400 in Queens, New York would have cost him $107 in Mexico and $184 in Canada.

Similar results were borne out by a number of other studies conducted throughout the United States, studies which mirrored the results that the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and I saw in our respective districts. But if my constituent or any American went to Mexico or Canada to buy this drug and tried to bring them back over the border into the United States, he or she would be committing a Federal crime and could theoretically be punished for that crime.

The only thing criminal I see are these extremely high prices that they are forced to pay for drugs in the United States. Mr. Chairman, $400 for Prilosec, a drug that was researched, patented and manufactured here in the United States. It begs the question, Mr. Chairman: why is Prilosec cheaper in Canada and Mexico than here in the United States where it was made and developed in the first place? It is because in the United States the major drug manufacturers practice price discrimination whereby they charge those least able to pay, such as seniors on a fixed income, more for their medications than they charge others such as HMOs and large hospitals, that enjoy sweetheart deals with the drug manufacturers.

Price discrimination is illegal in Canada and in Mexico. That is why I am offering this amendment today, to highlight the practice of price discrimination by the pharmaceutical industry that is being used against millions of American seniors who need prescription drug medication. More simply put, Mr. Chairman, Americans are being gouged by the American pharmaceutical industry.

I go about trying to stop this practice of price discrimination by prohibiting funding to enforce Section 801(d)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. Currently, this section of Federal law restricts the rights of an individual to cross across international borders to purchase one's prescription drugs. This amendment will not only allow border residents to travel, but also force this Congress to confront and stop the practice of price discrimination in the pharmaceutical industry.

Mr. Chairman, I hear from my constituents all the time about the high cost paid by them for medications. That further reinforces my determination for this Congress to pass legislation mandating the inclusion of a prescription drug benefit under the Medicare program. Unfortunately, the seniors of America did not get that before

the recess, despite all of the rhetoric from the other side of the aisle.

So I offer this amendment as a first step towards the assistance of America's seniors. Prescription drug medications are not a luxury, they are a necessity. Sometimes we forget that here as we enjoy our generous taxpayer-subsidized, top-of-the-line health insurance.

Let me make clear what my amendment will and will not do so as not to confuse the debate. It will decriminalize seniors who must travel south of the border to purchase their prescription drugs. It will highlight the fact that seniors in America are the continued victims of price discrimination which this GOP-controlled Congress continues to ignore. It will continue to prohibit the importation in the United States of non FDA-approved drugs that could be dangerous.

This amendment does not weaken inspection standards for the importation of foreign-made drugs into the U.S. At no time does this amendment change the existing Federal regulations regarding the importation of foreign manufactured drugs into the U.S. This amendment will not weaken the ability of our government to inspect and seize illegal narcotics being brought into the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) insist on his point of order?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Although it is well-intentioned, this amendment will go far beyond its stated purpose. The amendment would eliminate the ability of the Food and Drug Administration to trace a drug back to the original manufacturer. It is in opposition to the intention of Congress as expressed in the Prescription Drug Marketing Act of 1987 and, most significantly, this amendment may harm the very people the gentleman intends to help.

The amendment assumes that all drugs with the same name are, in fact, the same. Let me assure my colleagues that this is not the case when dealing with imported drugs. There are many ways in which a drug may differ from one that one would pick up at one's pharmacy. Drugs that look legitimate may be counterfeit, sub-potent or contaminated. There is a great profit, and great potential harm, in counterfeit drugs. This amendment would severely hamper the efforts of the Food and Drug Administration inspectors to stop counterfeit drugs.

The amendment further assumes that drug regulation in other countries brings the same measure of safety that drug regulation in the United States brings. This is a false assumption. There is a reason that U.S. drug approval is considered the ''gold standard.'' The FDA scientists inspect all manufacturing facilities and set standards for storage and handling of the drug. There is great variability in the quality controls on manufacturing throughout the world. It seems absurd that without any FDA inspection, consumers would take complex drugs made in countries in which they would not drink the water.

The amendment takes a shotgun approach to a very specific economic problem. It is not a solution that gives priority to people's health. In fact, it puts their health at risk. Is it fair for certain members of society, because of economic concerns, to have a lesser assurance of drug safety? Taking risks with drugs is not the way to solve an economic problem.

I would encourage my colleagues to address those concerns in other prescription drug discussions, and not in this bill.

1730

When we take medication and are confident in its safe and effective use, we have the regulatory system that we have created to thank. I urge Members to keep the system strong and fair for all Americans by voting no on this amendment.

Mr. COBURN. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for this amendment. I believe the gentleman from New York has hit on an issue that we talked about during the prescription drug debate.

I want to carry it a little further. The drug that he utilized, one of those, is Prilosec. There are three drugs on the market to compete with that in the United States. They all do essentially the same thing. Prilosec is about to go off patent. It is a $5.9 billion per year drug, per year.

Of the two drugs that have come to market to compete with it, they are priced exactly the same. To me, that smells like no competition, it smells like a wink and a nod. Why, in a market that is a $6 billion market, would there not be any price competition for a drug that does essentially the same thing?

I believe there may be some legitimate concerns about minimal packaging or safety, but the thing we need to remember is that this amendment is directed towards drugs made in this country, shipped to Canada and then come back, or into Mexico and then come back. So these are drugs that have already been licensed, they have been manufactured in an FDA facility, and in fact they should be, under NAFTA, readily coming across our border without any inhibition whatever if there is a bona fide prescription for that drug in this country.

We have a crisis in prescription drugs, but it is not a crisis in Medicare, it is a crisis in price. The reason we have the crisis in price is there is not adequate competition in the pharmaceutical industry.

I would direct the Members of this body to go to the FTC's website where they have identified four manufacturers over the last year raising the cost for prescription drugs close to $1 billion on four separate drugs because they colluded with people to not bring other drugs to market. They were actually paying their competitors not to bring drugs to market.

So I believe the gentleman from New York has a wonderful idea. I believe it is an appropriate idea. I think the safety concerns are a red herring. There are not the safety concerns because they are actually manufactured in this country. The FDA will not have any limitations on it.

As far as traceability, we are going to be able to trace these drugs like any other drug. They are not going to be allowed to be sold in Canada with a prescription unless we can trace it and keep a record, just as in this country. There will be completely the same types of regulations in terms of pharmaceuticals.

As a practicing physician that sees that people cannot afford their medicines today, we have to do something. The first thing we need to do is to start competition. If the Justice Department is not going to investigate the pharmaceutical industry, we should be doing this and passing this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will certainly support this amendment, but I must say that I will be amused to see those persons in this Chamber who will today vote for this amendment who just a short time ago voted to prevent us from being able to directly attack the problem of pricing for prescription drugs.

The fact is if this amendment passes what we will be saying is that, for instance, American senior citizens will not have to worry about whether they are being penalized when they go to Canada to buy drugs that are cheaper than they would be if they bought the very same brand name product in the United States.

To me, if this House wants to do something really significant, it would pass the Allen bill, which would simply require that in addition to providing a prescription drug benefit for all seniors under Medicare, that it would also guarantee that Medicare would be able to assure that drug prices charged to Medicare and to senior citizens under Medicare would have to be at the same lower price that drug companies make available their products to their most favored volume customers. That is what we really ought to do.

This amendment goes as far as it can go, but I would say that I do not think seniors should be fooled that they have gotten much help from folks who vote for this amendment who last week voted against our being able to expand Medicare coverage for every single

American, and, for that matter, to attack the price issue at the same time.

Senior citizens should not have to leave America in order to be treated like Americans. They ought to be able to get the right treatment here at home, and they would if this Congress had guts enough to take on the pharmaceutical industry. It does not, so I guess this is the best we are able to do under the circumstances.

That is not the fault of the gentleman who offers the amendment, but it is the fault of every other Member of this House who chose last week to make a decision that prevented us from providing real direct help to seniors on the issue of prescription drug price. I do not think that many seniors are going to be fooled by people who will cast that vote last week and then run to embrace this amendment this week. I think they will recognize tokenism when they see it.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, as well. It is really critical that we do something about the discrepancy in prices of prescription drugs in Mexico, Canada, and even in Europe as far as the prices that our senior citizens in rural Missouri are getting. We do not live close to any of the borders, just like the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) said.

However, I have got more constituents than I can mention, and one comes to mind whose son has a very severe case of epilepsy. The only way she can afford the epilepsy medicine is to go to Canada to get it. It is a big problem because she is always scared of being punished by this government for having to do that, but she wants her son to be well, and she otherwise could not afford the drugs. So this is very important.

This is very similar to the legislation that the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and I introduced, the International Prescription Drug Parity Act, which would allow wholesalers, distributors, and pharmacists to reimport drugs back into the United States, subject to FDA safety regulations. It is very important because we must deal with the issue of price before we deal with the issue of prescription drug coverage. I think most people would agree with that.

I do, however, want to ask the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) a couple of things, particularly with regard to the safety factor, because I cannot tell from the way his amendment is written if it is as tough with regard to safety as our legislation is.

Would the gentleman tell me about how the FDA would oversee or regulate the drugs that are reimported back into the United States, if he would?

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. This will not weaken the inspection standards for the importation of foreign-made drugs into the United States.

I understand the Committee on Commerce held hearings last month in June to address the concerns that the FDA had only inspected 25 percent of foreign drug manufacturers who brought medications by import into the United States.

My amendment will not weaken the FDA here at all, or even hamper their inspection services with regard to the foreign-made drugs being imported into the U.S. My amendment deals only with the reimportation, reimportation of American-made FDA-approved drugs back into the United States.

In fact, by taking the FDA out of the business of harassing seniors, the FDA might be able to free up additional resources to make sure what is being firsthand imported into America from abroad is safe for human consumption.

Additionally, by striking funding from the statute, we will not be opening up the borders for a free flow of non-FDA imported drugs to be brought into the United States. Section 21 of the U.S. Code states that it is illegal to bring non-FDA-approved drugs into the U.S.

My amendment does not change that law in any way. In fact, I understand why Section 801(d)1 was added to the law. Unfortunately, as of late, its interpretation has not been used to protect American consumers, but rather, large drug manufacturers, instead.

Mrs. EMERSON. I commend the gentleman and appreciate very much his explanation of the whole issue of safety, because we have got to get a handle on this issue once and for all, and I cannot bear to tell my constituents one more time that if they go to Canada or if they go to Mexico, they can get this drug for one-third to two-thirds less than they would pay here.

It is not fair for those people, and it is not fair that our American consumers are subsidizing the rest of the world. I thank the gentleman and I urge, again, strong support for this amendment.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Last week the House did take some action late one night, I think Thursday night or 1½ weeks ago, that will begin to open this door. But this issue needs to be talked about a lot by this Congress.

I have a chart here which sort of demonstrates the problem. Many of us in the last week have had town hall meetings back in our districts or have met with senior citizens. We had one in my district, and I learned or relearned what we have been hearing before.

That is one example of one of my constituents who was traveling in Europe. Her traveling partner needed to get a prescription refilled. The prescription here in the United States is $120. The price of having that prescription filled in Europe for the same drug made in the same plant by the same company under the same FDA approval was $32.

This person has to take that drug, has to have it refilled every month, so the savings of about $90 a month times 12 works out to about $1,000 a year. The differences between what Americans pay and what the rest of the world pays for the same drugs is just outrageous.

Let us take a drug like Coumadin. My 82-year-old father takes Coumadin. It is a blood thinner, a very commonly prescribed drug. Here in the United States, the average price is about $30.25 for a 30-day supply. That same drug made in the same plant by the same company under the same FDA approval in Europe sells for only $2.85.

Mr. Speaker, we have a serious problem right now. Part of the problem is that Americans are paying a disproportionate share of the cost for research and ultimately I think a disproportionate share of the profits for the large pharmaceutical companies.

It would be easy for us as a Congress to sit here and blame the pharmaceutical companies and say, shame on them. But the truth of the matter is that it is shame on us. It is shame on us for allowing this to continue. It is shame on our own FDA because, in view of these huge differentials, we would think that the FDA would be doing something to help senior citizens and other American consumers.

The fact of the matter is that our own FDA is making matters worse. These are excerpts from an actual letter sent to a senior citizen, a very threatening letter that in effect says if they continue to do this, we believe they may be in violation of Federal law and we may have to come after them.

If someone is an 82-year-old senior citizen taking Coumadin or Synthroid or some of these other commonly-prescribed drugs and trying to save some money by getting them either through Mexico, Canada, or Europe, the last thing our Federal Government ought to do is threaten us, especially when those drugs are absolutely legal, they are FDA-approved, and the problem is the FDA has put the burden of proof on the consumer.

Finally, I support this legislation or this amendment here today, as well, because in many respects our Justice Department has failed, as well. It has failed in its oversight responsibilities to make certain that there is adequate competition and that there is not collusion between the large pharmaceutical companies.

It is not just shame on the pharmaceutical companies, it is shame on us, it is shame on the FDA, it is shame on the Justice Department. It is time that this Congress sends a very clear message that the game is over. We are not going to continue to subsidize the

starving Swiss, we are not going to continue to subsidize the rest of the world in terms of prescription drugs, especially when our own seniors have to make very difficult decisions every day in terms of whether or not they are going to get the prescriptions that they need or the food they should have.

That is simply wrong, and we should not allow it to continue. I hope we can pass this amendment tonight to send one more clear message to the folks at FDA, the folks at Justice, and the people around the world that the game is over.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Crowley amendment.

1745

Mr. Chairman, I deeply support the Crowley amendment, and I am glad to see that many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle also believe that we need to overturn the current FDA prohibition on U.S. citizens traveling to other countries to purchase prescription drugs manufactured in our country solely for individual use.

This important amendment is to decriminalize seniors who travel to Canada and Mexico for cheaper prescription drugs. I might also add that I strongly support the bill put forward by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) which would make seniors the same preferred customers as HMOs and also the President's plan to expand Medicare to cover prescription drugs.

These are all important measures, but this is an important amendment that addresses the issue of price discrimination being practiced by the drug manufacturers today.

In my home State of New York, breast cancer medications can cost over $100 per prescription while they are available in Canada and Mexico to their residents for a tenth of that price. Many women in our home State and, indeed, across the country are forced to dilute their prescriptions that fight breast cancer, to cut their pills in half because they cannot afford their prescription drugs in order to get by financially. And many in my home State get on the bus every weekend to go to Canada to purchase American manufactured drugs because it is cheaper than in their own country.

Mr. Chairman, this is just plain wrong. No doctor recommends it. No person deserves this type of treatment. They should be charged, at the very least, the same that the foreign governments are charging their citizens.

Recently, I conducted a study on price discrimination on consumers in the district that I represent which is Manhattan, East and West side, and Astoria, Queens, and compared the prices that were paid by consumers in other Nations, Mexico and Canada. I must add I was assisted in this by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the staff of the Committee on Government Reform, and what we found was absolutely shocking.

We asked them to look at a total of eight drugs and compared the average costs in my district with the average costs paid by consumers in Mexico and Canada, and the drugs included in the study were some of the most widely prescribed drugs today. To take one example, the breast cancer drug Tamoxifen. Tamoxifen is sold under the brand name of Nolvadex, and it is the most frequently prescribed breast cancer drug in this Nation.

It is used by thousands of women across my State, across this Nation, across the country to treat early and advanced breast cancer. In fact, in 1998, the total sales of Tamoxifen were over $520 million. Yet women in this country who need Tamoxifen must pay 10 times what seniors in Canada pay.

Our studies showed that a 1-month supply of Tamoxifen costs only $9 in Canada, yet it costs over $109 in my district. This means that over the course of a year, women in my district will pay roughly 1,200 more than a woman in Canada. That is a price differential of over 10,000 percent.

This is a very important lifesaving drug that thousands of women need to survive. It is simply outrageous that drug companies are taking advantage of men and women suffering from this horrible disease.

But Tamoxifen is not the only drug that costs more in New York than in Canada and probably every other State in our country. In fact, all eight of the drugs which we studied costs at least 40 percent more in my district than they do abroad. The average price differential with Canada was 112 percent; with Mexico, it was 108 percent.

Prilosec, which is the top selling drug in the Nation, it is used for heartburn and ulcers, in the last 10 years, according to the manufacturer, more than 120 million prescriptions have been written for this drug, yet seniors and other consumers in my district they have to pay over $800 more each year for Prilosec than the consumers in Canada. Over $1,000 dollars more than seniors in Mexico.

Zocor, which is one of the most common cholesterol-reducing drugs in this country with over 15 million prescriptions in 1998, costs almost three times as much in my district as it does in Canada, and that is a difference of over $70 per month.

I would urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Crowley amendment, it is long overdue, and also the Allen amendment, the President's plan and others to bring drug fairness into this country.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will divide the time evenly between the proponent of the amendment and the opponent of the amendment. The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) each will control 10 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for his leadership on this important issue. We have an incredible situation, where those who are least able to pay for the important prescription medications that they require, our uninsured seniors and uninsured families, in fact, of all ages across the country, are asked to pay the highest prices for their prescription medications of any place in the entire world.

This burden has been imposed on those least able to pay and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) has come forward with a constructive proposal that will at least benefit those, who are near the Canadian and Mexican borders, since Canada does not impose price discrimination.

I think it is, however, very important to recognize that while Canada does not encourage price discrimination, this House has encouraged price discrimination. I have on two separate occasions with my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) advanced before the Committee on Ways and Means proposals that would permit seniors, not just to get on a bus to Canada or Mexico, but would allow them in their own neighborhood pharmacy to get prescription medications, as the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) has proposed, at the price that the pharmaceutical companies make those available to their most favored customers.

Unfortunately, every single Republican on the Committee on Ways and Means has joined with the pharmaceutical industry in saying no, in saying that it is right to continue charging our seniors, who are uninsured, more than anyone else in the world. So I applaud the effort of the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), but by blocking our proposal in committee, by blocking the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) when he offered the proposal last week, as Republicans presented not a Medicare prescription drug plan, but a political ploy here on the eve of the election, seniors have been denied the relief that they so desperately need. And this House has been denied the opportunity to extend to all Americans what the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) would tonight extend at least to those near the Canadian and Mexican borders to gain access to bring more reasonably priced medications.

Last week, I joined with some seniors in central Texas to explore this issue of at all places, the Austin Humane Society. I learned through a study that we conducted that in this country if you have four legs and a tail and need a particular prescription drug, if you can say meow or woof or arf, you get a much better deal on prescriptions than if you are simply a senior, who is in serious need of medication.

I know that the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and others have made similar findings in other parts of the country. We demonstrated that on one very important arthritis drug, Lodine, for example, that the manufacturer is charging 188 percent more to those who would use the exact same quality and quantity for animals, for a dog, a cat or a horse or a cow, than it does for a senior, who lacks insurance.

I think that such price discrimination is wrong, the kind of discrimination that says it is okay for the same quality and quantity and type of drugs for manufacturers price to charge the wholesaler 188 percent more than for an individual, a senior, who is in need of that drug. That is the kind of price discrimination that groups masquerading under names like Citizens for Better Medicare, which really is a front for the pharmaceutical industry, are imposing on us.

Tonight the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) proposes that we do just a little bit about it, and I encourage the House to adopt his approach, but hope that eventually we can move on to a broader proposal like that advanced by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

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

Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand the concerns of my colleague from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), and I do not feel that a restriction on a regulatory agency is the way to achieve prescription drug price reform.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak in favor of the amendment, and I do so with the greatest respect, of course, to the committee upon which I serve. But if we look at the seniors who are having to go across the border to get prescription drugs and other people who need it, they are not doing this because it is convenient, they are not doing it because they want to, they are not doing it because they want to support a Canadian pharmacy. They are doing it because they have to economically.

My dad is from Buffalo, New York, and I went to school in Michigan, and I know on those border States there is a lot of economic overlap and social overlap and everything else, and so for them to go to Canada to get cheaper drugs is not that unusual. But then imagine being 82 years old and getting a letter like this that says, however, future shipments of these or similar drugs may be refused admissions; that is very disturbing if we have to take something for high cholesterol or something for a heart condition. What am I doing?

These people are World War II veterans. They do not want to go around breaking the law, and that is what the implication is from FDA once they get it.

Mr. Chairman, look at these price differences. I think we cannot expect people who can save as much as 50 percent on a drug not to take advantage of it and to go overseas. But the second question about this is why are the drugs so less expensive in Canada than they are here, and I think that is where it becomes a universal quest for States that are not on the border. I mean, we need to know how come we can get Prozac for $18.50 and over here, it is $36. For Claritin, $44 versus $8.75. Prilosec, $109 versus $39.25.

We owe it to our constituents. Even if they are in Iowa, in the middle of the country geographically, if we are in a central State, domestically, in the United States of America, we would still need to know and we need to be able to tell our constituents why these drug prices are so different.

That is why I am supporting this amendment. I think, number one, we have to give people on the border States an opportunity; number two, we have to explore what are these differences, and this will help promote that debate.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that is before us this afternoon brings in the sharp relief the anomaly that exists with respect to the cost of prescription drugs in North America. It simply is unconscionable that if we travel to Mexico or to Canada we can buy prescription drugs for dramatically less than we can here within the United States.

It is unacceptable that seniors, who are the most vulnerable, who have the least in terms of resources to pay for these prescription drugs are the ones that are victimized to the greatest extent by this situation.

It is also an irony that is not lost on the seniors in this country that their pets can access these same prescription drugs for dramatically less than they can.

1800

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the comments of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle that have spoken in favor of the Crowley amendment, and I urge that all of our colleagues join in supporting this amendment to the appropriations bill.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the sponsor of this amendment, let me say that I am somewhat surprised at the support that this amendment has received from the other side of the aisle. I am astounded, quite frankly. I appreciate the support of many of the individuals who have spoken to me, some of whom are friends of mine from the other side of the aisle. I appreciate their comments on the floor. In no way do I believe that they are not being sincere at this point in time.

But just under 2 weeks ago, we stood here on this floor; and we passed a bill that I call to the floor a sham; and I continue to call that bill a sham.

The amendment that my colleagues have before them today is really of very little consequence, and I am the sponsor of this amendment. It basically takes away the authority of the FDA to prosecute any individual who reimports drugs that were made in this country. But it really is an attempt to shine a light on price discrimination in the United States.

But what this amendment does show, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, is the hypocrisy of this House at times. In 1 week we can pass a sham of a bill, and a week and a half later, come back and pass an amendment that in and of itself will not go far enough to help most of the seniors in this country who are not insured, seniors who struggle on a weekly basis to pay rent, to pay their bills.

My constituent from Jackson Heights, Ann Greenbaum, pays $300 for a particular drug that her son needs, the exact same drug, and pays $15 under his plan. I will not say how old Mrs. Greenbaum is. She is considerably older than her son. These are the individuals we are trying to help.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, will not help directly Ms. Greenbaum. What it does do, though, is highlight the hypocrisy of this House, how we can pass a bill that will not help the Mrs. Greenbaums of the world, will help some individuals, but certainly will not help enough.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 538, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 52 offered by Mr. ROYCE:
Strike section 741.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) reserves a point of order.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, the rationale behind this amendment is simple. Hard-working taxpayers should not have to subsidize the advertising costs of America's private corporations. In my view, that is what the Market Access Program does.

Since 1986, the Federal Government has extracted $2 billion from the taxpaying public and has spent it for advertising on the part of larger corporations and cooperatives in subsidies to basically underwrite their marketing programs in foreign countries.

I think the American people would agree that their money could be better spent on deficit reduction or education or the environment or tax cuts rather than these advertising budgets.

Originally, this bill contained a provision quietly inserted that would have allowed American tax dollars to be spent promoting the sale of luxury mink products in foreign countries. However, once we discovered their plan to expand eligibility in the MAP program, proponents reversed the course and agreed to strike the provision in the bill.

But an important question remains, if it is wrong to spend hard-earned American tax dollars on the promotion of mink products, why is it acceptable to spend those same tax dollars overseas to promote other products?

Last April, the GAO released an independent report, a report that was requested by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and myself and Senator SCHUMER. That report questioned the economic benefits of the foreign agricultural service study, which had advanced the arguments to begin with in the favor of this bill.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ROYCE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, what amendment are we debating?

Mr. ROYCE. Amendment number 52 to eliminate the Market Access Program.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is correct.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would just like to share that in the report the GAO determined that the Foreign Agricultural Service overstated the program's economic input, used a faulty methodology, which is inconsistent with Office of Management and Budget cost benefit guidelines.

The GAO also determined that the evidence contained within the relevant studies which estimate MAP's impact on specific markets is inconclusive. In fact, for every targeted market in which MAP funds demonstrated a positive effect, the studies found other target markets in which there was no discernible effect at all.

So various studies commissioned by Congress, commissioned by the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee have determined the economic benefits of the MAP program to be overstated, to be inconclusive, and to be speculative.

But even if one does believe the flawed studies used by the proponents, one has all the more reasons to support the amendment. Because if MAP works, then corporations and trade associations ought to be spending their own money on their advertising budgets. The taxpayers should not be spending it.

Finally, MAP proponents have argued that due to recent reforms, big corporations no longer receive MAP funds. It is true that, in order to correct some of the more egregious abuses of the Market Access Program of which we pointed out in the past, reforms were enacted that limit companies to 5 years of assistance in a particular country. After this time, companies were to be graduated from that country's market.

While in fact some of the corporations were graduated in 1998, the graduation requirements were waived for cooperatives. What was the result of that waiver? The result was that large corporations received the subsidies.

We simply do not need this wasteful program. Let us be honest. Most American businesses do not benefit and do not try to take advantage of government handouts like MAP. In the case of MAP, as in most corporate welfare programs, beneficiaries consist primarily of politically well-connected corporations and trade associations.

Most, if not all of these organizations, would advertise their products overseas even without MAP funds, and they probably would work much harder to ensure that the money is well spent.

Mr. Chairman, Congress should end the practice of wasting tax dollars on special interest spending programs that unfairly take money from hard-working families to help profitable private companies increase their bottom line.

MAP is a massive corporate welfare program in my opinion, and we should eliminate it. I urge the support of the amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) insist on his point of order?

Mr. SKEEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) proposes to strike from the bill a section already stricken on a point of order and, therefore, the amendment is not in order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, my question to the parliamentarian was whether offering amendment No. 51 or No. 52 would be in order. I believe he said 52. If I understand correctly, then the answer would have been No. 51.

It is amendment No. 51 that could be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) has the apologies of the Chair. In fact, the gentleman would be correct in offering amendment No. 51.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, that being the case, that concludes my opening arguments on amendment No. 51.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will entertain the offer of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate amendment No. 51.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 51 offered by Mr. ROYCE:
Page 96, after line 4, insert the following:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to award any new allocations under the market access program or to pay the salaries of personnel to award such allocations.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is a near-annual amendment, so I will not speak at length.

For many small companies in the United States, this program is the only way they have of promoting their products in markets overseas. Small companies cannot afford sophisticated marketing campaigns or presence overseas. The Market Access Program helps them reach those markets, increase their sales, increase employment, and, ultimately, benefit the farmers and ranchers that produce the raw materials.

I would also add, Mr. Chairman, that our competitors in Europe are spending far more than the authorized $90 million a year that the Market Access Program provides.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment also. I think, as the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) has said, the Market Access Program is a program that comes under attack every year in this appropriations process. But yet the Market Access Program is designed to help small and independents producers, small businesses get into foreign markets.

This Congress basically has said to our agricultural producers that the savior for your future is foreign markets. But, yet, we are unwilling, we

make an attempt on an annual basis to eliminate a program which helps small businesses and agricultural producers get into those markets.

Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) quoted some report. I would like to read from a report that was done by Deloitte and Touche, who was hired by the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture to evaluate MAP. I quote, ''MAP is a significant source of support for new companies and new products entering foreign markets. MAP support is also beneficial to small firms as they begin to export. Our cases suggest that, without MAP support, many small firms would not be capable of carrying out standard marketing programs in key foreign markets.''

Mr. Chairman, I encourage the Members to defeat the amendment.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. The MAP program is something that works. It not only enables our products to be sold overseas and to be promoted over there, but we have to keep in mind that any dollar spent in the MAP program are matched by the commodity groups themselves. So if one is a pork producer, one puts one's dollars in the program. If one is a corn or soybean producer or beef producer or rice, whatever product it is, one has to match those funds.

It is extraordinarily important that we maintain the market access and to promote our products overseas and to show the world the quality products that we have in America and to find markets for our products overseas.

The MAP program in years past had some problems with it. It has been reformed. It is not putting any particular hamburger brand or something promoting those type of products overseas. These are commodities that are being promoted overseas. It is extraordinarily important that we maintain this program.

I would just like to say also, the gentleman on an earlier amendment talked about the assistance that is needed for agriculture and the payments and the emergencies and all of that. Well, this will go farther to help us avoid those types of problems in the future than probably any other program. At a time when especially in the Southeast Asian market where they are recovering, we need to be there promoting American agricultural products so that we can regain the share of market that was lost before when they went through their financial crisis.

So just in closing, Mr. Chairman, I would strongly urge Members to defeat this amendment. It is very important for American agriculture to maintain this very small assistance for our farmers.

1815

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Royce amendment. The Market Access Program, or MAP, is a valuable program and it serves our Nation's agricultural growers and our producers well. MAP has been a tremendous asset in opening overseas markets and keeping U.S. agricultural exports competitive in the world market. They do not play on an even playing field without the help of MAP.

As many of my colleagues know, I am privileged to represent Sonoma and Marin Counties, one of our Nation's premier wine-making regions of the country; and the wine industry is vital to my area. But it is not just vital to the people I work for in my congressional district, it is also vital to the entire State of California. In fact, California produces more than 90 percent of the United States' wine exports.

While our wine speaks for itself, we still need help crossing the borders. The same is true with fruits and almonds and the many other products where the U.S. excels. We also face uneven trade barriers around the globe with these products, and we need assistance from USDA. This assistance is very important.

This is why I am a steadfast enthusiastic supporter of this program. I regret that the program has been a perennial target for budgetary cuts, but I am very pleased that Congress each time, time and again, has understood the worthiness of this program and has, in their wisdom, continued to fund the MAP program.

I urge my colleagues to continue its support for the Market Access Program and to vote against the Royce amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we face challenges in this country if we are to maintain a strong agricultural industry. The challenge right now is that other countries are doing better than we are helping their farmers. As much as this country works to operate this particular program of marketing help to get the word out of the quality of our products and the price of our products, our appropriations are flat and we are losing ground with other countries.

For example, I would call to the attention for the gentleman from California that the European Union spends $92 million more than we do. Twice as much! The Cairns Group, countries of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Brazil and others spend $306 million more than we do. So imagine, not only are countries such as the E.U. spending more than the United States in their so-called MAP program, in their effort to enhance marketing and promote their farmers' products, they are subsidizing their farmers up to five times as much as we do.

So on the one hand they are subsidizing their farmers to reduce the price they must charge for their exports and additionally they spend more on promotion—Huge competition for our American farmers, and in effect right now with the disastrous situation for farmers and ranchers in this country, it will put many of our farmers out of business. Again, not only are those countries subsidizing heavily to reduce their costs, but also they are spending much more than we are, double what we are, for example in Europe, to market their particular products at this lower subsidized price.

We have to make a decision in this country whether we are going to keep a strong ag industry in the United States. I think we should! This amendment should be defeated.

The export decline of the past several years has been harsh for America's farmers and ranchers, as well as for policy makers trying to address their concerns. While our export programs will never be a substitute for strong global markets and good agricultural policy we must ensure that the programs we administer are effective and efficient.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not claim to be from an agriculture rich district. In Brooklyn and Queens we do not grow all that much, or at least all that much that is addressed here in this bill, but I can tell my colleagues that I have been someone who has supported agriculture bills in this House because I recognize that there is a confluence of interest that exists. But just the same way frequently those of us who advocate for urban programs are called to task to defend some things in the bills that we support that often are troublesome, such is the case here for my friends who support agriculture spending.

Just so it is clear to those who are watching this debate, who are not as familiar with agriculture programs, like I am, this is essentially a program that pays for advertising for some of the biggest corporations in the United States. In the life of this program, to give some sense of context to this, McDonald's has received over $7 million. The Sunkist Corporation received nearly $7 million. Ernest and Julio Gallo received $5 million of taxpayer money to help, in essence, advertize their products overseas.

The argument that has been made a couple of times on this floor is, listen, we have to do it because there are those in other countries who are paying to subsidize their products and advertize them as well. Well, we are not in other countries. We do not represent the taxpayers in those countries, and we can argue the efficacy of doing that at another time. But the question we have to ask is, is this the wisest way for us to form coalitions behind agriculture programs and help family farmers that we have heard so much about on the floor this past couple of weeks.

Is the Pillsbury Corporation, the Wrangler Corporation, Burger King,

Campbell Soup, General Mills, Hershey Foods, are these companies that really need our help with their advertising budget?

This is an amendment, and I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) for offering it, this is an amendment that simply says let us have a strong agriculture policy. Let us have an agriculture policy that helps our farmers stay in business, that helps those of us in urban areas to continue to thrive because the agriculture sector is doing as well as possible. Let us try to help people from the bottom up.

This is a classic case of going into the corporate boardrooms and saying here is a bag of money because that is essentially what the MAP program is. If my colleagues think that Tyson Food needs some help, then the MAP program is good; if my colleagues think the Ocean Spray Cranberries Company needs some help, then the MAP program is probably one my colleagues would support.

In order to ensure that we are able to keep these coalitions together that help agriculture bills and help other bills pass, we have to weed out, no pun intended, some of the things that are truly weak in these programs, and this is such a case. I would urge my colleagues to support this reduction in the MAP program.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will divide the time equally between the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) proponent of the amendment, and an opponent of the amendment, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN). The gentleman from California will control 5 minutes and the gentleman from New Mexico will control 5 minutes.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to clarify something that was just previously said.

McDonald's does not get a dime of money, Tyson Food does not get a dime of money, the Sunkist Corporation does not get a dime of money. That is old news. As I mentioned earlier, this has been reformed.

The only thing we are promoting here are the products themselves. No brand names. No corporate brand names. So that argument is totally bogus. I want every Member to understand that. This promotion goes to promote pork, to promote eggs, to promote beef, soybeans, corn, whatever.

There is no McDonald's, there is no Sunkist, there is no Tyson. And for someone to say that is totally erroneous, and I want to just clarify that for the House.

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

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

Before anyone votes for this amendment, think what is going on in America. This is the harvest season. This is time we celebrate. People are eating corn on the cob, having back-yard barbecues, watermelons are being eaten. This is the is time we are celebrating county fairs all over the United States. We celebrate agriculture, our number one industry.

Our number one industry needs to find markets. We grow more food in the United States than we can consume. If we are going to keep the prices of agriculture low (and frankly I think in many cases they are too low), we need to keep the markets open for growers to be able to sell their crops.

So my colleagues, before voting for this amendment, which is a bad amendment, wake up and smell the coffee. Every time we watch television and we see Juan Valdez telling us to buy Colombian coffee, not to buy a particular brand but to buy Colombian coffee, that is market promotion. We see wine industries in Italy trying to sell us Italian wine. That is market promotion.

American consumers are being sold by market promotion by foreign competitors all the time and we do not realize that we need to do the same for our crops in this global market. So wake up and smell that coffee. Strike down this amendment. It is a bad amendment precisely because it will not allow the small businesses, that this bill emphasizes, to be able to take advantage of this expanded program. Not those large corporations, which was falsely stated, that use to get a lot of the market promotion. That stuff was struck out in 1998.

This market promotion helps keep agriculture viable in the United States. It is absolutely essential that we keep our markets open. And we have a trade surplus. That we keep this all in the black. So let us keep America strong, keep agriculture strong, and strike down this amendment. Thank you.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I am very aware of the problems facing the agricultural economy. It is abundantly clear that the prosperity of our economy as a whole does not extend to our farmers and ranchers. Although agricultural producers' problems are as diverse as the crops they grow, there is one point on which they all agree—the need for more export markets. There is no question that exports are already vital to the health of the agriculture sector. Approximately one-third of all the harvested acreage in the United States is exported, and 62 percent of these exports are of high value products. Is it any wonder then that farmers and ranchers suffer when exports decrease, as they have in recent years, falling from $60 billion in 1996 to $49 billion last year?

Fortunately, we have effective tools at our disposal to enhance our nation's agricultural exports. The Market Access Program (MAP) is a program that works—and works well—without distorting world markets through export subsidies. How? By providing matching funds for commodity groups and small businesses to conduct market research, technical assistance, trade servicing, advertising and consumer promotions abroad. The American farmer produces some of the highest quality food products in the world, but we can't assume that every international consumer knows about them. MAP helps fill this education gap and allow our producers to create the new export opportunities so sorely needed by growers and processors.

A prime example of how these programs work to benefit agricultural producers took place in my district earlier this month. The National Potato Promotion Board and the Washington State Potato Commission sponsored a tour and a series of briefings on processed potato products, and dehydrated potatoes in particular, for food industry research and development executives from the Philippines, China, Korea, Japan, and Mexico. These representatives learned about American potato products and how they can be used in consumer products abroad. This tour, partially funded by MAP dollars, will likely result in new opportunities to export value-added agricultural products.

I believe that it is simple common sense to support this kind of successful promotion effort. That is why I introduced legislation to increase funding for MAP and the Foreign Market Development Program (FMDP) earlier this year. This legislation, H.R. 3593, the ''Agricultural Market Access and Development Act,'' authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to spend up to $200 million—but not less than the current $90 million—on MAP. Likewise, the bill requires that a minimum of $35 million be spent on the promotion of U.S. bulk commodities overseas through FMDP.

These increases are funded using unspent funds for the Export Enhancement Program (EEP), usually around $500 million per year. EEP promotes U.S. exports through direct subsidies and is therefore subject to Uruguay Round restrictions and slated for reduction.

Right now, foreign countries directly subsidize their agricultural exports and spend far more than the U.S. does each year promoting their products abroad. MAP and FMDP are the only programs that give our farmers and ranchers the chance to compete on a level playing field worldwide.

These are proven and effective programs—and they are good for our producers. It's time to expand MAP and FMDP so that more growers can benefit from export opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons I rise in strong opposition to my friend's amendment to cut funding for the Market Access Program. We must work to open up opportunities to our farmers, not hamstring efforts to ensure agriculture success and independence. I urge my

colleagues to vote no on this amendment and support a level playing field for American agriculture in the world market.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Minge) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I certainly share with my colleague from California who introduced this amendment a level of discomfort with the market promotion program, the way it was structured several years ago. I think all of us in this body did. But the fact of the matter is the program has been adjusted. The most difficult to justify portions of the program have been eliminated, and what we are left with is generally a program that is promoting American agricultural products in foreign markets in a way that benefits farmers as opposed to benefiting corporate America.

I visited some of these offices, particularly in Japan. I have seen the men and the women that work for the Federal Government and work for some of the commodity groups present their material to the public in those countries, and I know that what they are doing is introducing American agricultural products to foreign consumers to build markets for American agricultural products, to open new opportunities for farmers in the United States, and I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this program.

There is no sector of the American economy that is more troubled than farming. We need to make sure that we explore every opportunity for America's farmers, not slam the door shut at this point in our economic history.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Market Access Program is the leftover product of two previously failed USDA programs, the Market Promotion Program and the Targeted Export Assistance Program, and MAP funnels tax dollars to corporate trade associations and cooperatives to advertise private products overseas.

Now, let me reiterate my position here. I think advertising is a function of the private sector, not of the taxpayers. While proponents of the program claim that it boosts exports, claims that it creates jobs, there is no evidence to support it. General Accounting Office studies indicate that this program has no discernible effect on U.S. agricultural exports. The private sector knows how to advertise. It does not need government interference. Taxpayer dollars merely replace money that would be spent by private companies on their own advertising.

Provisions in the 1996 farm bill have attempted to reform MAP, but thus far have failed. The GAO audit and other audits find it overstated, inconclusive, and speculative in terms of its effect.

1830

Although the percentage of large companies that get MAP money have decreased, a number of corporations still receive millions of dollars indirectly through trade associations. The studies show that about three-quarters of the money indirectly benefits these corporations.

Under this year's bill, an attempt also was made to expand MAP. Fortunately, this provision was stricken; and now we go to the question of the program itself. I believe it is now time to end the program.

In the last 10 years, American taxpayers have shelled out $1 billion for this subsidy. I think the American people would agree that their money could be better spent, and I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Royce amendment to eliminate the Market Access Program (MAP).

Several weeks ago, the House passed legislation to grant PNTR to China. One of the best arguments for PNTR is that it will grant U.S. producers access to the Chinese market, much of which has been closed for too many years.

MAP is the program that will help U.S. producers—not large agribusinesses—gain that access. Exporting is a challenge, even for the most experienced. Many individual producers and small companies find it difficult to break into it and to be competitive internationally. MAP helps our producers, primarily through grants to state departments of agriculture, to overcome these hurdles by partially funding international market research and trade missions to foreign countries.

Access to the Chinese market does us no good if we can't take advantage of it. MAP will help our producers develop it and become better at international trade and marketing. Reject this short-sighted amendment. Support MAP.

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

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

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 538, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in full committee I offered an amendment to deal with the concentration of economic power in the processing industry in this country. We cannot offer that amendment on the floor because of budget limitations, but I want to make clear that before this bill returns from conference, it ought to do a number of things.

I wanted to add funding for the Grain Inspection Packers and Stockyards Administration, for instance, and to the Agriculture Department's Office of General Counsel to bring both accounts up to the amount requested by the President. The reason that I wanted to do that is very simple: we can throw all the money in the world that we want to at farm programs, but unless we deal with the fact that the agriculture industry is largely dominated by oligopolies, we are not going to do very much to help either the consumer or the farmer in the process.

There are four companies that now control 81 percent of cattle purchases, beef processing and wholesale marketing, and in only 5 years we have seen the margin between the price paid to farmers and wholesale price of beef jump by 24 percent. It just doesn't apply to the beef industry.

If you look at the pork market, four companies now control 56 percent of the pork market, and the margin between the wholesale price of pork and the price paid to the farmer has jumped by more than 50 percent.

We have had a continuous consolidation in the grain industry and in the dairy industry and an amazing concentration of economic power in the poultry industry, where giant corporations such as Perdue and Tyson's are not only squeezing farmers, but also abusing workers and wreaking havoc on the environment in the process.

To really address these problems, it seems to me we need substantive legislation, for example to grant the Agriculture Department authority to review mergers and acquisitions affecting farming and food, and we need to do a variety of other things. That, obviously, is beyond the scope of this bill. But this bill, for instance, in addition to the other funding shortfalls that I have discussed, also has a serious shortfall in the Office of General Counsel. We need to correct those problems when this bill comes back from conference.

As I say, we are precluded from offering an amendment to do anything major on this right now because of the Budget Act, but it is my full intention to see to it that when we go to conference, this matter is corrected; because until we do correct it, the consumers are going to continue to get euchred by the situation, and so will virtually every small farmer in America.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as you may know, I have an amendment at the desk. I rise to explain why I will not be offering that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, that amendment deals with the provisions of this bill which provide funds for the inspection and facilitation of agricultural imports, particularly those from the Islamic Republic of Iran. In March of this year the administration lifted our ban on imports from Iran as to four products, three of them agricultural products; and I believe that lifting this ban may have been the result of undue optimism, or at least premature optimism.

The rhetoric in Tehran has improved, but the actions of the Iranian government have not. A year and a half ago, 13 Jews were arrested in the southern Iranian city of Shiraz. They have been subjected to show trials. Ten have been convicted. The average sentence is 9 years. Some of the sentences go up to 13 years.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I drafted an amendment that would say that those three agricultural imports cannot come into this country, or at least none of our taxpayer dollars could be used for the necessary inspection.

But just as I believe the lifting of the ban on those imports may have reflected premature optimism, I do not want to be guilty of premature pessimism. It is quite possible, I think, that the Iranian president or their appellate court system will in the next few weeks vacate those verdicts, or at least release the prisoners. So I think it is best that I not offer this amendment, especially because this amendment, if adopted, would lock us into a particular position for an entire fiscal year; and it would deny the use of those funds to facilitate imports from Iran for the entire fiscal year.

Instead, I think it better that I will join with others in introducing legislation that will provide for a ban on all Iranian exports to the United States, agricultural and non-agricultural, until such time as the President of the U.S. is able to certify that the Iranian government has made substantial improvements in the treatment of its religious minorities.

Mr. Chairman, the charges against the 13 jailed in Shiraz were absurd, since no Jew in Iran is allowed to come anywhere near anything of military or security significance.

Mr. Chairman, the trials were reminiscent of those of Joseph Stalin, show trials with forced confessions, no evidence and very little specificity to the charges; and the verdicts were harsh, 10 convictions subjecting the defendants to a total of 89 years in prison.

Many governments around the world have said that these trials are the yardstick by which Iran must be judged as to whether it has made improvements in human rights and whether it has made improvements in treating its religious minorities. Clearly, Iran has not yet improved its behavior, even as there has been hopeful rhetoric.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that we should adopt the slogan ''no justice, no caviar.'' We should certainly not allow the import of caviar, pistachios, dried fruit, or carpets into this country until justice is achieved.

Not only is a ban on the imports to the United States from Iran helpful in that it applies some pressure economically to Iran, it is also the strongest way that we can signal our position and puts us in a stronger position to deal with other countries: Germany, where the Iranian foreign minister is visiting today; Japan, which, unfortunately, is funding hydroelectric facilities in Iran; and the World Bank, which, unfortunately, approved, but did not yet disburse, a loan of $231 million.

So, Mr. Chairman, my hope is that this amendment will turn out to be unnecessary; that the authorities in Iran will reverse the decision of the trial court, or at least pardon the defendants. If that does not occur, then we will be in the position to move with a separate bill that will allow more flexibility and a greater scope than is allowed in an amendment to an appropriations bill. A separate bill will apply to non-agricultural goods, as well as agricultural goods, and provide the flexibility of a presidential certification.

In addition, I would hope that if a month from now these obscenely harsh verdicts are not reversed, that the conference committee will see fit to add my amendment to this Agricultural Appropriations bill before it comes back to this House.

So that explains, why, Mr. Chairman, I will not be offering my amendment.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to your attention the fire blight problem which destroyed many apple and pear crops in Michigan. While back home this past week, I personally saw the devastation in literally orchard after orchard along the road.

In May, a severe disaster struck Michigan, all but destroying the apple and pear crops in this highly intensive agriculture region. In addition to extremely wet, warm, and humid weather conditions throughout the month, a severe thunderstorm passed over southwest Michigan in May, causing severe damage to fruit trees and fruit crops. The thunderstorm's hail, high wind, and heavy rain scarred and wounded the leaves, limbs and fruit on the trees. In the case of apple and pear trees, these wounds provided an avenue for the fire blight to enter the trees, causing severe and widespread disease.

The result is that nearly 7,650 acres of the 17,000 acres of apple trees in this region have been severely affected by fire blight. Some of the remaining 9,000-some acres are affected as well, depending upon apple variety; but the trees are expected to recover in future years. Of the acreage severely affected, we suspect that nearly some 2,000 acres of apple trees will, in fact, die. The remainder may be saved, but their production in the future will certainly be significantly reduced.

My governor, Governor Engler, in conjunction with myself, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), and Senator ABRAHAM have requested Secretary Glickman to designate the affected counties in Michigan as a disaster area, which should help to some degree.

However, more must be done. I am pleased to report that Senator ABRAHAM in the other body is working with his colleagues to provide some additional funds for relief as this body considers the fiscal year 2001 agriculture appropriation bill.

I would ask the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) that as this bill moves through the legislative process that the gentleman work with our colleagues in the other body to provide much-needed relief to growers in southwest Michigan whose crops have been devastated by this fire blight.

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

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his attention to this important issue. I give him my assurance that as this bill moves through the legislative process, I will do all that I can to work with the other body to provide much needed funding for the growers in southwest Michigan whose crops have been devastated by fire blight.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his assurance, and I look forward to working with him in the future to make sure that we get needed assistance back to our growers in the Midwest.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Insert before the short title the following title:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the amounts made available in this Act for the Food and Drug Administration may be expended to take any action (administrative or otherwise) to interfere with the importation into the United States of drugs that have been approved for use within the United States and were manufactured in an FDA-approved facility in the United States, Canada, or Mexico.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that time for debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes in opposition and 10 minutes in favor.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will control 10 minutes, and a Member opposed to the amendment will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), and several others for their work in this area.

All this bill says is we are not going to intimidate seniors who are following the law, following NAFTA, and bringing drugs into this country from Canada or Mexico, as long as those are approved drugs and they have been manufactured in FDA-approved facilities.

Mr. Chairman, we have debated this issue to a great extent. All this amendment will do is say ''hands off, FDA'' on legal and qualified manufactured products. It does not have anything to do with limiting their ability on safety; it does not apply to anything but a legal drug. So that means my patients who now are trying to get their drugs from Canada, from Oklahoma, can in fact have a prescription mailed to Canada or Mexico and have it filled and shipped across the border, and the FDA cannot intimidate them and say they cannot do that. That is all we are talking about, drugs that are manufactured in this country and manufactured in FDA-approved facilities that are legal drugs.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a Member that rises in opposition to the amendment?

If not, does the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) yield time?

1915

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his leadership in this area and his knowledge and the way he has been able to work together in a bipartisan fashion to get this issue addressed.

This is a very important issue to the State of Maine which borders Canada and which sees its citizens go regularly across the border in frustration as to why those same particular medicines cost so much less than they do in their own country. Recognizing that, the pharmaceutical industry, which I do not intend to vilify, has only said that they charge whatever the market will bear. I recognize, and this amendment recognizes, that many American citizens cannot bear what the pharmaceuticals are charging.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment to be able to send a message that this is not an acceptable practice. We are watching many of our seniors have to split their drugs in half or not take them at all because they cannot afford them and they can go right across the border for the same drug that is manufactured in this country at a third or a fourth of the price, and only recognizing that it is the companies, in charging what they are charging, that is the differential between what they are paying and what the counterparts across the border will pay. We must ensure that the taxpayers who are providing the basic research at NIH and other research facilities, building the elemental research which the pharmaceutical industry builds upon those tax dollars, that the taxpayers of the United States have an opportunity to access in an affordable fashion.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his leadership in working together in a bipartisan fashion to address this issue and many other Members that are working on this issue, in the final analysis, to make sure that at the end of the day, the seniors have affordable, accessible prescription medicines so that they do not have to worry about the quality of their life and be able to be independent and live out their lives in a quality environment.

I support the amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

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

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this pending amendment which would do more than any single action to lower the prices in this country for prescription medications.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) yield?

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would ask very simple questions of those who have drafted this amendment and are offering it. Do the gentlemen wish to do anything in this amendment that would lessen the inspection that the FDA does of drugs that may be manufactured or sold in another country and used by U.S. citizens? I want to understand the full intent of the amendment, because when the FDA Commissioner came before our subcommittee and I asked the question about drugs from other countries, she said that they could not give certainty that they were of equal quality.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the drugs that are produced in FDA-approved facilities, they do assure at this time that they are made to the same standard as the drugs that are made in this country. Otherwise, they would not have their approved labeling from the FDA, and that is true in all FDA-approved facilities.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the clarification.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I want to discuss a little bit about this problem.

We spent 2 weeks ago talking about the crisis in the pharmaceutical industry as far as our seniors in getting drugs. It is not just our seniors; it is everybody in this country is paying too much for drugs. There are five things that could happen tomorrow to lower the price for prescription drugs in this country. This is a small step that would help. It is not even one of the major ones.

The number one thing is to have a competitive market for prices in this country. We believe in free enterprise; there is not free enterprise in the pharmaceutical industry right now. All one has to do is look at the FTC Web site. There is documented collusion. We need to address that.

Number two, our President needs to stand up and bully pulpit the pharmaceutical industry's prices. We do not need price controls. We need competition. Competition allocates scarce resources better than any type of price control ever will. What we need is real competition. Ms. Reno has received a letter signed by me asking for an investigation of which as of today, now, 4 weeks later, there has been no response on the documented areas of collusion within the drug industry.

Number three, doctors need to do a better job giving generics to seniors, and they are not.

Finally, number four, the pharmaceutical companies are not all bad. They do a lot of good things. There are private, indigent programs in the pharmaceutical industry that the health professions need to utilize. They will supply their drugs.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI) is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues from Oklahoma, from Maine, from New Hampshire and other Members that have spoken in support of this.

In Minnesota I know that we have had many seniors that have gone on bus trips and otherwise to Canada to purchase prescription drugs and often they come back with a feeling of intimidation. What we need to do is to assure them that if they are purchasing drugs that are safe, if they are purchasing drugs that are important for their health, that they are not subject to the harassment or the problems that they might face at the border when they come back.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, because the gentleman from Oklahoma raised the issue of collusion. We have held hearings with the advisory panels of the Food and Drug Administration and the CDC that makes recommendations on vaccines, and we have found through our committee investigations that many of the people who are on these advisory committees that are making the decisions on what kind of vaccines our children are getting are being paid by the pharmaceutical companies that own large amounts of stock in the pharmaceutical companies.

So I would just like to say that the collusion that the gentleman refers to is not limited to the price controls or price problems that he has been talking about here today. We believe that there are other problems that need to be addressed. So I think the gentleman is on the right track, and I support this amendment strongly.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), if he would like to follow up and reinforce the safety and labeling issues that have been raised here.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to address those issues. Number one, we cannot manufacture a drug that comes into this country unless we are manufacturing it in an FDA-approved facility. That is number one. So safety is not a concern, and they can do whatever they want if it is not manufactured in an FDA-approved facility. Number two, it does not apply to a drug that is not approved in this country. So as far as the drugs that are approved in this country, those are the ones that are manufactured in an FDA-approved facility that will come in safe.

All we are saying is, since NAFTA is here, and I would have voted against had I been a Member of Congress at that time, but since it is here, let us use it. Let us get some benefit out of it besides stealing some of our jobs. So let us utilize NAFTA. This will not hamper the FDA.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I just want to first of all say that we are not under any illusions that all of a sudden one amendment is going to turn things around, but I believe that it is like many things, that it sends a message out, and from a million different amendments and messages and resolutions, at the end of the day, they have to receive the message and have got to be able to sit down and fashion a proposal that works universally across the board, accessible and affordable to all of our seniors, regardless of where they live and what their income is.

I think what we are seeing here today on the floor of the House and have seen throughout the country is a frustration with recognizing that something is up. People have figured out long before all of us that something is up and we need to address it. This is just one vehicle, one way to be able to do it. There are many others, and I support many of the different approaches, but at the end of the day, we have to make sure the seniors are taken care of.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about this amendment and perhaps others that will be offered only from the sense of safety.

I rise in opposition, reluctantly, to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman who is offering the amendment here on our side. That is to ask, if a senior citizen, for example, goes on a bus trip from Maine or Ohio up to Canada or down to Mexico, when they go to a pharmaceutical operation and they go to buy a drug, let us say it is Claritin, how do they know that that is manufactured in any of the countries the gentleman is talking about with his amendment? Is it labeled? How do they know that it was manufactured in an FDA-approved facility?

The gentleman says in his amendment that these drugs were approved for use within the United States and manufactured in an FDA-approved facility. Does it say that on the box? Can the gentleman assure me, unlike the FDA commissioner who appeared before our committee and did not have the confidence that the gentleman has that seniors could be assured of equal content and equal inspection of these drugs? How can the gentleman be so certain that they are getting a product of equal import? If the gentleman could answer that question.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I certainly will yield, if I can, to the gentleman from Oklahoma who is a physician and practices.

But my experience, and from people that I have talked to that have gone across the border from Maine to Canada have purchased the same drug where it is made in the USA, and it does not say right on the label that it has been inspected by the FDA, but it was made in the USA, and that it is the same drug that they are purchasing.

Their experience is that they paid $400 or $500 for what would be $1,000 in this country. It is no different than what has been happening in agriculture with the pesticides and other types of products that are manufactured in this country, are sold overseas, and trying to be able to reimport those because of a permit process, not because of safety, not because of any issue as it may pertain to the impacts of the health of the individual, but just because of those issues, our farmers have been disadvantaged, our seniors have been disadvantaged, and as the gentleman from Oklahoma has said, it seems that NAFTA is a one-way street. They build the wall, and nothing gets in, but everything tends to come out. The gentlewoman recognizes that in her fights that she has led in this Congress over the years with regard to those issues.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) may like to respond on the safety issues.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I think a couple of points are important. Number one is when we get a drug in this country, we do not know where it is made, because a large portion of our drugs in this country are made in Europe, made in South America, made in Puerto Rico, in FDA-approved facilities. They have to meet that standard. That is number one. Will there be an accident? Sure, there will be. I will not deny that there will be a mistake made in filling a prescription just like there is every day in this country as well.

However, I would challenge the ranking member on this committee, how many people are not getting the medicines they needed to because they cannot afford to get them, and if we allow competition to resume, which this is just one way of doing it, whom of them will markedly benefit their health, their quality of life? People's lives are being shortened today because of the abnormally high and ridiculously increased prices of many pharmaceuticals out there.

Can we assure 100 percent safety? No. The FDA cannot now. As a matter of fact, what they do is they look at drugs and say, are they safe enough? There is not any drug that is absolutely safe.

1900

Aspirin is not absolutely safe. But are we going to markedly increase the risk for Americans with this? Absolutely not. The FDA knows those facilities.

Will they have absolute assurance on a drug like Viagra, will somebody try to prostitute that drug and make a substitute? They are doing that now and they are bringing them in. It is not going to be a new problem for the FDA, and it is not going to be more of a problem.

What it is going to be is more access at better prices for our seniors and everybody else in this country for the pharmaceuticals, because the competitive model is not working in this industry today. This will be a shot that says that we need the competition to work. That is why we want to do this.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the officials from the Food and Drug Administration are listening to this debate. If there is any doubt in their minds as to the net effect of this amendment as we move towards conference, we can tighten up the language to make sure that we do nothing to lessen the food, drug, and safety laws of the country, which are the strongest in the world, to protect the health of our people.

I know that neither gentlemen would want to undermine that. Obviously, they would want to improve it. Maybe there is some way that FDA could indicate on the boxes that it is from an FDA-approved facility. I think we want to give consumers ultimate confidence that the purchase they are making will not harm them.

Mr. COBURN. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, the European Union today has just as strong rules as we do. They import drugs from all

over. In terms of quality, efficacy, and safety, their laws are almost exactly the same. They are coming from a range of 13 to 15 countries. If they can do it, certainly we can do it with our neighbors.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would just say to the gentleman, in the food area they obviously do not have the same standards. In the drug area, their system is quite different.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield further, I appreciate the gentlewoman's suggestion. I would encourage the FDA and others that have any issue here, that can be tightened up in conference. I think that is an excellent suggestion, and I would look forward to working with the gentlewoman to tighten that up if it needed to be.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for that. I withdraw my reluctant opposition, and look forward to the conference on the amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I am astonished that we are again debating an amendment that would stifle biomedical research and impose political will on an agency whose work is based on the non-partisan rule of science. This is an invasion into the FDA's drug approval process—a place where Congress has no right to be. We are not scientists. We created the FDA and charged it with determining which drugs are safe and effective for use in this country. We were wise to do so—the FDA has a long history of protecting the public from drugs that are uncertain or unsafe.

This amendment would change all that. In an attempt to impose their beliefs on all of America, anti-choice proponents of this amendment would have you believe that it would apply to drugs solely for the purpose of the chemical induction of abortion. But, in fact, we know that it would reach far beyond that.

Often times drugs are approved for one purpose, and later are found safe and effective for treating an entirely different condition. For example, the drug Doxil was originally approved by the FDA as an AIDS treatment. But later, in June of 1999, the FDA approved the same drug for the treatment of ovarian cancer. Even mifepristone, the target of this amendment, currently shows promise for use in the treatment of breast cancer, benign brain tumors, ovarian cancer, and even prostate cancer.

Let's call this amendment for what it is—an attempt to score a political point on abortion. Unfortunately, the casualties in this political move are biomedical research, independent scientific evaluation of medicines, and patient access to reproductive health drugs.

What this amendment would in fact do is begin a path whereby Congress decides, based on political and ideological considerations, what drugs it thinks America should or should not have access to, and then blocks the FDA from taking action to approve drugs deemed inappropriate. Let me ask you, what would this lead to next? Which political issue would be the target of the next attempt to thwart research or invade the FDA's drug approval process? We must be mindful of the dangerous precedent this amendment would set.

Now is not the time to limit the FDA in their work to determine the safety and efficacy of promising new drugs in America. This amendment would not only limit the FDA but it would have a chilling effect on biomedical research, particularly women's health research, which has been severely understudied for years. This amendment may be aimed at one issue, but it will have consequences for millions of Americans.

When we halt action on an entire category of drugs, we erase the possibility that those drugs could hold for treating other conditions. We stamp out the scientific pursuit of medicines that heal with one attempt to limit the safe practice of abortion—which I might remind my colleagues is still a legal right in this country.

This Congress has made biomedical research a priority. We have agreed that we have an obligation to fund the search for cures and better treatments for disease in this country. We have the unique opportunity as lawmakers to use public policy to actually improve people's health and improve their lives. But what this amendment would do is exactly the opposite—it would place political gain ahead of real progress. It would replace the gold standard of drug approval that this nation has come to trust with congressional restrictions based only on personal ideology—not sound science.

Speaking as both a legislator and a cancer survivor, I know the value of modern medicines. To be quite frank, I am offended by the idea that some lawmakers think they can dictate to the FDA what work they can do on proposals that could improve the lives of Americans.

I urge my colleagues—don't force your opinion regarding choice on the FDA and the people who rely on it for sound, scientific judgement. Allow the FDA to continue the important work it does in evaluating all potential pharmaceuticals. Do not subject the FDA scientists to the personal philosophies of some Members of this House. Preserve the promise of biomedical research and new drugs for all Americans. Defeat the Coburn Amendment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by Representative COBURN.

For the past three years, Congress has revisited Rep. COBURN's amendment to prohibit the FDA from testing, developing, and approving drugs that could cause the chemical inducement of abortion. Like the so-called ''partial birth abortion'' ban, it has become a hallmark of the anti-choice agenda.

But this measure is not about abortion or even mifepristone. It is about Congress trying to dictate what the FDA is permitted to do and not to do. As a public health specialist by training, I am appalled that my colleagues would attempt to interfere with the FDA's ability to test, research, and approve any drug with political mandates.

Reproductive health drugs should be held to FDA's rigorous science-based requirements that any drug must meet before approval can be granted—just like any other drug. They should not be singled out simply because they deal with reproductive health.

In 1996, the Food and Drug Administration found mifepristone a safe and effective method for early medical abortion. This drug has been used successfully by more than 500,000 women around the world for over twenty years in countries like France, Sweden, and the United Kingdom, and was just recently made available in Spain, the Netherlands, Australia, and Israel. Every country in Europe, and beyond, seems to recognize the benefits of making this drug available to women—except the United States.

This measure seeks not only to deny American women access to mifepristone, it also threatens the health of Americans in general. In addition to providing safe, medical abortions, there is evidence that mifepristone has great potential to treat serious medical conditions such as inoperable brain tumors, prostate cancer, and infertility—as well as female specific conditions like endometriosis, uterine fibroids, and breast cancer.

I ask my colleagues, how many other uses are there for a drug like Viagra? Yet, Viagra hit the market in record time. What kind of message does that send to the world? The consideration of this measure and the failure of the United States to make this drug available tells the world that the health of Americans is negotiable and subject to the will of anti-choice politicians.

If passed, this amendment would not only compromise the integrity of FDA's scientific process, it would open the door for further invasions on the drug approval process. More importantly, it would set a very dangerous and irrevocable precedent in the medical community.

Over the past three decades, the face of reproductive health care has drastically changed to serve the needs of American women. And for the first time in history, a reproductive health drug has the potential to benefit not only American women, but to provide more appropriate care to millions of Americans. Who are we, Members of Congress, to interfere in the face of such immense scientific progress?

Americans trust that drugs approved by the FDA are safe. Vote ''no'' on the Coburn amendment and let the FDA do its job.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Coburn amendment to the Agriculture Appropriations bill. I strongly disagree with this amendment because it would block the Food and Drug Administration from testing, developing, or approving any drug that would induce abortion, including RU–486. The Coburn amendment would limit the development of the next generation of safer, more effective contraceptives and this is wrong.

Women in America have a right to choose. We must protect this right. The goal of this Congress should be to reduce the number of abortions, protect the right of women to choose, and to make necessary medical choices safe and legal. It is wrong for Congress to tell the FDA to approve a particular drug or to disapprove one. Instead, it is the FDA's mission to decide whether a drug is ''safe and effective.'' The Coburn amendment would make this decision for the FDA and substitute Congress' judgement over the judgement of medical professionals.

We must remember that RU–486 is a product proven to be medically safe. After extensive French and United States clinical trials, the FDA has determined that it is safe and effective for an early medical abortion. For about 20 years RU–486 has been available to Europe's women. The effect of this amendment is to ban RU–486 which can be used for a nonsurgical abortion. For women for whom surgical abortion poses risks or is otherwise inappropriate, the Coburn amendment unconstitutionally restricts the right to choose. For

women living far from clinics, it precludes the possibility of receiving RU–486 in their physician's office, again burdening the right to choose. Women have the right to choose and I support the current FDA medical approval process.

We should not trample on the FDA's ability to test, research and approve drugs based on sound scientific evidence. We should also remember this amendment is not limited to just this one safe and effective drug. It is not simply about access to RU–486 alone. It would have a dangerous chilling effect on developing other drugs for various other medical purposes. Drugs used to treat other conditions including cancers and ulcers can induce abortion. This proposed ban could limit the FDA's capacity to consider approving these other therapies and could force researchers to reject promising treatment opportunities.

I stand with the American Medical Association; the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; and the American Medical Women's Association to oppose this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Coburn amendment and protect a woman's right to choose. Vote "no" on the Coburn amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 538, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. KAPTUR:

Page 96, after line 4, insert the following new section:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. . Within available funds, the Secretary of Agriculture is urged to use ethanol, biodiesel, and other alternative fuels to the maximum extent practicable in meeting the fuel needs of the Department of Agriculture.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer a sense of Congress resolution in the form of an amendment concerning ethanol and diesel fuels.

Mr. Chairman, we all have seen the price of fuel rise across the country, spike, and cause businesses and households a great deal of economic anxiety this summer. It was but yet another example of our overdependence on imported fuels to move this economy.

There is no one answer to that problem, but obviously we should all have a strong, very strong-willed position to move America toward any energy independence in our lifetime.

One of the most important departments to help us do that is the Department of Agriculture. In fact, the potential for the expanded use of ethanol and biodiesel and biofuels of all kinds using cellulose from our fields and forests is absolutely unlimited and it is renewable.

In addition to that, it is much less polluting. The State of Ohio, for example, I think leads the Nation in mixtures that involve ethanol. We have shown that research can be done in producing alternative fuels that benefit our environment, can actually help our engines burn more cleanly, and end our growing dependence.

Over 60 percent of the fuel used to power this economy comes from foreign sources. It is our major strategic vulnerability.

USDA has been helping in research, albeit slowly, over the years. We are making some progress. The intent of this resolution is to further encourage the Secretary of Agriculture to use ethanol, biodiesel, and other alternative fuels to the maximum extent practicable in all of USDA facilities across the country. There are hundreds.

One of the areas in which we are successfully working is in the district of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) in Beltsville, Maryland, at the chief research station in this country to power many of the land vehicles, tractors, and cars, used in that major research station.

What we are asking USDA to do in this sense of Congress resolution is to exert the maximum effort possible and look at the other sites around the country, including cooperative efforts with our land grant universities, with other research sites across the country, with the headquarters facilities here in Washington, D.C., and really help lead America forward and develop the set of connections that can move product from the farm into industrial and agricultural use by the end user.

So it is very straightforward, and if we are to be serious about alternative fuels, we must use every arrow in our quiver. We are asking the USDA to put added muscle behind this in every single facility that it operates across the country.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentlewoman's amendment, and recommend that the House do so, as well.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman. I just wish we could power some of those sheep with some ethanol, but we will probably figure out a way to do that in the future.

Mr. SKEEN. We keep them well inoculated, and they do not buy their pharmaceuticals from anyplace other than home.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for his support.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 70 offered by Mr. GILMAN:

Page 85, after line 15, insert the following new section:

SEC. . The Secretary of Agriculture shall use $15,000,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide compensation to producers of onions whose farming operations are located in a county designated by the Secretary as a disaster area for drought in 1999 and who suffered quality losses to their 1999 onion production due to, or related to, drought. Payments shall be made on a per hundredweight basis on each qualifying producer's pre-1996 production of onions, based on the 5-year average market price for yellow onions.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would require the Secretary of Agriculture to use $15 million of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide compensation to producers of onions who were hard hit by drought in the 1999 growing season.

The reason for this amendment is quite obvious. Onion producers from my congressional district in Orange County, New York, have been devastated by either drought, wind, or rain 3 out of the past 4 years. Making matters worse, the USDA crop insurance program provided little or no assistance to these growers.

I had the opportunity to visit with our onion producers just this past week to learn of their outstanding plight. While it is imperative that these growers receive adequate assistance in order to survive, I will withdraw my amendment, since it is subject to a point of order in the House.

However, I would ask the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), if I could speak with him on this important matter.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's concern, and we will continue to do our best as the bill proceeds to conference.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentleman, onion growers in Orange County, New York in my congressional district have suffered devastating losses 3 out of the past 4 years, 1996, 1998, and 1999. They are in desperate need of meaningful assistance. The small sums which crop insurance paid to these farmers due to the 1996, 1998 and 1999 losses failed to provide anything close to minimal relief.

Accordingly, our farming families continue to lose their farms, individuals are uprooted, a traditional way of life is jeopardized, and a segment of our

national food supply has been further diminished. These are the very upheavals which crop insurance was designed initially to prevent.

The USDA has clearly demonstrated its inability to effectively deliver needed and equitable crop loss disaster assistance to Orange County onion farmers. Repeated and intense communications between the Department, my office, and onion producers over the last few years at all levels have failed to address any of our concerns.

USDA officials have stated that the Department does not have a clear direction from the Congress on how to proceed with the complicated and untraditional issues surrounding the unique situation facing these onion growers, including, one, how to compensate for crop quality losses; two, reliance on a crop insurance model that cannot adequately account for multiyear losses, let alone 3 out of the 4 years; and third, how to calculate payment for high-value family farm specialty crop businesses.

Accordingly, I would ask for the chairman's commitment to work with me to provide assistance to our onion growers in Orange County, New York, who have incurred devastating crop losses due to damaging weather-related conditions 3 out of the last 4 years.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, again, I understand the gentleman's concern. We will continue to do our best as the bill proceeds to conference.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, while I am sure it will come as no surprise, our onion growers in Orange County are proud to receive few government subsidies. However, the current plight of these hard-working producers threatens the overall fate of our Hudson Valley, our State, and Nation's agricultural industry.

As their representative, I can no longer allow that unique and devastating situation to go unnoticed and unassisted, and thus I greatly appreciate the gentleman's willingness to work with us on this important matter. I thank the chairman.

Mr. SKEEN. I would tell the gentleman, we will do the very best we can on that matter.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANGEL:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section, preceding the short title (page 96, after line 4), the following new title:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to implement section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2370(a));

(2) to exercise the authorities conferred upon the President by section 5(b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which were being exercised with respect to Cuba on July 1, 1977, as a result of a national emergency declared by the President before that date, and are being exercised on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, and any regulations in effect on the day before such date of enactment pursuant to the exercise of such authorities;

(3) to implement any prohibition on exports to Cuba that is in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act under the Export Administration Act of 1979;

(4) to implement the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, other than section 1705(f) of that Act (relating to direct mail service to Cuba);

(5) to implement the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, or the amendments made by that Act;

(6) to implement subparagraph (A) of section 901(j)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to denial of foreign tax credit, etc., with respect to certain foreign countries) with respect to Cuba;

(7) to implement section 902(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985;

(8) to implement General Note 3(b) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States with respect to Cuba; or

(9) to regulate or prohibit travel to and from Cuba by individuals who are citizens or residents of the United States, or any transactions ordinarily incident to such travel, if such travel would be lawful in the United States.

Mr. MENENDEZ (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized on his point of order.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against this amendment on the ground that it violates clause 7 of rule XVI on the issue of germaneness.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment references a number 9, as a matter of fact, programs and/or laws. All of the programs, certainly not even the overwhelming majority of them that are referenced, are either administered or enforced or regulated or in any way funded by this bill that we are considering this evening.

There is clearly an issue of germaneness, so under clause 7 of rule XVI, I raise the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RANGEL. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that the gentleman from Florida was part of an agreement that would allow our farmers to export their products to Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, while it is true that the agreement was supposed to be done in conference and not on the floor, I thought I could facilitate what he was a party to by merely removing any restrictions that our farmers would have to allow them to sell their products. Knowing his disdain for communism and his support, I assume, to try to eliminate this form of lack of democracy in Cuba, it was the feeling of the House that we could attempt to derail the communism that existed in China, North Korea, in North Vietnam.

I just felt that if we have such compassion about trying to instill democracy all across Asia, we should have just as much concern about the nearness and proximity to my friend's home State, Florida.

1915

I thought that since the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) was party to the agreement that this would allow us at least to do publicly on the House floor what so many said was going to be done privately in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there another Member that wishes to be heard on this point of order?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recognized on this point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind Members that they should direct their comments to the Chair regarding whether or not the point of order should or should not be sustained.

The gentlewoman from Florida may continue.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Rangel amendment, but I support my dear colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) on the various points about why this part of the bill should be stricken, why this amendment should be stricken.

What this amendment is asking our U.S. agencies to do is to look the other way when U.S. laws governing trade with the oppressive Castro regime are being violated. It does so by prohibiting funds in the act from being used for the implementation of various foreign policy and national security restrictions.

This amendment extends far beyond the jurisdiction of the appropriations bill by referring to authorities, export controls and sanctions imposed under the Foreign Assistance Act, The Trading With the Enemy Act, the Export Administration Act, the Cuban Democracy Act, and other existing laws whose enforcements are administered by the Department of Commerce, the State Department, the Treasury Department and sometimes in consultation with the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, it is ironic that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), my good friend, the sponsor of this amendment, who repeatedly comes to the floor advocating for greater presidential authority over foreign policy and trade matters and seeks a minimal congressional involvement in

any of these issues would offer an amendment which actually restricts the President and issues a congressional mandate dictating what the pertinent agencies can and cannot do. So I believe that this amendment, which really seeks to change U.S. policy toward the brutal Castro dictatorship which rules Cuba with an iron grip by circumventing and ignoring the committees of jurisdiction, who have the expertise in these issues; without affording those committees an opportunity to debate, discuss and offer recommendations.

Further, Mr. Chairman, the Rangel amendment is in direct conflict with the agreement that we had reached a few weeks ago on the sanctions issue, an agreement which I believe has received broad range of support, and this agreement not only maintains a strong stance against Cuba's totalitarian regime, but it also protects American taxpayers from bearing the burden of failed loans and poor investments with Castro.

I would hope that the chairman would rule that this is not germane to the bill in question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule, but would inquire, are there other Members who wish to be heard specifically on the point of order?

The Chair has been lenient allowing a certain amount of substantive debate to creep into this and would be prepared to rule, unless there are other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Minnesota rise?

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for that purpose.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for bringing up this issue. We have all read of numerous hours of negotiations that have been spent on Cuba trade and agricultural products. We know that the agricultural appropriations bill has been held up for probably a month as a result of negotiations behind the scenes. This amendment is an opportunity for us to consider on the floor of the House of Representatives this very important issue, otherwise, this point of order seeks to force deliberation on this amendment into the closed confines of conference committee.

I urge that the Chairman rule against the point of order so that we have openness with respect to the legislative process and so that we have an opportunity to consider an amendment that provides a realistic opportunity for trade with Cuba rather than a hollow provision which will allow for very limited trade with Cuba.

Mr. Chairman, I really feel that this particular amendment is the only opportunity that this body will have to debate and deliberate on the trade with Cuba issue which otherwise is going to be foreclosed to this body, we will see something come back from conference committee, there will be a rule, which will waive all points of order, and this particular debate will be precluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has the burden of proving that the amendment is germane.

Does the gentleman have additional arguments he would like to make in that regard?

Mr. RANGEL. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) has been working on some points that deal with this point of order, and I would like to hear from her, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has been quite lenient but asks Members to speak to the point of order.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support my colleague from New York (Mr. RANGEL) on this amendment and certainly believe it to be germane. I think it has been correctly stated that there has been a lot of backroom dealing going on on this issue. Day in and day out, we have heard about all of the antics, all of the various manipulations and maneuvering that has gone on only to have surfaced some very, very limited trade. One way that would perhaps allow our farmers to sell to Cuba, but would, on the other hand, do a lot of damage to the work that this President has been doing to help open up discussion and debate and to export democracy to Cuba.

It seems to me that this amendment would take care of some of the problems that have been created by my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, and I would simply ask that the Chair would recognize that and rule in favor of my colleague and the work that he is attempting to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

For what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey rise?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). I believe his venue here is inappropriate.

For those of us who are not privileged to sit on the Committee on Appropriations but who have ranking positions, as I do, on the Committee on International Economic Policy and Trade for which sanctions issue fall within the jurisdiction of our committee.

We do not believe that the appropriations bill is the appropriate venue for the pursuit. I did not believe that the amendment of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) in the committee, which was legislating an appropriations bill, was appropriate.

It deprives those of us who have jurisdiction over certain items, if that is allowed to move forward, to, therefore, nullify the value of our positions; therefore, I think that the amendment is not germane.

I further think it is an attempt to legislate in an appropriations bill, because it talks about travel as well which has nothing to do within the appropriations part of this agriculture bill. On the merits, of course, I have a strong disagreement with the gentleman, but I believe his venue is wrong and I would urge that the Chair rule the amendment out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the amendment.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has the burden of proving that the amendment is germane. The preface in the amendment that it is confined to funds in the bill is helpful in determining germaneness, so long as the listed funding to be prohibited bears some relationship to the functions of departments and agencies covered by the bill.

The Chair is unable to determine any role the covered agencies have in carrying out several of the laws mentioned in the amendment. Title VIII of the reported bill has been stricken on a point of order and the list of sanctions relating to Cuba is no longer in the bill. For this reason, the amendment, although in the form of a limitation, does not relate in all respects to programs covered by the bill and is not germane. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to simply speak on behalf of the amendment that was already adopted, which I strongly support, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for supporting. I also want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) for supporting this as well.

This dealt with the alternative fuels amendment that was already adopted, and the reason I wanted to rise in support of it is because for the last 11 months the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, which is located in my district and so strongly supported by the committee, has been conducting a pilot project using biodiesel. Biodiesel, or any of the other alternative fuels, makes sense for two reasons, Mr. Chairman. First, because biodiesel is derived vegetable or soybean oil it opens another potential market for our Nation's farmers. Secondly, biodiesel is good for the environment. It is a renewable resource that burns much cleaner than conventional diesel.

At BARC, they use 80 percent diesel and 20 percent soybean oil mix. Their test results found that using biodiesel reduces carbon dioxide emissions 16 percent. Now that may have already been mentioned, but it bears repeating. Particulate matter, which is a major component of smog, is reduced by 22 percent and sulfur emissions are reduced by 20 percent.

Mr. Chairman, to date the 143 vehicles in their fleet have used over 60,000

gallons of biodiesel in their trucks, tractors and buses. They have found that maintenance costs are the same as using conventional diesel fuel.

In fact, the mechanics at BARC's motor pool actually prefer using biodiesel. Not only does it increase lubrication throughout the engine but unlike regular diesel, it does not emit fumes that cause eye irritations, a fact that those of us who have been behind buses from time to time will think is a pretty good idea.

I was going to urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, but I want to commend my colleagues for already having done that, but I am pleased that I had the opportunity to rise. I congratulate the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for this initiative.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for being such a strong supporter of alternative fuels and, obviously, with the gentleman's support, the Beltsville Research Station, the premiere agricultural research station in the country, is leading the rest of the Nation in this important arena.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his own leadership as a member of the Committee on Appropriations in assuring that Beltsville understands the seriousness of this Congress in trying to move additional alternative fuels on-line for the sake, not just of the Beltsville station, but for the sake of the Nation. I want to thank the gentleman for taking the time today to place in the RECORD the actual research, the demonstration and the results of what has actually been accomplished at Beltsville.

Without question, the gentleman is placing a foundation there that can be built upon and transferred to other USDA sites, as well as the cooperative agreements that USDA can reach with all of our land grant universities across the country.

I just want to thank the gentleman for helping to spur these efforts forward and for helping Beltsville lead the rest of the Nation as it should.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and thank her for her leadership. Again, I thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), my friend, for his leadership as well.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 33 offered by Mr. SANFORD: Insert before the short title the following:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to the Department of Agriculture may be used to carry out a pilot program under the child nutrition programs to study the effects of providing free breakfasts to students without regard to family income.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply gets at funding for the school breakfast pilot program. Mr. Chairman, this program was a 3-year authorization which basically chose six school districts from around the country to begin a pilot program looking at the link between eating breakfast and performance in school. Last year, $7 million went toward that cause, another $6 million is in this bill. This amendment goes after $6 million that is currently in the bill.

I would simply say that common sense would dictate, not another $6 million, that there is directly a link between having breakfast and performance for a young person at school.

1930

It does not take $13 million to tell us that young folks will do better in school after breakfast than without breakfast.

So I do not think this amendment is at all about the merits of the pilot program itself. Rather, I think that what this is about is do we want this pilot program to, since we know that is directly a link between one's performance and having breakfast, do we want to grow this into school breakfast for everybody around the country? For me, the answer would be no. Because if one actually looks at the numbers, it would cost a full $750 million a year to provide free breakfast for every school and every child in school districts across the country. To me, that says there is no free breakfast, there is no free lunch. $750 million is a lot of money.

Now, the reason I think it is worth looking at is that, if one is poor, one is going to get a free breakfast at school. Since 1975, the result of basically action taken here in this Congress, poor folks have been able to get a free breakfast. In fact, I have a chart here that shows participation rates around the country. In South Carolina, 98.9 percent of school districts offer breakfast. In West Virginia, it is 98.7. In Idaho, it is 97.8. In Texas, it is 96.8. In Delaware, it is 96.6.

I could read the other numbers for each of the other States in the Union; but the point is that, in the whole, we are looking at very high participation rates for breakfast.

The point is do we want to have another Federal mandate that says one is going to have school breakfast, and again I would say no. The reason I say no is that I think we have to take aim at helping folks. I think that those in need absolutely should be given a free breakfast. But if one is a lawyer, does one need to have a free breakfast for one's children? If one is a doctor, does one's children need to get a free breakfast? If one is a high-tech zillionaire from Silicon Valley, does one's children need to get a free breakfast?

In fact, if I look at the number of school districts across this country, 20 percent of the families who send their kids to public schools make in excess of $75,000. Five percent make over $132,000. Do we want people from Georgetown County, where per capita income is basically a little less than $20,000 a year in South Carolina, subsidizing people who make over $132,000 in the purchase of their child's breakfast? I would have to say no.

I as well would just make a point that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, in the debate that occurred at the committee level on this came out on the side of we do not need a universal free breakfast program.

Finally, I want to say that I think that this is the most basic of all parental responsibilities. The idea that before one sends one's kid off to school that one help them with breakfast, especially if one is financially able to do so. This is a place wherein family traditions can be passed along, family history can be passed along, have you done your homework can be passed along. A lot of other normal family questions can occur at the breakfast table. So handing this off to school districts to me would be a mistake on that basis as well.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in absolute opposition to the Sanford amendment, which would prohibit the Department of Agriculture from completing the School Breakfast Demonstration pilot project.

The School Breakfast Demonstration program is a scientific study to measure the effect of providing breakfast at school free of charge to all children, regardless of income, on a broad range of student outcomes, including grades, attendance, tardiness, and also behavior and concentration.

Mr. Chairman, yes, we should be providing breakfast for all of our children at their homes in the morning. But we are sure that parents in this busy world we are living in are commuting long hours, they are working long hours, and they leave the house before their children have had breakfast. Every child needs to go to school ready to learn on a full stomach.

The Meals for Achievement Act that I authored has already received half of its needed funding. The first $7 million was appropriated last year. The program is already under way. After a nationwide competition, six school districts have been chosen to participate.

As we debate, these school districts across the country representing a wide variety of schools, school districts, and students are already setting up their programs. Why would we today take that funding away from them?

Mr. Chairman, as a Nation, we are searching for answers to the many

challenges our schools and our children face. Numerous studies, including one by Harvard University and Massachusetts General Hospital, show that children who eat breakfast improve both their grades and their behavior in school. But I can assure my colleagues, if I came to this floor and said to them that it is absolute that children who eat breakfast do better in school, one would say to me prove it.

I want a scientific study, and I want that study to be a government, a Federal Government-paid and -monitored study. That is why we need to do this pilot program.

But because children need to have breakfast is one of the reasons why many school districts and some in my district provide breakfast at school to all of their students on the mornings before standardized testing.

In today's world, if a child is lucky enough to have two parents living at home, chances are that both parents are working and commuting long hours. More and more parents are out the door on the road early in the morning with no time to sit down to breakfast. That does not mean they cannot afford breakfast. It means these children do not eat breakfast because there is nobody there to insist that they do.

The breakfast program is voluntary. Nobody has to go to school and eat breakfast. It will be available for all children no matter when and if they want to eat breakfast.

Whether we like it or not, many children do not eat; and they do arrive at school hungry. And when they are hungry, they are not ready to learn.

So unless we want to pass a law requiring every family to ensure their kids eat breakfast before school, and then hire a bunch of breakfast police to enforce our law, we need to understand the benefits of a universal school breakfast program.

That is why we must allow the Department of Agriculture to use the funds included in this bill to complete the School Breakfast Demonstration program. Along with most educators and scientists, I believe that previous experience and studies will hold true and that the School Breakfast Demonstration program will prove once again that school breakfast is not a welfare program, it is an education program that will benefit all students.

Just as we do not charge the wealthy students for their books and their computers because they can afford it, we must not charge students for breakfast. Because like a book or a computer, breakfast is a learning tool, a tool that must be made available to all.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I want to commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for her great leadership on assuring that every child in this country obtains proper nutrition. Obviously, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) represents a different area of the country than I might coming from northwest Ohio or the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), the author of the amendment.

However, I can tell my colleagues, even in my own district, some of the most instructive people one can speak with are the food service workers in our schools. It is very shocking to go into some of the schools and to talk to these food service workers who tell us about a young child that comes in on a Monday morning who has not eaten all weekend and who asks permission to eat two school breakfasts because he or she has not had a decent meal all weekend. It is sad to think that that can happen in America; but in fact, it is happening every day. I am sure in some communities it is happening more than in other places.

I think as we use the school breakfast program to try to make sure that every child in these early years receives proper nutrition, and maybe that is a mothering role and so maybe the women of America feel more strongly about it, I think it is important to recognize that we need to understand how to make these programs work better to make sure that we are providing proper nutrition, to really understand which children may not be getting proper nutrition and what we can do about it.

Hopefully, every child would get the food they need at home; but we know that that just is not the case in today's world with people working two and three shifts, different jobs, split shifts, all the rest. Sometimes just finding family time for dinner is difficult in today's world. That is not the world I grew up in, but it is the world that so many families deal with today.

The money that we initially provided for this study totaled $7 million; and, in fact, the study is under way. The remaining $6 million that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and others have supported is coming from transferring monies out of the WIC program, the Women, Infants and Children's feeding program that are carrying over balances that are not needed because we are being successful with enrollment in that program, taking great care to be sure that sufficient dollars do remain in the WIC program.

Nothing is more important than a good meal with proper nutrition for the learning ability of children. When they do not eat enough and they do not eat properly, they get tired. Their brains do not grow fast enough. Their early years are absolutely critical in producing a child that can fully function in this society.

So I would urge defeat of the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) and again compliment the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for her outstanding leadership and her great heart on making sure that every child in America grows to their full potential, beginning with good nutrition.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, hunger is an issue many in America would prefer to ignore.

This amendment is about hunger.

This amendment is about making sure all of our children have a hearty meal and a healthy start as they begin the school day.

There is evidence of hunger in 3.6 percent of all households in America.

Close to four million children are hungry.

Fourteen million children—twenty percent of the population of children—live in food insecure homes.

In food insecure homes, meals are skipped, or the size of meals is reduced.

More than ten percent of all households in America are food insecure.

Because there is such hunger and food insecurity, there is also infant mortality, growth stunting, iron deficiency, anemia, poor learning, and increased chances for disease.

Because there is such hunger and food insecurity, the poor are more likely to remain poor, the hungry are more likely to remain hungry.

It seems strange that we must fight for food for those who can not fight for themselves.

It really is time to stop picking on the poor.

Less than 3 percent of the budget goes to feed the hungry.

It is for those reasons we must soundly and solidly reject this ill-advised amendment.

Currently, Mr. Chairman, the Agriculture appropriations bill includes $6 million to complete the School Breakfast Program Demonstration program.

Last year, $7 million was appropriated for the project, and school districts have been chosen to participate.

It is imprudent, unwise and injudicious to discontinue this study at this time.

This project will give us the information we need to determine if providing breakfast at school for all children is a sound investment for federal dollars.

The link between eating breakfast and improved learning and behavior is already well established.

Students who eat breakfast do better on tests.

Students who eat breakfast make better grades.

Breakfast is a learning tool, just like books and computers.

We cannot prepare our children for the future if we insist upon policies that relegate them to the past.

And, we cannot protect and preserve our communities, if we do not adequately provide the most basic commodity for living—something to eat.

Nutrition programs are essential to the well-being of millions of our children.

These are citizens who often cannot provide for themselves and need help for existence.

They do not ask much.

Just a little help to sustain them through the day.

Just a little help to keep them alert in class and productive in their lives.

Food for all, especially our children, is worth fighting for.

Reject this Sanford amendment.

It is not worthy of our support.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Congressman SANFORD to H.R. 4461, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug

Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for 2001. This amendment would prohibit the use of funds to complete a pilot project under which all children will receive free school breakfasts, regardless of income.

I am a long-time proponent of child nutrition programs, but I also believe we must focus funding on those children in greatest need to services.

The universal breakfast pilot project is based on the premise that children who do not eat at school don't eat breakfast and that more children would eat breakfast at school if all children could eat for free.

Mr. Chairman, any school that wants to participate in the school breakfast program with federal reimbursements can do so, and all children are eligible for participation. However, in contrast to a universal breakfast program, only low-income children are eligible for free meals.

The school breakfast program has grown tremendously over the past years. In 1980, approximately 33,000 schools served breakfast. In 1990, approximately 43,000 schools participated. This year, approximately 74,000 schools did. The number of children participating in breakfast programs has increased as well. During the past 10 years the number of children receiving school breakfasts rose 88 percent, climbing from 4 million to 7.5 million

Over 85 percent of low-income children enrolled in elementary school attend a school offering the breakfast program. This is an important fact because there are more breakfast programs in elementary than secondary schools. As a results, the opportunity to participate in a breakfast program is available to the majority of low-income children in elementary schools.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt there is any member in this body who would disagree with the fact that breakfast is an important meal for children. It helps provide them the energy they need to perform will in school. We do not need to prove this through a demonstration program.

What is under debate is who is responsible for feeding our nation's children. While I believe it is important that all children have an opportunity to participate in a school breakfast program, I also think the primary responsibility for feeding children lies with their parents.

Any proposal to make school breakfast free to children at all income levels in all schools would primarily subsidize middle and upper income children who do not need a free breakfast.

One reason children do not participate in the breakfast program to the extent they participate in the lunch program is that many children eat breakfast at home with their families. This is not usually an option for lunch. Why would we want to encourage children to eat at school when they can spend valuable time with their parents?

If the argument in support of a universal breakfast program is that it will reduce the number of children who are missing breakfast, large research evaluations funded by the USDA in the early 1990s do not support that contention. Studies show that 94 percent of children in kindergarten through third grade already eat breakfast and that the presence of school breakfast does not increase this number.

I have opposed the funding of this pilot project from the beginning and continue to oppose it. It is not needed. We have a school breakfast program that is available to the majority of low-income children. Other children can participate if they want to do so.

At every opportunity, we should encourage children and parents to share meals together.

Mr. Chairman, I want to particularly thank Mr. SANFORD for the forethought and commitment to have us stop moving forward on an effort that is unnecessary and I think unwise. All a universal breakfast program does is increase the federal budget and reduce quality time between parents and children. I encourage my colleagues to support the Sanford amendment. We do not need this pilot project.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 538, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 26 offered by Mr. DEFAZIO: Insert at the end of the bill (before the short title) the following:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, not more than $28,684,000 of the funds made available in this Act may be used for Wildlife Services Program operations under the heading ''ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE'', and none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for Wildlife Services Program operations to carry out the first section of the Act of March 2, 1931 (7 U.S.C. 426), may be used to conduct campaigns for the destruction of wild predatory mammals for the purpose of protecting livestock.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) reserves a point of order.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, may I ask, does the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) intend to pursue his point of order, because in the interest of time, if he does, I will offer a different amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw amendment No. 26.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 39 offered by Mr. DEFAZIO: Insert before the short title the following:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, not more than $28,684,000 of the funds made available in this Act may be used for Wildlife Services Program operations under the heading ''ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE'', and none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for Wildlife Services Program operations to carry out the first section of the Act of March 2, 1931 (7 U.S.C. 426), may be used to conduct campaigns for the destruction of wild animals for the purpose of protecting stock.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes evenly divided between the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have debated this amendment before. Actually, this amendment passed the House this fiscal year 1999 but was narrowly defeated on a reconsideration vote after powerful special interests weighed in with howls of protest, false sense, and red herrings.

Well, first, let us dispense with the false arguments that we will hear tonight from the gentleman from Texas and others. This is not about public health and safety. Children in school yards will be safe whether or not this amendment passes. It does not go to the issue of wildlife that presents a public health and safety issue. It is not about dusky geese. It is not about brown tree snakes in Hawaii. It is not about airplanes falling from the sky after bird strikes.

1945

None of those activities of the Animal Damage Control agency, now called Wildlife Services, would be affected by this amendment. It is not about tuberculosis and deer in the Midwest. We will hear all those things. It is not about that.

It is about one thing and one thing only. One specific program that is reserved for private ranching interests in the western United States. A program of subsidies to those ranchers. A program that is not available to any other member of the public who has a particular problem with wildlife on their property. It is only available to the ranchers.

It is an ineffective, indiscriminate program shooting, trapping, poisoning wildlife that has been promoted by ADC, which now calls themselves Wildlife Services. And this is, again, unlike their indiscriminate ineffective program, a very specific target, eliminate the $7 million a year subsidy. That would reduce the bill to the funding recommended by the President, which would fully meet all of the obligations to protect public health and safety and other duties of that agency except for the subsidized program which goes on to private ranch lands, benefits Sam Donaldson and others.

They have spent millions of dollars on this program, and there are more coyotes today than there were when the program began. They do not understand coyote biology. When they kill the alpha male and female, they end up with more coyotes spread over a wider range, which is exactly what has happened. They have managed to kill people's pets. They have managed to kill, unfortunately, human beings from plane crashes with the aerial gunning program.

Nothing in this amendment would prevent those same ranchers, who are subsidized by Federal taxpayers, from hiring someone or doing it themselves by any legal means to protect their livestock. They can do it themselves. Nothing in this amendment would prevent that. But it would say that they no longer will have the luxury of calling for a Federal employee to come upon their land to take care of their private wildlife problems. It will be up to them to pay for it themselves, to hire someone to do it for them.

That is the gist of this amendment. It is an amendment of great merit. It has passed the House before, and I recommend Members support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make two points in regard to the amendment. First, the reason the committee has recommended funding Wildlife Services above the administration's level is because of requests from Members of this body. In fact, if we had the budget to accommodate all requests, the number would be much higher.

I would also point out that the committee recommendation also includes $1 million for aviation safety that was requested by the USDA officials after the budget submission. Sadly, Mr. Chairman, again this year APHIS suffered a plane crash that killed two people working for Wildlife Services. The USDA is in the second year of upgrading its aviation safety program and this budget is where that money comes from.

My second point, Mr. Chairman, is the issue of fairness. Livestock producers benefit from the APHIS program, and so do many other sectors. What is the point in singling out one group? Why not take away the funds used to protect fish farms or oilseed producers from migratory birds? Why not make the States and the cattle industry assume the full cost of the brucellosis program? Why not make the State of Hawaii and its tourism industry assume the full cost of protection from the brown tree snake? Let the States assume the full cost of rabies eradication and let the airlines and local airports assume the full cost of protection from bird strikes.

What I am saying to the vast majority of Members of this body whose districts benefit from Wildlife Services programs is that it is unfair to single out or attempt to single out one sector of one industry when so many others benefit.

In closing, I strongly recommend a ''no'' vote on this amendment. It will not achieve its purported purposes. It will endanger the health and welfare of people and animals alike. It is opposed by the States the sponsors represent. Contrary to recent assertions, it will have far-reaching and negative effects upon the Wildlife Services authority.

The sponsor should play it straight up and offer an amendment to do away with all lethal predator control. But they know it would never pass the House, so they attack one part of American agriculture that they have no use for. Oppose this amendment and let us get back to the real business of the House.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make five points. Number one, the wildlife methods of predator control are ineffective and wasteful. From 1983 to 1993, the amount of money that has been spent on this program has gone up by 71 percent, kills have gone up by 30 percent, and there is no significant reduction in the predator population.

Number two. Taxpayers should not be responsible for subsidizing predator control. As my friend from Oregon said when he spoke, not one word in this amendment would in any way impact a rancher's ability to shoot or control livestock on his or her property. All it says is that the taxpayers of this country are not going to subsidize gunning of predators on these ranches out in the West.

Thirdly, the Wildlife Services methods for predator control are inhumane. All we have to do is see footage of films of these helicopters and aircraft speeding low across the range with people with guns shooting indiscriminately from one end to the other. It is inhumane and it is dangerous.

My colleagues will hear and see the same posters that we have seen for years now, getting a little bit dog-eared, of the wolf chasing the little white sheep. They are gruesome pictures. What they do not show are the seven humans who have been killed in aviation accidents associated with gunning these animals down. These individuals ride in these helicopters and aircraft with their rifles shooting from the aircraft, which by the way, is a violation of FAA regulations.

I guess the fourth point is that alternative methods of predator control do exist. They do exist. We do not have to support a program where we take taxpayers' funds and use them to kill animals in a program that has never really worked, and all it really constitutes in the end is a subsidy to large western ranchers.

I urge support of the pending amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong opposition to the DeFazio amendment.

This is amazing, this debate, and what kind of rhetoric is being tossed around this Chamber. The Wildlife Services program is violating Federal law in the air? FAA regulations? Give us a break.

These accusations that the program is inhumane. The accusations that it is not focused and that innocent wildlife are somehow caught in the cross-fire. The accusation that because there are more coyotes today, and there are, that it is a direct result of this program?

Those who are going to stand up and propose this amendment ought to at least stick to the facts. I have a fact here and a photo to prove how if we do not participate in this program, this inhumane activity will occur. These are several sheep in Oregon that were destroyed earlier on in a brutal way, as my colleagues can see from the photo, by wild coyotes who were roaming this area. This is the kind of inhumaneness that we are trying to stop. It is not only inhumane, it is of great cost to producers and farmers and ranchers around the country.

All of those who are standing up with this false rhetoric right now should perhaps consider, as they look at this photograph, about rewriting the nursery rhyme ''Mary Had a Little Lamb'' and we failed to protect it. That is what should rest on the consciences of those who would eliminate this very important program that promotes humaneness, is cost effective, and very important to farmers and ranchers around this country.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding me this time, and I of course am horrified by the picture of the slaughtered sheep that was shown here.

But let us talk for a moment about why this is offered. And I would suggest to my colleague from Texas that it is not superheated rhetoric. I would

have invited him to go to Clackamas County, just outside of Portland, in my district, for a tragic incident a few months ago where the Wildlife Services agent placed a cluster of canisters of sodium cyanide on the land of a tree farmer. These so-called M–44 devices, once triggered, explode and release sodium cyanide gas several feet in the air. If sodium cyanide makes contact with the mucus membrane of an animal, touching the mouths, eyes, or nose, the animal will suffer a miserable death.

On a tree farm in Estacada, a family pet, a German Shepherd named Buddy, made the fatal mistake of stumbling across an M–44 loaded with sodium cyanide. I will not show my colleagues the picture of Buddy, his face dried with blood and foam caked on his face. But what if that canister had been dealt with by a child instead of a German Shepherd?

Currently, in my State, citizens have gathered 103,976 signatures to place on a Statewide ballot a measure to restrict the use of inhumane traps and poison. They do not want the USDA personnel setting out land mines on their private or public lands. These traps set by the Wildlife Services are just as dangerous as the poison.

Dozens of people in the State of Oregon have come forward to tell of their tragic experiences with steel-jawed traps, leghold traps, neck snares, and Conibear traps.

A chief copetitioner of the Oregon ballot measure is Jennifer Kirkpatrick, from the rural community of Scappoose, who has the story of being in a stream and had the misfortune of having her hand caught in the vice-like grip of one of these traps, a device set out in the water to crush the vertebrae of beaver, muskrat, or otter that swims into it. She indicated it was the most excruciating pain she had ever endured.

Because the trap was so large and powerful, she could not free her hand, with the trap crushing it. I think we can all imagine a car door slammed on our hand. She had to walk a quarter mile to her car and then drive several miles to a neighbor's home. The neighbor struggled 15 minutes to pry open that trap. She experienced a near complete loss of the use of her hand for 9 years. And being a seamstress, she was out of work and feared that her career would be over.

No place in Oregon, nor any other place in the West, is a logical area for the widespread use of these horrific traps and poisons at taxpayer expense. This amendment helps correct the problem. It does not stop private individuals who want to protect their livestock as they see fit. It simply requires the ranchers to assume the responsibility if they want to use these lethal weapons. I strongly urge approval of the amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) that the Committee do now rise.

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the motion to rise is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) controls 11 minutes and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) controls 7 minutes.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the DeFazio amendment again this year, and for the basic same reasons we have in the past. There is a lot of misinformation about what this amendment does and does not do.

And I concede the point to the gentleman, and all of those who are proposing this amendment, that they are opposed to killing of wolves and coyotes and other animals that do great damage to American agriculture. I concede that point. But from the standpoint of what this amendment does, I think it is important to understand, first off, that the Wildlife Services program is a highly specialized organization within the United States Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. Wildlife Services uses, uses now, contrary to the previous Speaker, integrated wildlife management techniques and strategies to minimize the negative impacts of wildlife on livestock and crops, human health and safety, property, and threatened and endangered species.

2000

If this amendment were to pass, the $7 million, the DeFazio amendment would redirect the $10 million in additional funds by prohibiting their use for livestock protection programs. Because of the cooperative nature of this program, a $7 million cut and a redirection of funds actually results in a total loss in the program of $23.7 million.

Now, this also will knock out $2 million of the bill's appropriated funds to increase wildlife services that will be dealing with the rabies control program and collaborations. The DeFazio amendment would not only cause a loss of $2 million for this important program, but would also cause an additional loss of cooperative money by local sponsors.

The funding for these wildlife professionals provides the basis that allows the State to devote funds for permanent personnel to perform all of the duties of animal control. By limiting the duties that wildlife professionals perform, we undermine the entire program.

Please oppose this misguided amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the DeFazio-Bass-Morella amendment. What this amendment does is it would simply cut $7 million from the Department of Agriculture's Wildlife Services program, which would bring their budget to $28.7 million, as requested by the administration.

Wildlife Services spends millions of dollars annually to kill more than 100,000 coyotes, foxes, bears, mountain lions, and other predators in the Western United States. Although non-lethal alternatives do exist, Wildlife Services chooses to shoot, poison, trap and even club to death both target and non-target animals.

This is a taxpayer subsidy, as has been mentioned; and this taxpayer subsidy gives ranchers a disincentive to seek alternative methods of livestock protection that might be far more effective.

The USDA predator control methods are non-selective, they are inefficient, they are inhumane. Aerial gunning, sodium cyanide poisoning, steel-jawed leghold traps and neck snares are all common methods used by Wildlife Services. These techniques have been known to kill pets, as well as endangered and threatened species. Much of the killing is conducted before livestock is released into an area, with the expectation that predators will become a problem. However, killing wildlife to protect livestock is effective only if the individual animals who attack livestock are removed. Targeting the entire population is needlessly cruel, it wastes taxpayer dollars, and it can be counterproductive.

With this amendment, the Wildlife Services program could leave intact the research, education, and exchange of new information on wildlife damage management and non-lethal methods. Programs would also be funded to assist with non-lethal predator protection services and in cases to protect human and endangered species lives.

Reducing the proposed budget of Wildlife Services to the administration's request would send the message, would send the message, that efforts must be made to implement humane methods of protecting livestock. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Texas earlier

used a little better quality shot of this. My colleague from Maryland who just spoke talked about how we need more humane protection of livestock. Let me tell the gentlewoman from Maryland about this picture. Let me tell about this picture.

Twenty-eight sheep were killed in one night by cougars. There were guard dogs, four of them, guarding these sheep. There were sheep herders on site when Sky Crebbs, a rancher in my district, ended up with this kill. This photo is so gruesome, I covered these up. My colleague from Texas did not do that. But it is so gruesome, I covered them up.

This is not unusual. I want to enter into the record, Mr. Chairman, a letter from Phil Ward, who is the head of the Oregon Department of Agriculture. It says: ''According to a recent survey conducted by the Oregon Agricultural Statistics Service, more than $158 million of annual damage to Oregon agricultural products occurs from wildlife.''

All across my district, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing more and more incidents of predator problems: 144 pets were killed in Oregon in 1997, 165 in 1998, and 203 in 1999.

Let me share with you some headlines out of our local newspapers: ''Agents track cougar that tussled with man.''

''Cougar attacks and kills colt. Upset rancher threatens suit.''

''Cougars come home to town.''

''Calls from residents rise as the once elusive cat grows.''

''Annie Hoye figured raccoons had gotten into an attached shed last spring when a banging against the side of the house woke her early one morning. But that afternoon she found the eviscerated carcass of a deer in her backyard. 'It must have been about how farmers feel when they find a mutilated cow and blame it on aliens,' she said.''

''Cougar shot in La Grande neighborhood.''

''Cougar seen in Ashland still around.''

''Elk herds continue nose-dive because of predators.''

''USDA employee kills big cougar out at Cottage Grove.'' My friend and colleague from the fourth district may be interested in this one: ''A 7-foot 5½ inch male weighing 135 pounds was tracked down and shot after it killed its 30th sheep on a ranch near Elkton.''

This is a serious problem if you are in a rural district like mine, with 70,000 square miles. Part of the problem is the Federal Government is the landlord of over half that land.

So I believe these people, who pay taxes and farm and ranch in this country, have the right to expect that the neighbor, the Federal Government on over 55 percent of the land, has an obligation to help manage this.

That is why, with predators on the rise, we should not be cutting funds. We should be using as many non-lethal efforts as possible, but that is not always possible. When you get a 7-foot cougar that has killed its 30th lamb, it is time for action before it kills a person.

Mr. Chairman, I include the letter referred to above for the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Salem, OR, May 19, 2000.

Hon. JOE SKEEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SKEEN: Early next week the House of Representatives will vote on appropriations for the U.S. Department of Agriculture and related agencies.

I urge your support for full funding of the USDA–APHIS Wildlife Services programs. The Oregon Department of Agriculture works in cost-sharing and program relationships with USDA Wildlife Services to address the concerns of wildlife damage to agriculture crops in Oregon. Many producers also provide cost-share for the use of this program.

According to a recent survey conducted by the Oregon Agricultural Statistics Service, more than $158 million of annual damage to Oregon agricultural products occurs from wildlife.

APHIS/Wildlife Services also provides services through cooperative agreements with thousands of entities nationwide, including state game and fish agencies, state departments of health, city and local governments, school districts, colleges, airports, the U.S. military, Indian tribes, National Wildlife Refuges, departments of transportation, homeowner associations, electrical companies and many other parties.

I strongly request that you oppose any reduction in funding, and fully support adequate increases for necessary staffing and program costs.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP C. WARD,
Director.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Salem, Oregon, May 18–19, 2000.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE OPPOSES ANY REDUCTION TO THE USDA–APHIS WILDLIFE SERVICES BUDGET

Whereas agriculture is a leading economic force in Oregon and the United States, and

Whereas the Wildlife Damage Survey identified in excess of $158 million of annual damage to Oregon agricultural products, and

Whereas agricultural producers implement $6 million of wildlife damage prevention efforts themselves and still require professional assistance from USDA–APHIS Wildlife Services, and

Whereas USDA–APHIS Wildlife Services delivers services to minimize the impact of wildlife damage which are vital to agriculture and to all segments of the population.

Be it resolved that the Oregon State Board of Agriculture opposes any reduction to the USDA–APHIS Wildlife Services budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if I could inquire on the time, I yielded myself 3 minutes, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) 3 minutes, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) 2 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) 3 minutes.

How did we get that one-half minute in there?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) did not consume the entire amount of time and yielded back one-half minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment where hopefully all of my colleagues will spend a little bit of time understanding the specifics of the amendment. It is an amendment which truly is very simple when we understand it and we look at the specifics of the amendment.

The specifics of the amendment deal with a corporate welfare program that exists in the United States of America as bad as any corporate welfare program that exists in this country. It specifically applies to ranchers, specifically to a function that there is no justifiable policy reason that taxpayers across this country should be subsidizing these ranchers. That is the program. That is what we are talking about.

We are not talking about whether or not coyotes should exist or whether or not ranchers should have the ability to do animal control. That is not what this amendment is about. What this amendment is about is taxpayer money being spent on a private function without a public purpose. That is what it is about, and that is why I urge the adoption of the amendment.

In a sort of Hobson effect, though, this is a program which is not even effective, which is one of the weird things about this; that there are in fact more effective ways to deal with animal control that have been done in many places without the use and the methods that are used by the Animal Damage Control program.

This is a program that the public holds in poor regard because it reflects a callous attitude and a waste of taxpayers' dollars. This program amounts to nothing more than corporate welfare. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Oregon to decrease funding by $7 million for the Department of Agriculture's Wildlife Services program.

This program is costly, unnecessary, inhumane, dangerous and continues to expand eliminating any landowner incentive to control predators through other more cost-effective and humane measures.

The predator control program is not cost-effective and its funding has increased to almost $10 million annually. Sheep and cattle killed by predators could be replaced at one-third the cost the government spends in trying to control predators. These predatory control methods are dangerous for the animals, but some of the forms of predatory control such as aerial gunning are also high risk to Wildlife Service employees. Since 1996, six employees have been killed in four helicopter and plane crashes, the most recent occurred on March 27, 2000.

Ranchers should be taking care of predator control problems themselves. This amendment would not prevent ranchers and farmers from doing so. Currently, because of the federal subsidy, ranchers are discouraged from using more effective, humane, less-costly, and non-lethal methods such as guard dogs, electric sound and light devices, or predator exclusion fencing. There is no incentive for ranchers to use these types of control methods because the government is paying to kill the wild animals which attack these farmers' livestock. I don't object to farmers and ranchers protecting their property but I do object to the federal government paying for it.

Again, this program is costly, unnecessary, inhumane, and dangerous. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the DeFazio-Bass-Morella amendment to the Agriculture Appropriations bill.

While I know the Wildlife Services engage in a number of valuable programs to mitigate human-wildlife conflicts, such as the bird control program at Denver International Airport, I am troubled by the reckless and seemingly inhumane procedures undertaken by this agency.

The most disturbing, not to mention dangerous, Wildlife Services endeavor is the Aerial Hunting Campaign. Over the past 10 years, 31 people have been injured, 7 of them fatally, in Wildlife Services aircraft accidents. Low altitude, low speed flying in remote areas is invariably high risk. To me this seems like a hazardous and costly way to go about predator control. As if that was not enough, Aerial Gunning does not help reduce livestock losses because it does not target offending animals, predators that we know are feeding on livestock.

For my colleagues who are not swayed by the disturbing, twisted excesses of the Wildlife Services program, I encourage you to look at the flawed economics behind this program. For every dollar of reported livestock damage, the Wildlife Services spends three dollars in the West to fix the problem.

The DeFazio-Bass amendment offered today is less punitive than amendments offered in previous years. It allows the agency to retain adequate funding, but compels the program to use tax dollars to kill the public's wildlife through a subsidy for private ranchers.

I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon) having assumed the chair, Mr. Nussle, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4611, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of H.R. 4461 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 538, that no further amendments to the bill shall be in order except, one, pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate; two, the following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes:

The amendments printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and numbered 9, 29, 32, 37, 48, 61 and 68.

Each additional amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in this request, or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed, or a designee, and shall be considered as read. Each additional amendment shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for the purpose of discussion, I want to just clarify, because we have some Members on this side who have brought amendments up just recently and we had not expected those. I wanted to make sure that those Members understood that under this unanimous consent agreement, which I will ultimately support, I do not believe that they would be able to bring their amendments up. I wanted to clarify that.

The only amendments that would be allowed would be those that have already been printed in the RECORD?

Mr. SKEEN. If the gentlewoman will yield, that is correct.

Ms. KAPTUR. And available to the committee?

Mr. SKEEN. That is correct.

Ms. KAPTUR. For example, we have a Member here who may want to be recognized at this point to ascertain whether her amendments would be in order under this unanimous consent agreement. I would not want to preclude the gentlewoman from being at least able to inquire as to whether those amendments would be allowed.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to whether or not the three amendments that are being referenced are included in this group that is being agreed upon? These are three amendments that we had prepared. We did not realize that there would be perhaps a reduction or closing off of the opportunity to present amendments. I would certainly ask my colleagues to include these three amendments in this group.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I believe these would be the only three amendments on this side that currently are not allowed under the unanimous consent request. They all concern serious issues of civil rights and litigation related to that at the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, could I ask the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) a question under the reservation of objection of the gentlewoman from Ohio? Could I ask whether or not, since it is my understanding that the amendments of the gentlewoman from California are subject to points of order, is it possible under the unanimous consent request that the gentleman is proposing, for those to be handled under the pro forma procedure laid out in the unanimous consent request?

Mr. SKEEN. If the gentlewoman will yield, yes.

Mr. OBEY. So the gentlewoman would be able to offer those amendments, even though they would be subject to a point of order? The gentlewoman cannot get a vote on the amendment, obviously, but we could strike the last word so that she can make the point that she wants on each of the three amendments?

2015

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I will move to strike the last word and then yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) at the appropriate time.

Mr. OBEY. So the gentleman will rise to strike the last word and recognize the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS)?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for that allowance. We realize it is in the nature of an unusual request, but we were unprepared as well until very recently. I also thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 538 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. 4461.

2016

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. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. NUSSLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, pending was the amendment numbered 39 offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 538, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN); amendment No. 47 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE); amendment No. 36 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY); amendment No. 51 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE); an amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN); and amendment No. 33 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) 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. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 187, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 373]

AYES—182

Aderholt	Bilirakis	Canady
Archer	Bliley	Cannon
Armey	Blunt	Coble
Bachus	Bonilla	Coburn
Baker	Bono	Combest
Barcia	Borski	Cooksey
Barrett (NE)	Brady (TX)	Costello
Bartlett	Bryant	Cox
Barton	Burton	Crane
Bateman	Buyer	Cubin
Bereuter	Callahan	Cunningham
Berry	Calvert	Danner
DeLay	LaHood	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Largent	Royce
Dickey	Latham	Ryan (WI)
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Ryun (KS)
Doyle	Linder	Salmon
Dreier	LoBiondo	Sanford
Dunn	Lucas (OK)	Saxton
Ehlers	Manzullo	Schaffer
Emerson	Martinez	Sensenbrenner
English	Mascara	Sessions
Everett	McCrery	Shadegg
Ewing	McHugh	Shaw
Fletcher	McInnis	Sherwood
Gallegly	McIntyre	Shimkus
Gekas	McKeon	Shows
Gillmor	Metcalf	Shuster
Goode	Mica	Simpson
Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Skeen
Goodling	Mollohan	Skelton
Goss	Moran (KS)	Smith (NJ)
Green (WI)	Murtha	Souder
Gutknecht	Nethercutt	Spence
Hall (OH)	Ney	Stearns
Hall (TX)	Northup	Stenholm
Hastings (WA)	Nussle	Stump
Hayes	Oberstar	Stupak
Hayworth	Ortiz	Sununu
Hefley	Oxley	Tancredo
Herger	Packard	Tauzin
Hill (MT)	Paul	Terry
Hobson	Pease	Thornberry
Hoekstra	Peterson (MN)	Thune
Holden	Peterson (PA)	Tiahrt
Hostettler	Petri	Traficant
Hunter	Phelps	Visclosky
Hutchinson	Pickering	Vitter
Hyde	Pitts	Walden
Istook	Pombo	Walsh
John	Portman	Wamp
Johnson, Sam	Quinn	Watts (OK)
Jones (NC)	Radanovich	Weldon (FL)
Kanjorski	Rahall	Weldon (PA)
Kasich	Regula	Weller
Kildee	Reynolds	Weygand
King (NY)	Riley	Whitfield
Kingston	Roemer	Wicker
Knollenberg	Rogan	Wolf
Kucinich	Rogers	Young (FL)
LaFalce	Rohrabacher	

NOES—187

Abercrombie	Dixon	Kleczka
Ackerman	Doggett	Kolbe
Allen	Dooley	Kuykendall
Andrews	Edwards	Lampson
Baca	Ehrlich	Lantos
Baird	Engel	Larson
Baldacci	Eshoo	Leach
Baldwin	Etheridge	Levin
Barrett (WI)	Evans	Lewis (GA)
Bass	Farr	Lofgren
Bentsen	Filner	Lowey
Berman	Foley	Luther
Biggert	Frank (MA)	Maloney (NY)
Bilbray	Franks (NJ)	Markey
Bishop	Frelinghuysen	Matsui
Blagojevich	Frost	McCarthy (MO)
Blumenauer	Ganske	McCarthy (NY)
Boehlert	Gejdenson	McDermott
Bonior	Gephardt	McGovern
Boswell	Gibbons	McKinney
Boucher	Gilman	Meehan
Boyd	Gonzalez	Meek (FL)
Brady (PA)	Gordon	Meeks (NY)
Brown (FL)	Granger	Menendez
Brown (OH)	Green (TX)	Millender-McDonald
Capps	Greenwood	Miller (FL)
Capuano	Gutierrez	Miller, George
Cardin	Hastings (FL)	Minge
Carson	Hilliard	Mink
Castle	Hinchey	Moore
Clay	Hoeffel	Moran (VA)
Clayton	Holt	Morella
Clement	Hooley	Nadler
Clyburn	Horn	Napolitano
Condit	Houghton	Neal
Conyers	Hoyer	Obey
Cramer	Inslee	Olver
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Ose
Cummings	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pallone
Davis (FL)	Jefferson	Pascrell
Davis (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Pastor
DeFazio	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
DeGette	Jones (OH)	Pickett
Delahunt	Kaptur	Pomeroy
DeLauro	Kelly	Porter
Deutsch	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Dicks	Kind (WI)	Ramstad
Dingell	LaTourette	Rangel
Doggett	Lazio	Reyes
Dooley	Lee	Rivers
Edwards	Levin	Rodriguez
Ehrlich	Lewis (GA)	Rothman
Engel	Lofgren	Roukema
Eshoo	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Etheridge	Luther	Sabo
Evans	Maloney (NY)	Sanders
Farr	Markey	Sandlin
Filner	Matsui	Sawyer
Foley	McCarthy (MO)	Schakowsky
Frank (MA)	McCarthy (NY)	Scott
Franks (NJ)	McDermott	Serrano
Frelinghuysen	McGovern	Sherman
Frost	McKinney	Sisisky
Ganske	Meehan	Slaughter
Gejdenson	Meek (FL)	Smith (MI)
Gephardt	Meeks (NY)	Smith (TX)
Gibbons	Menendez	Snyder
Gilman	Millender-McDonald	Stabenow
Gonzalez	Miller (FL)	Stark
Gordon	Miller, George	Strickland
Granger	Minge	Sweeney
Green (TX)	Mink	Tauscher
Greenwood	Moore	Thomas
Gutierrez	Moran (VA)	Thompson (CA)
Hastings (FL)	Morella	Thompson (MS)
Hilliard	Nadler	Thurman
Hinchey	Napolitano	Tierney
Hoeffel	Neal	Toomey
Holt	Obey	Towns
Hooley	Olver	Turner
Horn	Ose	Udall (CO)
Houghton	Pallone	Udall (NM)
Hoyer	Pascrell	Upton
Inslee	Pastor	Velazquez
Jackson (IL)	Pelosi	Waters
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pickett	Weiner
Jefferson	Pomeroy	Wexler
Johnson (CT)	Porter	Wilson
Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)	Wise
Jones (OH)	Ramstad	Woolsey
Kaptur	Rangel	Wu
Kelly	Reyes	Wynn
Kennedy	Rivers	
Kind (WI)	Rodriguez	
LaFalce	Rothman	
LaHood	Roukema	
Largent	Roybal-Allard	
Latham	Sabo	
Lewis (KY)	Sanders	
Linder	Sandlin	
LoBiondo	Sawyer	
Lucas (OK)	Schakowsky	
Manzullo	Scott	
Martinez	Serrano	
Mascara	Sherman	
McCrery	Sisisky	
McHugh	Slaughter	
McInnis	Smith (MI)	
McIntyre	Smith (TX)	
McKeon	Snyder	
Metcalf	Stabenow	
Mica	Stark	
Miller, Gary	Strickland	
Mollohan	Sweeney	
Moran (KS)	Tauscher	
Murtha	Thomas	
Nethercutt	Thompson (CA)	
Ney	Thompson (MS)	
Northup	Thurman	
Nussle	Tierney	
Oberstar	Toomey	
Ortiz	Towns	
Oxley	Turner	
Packard	Udall (CO)	
Paul	Udall (NM)	
Pease	Upton	
Peterson (MN)	Velazquez	
Peterson (PA)	Waters	
Petri	Weiner	
Phelps	Wexler	
Pickering	Wilson	
Pitts	Wise	
Pombo	Woolsey	
Portman	Wu	
Quinn	Wynn	
Radanovich		
Rahall		
Regula		
Reynolds		
Riley		
Roemer		
Rogan		
Rogers		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Royce		
Ryan (WI)		
Ryun (KS)		
Salmon		
Sanford		
Saxton		
Schaffer		
Sensenbrenner		
Sessions		
Shadegg		
Shaw		
Sherwood		
Shimkus		
Shows		
Shuster		
Simpson		
Skeen		
Skelton		
Smith (NJ)		
Souder		
Spence		
Stearns		
Stenholm		
Stump		
Stupak		
Sununu		
Tancredo		
Tauzin		
Terry		
Thornberry		
Thune		
Tiahrt		
Traficant		
Visclosky		
Vitter		
Walden		
Walsh		
Wamp		
Watts (OK)		
Weldon (FL)		
Weldon (PA)		
Weller		
Weygand		
Whitfield		
Wicker		
Wolf		
Young (FL)		

NOT VOTING—65

Ballenger	Fowler	Moakley
Barr	Gilchrest	Myrick
Becerra	Graham	Norwood
Berkley	Hansen	Owens
Boehner	Hill (IN)	Payne
Burr	Hilleary	Pryce (OH)
Camp	Hinojosa	Rush
Campbell	Hulshof	Sanchez
Chabot	Isakson	Scarborough
Chambliss	Jenkins	Shays
Chenoweth-Hage	Kilpatrick	Smith (WA)
Collins	Klink	Spratt
Cook	LaTourette	Talent
Coyne	Lazio	Tanner
Davis (VA)	Lee	Taylor (MS)
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (NC)
DeMint	Lipinski	Vento
Duncan	Lucas (KY)	Watkins
Fattah	Maloney (CT)	Watt (NC)
Forbes	McCollum	Waxman
Ford	McIntosh	Young (AK)
Fossella	McNulty	

2043

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MARKEY and Mrs. BIGGERT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. OBERSTAR changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 373 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 538, 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. 47 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 47 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 53, noes 316, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 374]

AYES—53

Archer
Armey
Barton
Biggert
Bilbray
Brady (TX)
Burton
Cannon
Coble
Coburn
Cox
Crane
DeLay
Ehrlich
Franks (NJ)
Goode
Gutknecht
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Linder
Manzullo
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Paul
Pease
Petri
Pitts
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Stearns
Sununu
Tancredo
Toomey
Vitter

NOES—316

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—65

Ballenger
Barr
Becerra
Berkley
Boehner
Burr
Camp
Campbell
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Collins
Cook
Coyne
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeMint
Duncan
Fattah
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Gilchrest
Graham
Hansen
Hill (IN)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hulshof
Isakson
Jenkins
Kilpatrick
Klink
LaTourette
Lazio
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Lucas (KY)
Maloney (CT)
McCollum
McIntosh
McNulty
Moakley
Myrick
Norwood
Owens
Payne
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Sanchez
Scarborough
Shays
Smith (WA)
Spratt
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Vento
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Young (AK)

2052

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 374 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 36 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 363, noes 12, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 375]

AYES—363

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen

Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—12

Archer
Dingell
Dooley
Dreier
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Holt
Knollenberg
McCrery
Pease
Roukema
Thomas

NOT VOTING—59

Ballenger
Bateman
Becerra
Berkley
Burr
Camp
Campbell
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Collins
Cook
Coyne
Davis (VA)
DeMint
Fattah
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Gilchrest
Graham
Hansen
Hill (IN)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hulshof
Isakson
Jenkins
Kilpatrick
Klink
LaTourette
Lazio
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Maloney (CT)
McCollum
McIntosh
McNulty
Moakley
Myrick
Norwood
Owens
Payne
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Sanchez
Scarborough
Shays
Smith (WA)
Spratt
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Vento
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Young (AK)

2059

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 375 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, due to mechanical difficulties, my flight was 262 minutes late which is why I missed rollcall votes No. 373, No. 374, and No. 375. Had I been present, I would have voted no on No. 373, no on No. 374, and yes on No. 375.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment No. 51offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) 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. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 77, noes 301, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

AYES—77

Andrews
Archer
Armey
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Berkley
Brown (OH)
Cannon
Chabot
Coble
Coburn
Cox
Crane
Cunningham
DeLay
Doggett
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Green (TX)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hoekstra
Holt
Hostettler
Hyde
Istook
Kelly
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Largent
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luther
Manzullo
McInnis
McKinney
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Morella
Nadler
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Petri
Portman
Ramstad
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Stark
Stearns
Sununu
Tancredo
Tierney
Toomey
Udall (CO)
Visclosky
Wamp
Weiner
Wu

NOES—301

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—56

Ballenger
Becerra
Burr
Camp
Campbell
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Collins
Cook
Coyne
Davis (VA)
DeMint
Fattah
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Gilchrest
Graham
Hansen
Hill (IN)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Isakson
Kilpatrick
Klink
LaTourette
Lazio
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Maloney (CT)
McCollum
McIntosh
McNulty
Moakley
Myrick
Norwood
Owens
Payne
Pelosi
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rush
Sanchez
Sandlin
Shays
Smith (WA)
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Vento
Waxman
Young (AK)

2106

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 376 on July 10, 2000, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 370, noes 12, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

AYES—370

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOES—12

Archer
Conyers
Crane
Dingell
Dooley
Jackson (IL)
Knollenberg
Lowey
McCrery
Porter
Thomas
Waters

NOT VOTING—52

Becerra
Burr
Camp
Campbell
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Collins
Cook
Cooksey
Coyne
Davis (VA)
DeMint
Fattah
Forbes
Fossella
Gilchrest
Graham
Hansen
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Houghton
Hulshof
Isakson
Kilpatrick
Klink
LaTourette
Lazio
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Maloney (CT)
McCollum
McIntosh
McNulty
Moakley
Myrick
Norwood
Owens
Payne
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Sanchez
Shays
Smith (WA)
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Vento
Waxman
Weller
Young (AK)

2114

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 377 on July 10, 2000, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment No. 33 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) 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. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 59, noes 323, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

AYES—59

Armey
Baker
Barr
Bartlett
Bonilla
Brady (TX)
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Cannon
Chabot
Coble
Combest
Cox
Crane
Cubin
DeLay
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Franks (NJ)
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Granger
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kingston
Largent
Manzullo
Mica
Miller, Gary
Paul
Pease
Pitts
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Stearns
Stump
Thune
Toomey
Watts (OK)

NOES—323

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Calvert
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri

Phelps	Serrano	Thurman
Pickering	Sessions	Tiahrt
Pickett	Shaw	Tierney
Pombo	Sherman	Towns
Pomeroy	Sherwood	Traficant
Porter	Shimkus	Turner
Portman	Shows	Udall (CO)
Price (NC)	Shuster	Udall (NM)
Quinn	Simpson	Upton
Radanovich	Sisisky	Velazquez
Rahall	Skeen	Visclosky
Ramstad	Skelton	Vitter
Rangel	Slaughter	Walden
Regula	Smith (MI)	Walsh
Reyes	Smith (NJ)	Wamp
Reynolds	Smith (TX)	Waters
Riley	Snyder	Watkins
Rivers	Souder	Watt (NC)
Rodriguez	Spence	Weiner
Roemer	Spratt	Weldon (FL)
Rogan	Stabenow	Weldon (PA)
Rogers	Stark	Weller
Ros-Lehtinen	Stenholm	Wexler
Rothman	Strickland	Weygand
Roukema	Stupak	Whitfield
Roybal-Allard	Sununu	Wicker
Ryun (KS)	Sweeney	Wilson
Sabo	Tancredo	Wise
Sanders	Tauscher	Wolf
Sandlin	Tauzin	Woolsey
Sawyer	Terry	Wu
Saxton	Thomas	Wynn
Scarborough	Thompson (CA)	Young (FL)
Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	
Scott	Thornberry	

NOT VOTING—52

Becerra	Hilleary	Myrick
Burr	Hinojosa	Norwood
Camp	Houghton	Owens
Campbell	Hulshof	Payne
Chambliss	Isakson	Pryce (OH)
Chenoweth-Hage	Kilpatrick	Rush
Collins	Klink	Sanchez
Cook	LaTourette	Shays
Coyne	Lazio	Smith (WA)
Davis (VA)	Lee	Talent
DeMint	Lewis (CA)	Tanner
Ewing	Linder	Taylor (MS)
Fattah	Lipinski	Taylor (NC)
Forbes	Maloney (CT)	Vento
Fossella	McCollum	Waxman
Gilchrest	McIntosh	Young (AK)
Graham	McNulty	
Hansen	Moakley	

2120

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 378 on July 10, 2000, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, due to official business in my district, I was unable to record my vote on the following amendments to H.R. 4461, the Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001, on which rollcalls were ordered. On the amendment offered by Mr. COBURN (rollcall No. 373), I would have voted ''no;'' on the amendment offered by Mr. ROYCE (rollcall No. 374), I would have voted ''no;'' on the amendment offered by Mr. CROWLEY (rollcall No. 375), I would have voted ''aye;'' on the amendment offered by Mr. CHABOT (rollcall No. 376), I would have voted ''no;'' on the amendment offered by Mr. COBURN (rollcall No. 377), I would have voted ''aye;'' and on the amendment offered by Mr. SANFORD (rollcall No. 378), I would have voted ''no.''

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to reluctantly support H.R. 4461, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2001. I wish to commend Chairman YOUNG, Ranking Member OBEY, Subcommittee Chairman SKEEN and Subcommittee Ranking Member KAPTUR for their hard work during this stressful time for American agriculture and our hard-working farmers.

I support this legislation with the understanding that while this bill falls short in many areas, Congress needs to move now to stem the flood of debt, drought and despair in rural America.

Indeed, this bill has some acceptable provisions. To address the credit gap that farmers face, this bill appropriates the Administration's request of $130 million to support $4.6 billion in loans to farmers and ranchers through the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund. There is increased funding for Farm Operating Loans and Farm Ownership Loans. In addition, there is $150 million for emergency disaster loans and $100 million for boll weevil eradication loans. As an increasing number of farmers sell their commodities at prices below their cost of production, the availability of this credit could be the difference in keeping many of the farmers in my District on the land.

This bill appropriates adequate stop-gap funding for Farm Service Agency salaries and expenses which will allow farmers to continue to get the services they need at their local FSA offices.

This Agriculture Appropriations bill increases funding for the Agricultural Research Service by $20 million over last year. This will allow for improved research for many producers. The bill appropriates $946 million for Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service to advance research, extension and education in the food and agricultural sciences. Soil and water conservation spending is increased by $16 million over last year's level. Rural Housing programs will increase by $89 million.

Many of these programs deserve more, but producers and other recipients need these programs now. I will continue to fight for agriculture's fair share.

Mr. Chairman, there are great deficiencies in this bill. The bill does not contain funding for important peanut research projects at the Dawson, Georgia ARS facility. A project to Develop, Evaluate and Transfer Technology to Improve the Efficiency and Quality in Peanuts and a project to Develop Technology/Methodology for Peanut Quality Management During Production and Post Harvest Processing are left unfunded in this bill. I will do everything I can to see that these important projects are funded in the final Conference Report.

The bill provides $35.2 billion for domestic nutrition programs—including food stamps, the school lunch and breakfast programs, and the Special Supplemental Food Program for Woman, Infants, and Children. This is an increase of $186 million over last year's level, but $1 billion less than the Administration requested. During this time of plenty in much of America we can do better.

I am going to vote for this bill even though it fails to address fundamental problems in providing the economic safety net farmers need to keep growing the highest quality, safest and cheapest food in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill because it keeps the American food ship afloat. But it remains for this House of Representatives to complete its work to knit a safety net for America's farmers who are drowning in debt, disaster and depressed prices. This vote is just the first step.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the point of order offered by my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) to strike Title VIII from H.R. 4461, the Department of Agriculture Appropriations Act. As my colleagues know, Title VIII would amend current law to ease economic sanctions against five nations: Cuba, Iran, Sudan, Libya, and North Korea. While much of the news reports and talk over the last few weeks have focused on the pros and cons of the compromise reached between members of both sides of the aisle on how the provision will affect the communist nation of Cuba, I mainly oppose this provision because of how it deals with—or shall I say ignores—the tragic situation that currently grips Sudan.

As a member of the International Relations Committee and especially the Subcommittee on Africa and the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, I have been following the situation in Sudan with great interest and concern. One of the reasons I chose to be on the Africa Subcommittee was to address the conflict in Sudan and the practice of slavery that still takes place in this modern day and age. This is a country, which has the longest running civil war in the world, and has been witness to over 1.9 million deaths over the past 15 years. More people have died in Sudan than in Kosovo, Bosnia, Afghanistan, Chechnya, Somalia and Algeria combined, yet few people still seem to take notice. At a time when we are sending military troops and proposing emergency supplemental appropriations for the situation in Kosovo, little is being done to counter these grievous human rights abuses that have been taking place for over a decade. It is time for the United States to take notice of the tragedy in Sudan, and for us to lend assistance to the Southern Sudanese, a people who are being butchered and enslaved by their own corrupt government.

But repealing economic sanctions on Sudan will, without a shadow of a doubt, aid the government of the Sudan, the National Islamic Front in Khartoum, which has perpetuated the deplorable human rights abuses.

I urge my colleagues to reexamine the proposed compromise—exempt Sudan from the provision so that we can all work toward meaningful change in this turbulent region of Africa.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO) having assumed the chair, Mr. NUSSLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 4811, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. CALLAHAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–720) on

the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs 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. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I was delayed on the first two votes this evening because of plane delay due to inclement weather in Cincinnati.

If I had been here on the Coburn amendment prohibiting the development or approval of any drug intended solely for the chemical inducement of abortion, I would have voted ''yes.''

On the Royce amendment, to reduce the total fiscal year 2001 agriculture appropriations by 1 percent, I would have voted ''no.''

CORRECTION TO CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JUNE 21, 2000, ROLL-CALL VOTE NUMBER 305

Pursuant to the order of the House of June 26, 2000, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of June 21, 2000, was ordered corrected to correctly reflect that Representative ROYBAL-ALLARD did not vote on rollcall number 305 (H.R. 4635/ on agreeing to the Collins of Georgia amendment). The electronic voting system had incorrectly attributed an ''aye'' vote to Representative ROYBAL-ALLARD.

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.

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, many of us over the last several years have asked a very basic and fundamental question, and this question is going to be answered again this week, and that is: Is it right, is it fair that under our Tax Code 25 million married working couples pay on average $1400 more in higher taxes just because they are married?

Is it right, is it fair that two people who joined together in holy matrimony, who both happen to work, are forced to pay higher taxes if they choose to get married? Today, the only way to avoid the marriage tax penalty if both the husband and wife work in the workforce is either choose not to get married or to get divorced. That is just wrong, that 25 million married working couples, 50 million Americans, pay higher taxes just because they are married. It is wrong, I believe, and I know many in this House do believe that it is wrong, that we punish society's most basic institution, marriage, with higher taxes. That is just unfair.

Let me introduce to my colleagues Shad and Michelle Hallihan, two public school teachers, from Joliet, Illinois. Shad and Michelle chose to get married a couple of years ago. They are both in the workforce. They just had a child this past year, a new baby. They pay the average marriage tax penalty of $1400. They knew that going into getting married, that they were going to pay more in taxes, but they chose to still get married.

I believe it is wrong. They pay $1400 more in higher taxes. In Joliet, Illinois, which is a south suburban community southwest of Chicago, $1400 for Shad and Michelle Hallihan, the average marriage tax penalty, is one year's tuition at Joliet Junior College, our local community college. It is 3 months of day care for their child. It is just wrong they have to pay more in taxes just because they are married.

Now, the marriage tax penalty comes into play when two people marry and they are both in the workforce and have two incomes, because under our Tax Code they file jointly, which means they combine their incomes. So in the case of Shad and Michelle, had they chose to stay single and just live together, they would each file as singles and they would each pay in the 15 percent tax bracket. But because they chose to get married, their combined income pushes them into the 28 percent tax bracket, so they get stuck with a higher tax bill just because they chose to get married.

Now, we believe in this House, and it is clearly one of the top agenda items for House Republicans, that we should bring about some tax fairness by eliminating the marriage tax penalty. I am proud that earlier this year every House Republican, and 48 Democrats who broke with their leadership, voted to wipe out the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married working couples. Unfortunately, Senator DASCHLE and the Senate Democrats used parliamentary procedures to block action on that legislation, and we have now had to go through the budget process, or so-called reconciliation, which is a word few people know the meaning of, but it allows us to bring up a bill with a simple majority vote.

2130

With that ability, this week both the House and Senate are going to be voting on legislation which will wipe out the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married working couples.

Now, some on the other side and AL GORE and a few others say, Well, let's give just a little bit of marriage tax relief so we can say we are for it. AL GORE says we should only give marriage tax relief to those who do not itemize their taxes, those who use the standard deduction.

Well, we want to help those who do itemize, as well as those who do not itemize. If you think about it, most middle-class families, most middle-class couples, itemize their taxes because they are homeowners. Think about that. If you are a homeowner, those who oppose the bill we are going to be passing this week, because they do not want to help homeowners and they do not want to help those who itemize taxes, because they say they are rich, only rich people own homes today, according to AL GORE and other people.

Well, the bottom line is, the only way we can help Shad and Michelle Hallihan is if we pass the legislation we are going to pass this week, legislation that doubles the standard deduction for joint filers to twice that of singles, so we wipe out the marriage tax penalty for those who do not itemize, and then for those who do itemize, such as homeowners, or those who take the charitable deduction because they give to their institutions of faith or charity, we also widen the 15 percent bracket to twice that for joint filers to twice that of singles. That will eliminate essentially the marriage tax penalty for Shad and Michelle Hallihan.

Think about it. If we eliminate the marriage tax penalty, which we are going to vote this week to do, for 25 million married working couples, 50 million Americans, people like Shad and Michelle will have that extra $1,400 to take care of their child. That is 3 months of daycare. It is a year's tuition at Joliet Junior College if they want to continue to improve their education.

I want to extend an invitation to my friends on the Democratic side to join with us. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty this week.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss for a few moments the legislation which we have been debating today and will take up again tomorrow in the U.S. House of Representatives. This is the agricultural appropriations bill.

I think many of us have rejoiced in the robust economy we have had here in the United States, but the sad fact is that farmers in America are not sharing in this robust economy. Instead, they are facing unprecedented low prices if you adjust for inflation. They are also looking at higher interest costs and increased fuel costs. This is a toxic cocktail that is going to take its toll on America's farmers as the year wears out.

So as we look at the agricultural appropriations bill, the question is, are

we treating the farm sector of our economy fairly? I think in this regard it is important to first note that the appropriations subcommittee is constrained by the budget.

I happen to serve on the Committee on the Budget. I was very disappointed with the unfair treatment that America's farmers received from the Republican budget. I was constrained to vote against it, and I hope that as this appropriations bill moves to the Senate and comes back for consideration, that we can rectify some of its shortcomings. I would just like to point out a few.

First, and perhaps most importantly, we have failed to target the billions of dollars of agricultural assistance that is being spent in the U.S. Treasury. Instead, this money is going out the back-door, billions and billions these months; and it is going largely for the benefit of land ownership. It is not being targeted to assist those operating farmers who, indeed, are suffering from low prices.

Mr. Speaker, we are not targeting this money. We ought to be targeting the money. We ought to have programs that focus on the safety net concept, dealing with prices that farmers are receiving, not simply spending billions willy-nilly. We ought to have programs that recognize effective caps, but instead we have some that are receiving hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars and others scarcely enough to enable them to stay in their farming occupation.

A second problem is that the farm programs are largely administered by the Farm Service Agency. That agency, unfortunately, has many new programs thrust upon it, complicated changes in the programs it administers; and it has an inadequate staff. This is a dangerous recipe for disappointment, frustration and resignation ultimately by key employees. We ought to be providing the Farm Service Agency with the resources it needs, the staff that it needs to carry out its mission.

Third, the farm programs are also implemented, especially in the conservation area, by the Natural Resources and Conservation Service. The service itself is not adequately compensated. Furthermore, the conservation programs themselves are shortchanged.

Fourth, we have a dramatic limit on agricultural research, dramatically less than requested by the President.

Fifth, we have a dramatic limit on rural development, and, again, dramatically less than requested by the President.

Sixth, we have inadequate funding for the Packers and Stockyards Administration, or GIPSA. This is the agency in the Department of Agriculture that is charged with making sure that in the livestock sector we do not have unfair trade practices that undermine the farmer's ability to receive a fair price for the livestock that he or she is marketing. It is absolutely necessary that if we are going to fulfill the mission of the Packers and Stockyards Act, that GIPSA be adequately financed. It is shortchanged.

Similarly, the Office of General Counsel within the Secretary's office is shortchanged. We cannot expect these agencies of the Federal Government to perform their mission if they do not have an adequate staff of attorneys and economists.

Finally, the promise of trade has been held out to America's farmers as really the hope that they have for improved prices. But trade cannot be the cornerstone of our agricultural policy. It has to be one part.

We have talked about trade with Cuba today. Unfortunately, trade with Cuba is an illusion. It is not in the agriculture appropriations bill, and I fear it will not be when it comes back.

To be sure, we need to do the very best we can in this appropriations bill, but we have got to do more.

MISSILE DEFENSE

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend we had one in a series of tests of our national missile defense program, which is currently under development, and supported both by the White House and by overwhelming support in both the House and the Senate. Unfortunately, this test was not a success, and there are those who are using this test to criticize the overall program and to say that technologically we are not prepared to move forward with missile defense.

I want to take a few moments to clarify what did happen and to clarify for the record what occurred in that test, and am offering to Members this week to have a full briefing, both classified and unclassified, on the details of the test that occurred this past weekend.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the hit-to-kill technology that is fundamental to missile defense was not tested. It was not tested because we could not get the separation stage away from the main rocket.

Now, that is not new technology. That is not missile defense technology. In fact, Wernher von Braun and other scientists solved this problem 40 years ago. It is a technology necessary to launch every communications satellite into outer space. It is a technology utilized for every space mission that we get involved with. It is not a technology specific to missile defense. However, it failed. No one expected it to fail, just as when we launch communications satellites, we do not expect the separation technology to fail to allow that communications satellite to be put into an orbit.

Unfortunately, there are those who are misinformed; and there are those who are informed but want to mischaracterize what occurred as to say that this test was an indication that we are not ready to move forward with missile defense. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have come out and strongly criticized the corporation who was responsible for the separation stage technology and have put them on notice that if we do not solve this quality-control issue, there will be legislation to punitively punish them for other failures that may occur in the future.

But make no mistake about it, this test was not a failure of missile defense capability. We never got to that stage. The kill vehicle never had the opportunity to go after the target. It never had the opportunity to employ the sensors that are needed in missile defense to kill the incoming missile on its way into an American city.

We will do a full analysis and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization and the Department of Defense will provide the full reports to us. But this week I will arrange, as the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Research and Development, for any colleague in this Chamber that wants, a full briefing on the test, exactly what occurred and why the test failed.

But, again, I would repeat, it was not a failure of missile defense, any more than a rocket trying to launch a satellite into space and failing would cause us to stop all future communication satellite launches. It is simply a problem that we need to get corrected, and we will get corrected.

As Jack Gantzler, our Deputy Secretary of Defense, and General Kadish, our three-star general in charge of missile defense, stated in Congressional hearings 2 and 3 weeks ago, they are totally confident in our technology; and we will move forward. But there are those who want to distort the facts. The Union of Unconcerned Scientists is one of them. Those members of the Flat Earth Society that would like to mischaracterize what occurred are not going to be allowed to get away with that, and I would encourage our colleagues to make sure they avail themselves of all the factual information surrounding that test.

NUCLEAR ENERGY CRISIS LOOMING

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, we all know what happens when we are too reliant on foreign sources for oil; and, as a result, in my district in southern Ohio and across this country, consumers are paying outrageous prices for a gallon of gasoline.

But there is another energy crisis looming that many of us seem not to be aware of. I think it is important for

Members of this House and for citizens of this country to be aware of the fact that 23 percent of our Nation's electricity is generated by the use of nuclear power plants, and almost all of that fuel comes from a domestic source.

Unfortunately, in July of 1998, the United States Enrichment Corporation, which is the public corporation that was responsible for operating the two existing uranium enrichment facilities in this country, that corporation was privatized. Since privatization, disasters have occurred.

The mining industry is on the verge of collapse. The conversion industry, there is only one conversion plant in this country, and that is in Metropolis, Illinois. It is on the verge of collapse. And just 2 weeks ago the United States Enrichment Corporation, the privatized corporation, announced that they were closing one of our two enrichment facilities, the one in my district in Piketon, Ohio; and within a year some 1,800 to 2,000 workers will lose their jobs.

How did this disaster happen? Why are we on the verge of having to depend upon foreign sources for perhaps 20 percent of our Nation's electricity?

I have in my hand a waiver letter that was written by the chairman of the Public Board, Mr. William Rainer; and in this letter he is addressing the CEO of the Public Board, who is now the CEO of the private corporation.

Mr. Rainer says to Mr. Timbers in this letter: ''As employees of a wholly owned government corporation, you may not participate personally or substantially in any particular matter that would have a direct and predictable effect on your financial interests or those of others, such as spouse.''

2145

However, Mr. Rainer granted Mr. Timbers this waiver, giving him permission to advise the board on whether or not USEC should be privatized, how it should be privatized, and the selection of the individuals to serve on the new privatized board. What is the result? Mr. Timbers went from making $350,000 as a government employee and after the company was privatized, Mr. Timbers made $2.48 million.

Mr. Speaker, if that is not substantive, I do not know what is. This is a sham and a farce, and this administration and this Congress have an obligation to look into these matters. If someone who worked for the government made $350,000, and then was given the privilege of making decisions which had the benefit of enabling him to enrich himself and then a year-and-a-half later ends up with a salary of $2.48 million, then there is no sense in us having any prohibition on these kinds of government employees being involved in matters that could enrich themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking this House, I am asking this administration to come to their senses and to understand that we are facing a looming crisis in this country. If this rogue corporation continues without any prohibition, we find ourselves perhaps facing the demise of the enrichment industry in this country and becoming completely dependent on foreign sources for the essential fuel that is necessary to power our nuclear plants which provide some 23 percent of all of the electricity in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. I am appreciative of the time I have had to share this with my colleagues and with the country. I will include for the RECORD at this time the letter I referred to earlier in my remarks.

USEC,
Bethesda, MD, September 26, 1995.

Mr. WILLIAM H. TIMBERS, Jr.,
President and Chief Executive Officer, United States Enrichment Corporation, Bethesda, MD.

DEAR MR. TIMBERS: Under 18 U.S.C. §208(a), USEC employees, as employees of a wholly owned Government corporation, may not participate personally and substantially in any particular matter that would have a direct and predictable effect on their financial interests or those of certain others, such as their spouses. Nevertheless, as Chairman of the Corporation's Board of Directors, under 18 U.S.C. §208(b)(1) I may waive the prohibition of 18 U.S.C. §208(a) where I determine that the employee's financial interest in the matter ''is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services which the Government may expect'' from the employee.

On September 25, 1995, you provided me with a request for a waiver under section 208(b)(1) to allow you to participate in matters directed toward implementation of the ''Plan for the Privatization of the United States Enrichment Corporation'' (Plan), presented to the President of the United States on June 30, 1995, and effectuation of the Corporation's privatization. Your request stated that such matters would include, but not be limited to, providing advice and recommendations to the Corporation's Board of Directors on the following matters: the method that USEC should utilize in privatizing, e.g., an IPO or an M&A transaction, the timing of a privatization transaction, and whether any such transaction would meet the requirements of section 1502(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; the selection of a M&A buyer and the negotiation of a M&A transaction if a buyer is selected; and the selection of individuals to be appointed to serve on the board of the privatized corporation.

You presently are the President and Chief Executive Officer of USEC. In your position, you are required to implement resolutions adopted and approved by the Board of Directors and to act on directions provided thereby, to abide by the terms of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and of other laws, as each relates to the Corporation, and to carry out your duties as provided by the Corporation's By-laws. One of the primary responsibilities of the Corporation is to effectuate privatization through implementation of the Plan. In your position as President and CEO, you are responsible for overseeing day-to-day implementation, and ensuring the successful realization, of this project. In carrying out your privatization-related duties, including those matters detailed in your waiver request as outlined above, your financial interests in both your current Federal employment and your future employment will be affected. They will be affected by virtue of the privatization of USEC resulting in the termination of your current Federal employment. Moreover, matters relating to privatization also likely will affect your interests in future employment by structuring the possibilities for your employment with the private successor to USEC. In turn, the financial interests of the privatized entity may be imputed to you under the statute if you have an arrangement regarding future employment therewith. These effects on your current and future employment interests give you a disqualifying financial interest in privatization-related matters undertaken by the Corporation.

Under the terms of section 208(b)(1), disqualifying financial interest may be waived if the ''interest is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services which the Government may expect'' from the employee. In this instance, the particular matter of privatization of the Corporation is not a project proposed by you or another employee of the Corporation. It is a goal that was placed with the Corporation by Congress. Therefore, working to realize that goal is incumbent upon every employee of the Corporation, although each will be personally affected by the outcome. Without such effort by USEC employees, privatization could not be realized. Given the effect that privatization will have on the financial interests of each of the officers of the Corporation, not just your own, it is not feasible to delegate your participation in privatization-related matters to a subordinate officer qualified to perform such tasks. However, the openness of the privatization process to the scrutiny of the USEC Board of Directors, the U.S. Treasury as the sole shareholder of the Corporation, and officials of the other Federal agencies will provide additional assurance as to the integrity of the services provided by each USEDC employee participating in the privatization process.

Given these factors, and the scope of this waiver as delineated herein, I do not find your disqualifying financial interests to be so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of your services to the Government.

Pursuant to the foregoing analysis, I hereby grant a waiver of 18 U.S.C. §208(a) with regard to your participation in matters that would affect your financial interests, and those imputed to you, as previously described in this memorandum. Those financial interests, in light of the requirements imposed upon the Corporation by the Act and the Plan, are not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of your services in these matters.

The scope of this waiver extends to those matters, within your scope of authority and responsibility as President and Chief Executive Officer of USEC, directed toward implementation of the Plan and effectuation of the privatization. This waiver, however, does not extend to; (i) matters involving the determination of the terms and conditions of the counterpart position in the privatized corporation to that which you currently hold; or (ii) matters involving the determination of whether the person holding such position should be selected as a candidate for the board of directors of the privatized corporation.

As the Corporation's privatization efforts proceed, financial interests that conflict with your required duties, that were not anticipated at the time this waiver was issued, could arise. If at any time you have questions regarding the scope of this waiver, you

should seek guidance from the General Counsel. The USEC General Counsel, on my behalf, has consulted with the Office of Government Ethics on this waiver and will provide them a copy of it.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. RAINER,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

SALUTE TO JOHNS HOPKINS HOSPITAL

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Johns Hopkins Hospital located in my district in Baltimore, Maryland for its recently announced number one ranking among the Nation's hospitals.

Treating nearly 600,000 patients per year, Johns Hopkins Medicine has been recognized for more than a century as a leading center for patient care, medical research, and teaching. The institution, which includes a hospital and health system and the School of Medicine, is noted for its excellent faculty and staff covering every aspect of medicine, its two world class medical campuses, and multiple outreach programs for regional, national and international patient activities.

The flagship of this institution, Johns Hopkins Hospital, is a 1,025-bed facility and encompasses renowned centers such as the Brady Urological Institute, the Wilmer Eye Institute, the Johns Hopkins Comprehensive Cancer Center, and the Johns Hopkins Children's Center.

For the 10th straight year, the hospital has placed first on the annual U.S. News and World Report magazine hospital ranking. The rankings are based on three factors: reputation, mortality, and aspects of treatment such as technology and nursing care. Among 17 medical specialties evaluated, Hopkins ranked in the top 10 in 16 of them, including number one in ear, nose, throat, gynecological services, urology, and eye care. Further, 41 Johns Hopkins Hospital doctors were recognized in an American Health Magazine survey as among the best in the United States, more than any other medical center in the Nation.

Most significant to me, however, is Hopkins' commitment to Baltimore and the worldwide community. This institution has a sense of obligation and social responsibility that finds its foundation in instructions by its founder and benefactor. Over a century ago, the Baltimore merchant Johns Hopkins wrote to his trustees, and I quote, ''The indigent of this city and its environs, without regard to sex, age or color, shall be received into this hospital.''

In recent years, Hopkins has followed this commitment with the incorporation of the historic East Baltimore Community Action Coalition, better known as HEBCAC. It is a coalition formed among Baltimore City, the State of Maryland, Hopkins and the neighborhood to improve housing, attract new business, and offer social services to the 47,500 residents of East Baltimore, 43 percent of whom live in poverty. HEBCAC was part of the city's successful bid to become a Federal empowerment zone and secure $34 million from the Federal Government for physical rehabilitation of the neighborhood.

After more than a year of working closely with the East Baltimore community to identify their health concerns, Johns Hopkins also committed $4.5 million over a period of 5 years to establish an Urban Health Institute to tackle the vexing health problems that plague the community. The Institute brings together a wide range of Hopkins health experts, community leaders, business leaders, clergy and State and local agencies to forge a partnership that will first identify the most pressing health issues and then develop the best methods, including research, education and community outreach to address these problems.

Health priorities identified by the community that the institute is expected to address include substance abuse, violence, sexually transmitted diseases, HIV/AIDS, cardiovascular disease, pulmonary disease, environmental health, the elderly, and family maternal and child health services.

In my stead as a Member of this body, my focus is to create a livable community in my district of Baltimore as well as throughout the Nation. I believe that all Americans, regardless of race, ethnicity and social economic status, deserve livable communities where they feel safe, where their children can obtain a quality education, and where they have access to quality health care. All must share equitably in this American dream.

Johns Hopkins is truly making an effort to ensure that Baltimoreans and persons around the world are able to realize this dream by providing the kind of patient care that will allow them to live fruitful and productive lives. The hospital's commitment to medical excellence and to serving this community are deserving of recognition; and today, I salute Johns Hopkins Hospital for these efforts.

Congratulations to Johns Hopkins for being named the number one among hospitals and certainly a premier servant to our Nation's patients.

COURAGE OVER CAUTION—WE MUST HAVE PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in less than 48 hours, one of the most historic and, I believe, one of the most important meetings will take place just a few miles away from the Capitol of the United States of America, and that is the gathering of President Clinton, Prime Minister Barak and President Arafat on deliberating on peace in the Mideast.

Let me salute all three of these gentlemen and particularly let me applaud the leadership of President William Jefferson Clinton. Many might offer to say that there is nothing else that he could do. Why should he not hold this summit? It is a win-win situation for him in the short time that he has to lead this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, peace is never easy. I think it is important to realize the leap of faith that is being taken by all three of these heads of nations. Camp David will be a very serious place; and, for many Americans, I believe it is important to focus our attention, our hearts and our minds on an effort to bring about peace to a region that has had 52 years of bloody conflicts. For more than half a century, there has been no peace in the Middle East.

I want to applaud the Prime Minister of Israel who realizes that he is on very dangerous ground. Already, three of the six of his coalition members have broken away and resigned because of its efforts to seek peace. Many have said he is fragilely kept in government, that no one will support him, and that there is no guarantee that he will remain as prime minister or head of government of the country of Israel. But I salute him for his words that he comes here with a profound sense of responsibility and, as well, to acknowledge that he has a mandate from the voters, the citizens of Israel to do all that he can to establish peace, not for those of us who live and those of us who are adults responsible for ourselves, but for the children and for those yet not born.

He is willing to consider giving 90 percent of the West Bank to the Palestinians; he is willing to consider some answer to the problem of Jerusalem running some part thereof. The details are not all present, but he is willing to discuss the status of Jerusalem. He is willing as well to allow a small number of Palestinians, so it has been reported, to return to what is today Israel. Yes, we must answer the question of the Palestinians who continuously view parts of Jerusalem or Jerusalem as having a religious significance to them. Jerusalem has a religious significance to all of us of many faiths from around this world. We must find a way to solve the problem with a respect for all and dignity for all and peace for the world.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that once this peace agreement comes to fruition, that we look at an international peacekeeping contingent, as has been suggested by the Palestinians. Yes, as Secretary Albright has already stated, this is an effort of high stakes. It is an effort that hopefully will avoid the tragedy of death of a young Palestinian mother and child experiencing the wrong turn at the wrong time, and they met their death during some bloody conflict just a few days ago. Apologies were offered by the Government of Israel, but how many more will

die? How many more mothers will lose their lives or babies or elderly? How many more Palestinians or how many more citizens of the State of Israel?

So as has been offered, it is high stakes, but frankly, I believe it is life or death. It is life or death for this world order. It is life or death for those of us who believe that the Mideast offers one of the strongest opportunities for anchoring the understanding of people from different walks of life and religious beliefs.

This is the time now to view this summit with all of the resources that we might offer as the United States of America to bolster the journey and travels of Prime Minister Barak, to acknowledge that he has lost his interior minister who has resigned, and his minister of foreign policy refuses to come. Yes, he is traveling a very difficult journey, but I believe that if the American people can offer to him their applause and congratulations along with our applause and respect for President Arafat, and to say to all three men and all that will be engaged in this discussion for peace, it is now time to select and to choose, Mr. Speaker, courage over caution. We must have peace.

ISSUES OF CONCERN TO COLORADO AND THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, to begin this evening, as my colleagues know, many of us have been delayed due to transportation difficulties with the airlines out there. Some of my constituents were surprised to learn that Congressmen, in fact, also have their bags lost, that Congressmen also are delayed on these flights. So tonight I thought I would show my colleagues a pretty clear demonstration, since they may see it as I speak, of exactly what happens to a Congressman who loses his baggage. If my colleagues will look down, they will see my dress socks. Obviously, the real socks are in the suitcase and somewhere the suitcase is out there in that system.

In all seriousness about that, in the last 8 years, in serving in the United States Congress, I have had very good air service across this country.

2200

As many of my colleagues know, we are very, very dependent in all walks of life in this country, we are very, very dependent on our service from one State to the next State or across the country.

I am telling the Members, in the last 3 months the air service in this country has deteriorated significantly. I have not, with the major airline that I fly, I have not, to the best of my knowledge, had an on-time arrival in 3 months. That has not happened, that kind of record has not happened in 8 years.

I am not going to speak about transportation this evening any more than I am doing right now other than to point out that this problem is getting worse. Once in a while the airlines can blame it on weather, once in a while the airlines can blame it on mechanics, but the fact is that there is a deterioration of service, and it is incumbent upon the executives of these airlines to fix the problem, because our country is too dependent upon it.

The taxpayers in this country provide a lot of dollars for airports. The passengers in this country provide a lot of dollars in their taxes that are put on there, passenger taxes at airports to help supplement our airline service. We deserve more, in my opinion.

It was with some interest last week that I saw news stories about what I guess they call air rage. There is no place for anyone on an airplane to take out their frustrations, in my opinion, on a stewardess or someone else on the airplane. But I do want Members to know that there should be some understanding of some of the frustration being felt by these passengers across the country.

I was at Denver International Airport today and there was a lady there who had been stuck for 2 days at that airport. So as we talk about airplane rage or some of these other things, remember what is happening to the passengers in this country. We deserve more from some of these airlines. That is not all of the airlines. Obviously, some of them are performing well.

I think it is time we pay very close attention, Mr. Speaker, to those ratings that come out every month or so talking about which of these airlines are having a tough time with service and which of the airlines want to merge, and come to us and ask us for more dollars for airports and things.

I think we have every justification to stand out and say, ''Hey, why do you not improve your service? There are a lot of people paying taxes out there for better service.''

In Denver, for example, we have one dominant airline. We have some of the highest business rates in the United States. We should expect premium service. I should add again that for many, many years I have received premium service out of Denver, but something has happened in the last 3 months. It is going to damage our economy here before too long.

TOLL ROADS IN THE STATE OF COLORADO

Let me go on. I want to talk about several other things this evening. First, I want to talk about the proposition of toll roads in the State of Colorado. I want to move from there.

I have noticed several editorials in the last few days about estate taxes, actual editorials. In fact, it sounds to me like the Democrats, who have for years and years supported the death tax, and in fact, this year the Clinton administration in their budget proposes an increase, an increase in the death tax, these editorials sound like they are writing for that portion or that section of the Democratic Party that supports these death taxes. They act as if we owe the government these death taxes.

I am going to talk about the death taxes for a few minutes after I finish talking about the toll roads, and then I will spend a few minutes on social security and talk about the plan that we as Congressmen have for our retirement, although we are also on social security; the plan that Vice President GORE voted for, the plan that Vice President GORE, under his policies, under his procedures, supported.

We will talk a little about social security. We will talk about the problems with social security. We will talk about, look, do we do what the Vice President has proposed, although he has recently changed his mind, and that is kind of, do not touch it? Of course we are afraid to touch it, but if we do not do something about it, that system is going to break. It is going to fall out of the air. The engines are going to start coughing and that plane is going to fall out of the air.

We have to keep social security firm. The way to do it in my opinion is take some bold moves. Frankly, those bold moves have been proposed by George W. Bush, the Governor of the State of Texas. I want to talk about these policies.

I am not here tonight to get into partisan politics, but clearly there is a big distinction when it comes to social security between the Governor of the State of Texas and the Vice President. We have every right to stand on this floor and debate what those differences are.

I would venture to say that by the end of the debate, the majority of my friends on the Democratic side will join us on the Republican side saying, hey, let us take a bold move. Let us do something with social security. Let us save social security.

I would also venture to say that the majority of my colleagues on the Democratic side need to wake up, in my opinion. I do not say that in a derogatory fashion, but be aware, probably, is a better word, be aware of the fact that this death tax is hurting a lot of people in this country. Their policy of the death tax in this country should be changed. We will get into that.

Let us first of all talk about the newest proposition in the State of Colorado by some elitists, in my opinion. That is, gosh, Colorado is a popular spot.

Mr. Speaker, I represent the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado. That district is one of the largest districts in the United States. It is also the highest district in the United States. Basically, it is all of western Colorado, here to my left.

If we talk about the mountains, and for those not familiar with western and eastern Colorado, the easy way to

think about my district is basically all of the mountains, and then I do go some in eastern Colorado.

The Third Congressional District is geographically larger than the State of Florida. Although there are six congressional districts in Colorado, the Third Congressional District only has a little less than 20 percent of the population. Eighty plus percent of the population lives outside the Third District. But do Members know what? That 80 percent of the population to a large extent enjoys going into the mountains of Colorado.

A lot of us who grew up in Colorado, a lot of us who spent time in Colorado, know what those mountains mean to us. For generation after generation after generation of my families in Colorado, the mountains are what kept them in Colorado. The people of Colorado love their mountains. The people of Colorado are entitled to see their mountains. The people of Colorado are entitled to enjoy those mountains.

But last week we had a new proposal from some bureaucrat, quite frankly, saying, you know, we have too much traffic on I–70. For those who do not know what I–70 is in Colorado, they all know Interstate 70, but where it lies, it virtually cuts the State in half. The mountains go about like this.

What this bureaucrat has come up with is to say, well, let us go ahead because I–70 is so heavily traveled, especially out of the major cities, and we have another interstate called I–25, here, so we have a lot of traffic coming out of these cities, the metropolitan population areas, into the Third Congressional District to enjoy those mountains.

By the way, the highways in the Third Congressional District, they were not paid for by people in the Third Congressional District. Those are taxes to build those highways that were paid for by everybody in the State of Colorado and visitors to the State of Colorado. In fact, our Governor, who personally I have known for a number of years and who I think has done the most outstanding job of a Governor in many, many years, was able to forge through in his first few days and months of office a new program to fund additional taxes to build these highways.

We have grown in popularity. We do have a lot heavier traffic on the I–70 corridor. It used to be when I was in the State House of Representatives the only time we had heavy traffic on I–70 was on Friday afternoon, traffic up to the ski areas, and on Sunday afternoon, traffic back from the ski areas. Now almost every day of the week we have traffic on I–70.

So what happens? We have a highway that is being utilized very heavily, so we are trying to figure out solutions for it. Maybe there are ways, other routes that we can use. What are the solutions?

I could not believe my ears last week. We had a bureaucrat that came out and said, hey, not for any other congressional district in the State of Colorado, just the congressional district that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) represents, let us put a toll booth right on the highway. Let us bring the troll in. We have taxed the people to build the highway, now let us tax them to keep them off the highway.

Most are familiar obviously with toll booths, Mr. Speaker. My guess would be their experience with toll booths has been we set up a toll booth to collect money because it is the truest form of ''the user pays.'' The person who benefits from the highway is the one who travels on the highway and is the one who pays the tolls.

This toll booth being proposed by a bureaucrat is not a toll booth to raise money for construction of highways, it is a toll booth to impose a penalty upon people who want to come visit the Colorado mountains. It is a price to be put on, and if people can meet it, if they are wealthy enough, they get to go to the mountains. If they are a poor working guy out there or gal who does not have that kind of money, they do not get to go to the mountains. It is a new toll. We have a new troll in Colorado.

It is not fair. Fundamentally it is not fair. Let us talk a little about it. What kind of rate do Members think they would have to charge in that toll booth to keep people from visiting their mountains, $1? We are not going to stop anybody for $1, by charging a dollar in the toll booth, and the reason is we do not want them to go onto the highways, we want to slow down what we call congestion traffic.

Would it be $5? That is not going to slow it down. What about $20? Maybe a little. But $30 or $40, yes, we will then begin to slow the traffic down on I–70 going into the Colorado mountains, $30 or $40 or $50 at the toll booth. We will begin to take the congestion off that highway.

Do Members know who they are impacting or where the unfairness of this is? They are not impacting the person who drives the Mercedes, or in fact the person even in my economic bracket. I could afford to pay for it. But the people we are impacting are the people who live out here who work 40, 50, 60 hours a week, can barely get by, and they take their families to Glenwood Springs, Colorado, to the Hot Springs pool for family recreation, or they take them to the Sunlight Ski Area in Glenwood Springs, or to Powderhorn in Grand Junction, or they run them up to Breckenridge when there is a special rate for skiing.

There are a lot of families in Colorado that are not wealthy, Mr. Speaker. There are a lot of families in Colorado where both the man and woman are both working to make ends meet. A lot of those families that are not wealthy, where both parents have to work to make ends meet, enjoy the mountains just like somebody who has a lot of money enjoys the mountains.

It goes the other way, too, by the way. My guess would be, although I have not had a personal conversation with this individual who proposed this, my guess would be that he also wants to collect a toll going the other direction.

So when the people in rural Colorado, and I can tell the Members, a lot of children in rural Colorado have never been in an airplane. They have never been higher than maybe a four- or five-story building. Right now in probably 98, and this is hard to believe, in 98 or 96 percent of the State, maybe, 96 percent of the State of Colorado, there is one escalator, one escalator. So one of the beautiful areas of Colorado, one of the areas of major attractions, is Denver. Denver has the Broncos, it has the Rockies, the Children's Museum, the fish aquarium, it has the hockey team, it has Elitch Gardens, a lot of different things; Denver University. There are lots of things that the people in the mountains like to go to the city.

Now all of a sudden we have somebody out there trying to get momentum claiming that it is good for the environment to go ahead and tax the people that were taxed to build the road, tax them to keep them off the roads. They never even mentioned in this proposal what kind of impact it is going to have on that blue collar worker, that blue collar labor who does not make a lot of money, and 30 or 40 bucks out of their pocket means a lot. It hurts.

If these people really want to cut down on congestion through a toll road, they are not going to do it with $1, with $5. They are going to have to do it with $30, $40, $50. All of a sudden we have discovered a troll sitting on the tollgate to my district, to the district that I am privileged to represent. We have made a determination in Colorado that if people want to go see the mountains of Colorado, if they want to enjoy those 14,000 foot majestic packs, and I have by far more 14,000 foot peaks than other people in the country, I have 54 or so, if people want to go out and enjoy that, they can as long as they are part of the wealthy status, as long as they have the money to pay the toll. When they go up to the troll, if they have 40 or 30 bucks, throw it in the box.

Fortunately, we have a Governor in the State of Colorado who in my opinion is not going to stand for that kind of thing. Fortunately, we have a Governor in the State of Colorado who has stood up and put together a good highway improvement program. He has put those taxpayer dollars into construction.

I think there is some legitimate argument, by the way, for a toll booth if in fact that money is going to improve that road.

2215

I can remember growing up, and my father used to show us all the time, the kids, he and my mom had six kids. My parents now live in Glenwood Springs,

they are great, great wonderful people. I remember when I was young and mom and dad pointed out the Denver Bolder Turnpike, the only toll booth in the State of Colorado.

My dad and my mom always used to tell us, you know what is good about this? They are going to take this down, the government promised us, they are going to take it down the day they pay for the improvements on the Denver Bolder Turnpike.

Do you know what the government did back then? The day that those improvements were paid off, the toll booths came down. Now, that is fair, and people back then accepted the Denver Boulder Turnpike toll booth, because they knew that money was to improve the highway.

It was not put there as a punishment as this is being proposed to do. It was not put there to raise money off the Denver Boulder Turnpike and to transfer to other people programs, it was put there to improve that turnpike. My, my, my how things have changed over time.

Now they want to put a toll booth up there, this recommendation, to penalize you for using the very roads that those taxpayers put in place, to penalize you especially if you are lower middle income or lower income, to penalize you from going up and enjoying the mountains that give you the pride of the State of Colorado.

Colorado is known to my colleagues throughout this floor. You know Colorado. Some of you may know it for the Broncos. Some of you may know it for the Rockies. But, realistically, you know it because of those Rocky Mountains.

We have a fundamental right as citizens of the State of Colorado to enjoy our mountains, without having to pay a toll at a government toll booth to keep congestion off that highway, a toll booth that allows only the wealthy to go by. If you do not have that cash, that $30, $40, $50, and that is exactly what it is going to take to stop that congestion or at least slow it down, then you are out of luck.

It is wrong. And I am not going to drop this issue. I have written Chairman Dan Stuart on their input. I said thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scoping phase of the I–70 environmental impact statement. I am writing to notify your commission and the Federal Highway Administration that I adamantly, adamantly oppose the use of tolls or any other so-called congested pricing levies aimed at discouraging Coloradans from traveling along I–70 in Western Colorado.

Again, how interesting that the only toll booth they are suggesting is right there on the gateway to the Third Congressional District. I have been told by officials that the use of congestion tolls is but one of the many possible remedies being considered. Even so, I strongly urge the traffic planners charged with drafting this EIS to dismiss out of hand the idea of congestion toll roads based clearly on the lack of merit and the discrimination that it exercises against the people who do not make that kind of money, and they are being kept out of the mountains for which they have a lot of pride.

They are citizens of Colorado or visitors to Colorado. There are a whole range of sound and reasonable solutions I write about in this letter that are available. But erecting a toll gate to and from Western Colorado, erecting a toll gate to get in and out of my congressional district is wrong. It is wrong because it is being put there for a punitive nature to punish people who want to go into the mountains, because some ivy league person has thought gosh how cars are evil. Highways are evil. Congestion is evil. Of course, who likes congestion? We all like to have some great method of transportation that does not have congestion.

For you to go out and penalize us in Western Colorado by putting a toll gate both coming in and out of my district, it is not going to be accepted. Forget it. That is not in the letter, I thought I would just ad-lib a little there. But erecting that kind of gate is unacceptable.

While the use of tolls may be appropriate in certain circumstances, it would be unfair to impose a congestion toll for no reason other than to discourage travel by taxpayers who paid for the roads in the first place. Colorado taxpayers have paid more than their fair share for construction and maintenance of these roads. A new congestion toll without a corresponding improvement in the quality of the interstate would seem punitive.

Well, you get the point. I am not too excited about this proposal. I have not had an opportunity to talk with the particular bureaucrat that is out there proposing it.

But I will tell you before it catches on, before you try and go out there and try and dress it up so it looks real pretty, you better understand and I think strengthen our voice that is going to oppose this.

I want to commend the governor of the State of Colorado, that governor understands that there are lots of approaches that we can use to resolve this problem, that governor understands highways. And I would hope that my message rings throughout the entire bureaucracy including the Federal Highway Administration. Do not put toll booths on this highway simply for the purpose of punishing people who want to go up there, not for construction, but to punish them because they want to visit the Colorado mountains.

DEATH TAXES

Let me move to another subject, death taxes. Colleagues we know what death taxes are. You work all your life. You accumulate. I will give you an example, my wife and I. My wife and I did not start with any money. We just started saving early on. I will tell you we did not have boats or nice cars. I mean we have used cars which were nice for us, and nothing against somebody who wants to have a boat, I think it is great. In fact, if I had the money, I would buy those, that is extra.

But in our mind, my wife and I in our life, one of our goals was to have something that when we went on, when we passed away and we could pass on to our children so they could have a little head start for their life so maybe they could afford a down payment on a home, so maybe the family ranch that is in my wife's family, that maybe her portion of the ranch could be enjoyed by the next generation following us, that maybe some of the other things that we have worked so hard to accomplish and we have toiled, just like many, many other young couples in our country are doing now, we did that a few years ago.

There are a lot of young people out in the country today, a lot of young people by the way, Democrats, in business. It is not all that bad, business. A lot of small business people, a lot of farmers and ranchers, a lot of young people getting into these professions and they, too, share the goal that my wife and I shared that my mother and father, my wife's mother and father shared and that is, look, we do not want to spoil the generation behind us, but let us do something for the generation, let us try and jump start them, let us give them a little head start.

Now, when you accumulate like that, you do not accumulate taxfree, with the exception of some IRAs, and those are taxed, but basically as my colleagues know, you do not accumulate this property tax free, you pay taxes on it. When you earn it, you are taxed on it, and you take what is left after the taxes and you put it into an account or you make some kind of an investment for the future.

We are not talking here about money that here you earn it, we are not talking about money that goes over here 100 percent, it does not happen. What happens here is the taxman comes in and he cuts his chunk here. He gets his chunk right here. So when it gets over here, your fund for the future has already been taxed.

So you begin to accumulate this property, with the goal, as my wife and I had, that at some point in the future you would be able to pass on in the next generation in our particular case maybe a piece of ground, maybe a business, maybe a portion of a ranch out there in Colorado. I keep referring to Colorado because ranching is an important industry, and the death taxes, Democrats, by the way you ought to pay attention to this, the death taxes have had a significant impact on our ranching community out in Colorado. They have been very punitive, very punishing.

So we get to this point and guess what happens? The government has not had enough. What the government does when you are young, there are teachers and in school they teach you to go out in America and capitalism, go out and

the harder you work, the chances are, the harder you work, the more successes you will have, and that you have an opportunity to accumulate, you can buy your own home in the United States.

In America, you can own a ranch. In America if you work hard enough, you can do things, you can accomplish. Who would ever think that the government that preaches that at our young ages and tells our young people that the opportunities are no greater anywhere in the world but America, who would ever think that very government is flying over you like a vulture on the day you die to come in here and take property that has already been taxed and, in some cases, take out between 50 and 70 percent of that and move it to the government.

Now, what do death taxes do? Let us talk about a couple editorials. I read an editorial over the weekend, maybe it was in the Wall Street Journal or in the Denver Post. Anyway, I read this editorial. I think it was Broder, whatever his name is, the gentleman's name, and he talks about this estate, and he sounds like it is only fair for the government to come out and take money from you upon your death, even though you have already paid taxes on it.

They talk about as if it is a windfall for a family. Take my wife's family, for example, they have been on the same ranch in Colorado since 1850. The writer of this particular article seems to think it is a windfall, if that family is able to pass that ranch on to the next generation, my wife's generation and then the generation after my wife, to that generation as if it is a windfall. Then they always like to jump. Democrats you had 40 years to do something about this death tax.

Some of you have come over on it and I appreciate that. I noticed lately in the last couple of weeks the Democrat leadership, because they have now sensed that their policy of increasing the death tax, which is exactly what the Clinton administration has proposed to do in their budget is not selling well with the American people. The American people are saying, wait a minute, it does not make sense to us. We have already paid taxes. Why should punish us upon our death with another tax?

Some of you sense that. And the leadership over on the Democrat side has sensed that and now they have come up with the bill to help get rid of the death tax. I am glad you have acknowledged that there is a problem. I am glad after time after time after time you fought us on trying to eliminate or at least give some relief under the death tax that your leadership, the Democratic leadership policy has now begun to shift towards our side to say, you know, something maybe it is not fair when somebody dies that the vultures of the government go down and pick apart the property that has already been picked apart with taxes.

Nobody complains about the initial taxation if it is fair. Where the complaint comes in is how much more do you want, how much more do you think you can take out of this family ranch before you make that ranch collapse from an economic point of view?

Let us talk about what happens in an estate tax. Remember even if the wealthy and, oh, do they love that, do the editors and do some of the Democrats opposing this do they love to talk about the wealthy people of this country. This is a tax against the wealthy. In fact, it was designed in part as a punitive tax against the Carnegies and the Rockefellers and the Fords and people like that around the turn of the last century. Do they love to go out after rich people?

They love to create class warfare in this country. Let me tell you what happens even with a rich person in a community. I am going to give you a good example. A small town in Colorado, population maybe 9,000 people. I am not going to identify the person, other than to say let us call the gentleman Joe. Joe and his wife, Mary, these people are my parents' age, so they are in their 70s. They started out in this small town of Colorado.

Joe started out as a bean counter, as a bookkeeper for a construction company. I am telling you these names are made up, but the story is true. Mary was a homemaker, so they both worked real hard, she took care of the kids and Joe worked hard.

From day 1, he worked 6½ days a week. He sacrificed a lot of time away from his kids, and his wife sacrificed a lot of her time to make up for the time he was away from the kids. And over time he moved from being the bookkeeper in the construction company to have an opportunity to buy into it. This is a small town construction company, population 9,000. Then pretty soon he was able to save a little money here, save a little money there, and he was able to invest and start with some of his neighbors a local bank.

What did Joe do with the money? Joe did not take the money that he accumulated in his community, he did not take it out in his backyard and dig a hole and put the money in the ground. He used the money in the community. He bought buildings in the community. He employed people in the community. He gave significant contributions to almost every charity in the community. He helped a school on their funding drives. In other words, he was a strong economic factor. I should speak about both of them, both of them contributed to this in their own way. That couple was an economic mainstay of this small community in the state of Colorado.

What happens? Unfortunately, Mary passes away. My friend is a good guy, and his wife was very bright. But they did not go out and hire attorneys to try and evade taxes with the government. And so what happened when Mary died, the estate, her share of the estate went to Joe. Joe decided to liquidate the construction company, sell it, decided to sell the bank.

2230

He did and he got hit with a capital gains tax. That is fair enough. At that point in time, it was at least 28 percent, at least 28 percent on the sale of it.

Then unfortunately my friend Joe, who was an economic mainstay with his wife in this community, what happened to him is he got terminal cancer. Four, five months later, he passed away. The government then came into this community. They forced that family to liquidate the buildings they had to come up with the money to pay an effective tax on that estate, when one puts in the capital gains, an effective tax of I think around 82 percent of 50 years of hard work in this community, 82 percent when combined with the capital gains. The government came in.

Now, true, they were wealthy. By standards, they were wealthy. They had worked in this community. They earned every darn dime of it through hard work. It did not fall out of the sky for them. The government certainly did not give it to them. They taxed it all along.

What happened as a result of this? So much to the local contributions to the local church. That money now goes to Washington, D.C. Instead of that money being circulated in their own community where it had been circulated for 50 years, it now is going to be transferred to Washington, D.C., because the Federal Government says we are entitled upon one's death to transfer that money from one's local community to our big city. So there goes the local contributions and the charities.

Let me tell my colleagues, the church there, the church that he went to, 80 percent of their budget was donated by this individual. It was a pretty good sized church. It had several hundred members in it; 80 percent of it was funded by that individual.

When that church, when the elders of the church went to speak to the family about continuing these contributions, the family said we do not have the money anymore. The money has been transferred to Washington, D.C. So much for any more jobs being generated by that money. So much for deposits being put into savings accounts and the local banks where local people could then go borrow the money to set out on their dreams or to buy a car or to pay for improvements of their house or maybe to buy a house.

All of these different things, money was sucked out of that community. I remember Ross Perot talking about the sucking sound or something of Mexico. If my colleagues want to see where the real sound is, take a look at where the death tax where it takes that money.

If one lives in Kansas and one dies in Kansas and one is hit with a death tax,

that money does not stay in Kansas. That Federal death tax goes to Washington. If one dies in Florida and one gets hit with the death tax, that money does not stay in one's community in Florida, it goes to Washington. If one dies in California and Washington and Wyoming and Colorado and Utah and Idaho, wherever one dies, one's money does not stay in one's community to continue to circulate in one's community; it is sent to Washington, D.C.

How many of my colleagues out there think that money is being well spent in Washington, and how many of my colleagues out there think one darn dime makes its way back to that little community in Colorado?

These death taxes are fundamentally unfair. They are unjustified. It is perhaps, despite what some of these people are writing in their editorials, it is perhaps the most unjustified tax in our system. How does one justify taxing somebody upon their death simply because they have accumulated property upon which they have already paid taxes, simply upon which they have accumulated property by hard work, by following the American principles of free enterprise, by following the American principles of capitalism, by going out there and following their own dream in America; and when they get to that point in hopes of helping the next generation, they lose it.

Now, let us talk about something else that is impacted by these estate taxes, something that some of us may not even think about. Let us talk about open space.

In Colorado, again, I am awful proud of that State, and I am proud of my district. It is a wonderful, beautiful district. I think it is probably one of the most beautiful. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and I could compete, but by gosh we are both up there in the top. Our open space is what makes it beautiful.

We have tremendous, tremendous land in these States. But do my colleagues know what is happening? Take for example a typical family ranch. Now, some people will tell us, well, one has a large ranch out there and a ranching family, and the estate has a value over the amount of the government decides to tax, I mean the amount that puts it eligible for this death tax. What one ought to do, ranchers, go out and buy life insurance. That is what life insurance is for. If one is prudent and responsible to the next generation, one is going to go out and buy life insurance to save that ranch.

Well, do my colleagues know what, it is pretty obvious to me that people that make that kind of proposal have not ever tried to look very closely at the economics of ranching. One may have some land, but one does not get into ranching for money. One does not make enough money. Most ranchers out there do not make enough money to pay the premiums on the life insurance. So that is not a practical, realistic thing.

Well, what happens is, if one has a ranch, let us say a couple thousand acres, let us say in the Glenwood Springs Valley, so Glenwood Springs, Colorado, so one has high property values or higher property values, and, unfortunately, one and one's wife or one's wife and one pass away, do my colleagues know what happens to that property if one does not have the cash to pay off the government, if one's family does not have the cash to pay it off? I will tell my colleagues what happens. The family has got to sell the ranch.

Where is the value of a ranch in Colorado near Glenwood Springs? Is it in cattle ranching? Is it in sheep ranching? Is it in hay production? No. It is not in that economy. The value of it is one goes into that ranch, and one puts it in little tiny 35-acre parcels. One takes that beautiful open space, and one turns it into a 35-acre multihome, multiwealth subdivision.

So pretty soon these open spaces that one enjoys by the government that stands up here and preaches about the value of open space, and they themselves force one to dissect that land so one can pay them off upon the death of one's parents or upon one's death; one makes arrangements to have it split up like that.

These are some of the unintended consequences that decades of this death tax have had in our country. The time has come, and I can tell my colleagues I stand with a great deal of pride to see the governor of the State of Texas, one of his policies, if he becomes the President, and he has made it clear, and the reason I bring this up is I want to bring the Democrats to action. I want the Democrats to stand up and say me, too, because we want to get rid of this estate tax. The governor of the State of Texas said he is going after that estate tax if he becomes President.

Now, one can contrast that to the policies of the current administration. Remember what the current administration has proposed this year and in their budget. It is in the budget. It is not me just making this up. It is in their budget, the Democrats. It is in their budget. That is to increase the death taxes by $9.5 billion, not just keep it the same, but increase it.

I am telling my colleagues, fundamentally the American people will not support the proposal to raise the death taxes in this country. Every one of my colleagues on the Democratic side ought to take issue with the President and the Democrats' policy of trying to raise those estate taxes. Those death taxes are not right. They know they are not right. Their gut tells them it is not right to do that. It is not right to go to somebody who is living the American dream who has worked 50 or 60 years, or even if they worked 10 years, to go out and say on the property one has already paid taxes on, we are going to tax it again. We do not care what it does to the next generation. We do not care how the next generation pays for it. We do not know what kind of dreams have been squashed by the fact that those vultures are flying over one's death bed. The government does not care about what happens to the next generation that one has worked all one's life to provide a little something for. They do not care about whether or not those people get that money. They want that money transferred to Washington, D.C.

Now, tonight I know a lot of us have children who are now young couples. They are just now getting into the work force, couples that are worried about Social Security; couples that are worried about what they can save, and they have their dreams. Oh, to be that age again, to just dream about, oh, when we buy our first home, when we really get to go buy a brand-new car, when we get to have our children and our family, and then we can begin to think about, well, maybe we can put some money aside so they can have a college education, and maybe we can put some money aside so that, if something happens to us, they will be able to carry on the family business or the family ranch, or maybe they will have other money to give them a little head start.

If only they knew, if only these young people in this country knew what this policy, and, frankly, Democrats, they know they supported it, they have increased, they are proposing to increase it this year, they ought to join us. Because if these young people knew how this government operated with this death tax, they would be darn mad about it, very mad, very upset. I do not blame them a bit.

So I am asking my Democratic colleagues, and I am asking them to support a change in the policy of the Clinton-Gore administration, although GORE is very clear about his position on this. Let us do something about those death taxes.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Well, enough with the estate taxes, enough for the toll road in Colorado that I talked to my colleagues about. Now I want to talk about something else. First of all, let me tell my colleagues, if they are age, say, 48, if they are 48 years or older, they do not even have to worry about what I am going to talk about because they are well taken care of.

I can tell my colleagues that the principles of the plan that I am going to talk about have primarily been pushed or advocated by the governor of the State of Texas, George W. Bush. Very clearly one of his principles is the people, currently the older people of our society, 48 and above somewhere in that area, they do not have to worry about it.

What am I talking about? I am talking about Social Security. Social Security. Let us talk about that program a little tonight. First of all, and again, as I said, if one is 48 years old, I am about there, if one is my age or above,

there is plenty of money in Social Security.

On a cash basis, Social Security has a surplus. On an actuarial basis, which means once Social Security pays the obligations that it has made under the benefits of that program, Social Security is bankrupt. But for us to reach that bankrupt status, it is going to take 30 years. So that in my age bracket and above, we will not get to that point probably, or not many of us will get to the point where we really have to worry about the bankruptcy of Social Security. But I think it is incumbent upon those of us who do not have to worry about it for us that we sit down and start doing some planning and worrying about it for the next generation.

For the kids that are, the young men and women the age of my children, they should, and are now paying into the system. They are providing for us. We have an obligation to the young generation. Frankly, that is exactly what the governor of the State of Texas has said, George W. Bush. We have an obligation under his policies to provide some planning so that we do not hand to the next generation a bankrupt Social Security program.

Now, let us talk about the current problem. We will talk about some of the problems that we have in Social Security. But first of all, for any of those who think they can defend the Social Security system and the management of it right now, let me ask them a question, or just think about this for a minute. If one went down to the local convenience store and one bought a lotto ticket, paid 10 bucks, one bought a lotto ticket, and let us say one won the lotto and one won $10 million, wow, great, $10 million. Would anybody in these Chambers take one's $10 million or even $10,000 of that $10 million and send it to the Social Security Administration to invest it in the Social Security program for a return on one's dollars?

There is not any one in this Chamber that would even send $1 to Social Security voluntarily to invest on one's behalf. Why? Because over the last few years I will give one an example, if a young couple today putting into Social Security system, in other words, the young couple the age of my children, they can expect for the dollars that they are, that are taken out of their check and invested in the Social Security program, they can expect a return of 1.23 percent, 1 percent, a little over. Well, 1¼ percent is the kind of return that they can expect with their investment today.

That is assuming that no more benefits are increased. That is assuming that the number going into the system stays the same, 1.23 percent. I would defy anyone on this floor to go out there and show me a savings account anywhere in the country that pays 1.25 percent. Just show me one savings account that only pays that. I mean, even the most conservative savings account in the country pays 2 or 3 or 4 points above that. It is a lousy return.

It is a system that needs a fix. Let me tell my colleagues, the system is not broke entirely because of incompetence. There are several factors that have contributed to putting Social Security into the problem it is in today. One of them is pretty good news for all of us. That is that, over the years since Social Security was first put into place in about 1935, over the years, the lifespan has increased dramatically.

2245

When Social Security was first put in, they did not expect that kind of jump in the increase in life-span. Unfortunately, as the life-span has increased, the premiums have not increased along with it. So now we have people who we maybe thought were going to be in the system for 10 years who are now in the system for 15 or 20 years. That is a problem.

Number two, the people that have put into the system, because of inflation, medical inflation and increased benefits and so on, the people that are now drawing Social Security, that are currently drawing a check out of Social Security, those people, during their lifetime, will pull out an average of $118,000 more than they put into the system. So the people today drawing out will pull out an average of $118,000 more than they put in. A system cannot be run economically when it allows participants to pull out more money than they put into the system. That is another problem that we have.

And finally, let me comment about the workers. This is an interesting statistic. When Social Security was first put into place, we had 42 people working for every person that was retired. The reason I am taking the time to write this is because it is so important. There were 42 people that were working for every person that was retired. Today that number is 3 people working for every person retired. And within the very near future, say 10 or 15 years, we will have 2 people for every person retired. My colleagues, those numbers spell trouble. We need to pay attention to the system. We need to do something to try to change the direction of this ship.

Well, let me tell my colleagues, for government employees, for us in these Chambers, for the Congressmen, we realized that we did not want to totally depend on Social Security for retirement so we developed our own plan here called the Thrift Savings Plan. And it is not just for Congressmen, by the way, it applies to government employees, 2.5 million employees. It is a program of choice. They are not forced into it. It is called the Thrift Savings Plan.

What the government did is they had to take care of these 2.5 million employees, so they allowed them to have a program of choice and every month those employees can take up to 10 percent of their pay and the government matches the first 5 percent. So they can put in 10 percent and then the government matches the first 5 percent, and they can invest it in one of three different programs.

One is a program which has high risk, but it also has high return. And this is the stock market. I think last year it was 28 percent return or a 20 percent return. Or, by choice, they can take a program that has a lower return but lower risk, or a program that is guaranteed by the government which has the lowest return but also the lowest risk, which by the way still exceeds greatly the 1.23 percent return we get in Social Security.

Now, that all sounds confusing, but suffice it to say the government has a program called the Thrift Savings Plan for 2.5 million employees to provide them with an option in Social Security, providing them with choice in investment. For example, if an individual makes lousy choices, here they only have 10 percent. Only 10 percent. The rest of the retirement there is no choice about where it goes. It is guaranteed payment. So no one can ever lose everything they have. It cannot happen under this system.

Well, what happened. Do my colleagues know who supported that, to my colleagues on the Democratic side? The vice president supported that. In fact, I have a quote somewhere, but the vice president was a cosponsor of the Thrift Savings Plan. He was a cosponsor. So what the Governor of the State of Texas and what many of us have said to do is to apply that somewhat toward Social Security. Let us allow the people, especially the young people in this country, the young people who are just getting started and who want to have more of a choice, a more sophisticated investment return, let us give them a choice.

Let us give them an opportunity not to put all of their Social Security money into a stock market; we are not going to do that, but let us allow them to have choice up to 2 percent. Take 2 percent of their paycheck, 2 percent, and remember for the Federal Government employees are allowed to take 10 percent, but allow people on Social Security under this proposal to take 2 percent and let them invest. Let them try their hand in the market. Historically, no matter what investment we look at, historically every investment out there in the stock market and the bond markets, and here I am talking as a whole, does better than 1.23 percent, which is what Social Security now pays.

Now, why would that program cause the kind of uproar that has been created in the last few months? Is it because the person pushing it the hardest is running for president? That has something to do with it. But what it really is, it frightens the status quo. That is what really is happening. What scares Washington, what makes bureaucrats shiver in their knees, is the fact that someone comes into this town

and has a bold proposal, who wants to move off the status quo and wants to take charge. Someone who has enough guts to stand and say, hey, I am going to lead, I am going to take us into some positive territory, so either move with me or stand aside.

The minute the system, the bureaucracy of the Social Security or any government bureaucracy is challenged, watch out. Because, as my colleagues know, they will turn on you and try to tear you apart from every angle they can. And how interesting it is that that is exactly what is happening with the Governor of the State of Texas and his proposal to fix Social Security. He ought to receive a pat on the back from everybody in this Chamber. We ought to go up and say thanks for being bold enough to propose something with seriousness and be ready to charge forward with a change to Social Security. We should also thank him for being smart enough not to throw it all out; not to put it all at risk; and, most importantly under this proposal, he allows choice.

If a person in Social Security does not want to invest in any of those choices, they do not have to. If a government employee does not want to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan, they do not have to. It is a program of choice and it is a program, which, in my opinion, is the most viable option we have out there today to move Social Security out of the red into the black on an actuarial basis. That is the beauty of this thing.

Now, I know that since that proposal was made, first of all, after the Governor of the State of Texas advocated it, we had a lot of fire come from frankly the administration's policy and the vice president. But then, all of a sudden, the pollsters went out there and they came back with poll results that said the American people wanted to see us shore up Social Security; that the American people were willing to look at choice; the American people are willing to take reasonable, reasonable, risk, well, then all of a sudden the administration starts to change their policy. So now they have come up with a plan. That is good. Let us take these plans, let us put them together and let us save Social Security for the future.

Let me wrap it up. My colleagues have been very patient with me this evening. I appreciate the opportunity to address my colleagues.

I talked about toll roads, toll roads being proposed in the State of Colorado simply to punish people for being on the road. Not to build new highways, but to simply institute what I believe is congestive pricing. There is too much congestion, too much traffic on the road, let us take the people who built the roads with their taxes and let us tax them off the road. It is unacceptable.

Unacceptable as far as I am concerned, especially considering the fact they are putting the toll gate at the entrance of the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado.

Secondly, I talked about the death taxes and how unfair that tax upon a person's death is. Whether an individual is wealthy or whether they have a ranch or whatever, think about the consequences of penalizing somebody upon their death. It is an unjustified tax. It is a tax we should eliminate. I hope we will not let these editorial writers in some of these papers convince us that it is a good way to attack the rich, that it is a good way to get a vendetta going among people who have taken the American Dream and lived it and accomplished it.

And, finally, as my colleagues know, I just wrapped up on Social Security. Let us take a plan that is a bold plan. Not a risky plan, not a risky plan for this next generation, but let us do something, let us make the next generation have something better than we have. After all, the American Dream is to make sure that the people, the generation and the children beyond us, live a better life than the best life we have ever lived. And we can do it if we just stick together.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and July 11 on account of business in the district.

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of family illness.

Mr. SMITH of Washington (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal business.

Mrs. FOWLER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of travel delays.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MINGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. WELLER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELLER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, 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. 4425. An act 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.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 148. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to provide assistance in the conservation of neotropical migratory birds.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 30, 2000:

H.R. 3051. To direct the Secretary of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, to conduct a feasibility study on the Jicarilla Apache Reservation in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4762. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require 527 organizations to disclose their political activities.

On July 1, 2000:

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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 11, 2000, at 9 a.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:

8437. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pine Shoot Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 99–101–1] received June 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8438. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Tobacco Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tobacco Inspection; Subpart B—Regulations [Docket No. TB–99–10] (RIN: 0581–AB65) received June 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8439. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service,

Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Authorization of Japan as an Eligible Export Outlet for Diversion and Exemption Purposes [Docket No. FV00–930–4 IFR] received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8440. A letter from the transmitting the Department's final rule— Refrigeration Requirements for Shell Eggs [Docket No. PY–99–002] (RIN: 0581–AB60) received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8441. A letter from the Undersecretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a Report on Activities and Programs for Countering Proliferation and NBC Terrorism; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8442. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS): Technical Correction [Docket No. FR–4497–C–06] (RIN: 2577–AC08) received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8443. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Eighty-Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System covering operations during calendar year 1999, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 247; to the Committee on Banking and Financial

8444. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Leasing— received June 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8445. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Student Financial Assistance, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Family Education Loan Program, William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, and State Student Incentive Grant Program—received June 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8446. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Special Education & Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule -Notice of Final Funding Priorities for Fiscal Years 2000–2001 for New Awards for the Alternative Financing Technical Assistance Program, both authorized under Title III of the Assistive Technology Act of 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8447. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Investigational New Drug Applications; Amendment to Clinical Hold Regulations for Products Intended for Life-Threatening Diseases and Conditions [Docket No. 97N–0030] received June 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8448. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Sterility Requirement for Aqueous-Based Drug Products for Oral Inhalation [Docket No. 96N–0048] (RIN: 0910–AA88) received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8449. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report on the, ''Status of the State Small Business Stationary Source Technical and Environmental Compliance Programs (SBTCPs) for the Reporting Period, January-December 1998''; to the Committee on Commerce.

8450. A letter from the Deputy Division Chief, Competitive Pricing Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Access Change Reform Price Cap Performance Review for Local Exchange Carriers Low-Volume Long Distance Users Federal-State Joint Board On Universal Service [CC Docket No. 96–262, CC Docket No. 99–249, CC Docket No. 96–45] received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8451. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his termination of the national emergency with respect to Taliban, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(a); (H. Doc. No. 106—266); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

8452. A letter from the Lieutent General, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the listing of all outstanding Letters of Offer to sell any major defense equipment for $1 million or more; the listing of all Letters of Offer that were accepted, as of March 31, 2000, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

8453. A letter from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Public Use of NARA Facilities (RIN: 3095–AA06) received June 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8454. A letter from the Writer/Editor, Office of the Inspector General, National Science Foundation, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8455. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Park System Units in Alaska; Denali National Park and Preserve, Special Regulations (RIN: 1024–AC58) received June 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8456. A letter from the Management Analyst, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska, Subparts A, B, C, and D Redefinition to Include Waters Subject to Subsistence Priority; Correction (RIN: 1018–AD68) received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8457. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Designation the Cook Inlet, Alaska, Stock of Beluga Whale as Depleted Under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) [Docket No. 990922260–0141–02; I.D. 083199E] (RIN: 0648–AM84) received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8458. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Civil Contempt of Court Commitments [BOP–1092–F] (RIN: 1120–AA87) received June 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8459. A letter from the General Counsel, National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting the annual audit report of the National Tropical Botanical Garden, Calendar Year 1999, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 4610; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8460. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Maryland Swim for Life, Chester River, Chestertown, MD [CGD05–00–022] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received June 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8461. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—SAFETY ZONE: Arrival of Sailing Vessel AMISTAD, New Haven Harbor, Connecticut [CGD01–00–166] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received June 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8462. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the notification of suspension of preferential treatment for Belarus as a beneficiary developing country under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 1515a(b); (H. Doc. No. 106—264); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

8463. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an updated report concerning the emigration laws and policies of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(b); (H. Doc. No. 106—265); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1787. A bill to reauthorize the participation of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Deschutes Resources Conservancy, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4286. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Cahaba River National Wildlife Refuge in Bibb County, Alabama; with an amendment (Rept. 106–713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4132. A bill to reauthorize grants for water resources research and technology institutes established under the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (Rept. 106–714). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. 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 (Rept. 106–715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. House Resolution 415. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National Ocean Day to recognize the significant role the ocean plays in the lives of the Nation's people and the important role the Nation's people must play in the continued life of the ocean; with an amendment (Rept. 106–716). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. S. 986. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Griffith Project to the Southern Nevada Water Authority (Rept. 106–717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: H.R. 4108. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to make grants to improve security at schools, including the placement and use of metal detectors; with an amendment (Rept. 106–718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEKAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4391. A bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code to establish nexus requirements for State and local taxation of mobile telecommunication services; with an amendment (Rept. 106–719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CALLAHAN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4811. A bill making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–720). 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. ARCHER:

H.R. 4810. A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALLAHAN:

H.R. 4811. A bill making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4812. A bill to amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to prohibit any operator of an automated teller machine that displays any paid advertising from imposing any fee on a consumer for the use of that machine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4813. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to make available to Federal employees the option of obtaining health benefits coverage for dependent parents; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H.R. 4814. A bill to make illegal the sale, share or transfer of information acquired on the Internet with a pledge that it would not be released; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BALDACCI:

H.R. 4815. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance in planning, constructing, and operating a regional heritage center in Calais, Maine, to facilitate the management and interpretation of the Saint Croix Island International Historic Site; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 4816. A bill to make technical corrections in United States Customs Service regulations regarding the importation of goods bearing foreign owned trademarks or trade names, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

H.R. 4817. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that annuities paid by States to blind veterans shall be disregarded in determining supplemental security income benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4818. A bill to promote international monetary stability and to share seigniorage with officially dollarized countries; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

H.R. 4819. A bill to amend the Wildlife Services Program of the Department of Agriculture to emphasize the use of nonlethal methods of predator control for livestock protection and to target assistance under the program to operators of small farms and ranches through grants, training, and research regarding the use of nonlethal methods to predator control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. Con. Res. 369. Concurrent resolution to urge the Nobel Commission to award the Nobel Prize for Peace to His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, for his dedication to fostering peace throughout the world; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

386. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 42 memorializing the United States Congress to financially assist in the implementation of a dairy waste management program in Louisiana; to the Committee on Agriculture.

387. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 15 memorializing the United States Congress to amend Title X of the United States Code, relating to the compensation of retired military personnel, to permit concurrent receipt of retired military longevity pay and Veterans Administration disability compensation, including dependents allowances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

388. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 71 memorializing the United States Congress to study the need to increase the number and specificity of ethnicity categories used for the reporting of educational data; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

389. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 71 memorializing the United States Congress to study the need to increase the number and specificity of ethnicity categories used for the reporting of educational data; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

390. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 4 memorializing Congress to obtain an apology from the government of Japan for crimes against prisoners of war during World War II; to the Committee on International Relations.

391. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 54 memorializing the United States Congress to take appropriate action to eliminate unnecesarily intrusive questions on the long U.S. Census form so as to remove deterrents to a complete and accurate census and to urge and request Louisiana citizens to complete census forms as soon as possible; to the Committee on Government Reform.

392. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 7 memorializing the U.S. Congress to advise them that the State of Idaho, Governor and Legislature strongly object to President Clinton establishing roadless areas by executive order; to the Committee on Resources.

393. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 6 issuing a strong message to Congress and the President that the people of Idaho must be fully involved in any planning that would affect the economic well being of it's citizens and any such actions must be approved by way of vote of the people; to the Committee on Resources.

394. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 8022 memorializing the Congress to accept the support of the people of the State of Washington for the National World War II Veterans' Memorial, a most well-deserved and worthy project; to the Committee on Resources.

395. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 10 memorializing the Congress to conduct comprehensive hearings on the proposed rules and the Section 303(d) TMDL program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

396. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 17 memorializing the United States Congress to provide credit towards the nonfederal share in the Water Resources Development Act of 2000, for the cost of any work performed by the nonfederal interests for the interim flood protection that is determined to be compatible and an integral part of the Morganza to the Gulf of Mexico Hurricane Protection Project, and to allow the remaining portion of the nonfederal share to be paid over a period of time not to exceed thirty years; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

397. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 46 memorializing the House of Representatives to establish and perpetually maintain and operate an Idaho state veterans cemetery; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

398. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 14 memorializing the United States Congress to correct any disparate tax treatment of independently contracted school bus operators by enacting legislation to cause a return to the pre-1989 policy of treating such operators as hybrid employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

399. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 13 memorializing Congress to repeal the two federal Social Security provisions known as the Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision, and thereby prevent the reduction of Social Security benefits received by beneficiaries who also receive ''uncovered: government retirement benefits earned through work for a state or local government employer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

400. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 8 petitioning the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled, and to the Congressional Delegation representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States to quickly harmonize and equalize laboratory testing of potatoes so that there is mutual acceptance of each country's respective test results; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Ways and Means.

401. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relative to House Joint

Memorial No. 9 memorializing Congress and the Canadian Parliament concerning issues of communication, production data, animal health regulations, and the Pacific Cattle Project; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 49: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 107: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 205: Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.R. 218: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. STENHOLM.
H.R. 229: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 460: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 515: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 531: Mr. HALL of Ohio and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 804: Mr. MOLLOHAN.
H.R. 815: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 828: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 864: Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 865: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 894: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1111: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1168: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1217: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1248: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1263: Mrs. FOWLER.
H.R. 1264: Mrs. FOWLER and Mr. DEMINT.
H.R. 1285: Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 1322: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RILEY, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1485: Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 1525: Mr. KIND and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1592: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 1621: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 1871: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 1885: Mr. COBURN and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1926: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 2000: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.
H.R. 2059: Mr. NADLER and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 2420: Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, MS. GRANGER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.R. 2457: Mr. KING, MR. PASCRELL, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. SAWYER.
H.R. 2546: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2594: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 2631: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
H.R. 2635: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2741: Mr. ENGEL and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 2750: Mr. WEINER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. COOK, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 2814: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 2859: Ms. LEE, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2892: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2894: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 2900: Mr. WEYGAND.
H.R. 2902: Ms. STABENOW.
H.R. 2916: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 2917: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 3003: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 3010: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 3032: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 3193: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 3256: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
H.R. 3433: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 3463: Ms. RIVERS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
H.R. 3573: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 3580: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. LEE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 3590: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 3593: Mr. CLEMENT.
H.R. 3628: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3650: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 3700: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FOLEY, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3732: Mr. MOORE and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 3766: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WU, Mr. WATT of North Caroline, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.
H.R. 3825: Mr. FARR of California.
H.R. 3826: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 4076: Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. KUYKENDALL.
H.R. 4143: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4149: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4211: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 4215: Mr. THOMAS.
H.R. 4239: Mr. COYNE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 4260: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. CLEMENT.
H.R. 4271: Mr. FLETCHER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 4272: Mr. FLETCHER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 4273: Mr. FLETCHER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 4277: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. COYNE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. SKEEN.
H.R. 4310: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 4330: Mr. QUINN.
H.R. 4340: Mr. COOK and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 4346: Mr. FILNER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. CARSON, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 4357: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. WU, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 4375: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 4395: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 4434: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 4453: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 4479: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 4480: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 4492: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 4536: Ms. CARSON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 4547: Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 4548: Mr. THOMAS.
H.R. 4567: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 4639: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
H.R. 4644: Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 4652: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. VITTER.
H.R. 4653: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 4659: Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 4669: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HILLEARY, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 4677: Mr. TURNER and Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 4697: Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 4706: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 4722: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 4727: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. MASCARA.
H.R. 4737: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. EHRLICH.
H.R. 4744: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 4750: Mr. FROST, Mr. PASTOR, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 4773: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 4776: Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 4793: Mr. ROGERS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 4807: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.J. Res. 60: Mr. UPTON.
H.J. Res. 100: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.J. Res. 102: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. REYES, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. BONIOR.
H. Con. Res. 133: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H. Con. Res. 276: Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. PHELPS.
H. Con. Res 322: Mr. GILMAN.
H. Con. Res. 327: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FORBES, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H. Con. Res. 340: Mr. DIXON, Mr. HORN, and Ms. STABENOW.
H. Con. Res. 348: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 350: Ms. ESHOO.
H. Con. Res. 351: Mr. EVANS.
H. Con. Res. 363: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H. Con. Res. 367: Mr. FROST, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. EHRLICH.
H. Res. 187: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H. Res. 531: Mr. SALMON and Mr. SHERMAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

90. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Embassy of the Republic of Macedonia, relative to a Resolution on the Position and Role of the Republic of Macedonia in the Stability Pact for Southeastern Europe; to the Committee on International Relations.

91. Also, a petition of City Council of Detroit, MI, relative to a resolution in support of project D.R.E.A.M.Z.Z.S (Detroit Relief Effort to Aide Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and South Africa); to the Committee on International Relations.

92. Also, a petition of the Delegates of Aha Hawai'i Oiwi, HI, relative to A proclamation claiming authority to collectively represent the voice of the Hawaiian electorate worldwide, elected in accordance with principles enumerated by the one-man-one-vote rule, and as such, it is a legal and properly constituted elected body of representatives of the native Hawaiian people, both in Hawai'i and throughout the world; further reasserting the right to selfdetermination, incorporating the right to define our relationship with the United States, the State of Hawai'i and all aspects of self-goverance; to the Committee on Resources.

93. Also, a petition of the Legislature of Guam, relative to Resolution No. 268 petitioning the Congress of the United States of America not allow the designation of land on Guam as ''Critical Habitat''; to the Committee on Resources.

94. Also, a petition of City Council of Dixon, IL, relative to A resolution opposing any congressional action to implement the Advisory Commission on Electronic Commerce's report proposals that would preempt state and local sovereignty, guaranteed by the 10th Amendment of the United States Constitution; supporting simplification of state and local sales taxes, and urges states to move more expeditiously to craft and approve model legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

95. Also, a petition of The People of Chefornak, Alaska, relative to Resolution H.R. 701 petitioning the Congress to vote on and pass the Conservation and Reinvestment Act; jointly to the Committees on Resources, Agriculture, and the Budget.

96. Also, a petition of Lan-Oak Park District Board of Commissioners, Lansing, Illinois, relative to A resolution urging Congress to pass legislation to provide full and permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to pass HR 701/S 2123, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA) during its session in 2000; jointly to the Committees on Resources, Agriculture, and the Budget.

97. Also, a petition of City Council of Trenton, MI, relative to Resolution 2000–19 petitioning the 106th Congress to support the Conservation and Reinvestment Act by advancing CARA H.R. 701; jointly to the Committees on Resources, Agriculture, and the Budget.

98. Also, a petition of Legislature of Guam, relative to Resolution No. 268 petitioning the United States Congress to allow all excess federal lands returned to the Government of Guam to be disposed of as the local government determines, including but not limited to the return of the land to the original landowners and their heirs when possible; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Resources, and Armed Services.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4461

OFFERED BY: MR. RANGEL OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT NO. 75: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section, preceding the short title (page 96, after line 4), the following new title:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to implement section 620(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2370(a));

(2) to exercise the authorities conferred upon the President by section 5(b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which were being exercised with respect to Cuba on July 1, 1977, as a result of a national emergency declared by the President before that date, and are being exercised on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, and any regulations in effect on the day before such date of enactment pursuant to the exercise of such authorities;

(3) to implement any prohibition on exports to Cuba that is in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act under the Export Administration Act of 1979;

(4) to implement the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, other than section 1705(f) of that Act (relating to direct mail service to Cuba);

(5) to implement the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, or the amendments made by that Act;

(6) to implement subparagraph (A) of section 901(j)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to denial of foreign tax credit, etc., with respect to certain foreign countries) with respect to Cuba;

(7) to implement section 902(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985;

(8) to implement General Note 3(b) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States with respect to Cuba; or

(9) to regulate or prohibit travel to and from Cuba by individuals who are citizens or residents of the United States, or any transactions ordinarily incident to such travel, if such travel would be lawful in the United States.

H.R. 4461

OFFERED BY: MS. WATERS

AMENDMENT NO. 76: Page 96, after line 4, insert the following new section:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. . The amounts otherwise provided in this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available under the heading Commodity Credit Corporation Fund—Reimbursement for Net Realized Losses by $500,000, and increasing the amount made available under the heading Farm Service Agency—Salaries and Expenses by $500,000, which shall be available to employ additional contractors for the Judge Adjudication Mediation Service for the resolution of outstanding claims in the case Pickford v. Glickman.

H.R. 4461

OFFERED BY: MS. WATERS

AMENDMENT NO. 77: Page 96, after line 4, insert the following new section:

TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. . (a) The amounts otherwise provided in this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available under the heading Commodity Credit Corporation Fund—Reimbursement for Net Realized Losses by $1,000,000;

(b) There is hereby appropriated $1,000,000 for the payments of interest, which shall accrue at a rate of 20 percent per month, to any person who is a member of the plaintiff class in the case Pickford v. Glickman and to whom a payment pursuant to the consent decree entered in the case is more than 60 days in arrears.

H.R. 4461

OFFERED BY: MS. WATERS

AMENDMENT NO. 78: Page 96, after line 4, insert the following new section:

SEC. . Within available funds, the Secretary of Agriculture is urged to establish the position of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Civil Rights, and all funds that would otherwise be expended for or provided to, and all duties and authorities of, the Special Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights shall be expended for or provided to, or transferred to, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Civil Rights.

H.R. 4461

OFFERED BY: MS. WATERS

AMENDMENT NO. 79: Page 96, after line 4, insert the following new section:

SEC. . There is hereby established the position of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Civil Rights, and all funds that would otherwise be expended for or provided to, and all duties and authorities of, the Special Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Rights shall be expended for or provided to, or transferred to, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Civil Rights.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. ROEMER

AMENDMENT NO. 1: In title II of the bill under the heading ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

In title II of the bill under the heading ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $1,100,000)''.

In title IV of the bill under the heading ''MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—CONTRIBUTION TO THE MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT GUARANTEE AGENCY'', after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $4,900,000)''.

In title IV of the bill under the heading ''MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTER-AMERICAN INVESTMENT CORPORATION'', after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $9,000,000)''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. ROEMER

Amendment No. 2: In title II of the bill under the heading ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'', in the proviso relating to the Microenterprise Initiative, strike ''not less than one-half'' and all that follows and insert ''not less than one-half shall be made available for providing loans in the amount (in 1995 United States dollars) of $300 or less to very poor people, particularly women, or for institutional support of organizations primarily engaged in making such loans.''.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *106th* CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 10, 2000 *No. 87*

Senate

The Senate met at 1:01 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

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

Lord God, our help in ages past and our hope for years to come, we thank You for Your mercy and blessing toward the United States throughout our history. Hear us as we seek Your continued guidance today. May the women and men of this Senate be so sensitive to Your grand vision for our Nation that they will be a conscience to our citizens in calling them back to You. Give these leaders soundness of judgment, courage in their decisions, and a united zeal to serve You together. You have warned us that a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand. Help us to affirm that those things on which we agree are of greater value than those things on which we differ. As we work together, deepen our understanding of one another's needs and enlarge our respect of one another's opinions. Make us one in the common cause of justice, righteousness, and truth. We all commit ourselves to the work of government for the honor and glory of Your Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JON KYL, a Senator from the State of Arizona, 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.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today the Senate will immediately begin consideration of H.R. 4578, the Interior appropriations bill. I see that the chairman of the subcommittee is here and ready to proceed. Opening statements will be made and amendments are expected to be offered during today's session.

At 3:30 today, however, it will be my intention to turn to the executive nomination of Madelyn Creedon to be Deputy Administrator of the National Security Administration. This was included in an earlier agreement, that we would complete debate and have a vote on this nomination prior to Wednesday of this week. I thought it was best we do it today. The vote will occur on her confirmation at 5:30 p.m. today.

During the Senate's consideration of the Interior bill, those Senators who have amendments should work with the bill managers in an effort to complete action on the bill as soon as possible. I commend the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior for the work they have done on this legislation. Many areas could have been added that would have been controversial and would have made it difficult to complete the bill. They were not included. I hope, therefore, that in a relatively short period of time we can complete action on this very important Interior appropriations bill.

Members should be on notice that it will be the leadership's intent to debate amendments to the DOD authorization bill during the evening sessions this week. That was agreed to before we went out for the Fourth of July recess. There was a unanimous consent agreement entered into that limits Senators to relevant amendments to the Department of Defense authorization bill. I believe all amendments had to be filed by the close of business that day, which was Friday of the week before last. Any amendment votes ordered during the DOD authorization bill will be postponed to occur the next morning. We are hoping we can proceed under that agreement so that Monday night, Tuesday night, and Wednesday night, if necessary, we can go to the Department of Defense authorization bill around 6:30 or 7 o'clock each night so we can complete action on this very important bill.

I emphasize again that this Department of Defense authorization bill has been pending in one form or another before the Senate for quite some time. A number of nongermane amendments were offered and voted on that are connected to this bill. They have been dealt with in one way or another now. We are ready to complete action on the underlying Defense authorization bill itself. It has a lot of very important items for the future of our military. Included among those are significant improvements in the health care provisions for our military men and women and their families and for our retirees and their families. This is important legislation. Hopefully, we can complete it under this procedure of taking up amendments each night and having votes at the beginning of the session the next morning.

As a remainder, cloture was filed on the motion to proceed to the death tax legislation prior to the July recess. Pursuant to rule XXI, that cloture vote will occur 1 hour after the Senate convenes tomorrow, unless an agreement is reached where we don't have to have a recorded vote on the motion to proceed, that we can pass that by voice vote and move straight to the bill itself. We haven't worked that out yet. That is always a possibility. Otherwise, though, we will have that vote 1 hour after we come in on Tuesday morning.

The Senate is expected to return to the reconciliation bill, which has a statutory time limitation of 20 hours, the latter part of this week. Of course, that is the reconciliation bill for the marriage penalty tax relief. Votes will occur each day of the Senate's session, with late nights and possibly a late Friday or Saturday session in order to complete the reconciliation bill.

I thank my colleagues for their attention. I emphasize that point again. It is our hope to go to the reconciliation bill on the marriage penalty tax Thursday, and complete action on that bill before the end of the session this

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

week. Since we could take up to 20 hours under the reconciliation provisions—and of course amendments at the end of that process don't count against the 20 hours—we could very easily go into the afternoon on Friday, Friday night, or Saturday. I hope Members are aware of that and prepare their schedule accordingly.

Since we only have 3 weeks before we recess for the August period for the national conventions, I think it is safe to say we will be having votes throughout the day, and we will have votes on Monday and Fridays for the 3 weeks we have remaining. We have a lot of work to do. I appreciate the support and cooperation of all Senators.

I hope Members had a good Fourth of July recess period in the Nation's Capital or back home with constituents. We are prepared to work hard and get a lot of the people's business done.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, while the leader is on the floor, I state for the minority, we are here; we are ready to work; we understand the tremendous load of work that we have. We only have about 35 legislative days until we adjourn this Congress.

In addition to the appropriations bills, there are other pieces of legislation we can move along. The leader has indicated a couple of things he is interested in accomplishing this week. We are happy to work on those. It is also important that we don't lose sight of the fact we have a number of matters in conference. We have to complete the conference committee reports so we can come back and vote on those. We have issues that are out there, not the least of which are the Patients' Bill of Rights, prescription drugs, gun safety, a minimum wage increase for families around America, and education. I hope we also can focus on some of these issues during the next 35 legislative days.

The minority is here; we are ready to move. I think we have worked very hard on these appropriations bills in the last 6 weeks. I think the last week we were able to get a lot done, including the emergency supplemental, which is so important. We would also direct the leader's attention to the fact that there are other matters originally contained in the supplemental we need to complete in the immediate future.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to consideration of H.R. 4578, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4578), making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic, as follows:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau, and assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to Public Law 96–487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), $693,133,000, to remain available until expended, of which $3,898,000 shall be available for assessment of the mineral potential of public lands in Alaska pursuant to section 1010 of Public Law 96–487 (16 U.S.C. 3150); and of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be derived from the special receipt account established by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l–6a(i)); and of which $2,500,000 shall be available in fiscal year 2001 subject to a match by at least an equal amount by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, to such Foundation for cost-shared projects supporting conservation of Bureau lands and such funds shall be advanced to the Foundation as a lump sum grant without regard to when expenses are incurred; in addition, $34,328,000 for Mining Law Administration program operations, including the cost of administering the mining claim fee program; to remain available until expended, to be reduced by amounts collected by the Bureau and credited to this appropriation from annual mining claim fees so as to result in a final appropriation estimated at not more than $693,133,000, and $2,000,000, to remain available until expended, from communication site rental fees established by the Bureau for the cost of administering communication site activities: Provided, That appropriations herein made shall not be available for the destruction of healthy, unadopted, wild horses and burros in the care of the Bureau or its contractors.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for fire preparedness, suppression operations, emergency rehabilitation and hazardous fuels reduction by the Department of the Interior, $292,679,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $9,300,000 shall be for the renovation or construction of fire facilities: Provided, That such funds are also available for repayment of advances to other appropriation accounts from which funds were previously transferred for such purposes: Provided further, That unobligated balances of amounts previously appropriated to the ''Fire Protection'' and ''Emergency Department of the Interior Firefighting Fund'' may be transferred and merged with this appropriation: Provided further, That persons hired pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1469 may be furnished subsistence and lodging without cost from funds available from this appropriation: Provided further, That notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 1856d, sums received by a bureau or office of the Department of the Interior for fire protection rendered pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1856 et seq., protection of United States property, may be credited to the appropriation from which funds were expended to provide that protection, and are available without fiscal year limitation.

CENTRAL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS FUND

For necessary expenses of the Department of the Interior and any of its component offices and bureaus for the remedial action, including associated activities, of hazardous waste substances, pollutants, or contaminants pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), $10,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, sums recovered from or paid by a party in advance of or as reimbursement for remedial action or response activities conducted by the Department pursuant to section 107 or 113(f) of such Act, shall be credited to this account to be available until expended without further appropriation: Provided further, That such sums recovered from or paid by any party are not limited to monetary payments and may include stocks, bonds or other personal or real property, which may be retained, liquidated, or otherwise disposed of by the Secretary and which shall be credited to this account.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of buildings, recreation facilities, roads, trails, and appurtenant facilities, $15,360,000, to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 20, 1976, as amended (31 U.S.C. 6901–6907), $145,000,000, of which not to exceed $400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: Provided, That no payment shall be made to otherwise eligible units of local government if the computed amount of the payment is less than $100.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out sections 205, 206, and 318(d) of Public Law 94–579, including administrative expenses and acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, $10,600,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of lands or interests therein including existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such grant lands; $104,267,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That 25 percent of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands is hereby made a charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be transferred to the General Fund in the Treasury in accordance with the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

FOREST ECOSYSTEMS HEALTH AND RECOVERY FUND

(REVOLVING FUND, SPECIAL ACCOUNT)

In addition to the purposes authorized in Public Law 102–381, funds made available in the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund can be used for the purpose of planning, preparing, and monitoring salvage timber sales and forest ecosystem health and recovery activities such as release from competing vegetation and density control treatments. The Federal share of receipts (defined as the portion of salvage timber receipts not paid to the counties under 43 U.S.C. 1181f and 43 U.S.C. 1181–1 et seq., and Public

Law 103–66) derived from treatments funded by this account shall be deposited into the Forest Ecosystem Health and Recovery Fund.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For rehabilitation, protection, and acquisition of lands and interests therein, and improvement of Federal rangelands pursuant to section 401 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), notwithstanding any other Act, sums equal to 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year under sections 3 and 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act (43 U.S.C. 315 et seq.) and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees and mineral leasing receipts from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior pursuant to law, but not less than $10,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed $600,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

For administrative expenses and other costs related to processing application documents and other authorizations for use and disposal of public lands and resources, for costs of providing copies of official public land documents, for monitoring construction, operation, and termination of facilities in conjunction with use authorizations, and for rehabilitation of damaged property, such amounts as may be collected under Public Law 94–579, as amended, and Public Law 93–153, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary of section 305(a) of Public Law 94–579 (43 U.S.C. 1735(a)), any moneys that have been or will be received pursuant to that section, whether as a result of forfeiture, compromise, or settlement, if not appropriate for refund pursuant to section 305(c) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1735(c)), shall be available and may be expended under the authority of this Act by the Secretary to improve, protect, or rehabilitate any public lands administered through the Bureau of Land Management which have been damaged by the action of a resource developer, purchaser, permittee, or any unauthorized person, without regard to whether all moneys collected from each such action are used on the exact lands damaged which led to the action: Provided further, That any such moneys that are in excess of amounts needed to repair damage to the exact land for which funds were collected may be used to repair other damaged public lands.

MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

In addition to amounts authorized to be expended under existing laws, there is hereby appropriated such amounts as may be contributed under section 307 of the Act of October 21, 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701), and such amounts as may be advanced for administrative costs, surveys, appraisals, and costs of making conveyances of omitted lands under section 211(b) of that Act, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures, and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title; up to $100,000 for payments, at the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Bureau; miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate, not to exceed $10,000: Provided, That notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Bureau may, under cooperative cost-sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share the cost of printing either in cash or in services, and the Bureau determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigations, protection, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, maintenance of the herd of longhorned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, general administration, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources by direct expenditure, contracts, grants, cooperative agreements and reimbursable agreements with public and private entities, $758,442,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002, except as otherwise provided herein, of which not less than $2,000,000 shall be provided to local governments in southern California for planning associated with the Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) program and shall remain available until expended: Provided, That not less than $1,000,000 for high priority projects which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps as authorized by the Act of August 13, 1970, as amended: Provided further, That not to exceed $6,355,000 shall be used for implementing subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 4 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended, for species that are indigenous to the United States (except for processing petitions, developing and issuing proposed and final regulations, and taking any other steps to implement actions described in subsection (c)(2)(A), (c)(2)(B)(i), or (c)(2)(B)(ii)): Provided further, That of the amount available for law enforcement, up to $400,000 to remain available until expended, may at the discretion of the Secretary, be used for payment for information, rewards, or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Service, and miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activity, authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on his certificate: Provided further, That of the amount provided for environmental contaminants, up to $1,000,000 may remain available until expended for contaminant sample analyses.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvement, acquisition, or removal of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein; $54,803,000, to remain available until expended.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l–4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, $46,100,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531–1543), as amended, $26,925,000, to be derived from the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUND

For expenses necessary to implement the Act of October 17, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 715s), $10,000,000.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, Public Law 101–233, as amended, $16,500,000, to remain available until expended.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND APPRECIATION FUND

For necessary expenses of the Wildlife Conservation and Appreciation Fund, $797,000, to remain available until expended.

MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4201–4203, 4211–4213, 4221–4225, 4241–4245, and 1538), the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 (16 U.S.C. 4261–4266), and the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5301–5306), $2,500,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds made available under this Act and Public Law 105–277 for rhinoceros, tiger, and Asian elephant conservation programs are exempt from any sanctions imposed against any country under section 102 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2799aa–1).

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 79 passenger motor vehicles, of which 72 are for replacement only (including 41 for police-type use); repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed $1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are consistent with their primary purpose; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Service and to which the United States has title, and which are used pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources: Provided, That notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Service may, under cooperative cost sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share at least one-half the cost of printing either in cash or services and the Service determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards: Provided further, That the Service may accept donated aircraft as replacements for existing aircraft: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may not spend any of the funds appropriated in this Act for the purchase of lands or interests in lands to be used in the establishment of any new unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System unless the purchase is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in Senate Report 105–56.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For expenses necessary for the management, operation, and maintenance of areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service (including special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), and for the general administration of the National Park Service, including not less than $2,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1706, $1,443,795,000, of which $9,227,000 for research, planning and interagency coordination in support of land acquisition for Everglades restoration shall remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed $7,000,000, to remain available until expended, is to be derived from the special fee account established pursuant to title V, section 5201 of Public Law 100–203.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out recreation programs, natural programs, cultural programs, heritage partnership programs, environmental compliance and review, international park affairs, statutory or contractual aid for other activities, and grant administration, not otherwise

provided for, $58,209,000, of which $2,000,000 shall be available to carry out the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.).

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary in carrying out the Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470), and the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–333), $44,347,000, to be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2002, of which $7,177,000 pursuant to section 507 of Public Law 104–333 shall remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvements, repair or replacement of physical facilities, including the modifications authorized by section 104 of the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, $207,079,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That $1,000,000 for the Great Falls Historic District, $650,000 for Lake Champlain National Historic Landmarks, and $365,000 for the U.S. Grant Boyhood Home National Historic Landmark shall be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 470a.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

(RESCISSION)

The contract authority provided for fiscal year 2001 by 16 U.S.C. 460l–10a is rescinded.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

For expenses necessary to carry out the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l–4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of lands or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with the statutory authority applicable to the National Park Service, $87,140,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended, of which $40,000,000 is for the State assistance program including $1,000,000 to administer the State assistance program, and of which $10,000,000 may be for State grants for land acquisition in the State of Florida: Provided, That the Secretary may provide Federal assistance to the State of Florida for the acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, within the Everglades watershed (consisting of lands and waters within the boundaries of the South Florida Water Management District, Florida Bay and the Florida Keys, including the areas known as the Frog Pond, the Rocky Glades and the Eight and One-Half Square Mile Area) under terms and conditions deemed necessary by the Secretary to improve and restore the hydrological function of the Everglades watershed: Provided further, That funds provided under this heading for assistance to the State of Florida to acquire lands within the Everglades watershed are contingent upon new matching non-Federal funds by the State and shall be subject to an agreement that the lands to be acquired will be managed in perpetuity for the restoration of the Everglades: Provided further, That none of the funds provided for the State Assistance program may be used to establish a contingency fund.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 340 passenger motor vehicles, of which 273 shall be for replacement only, including not to exceed 319 for police-type use, 12 buses, and 9 ambulances: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Park Service may be used to process any grant or contract documents which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Park Service may be used to implement an agreement for the redevelopment of the southern end of Ellis Island until such agreement has been submitted to the Congress and shall not be implemented prior to the expiration of 30 calendar days (not including any day in which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) from the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of a full and comprehensive report on the development of the southern end of Ellis Island, including the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed project.

None of the funds in this Act may be spent by the National Park Service for activities taken in direct response to the United Nations Biodiversity Convention.

The National Park Service may distribute to operating units based on the safety record of each unit the costs of programs designed to improve workplace and employee safety, and to encourage employees receiving workers' compensation benefits pursuant to chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to return to appropriate positions for which they are medically able.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the United States Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, hydrology, biology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by 43 U.S.C. 31, 1332, and 1340; classify lands as to their mineral and water resources; give engineering supervision to power permittees and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licensees; administer the minerals exploration program (30 U.S.C. 641); and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; and to conduct inquiries into the economic conditions affecting mining and materials processing industries (30 U.S.C. 3, 21a, and 1603; 50 U.S.C. 98g(1)) and related purposes as authorized by law and to publish and disseminate data; $847,596,000, of which $62,879,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations; and of which $16,400,000 shall remain available until expended for conducting inquiries into the economic conditions affecting mining and materials processing industries; and of which $1,525,000 shall remain available until expended for ongoing development of a mineral and geologic data base; and of which $32,322,000 shall be available until September 30, 2002 for the operation and maintenance of facilities and deferred maintenance; and of which $147,773,000 shall be available until September 30, 2002 for the biological research activity and the operation of the Cooperative Research Units: Provided, That none of these funds provided for the biological research activity shall be used to conduct new surveys on private property, unless specifically authorized in writing by the property owner: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of topographic mapping or water resources data collection and investigations carried on in cooperation with States and municipalities.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the United States Geological Survey shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 53 passenger motor vehicles, of which 48 are for replacement only; reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gauging stations and observation wells; expenses of the United States National Committee on Geology; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Survey duly appointed to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts: Provided, That activities funded by appropriations herein made may be accomplished through the use of contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements as defined in 31 U.S.C. 6302 et seq.

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

ROYALTY AND OFFSHORE MINERALS MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for minerals leasing and environmental studies, regulation of industry operations, and collection of royalties, as authorized by law; for enforcing laws and regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other minerals leases, permits, licenses and operating contracts; and for matching grants or cooperative agreements; including the purchase of not to exceed eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; $134,010,000, of which $86,257,000, shall be available for royalty management activities; and an amount not to exceed $107,410,000, to be credited to this appropriation and to remain available until expended, from additions to receipts resulting from increases to rates in effect on August 5, 1993, from rate increases to fee collections for Outer Continental Shelf administrative activities performed by the Minerals Management Service over and above the rates in effect on September 30, 1993, and from additional fees for Outer Continental Shelf administrative activities established after September 30, 1993: Provided, That to the extent $107,410,000 in additions to receipts are not realized from the sources of receipts stated above, the amount needed to reach $107,410,000 shall be credited to this appropriation from receipts resulting from rental rates for Outer Continental Shelf leases in effect before August 5, 1993: Provided further, That $3,000,000 for computer acquisitions shall remain available until September 30, 2002: Provided further, That funds appropriated under this Act shall be available for the payment of interest in accordance with 30 U.S.C. 1721(b) and (d): Provided further, That not to exceed $3,000 shall be available for reasonable expenses related to promoting volunteer beach and marine cleanup activities: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, $15,000 under this heading shall be available for refunds of overpayments in connection with certain Indian leases in which the Director of the Minerals Management Service concurred with the claimed refund due, to pay amounts owed to Indian allottees or tribes, or to correct prior unrecoverable erroneous payments.

OIL SPILL RESEARCH

For necessary expenses to carry out title I, section 1016, title IV, sections 4202 and 4303, title VII, and title VIII, section 8201 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $6,118,000, which shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

REGULATION AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95–87, as amended, including the purchase of not to exceed 10 passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; $100,801,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to regulations, may use directly or through grants to States, moneys collected in fiscal year 2001 for civil penalties assessed under section 518 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1268), to reclaim lands adversely affected by coal mining practices after August 3, 1977, to remain available until expended: Provided further, That appropriations for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement may provide for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sponsored training.

ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation

Act of 1977, Public Law 95–87, as amended, including the purchase of not more than 10 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $201,438,000, to be derived from receipts of the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund and to remain available until expended; of which up to $10,000,000, to be derived from the Federal Expenses Share of the Fund, shall be for supplemental grants to States for the reclamation of abandoned sites with acid mine rock drainage from coal mines, and for associated activities, through the Appalachian Clean Streams Initiative: Provided, That grants to minimum program States will be $1,600,000 per State in fiscal year 2001: Provided further, That of the funds herein provided up to $18,000,000 may be used for the emergency program authorized by section 410 of Public Law 95–87, as amended, of which no more than 25 percent shall be used for emergency reclamation projects in any one State and funds for federally administered emergency reclamation projects under this proviso shall not exceed $11,000,000: Provided further, That prior year unobligated funds appropriated for the emergency reclamation program shall not be subject to the 25 percent limitation per State and may be used without fiscal year limitation for emergency projects: Provided further, That pursuant to Public Law 97–365, the Department of the Interior is authorized to use up to 20 percent from the recovery of the delinquent debt owed to the United States Government to pay for contracts to collect these debts: Provided further, That funds made available under title IV of Public Law 95–87 may be used for any required non-Federal share of the cost of projects funded by the Federal Government for the purpose of environmental restoration related to treatment or abatement of acid mine drainage from abandoned mines: Provided further, That such projects must be consistent with the purposes and priorities of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act: Provided further, That the State of Maryland may set aside the greater of $1,000,000 or 10 percent of the total of the grants made available to the State under title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, as amended (30 U.S.C. 1231 et seq.), if the amount set aside is deposited in an acid mine drainage abatement and treatment fund established under a State law, pursuant to which law the amount (together with all interest earned on the amount) is expended by the State to undertake acid mine drainage abatement and treatment projects, except that before any amounts greater than 10 percent of its title IV grants are deposited in an acid mine drainage abatement and treatment fund, the State of Maryland must first complete all Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act priority one projects: Provided further, That from the funds provided herein, in addition to the amount granted to the State of Kentucky under Sections 402(g)(1) and 402(g)(5) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act, an additional $1,000,000 shall be made available to the State of Kentucky to demonstrate reforestation techniques on abandoned coal mine sites.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary for the operation of Indian programs, as authorized by law, including the Snyder Act of November 2, 1921 (25 U.S.C. 13), the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.), as amended, the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2001–2019), and the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), as amended, $1,704,620,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002 except as otherwise provided herein, of which not to exceed $93,225,000 shall be for welfare assistance payments and notwithstanding any other provision of law, including but not limited to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, not to exceed $125,485,000 shall be available for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract support costs associated with ongoing contracts, grants, compacts, or annual funding agreements entered into with the Bureau prior to or during fiscal year 2001, as authorized by such Act, except that tribes and tribal organizations may use their tribal priority allocations for unmet indirect costs of ongoing contracts, grants, or compacts, or annual funding agreements and for unmet welfare assistance costs; and up to $5,000,000 shall be for the Indian Self-Determination Fund which shall be available for the transitional cost of initial or expanded tribal contracts, grants, compacts or cooperative agreements with the Bureau under such Act; and of which not to exceed $412,556,000 for school operations costs of Bureau-funded schools and other education programs shall become available on July 1, 2001, and shall remain available until September 30, 2002; and of which not to exceed $54,694,000 shall remain available until expended for housing improvement, road maintenance, attorney fees, litigation support, self-governance grants, the Indian Self-Determination Fund, land records improvement, and the Navajo-Hopi Settlement Program: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, including but not limited to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, and 25 U.S.C. 2008, not to exceed $43,160,000 within and only from such amounts made available for school operations shall be available to tribes and tribal organizations for administrative cost grants associated with the operation of Bureau-funded schools: Provided further, That any forestry funds allocated to a tribe which remain unobligated as of September 30, 2002, may be transferred during fiscal year 2003 to an Indian forest land assistance account established for the benefit of such tribe within the tribe's trust fund account: Provided further, That any such unobligated balances not so transferred shall expire on September 30, 2003.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, repair, improvement, and maintenance of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other facilities, including architectural and engineering services by contract; acquisition of lands, and interests in lands; and preparation of lands for farming, and for construction of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project pursuant to Public Law 87–483, $341,004,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such amounts as may be available for the construction of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project may be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation: Provided further, That not to exceed 6 percent of contract authority available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs from the Federal Highway Trust Fund may be used to cover the road program management costs of the Bureau: Provided further, That any funds provided for the Safety of Dams program pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 13 shall be made available on a nonreimbursable basis: Provided further, That for fiscal year 2001, in implementing new construction or facilities improvement and repair project grants in excess of $100,000 that are provided to tribally controlled grant schools under Public Law 100–297, as amended, the Secretary of the Interior shall use the Administrative and Audit Requirements and Cost Principles for Assistance Programs contained in 43 CFR part 12 as the regulatory requirements: Provided further, That such grants shall not be subject to section 12.61 of 43 CFR; the Secretary and the grantee shall negotiate and determine a schedule of payments for the work to be performed: Provided further, That in considering applications, the Secretary shall consider whether the Indian tribe or tribal organization would be deficient in assuring that the construction projects conform to applicable building standards and codes and Federal, tribal, or State health and safety standards as required by 25 U.S.C. 2005(a), with respect to organizational and financial management capabilities: Provided further, That if the Secretary declines an application, the Secretary shall follow the requirements contained in 25 U.S.C. 2505(f): Provided further, That any disputes between the Secretary and any grantee concerning a grant shall be subject to the disputes provision in 25 U.S.C. 2508(e).

INDIAN LAND AND WATER CLAIM SETTLEMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS PAYMENTS TO INDIANS

For miscellaneous payments to Indian tribes and individuals and for necessary administrative expenses, $35,276,000, to remain available until expended; of which $25,225,000 shall be available for implementation of enacted Indian land and water claim settlements pursuant to Public Laws 101–618 and 102–575, and for implementation of other enacted water rights settlements; of which $8,000,000 shall be available for Tribal compact administration, economic development and future water supplies facilities under Public Law 106–163; and of which $1,877,000 shall be available pursuant to Public Laws 99–264, 100–383, 100–580 and 103–402.

INDIAN GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans, $4,500,000, as authorized by the Indian Financing Act of 1974, as amended: Provided, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $59,682,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan programs, $488,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Bureau of Indian Affairs may carry out the operation of Indian programs by direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts and grants, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations.

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans, the Indian loan guarantee and insurance fund, and the Indian Guaranteed Loan Program account) shall be available for expenses of exhibits, and purchase of not to exceed 229 passenger motor vehicles, of which not to exceed 187 shall be for replacement only.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for central office operations, pooled overhead general administration (except facilities operations and maintenance), or provided to implement the recommendations of the National Academy of Public Administration's August 1999 report shall be available for tribal contracts, grants, compacts, or cooperative agreements with the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the provisions of the Indian Self-Determination Act or the Tribal Self-Governance Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–413).

In the event any tribe returns appropriations made available by this Act to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for distribution to other tribes, this action shall not diminish the Federal Government's trust responsibility to that tribe, or the government-to-government relationship between the United States and that tribe, or that tribe's ability to access future appropriations.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds available to the Bureau, other than the amounts provided herein for assistance to public schools under 25 U.S.C. 452 et seq., shall be available to support the operation of any elementary or secondary school in the State of Alaska.

Appropriations made available in this or any other Act for schools funded by the Bureau shall be available only to the schools in the Bureau school system as of September 1, 1996. No funds available to the Bureau shall be used to support expanded grades for any school or dormitory beyond the grade structure in place or approved by the Secretary of the Interior at each school in the Bureau school system as of October 1, 1995. Funds made available under

this Act may not be used to establish a charter school at a Bureau-funded school (as that term is defined in section 1146 of the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2026)), except that a charter school that is in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act and that has operated at a Bureau-funded school before September 1, 1999, may continue to operate during that period, but only if the charter school pays to the Bureau a pro-rata share of funds to reimburse the Bureau for the use of the real and personal property (including buses and vans), the funds of the charter school are kept separate and apart from Bureau funds, and the Bureau does not assume any obligation for charter school programs of the State in which the school is located if the charter school loses such funding. Employees of Bureau-funded schools sharing a campus with a charter school and performing functions related to the charter school's operation and employees of a charter school shall not be treated as Federal employees for purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Federal Tort Claims Act''). Not later than June 15, 2001, the Secretary of the Interior shall evaluate the effectiveness of Bureau-funded schools sharing facilities with charter schools in the manner described in the preceding sentence and prepare and submit a report on the finding of that evaluation to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House.

DEPARTMENT OFFICES

INSULAR AFFAIRS

ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for assistance to territories under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, $68,471,000, of which: (1) $64,076,000 shall be available until expended for technical assistance, including maintenance assistance, disaster assistance, insular management controls, coral reef initiative activities, and brown tree snake control and research; grants to the judiciary in American Samoa for compensation and expenses, as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1661(c)); grants to the Government of American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for construction and support of governmental functions; grants to the Government of the Virgin Islands as authorized by law; grants to the Government of Guam, as authorized by law; and grants to the Government of the Northern Mariana Islands as authorized by law (Public Law 94–241; 90 Stat. 272); and (2) $4,395,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses of the Office of Insular Affairs: Provided, That all financial transactions of the territorial and local governments herein provided for, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or used by such governments, may be audited by the General Accounting Office, at its discretion, in accordance with chapter 35 of title 31, United States Code: Provided further, That Northern Mariana Islands Covenant grant funding shall be provided according to those terms of the Agreement of the Special Representatives on Future United States Financial Assistance for the Northern Mariana Islands approved by Public Law 104–134: Provided further, That of the amounts provided for technical assistance, sufficient funding shall be made available for a grant to the Close Up Foundation: Provided further, That the funds for the program of operations and maintenance improvement are appropriated to institutionalize routine operations and maintenance improvement of capital infrastructure in American Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Federated States of Micronesia through assessments of long-range operations maintenance needs, improved capability of local operations and maintenance institutions and agencies (including management and vocational education training), and project-specific maintenance (with territorial participation and cost sharing to be determined by the Secretary based on the individual territory's commitment to timely maintenance of its capital assets): Provided further, That any appropriation for disaster assistance under this heading in this Act or previous appropriations Acts may be used as non-Federal matching funds for the purpose of hazard mitigation grants provided pursuant to section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c).

COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION

For economic assistance and necessary expenses for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands as provided for in sections 122, 221, 223, 232, and 233 of the Compact of Free Association, and for economic assistance and necessary expenses for the Republic of Palau as provided for in sections 122, 221, 223, 232, and 233 of the Compact of Free Association, $20,545,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by Public Law 99–239 and Public Law 99–658.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for management of the Department of the Interior, $64,019,000, of which not to exceed $8,500 may be for official reception and representation expenses and of which up to $1,000,000 shall be available for workers compensation payments and unemployment compensation payments associated with the orderly closure of the United States Bureau of Mines.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, $40,196,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, $27,846,000.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

For operation of trust programs for Indians by direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts, and grants, $82,628,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds for trust management improvements may be transferred, as needed, to the Bureau of Indian Affairs ''Operation of Indian Programs'' account and to the Departmental Management ''Salaries and Expenses'' account: Provided further, That funds made available to Tribes and Tribal organizations through contracts or grants obligated during fiscal year 2001, as authorized by the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.), shall remain available until expended by the contractor or grantee: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the statute of limitations shall not commence to run on any claim, including any claim in litigation pending on the date of the enactment of this Act, concerning losses to or mismanagement of trust funds, until the affected tribe or individual Indian has been furnished with an accounting of such funds from which the beneficiary can determine whether there has been a loss: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall not be required to provide a quarterly statement of performance for any Indian trust account that has not had activity for at least 18 months and has a balance of $1.00 or less: Provided further, That the Secretary shall issue an annual account statement and maintain a record of any such accounts and shall permit the balance in each such account to be withdrawn upon the express written request of the account holder.

INDIAN LAND CONSOLIDATION

For implementation of a program for consolidation of fractional interests in Indian lands and expenses associated with redetermining and redistributing escheated interests in allotted lands by direct expenditure or cooperative agreement, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended and which may be transferred to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Departmental Management of which not to exceed $500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: Provided, That the Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement, which shall not be subject to Public Law 93–638, as amended, with a tribe having jurisdiction over the reservation to implement the program to acquire fractional interests on behalf of such tribe: Provided further, That the Secretary may develop a reservation-wide system for establishing the fair market value of various types of lands and improvements to govern the amounts offered for acquisition of fractional interests: Provided further, That acquisitions shall be limited to one or more reservations as determined by the Secretary: Provided further, That funds shall be available for acquisition of fractional interests in trust or restricted lands with the consent of its owners and at fair market value, and the Secretary shall hold in trust for such tribe all interests acquired pursuant to this program: Provided further, That all proceeds from any lease, resource sale contract, right-of-way or other transaction derived from the fractional interest shall be credited to this appropriation, and remain available until expended, until the purchase price paid by the Secretary under this appropriation has been recovered from such proceeds: Provided further, That once the purchase price has been recovered, all subsequent proceeds shall be managed by the Secretary for the benefit of the applicable tribe or paid directly to the tribe.

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT AND RESTORATION

NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT FUND

To conduct natural resource damage assessment activities by the Department of the Interior necessary to carry out the provisions of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), and the Act of July 27, 1990, as amended (16 U.S.C. 19jj et seq.), $5,403,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

There is hereby authorized for acquisition from available resources within the Working Capital Fund, 15 aircraft, 10 of which shall be for replacement and which may be obtained by donation, purchase or through available excess surplus property: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft: Provided further, That no programs funded with appropriated funds in the ''Departmental Management'', ''Office of the Solicitor'', and ''Office of Inspector General'' may be augmented through the Working Capital Fund or the Consolidated Working Fund.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: Provided, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted: Provided further, That all funds used pursuant to this section are hereby designated by Congress to be ''emergency requirements'' pursuant to section

251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation which must be requested as promptly as possible.

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer of any no year appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of wildland fires on or threatening lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; for the emergency rehabilitation of burned-over lands under its jurisdiction; for emergency actions related to potential or actual earthquakes, floods, volcanoes, storms, or other unavoidable causes; for contingency planning subsequent to actual oil spills; for response and natural resource damage assessment activities related to actual oil spills; for the prevention, suppression, and control of actual or potential grasshopper and Mormon cricket outbreaks on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, pursuant to the authority in section 1773(b) of Public Law 99–198 (99 Stat. 1658); for emergency reclamation projects under section 410 of Public Law 95–87; and shall transfer, from any no year funds available to the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, such funds as may be necessary to permit assumption of regulatory authority in the event a primacy State is not carrying out the regulatory provisions of the Surface Mining Act: Provided, That appropriations made in this title for wildland fire operations shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft, or other equipment in connection with their use for wildland fire operations, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt thereof: Provided further, That for wildland fire operations, no funds shall be made available under this authority until the Secretary determines that funds appropriated for ''wildland fire operations'' shall be exhausted within thirty days: Provided further, That all funds used pursuant to this section are hereby designated by Congress to be ''emergency requirements'' pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation which must be requested as promptly as possible: Provided further, That such replenishment funds shall be used to reimburse, on a pro rata basis, accounts from which emergency funds were transferred.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by sections 1535 and 1536 of title 31, United States Code: Provided, That reimbursements for costs and supplies, materials, equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in this title shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, when authorized by the Secretary, in total amount not to exceed $500,000; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902 and D.C. Code 4–204).

SEC. 106. Annual appropriations made in this title shall be available for obligation in connection with contracts issued for services or rentals for periods not in excess of 12 months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

SEC. 107. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior for the conduct of offshore leasing and related activities placed under restriction in the President's moratorium statement of June 26, 1990, in the areas of northern, central, and southern California; the North Atlantic; Washington and Oregon; and the eastern Gulf of Mexico south of 26 degrees north latitude and east of 86 degrees west longitude.

SEC. 108. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior for the conduct of offshore oil and natural gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities, on lands within the North Aleutian Basin planning area.

SEC. 109. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior to conduct offshore oil and natural gas preleasing, leasing and related activities in the eastern Gulf of Mexico planning area for any lands located outside Sale 181, as identified in the final Outer Continental Shelf 5-Year Oil and Gas Leasing Program, 1997–2002.

SEC. 110. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior to conduct oil and natural gas preleasing, leasing and related activities in the Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic planning areas.

SEC. 111. Advance payments made under this title to Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and tribal consortia pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) or the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) may be invested by the Indian tribe, tribal organization, or consortium before such funds are expended for the purposes of the grant, compact, or annual funding agreement so long as such funds are—

(1) invested by the Indian tribe, tribal organization, or consortium only in obligations of the United States, or in obligations or securities that are guaranteed or insured by the United States, or mutual (or other) funds registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission and which only invest in obligations of the United States or securities that are guaranteed or insured by the United States; or

(2) deposited only into accounts that are insured by an agency or instrumentality of the United States, or are fully collateralized to ensure protection of the funds, even in the event of a bank failure.

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the National Park Service shall not develop or implement a reduced entrance fee program to accommodate non-local travel through a unit. The Secretary may provide for and regulate local non-recreational passage through units of the National Park System, allowing each unit to develop guidelines and permits for such activity appropriate to that unit.

SEC. 113. Refunds or rebates received on an on-going basis from a credit card services provider under the Department of the Interior's charge card programs may be deposited to and retained without fiscal year limitation in the Departmental Working Capital Fund established under 43 U.S.C. 1467 and used to fund management initiatives of general benefit to the Department of the Interior's bureaus and offices as determined by the Secretary or his designee.

SEC. 114. Appropriations made in this title under the headings Bureau of Indian Affairs and Office of Special Trustee for American Indians and any available unobligated balances from prior appropriations Acts made under the same headings, shall be available for expenditure or transfer for Indian trust management activities pursuant to the Trust Management Improvement Project High Level Implementation Plan.

SEC. 115. Notwithstanding any provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to negotiate and enter into agreements and leases, without regard to section 321 of chapter 314 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 303b), with any person, firm, association, organization, corporation, or governmental entity for all or part of the property within Fort Baker administered by the Secretary as part of Golden Gate National Recreation Area. The proceeds of the agreements or leases shall be retained by the Secretary and such proceeds shall be available, without future appropriation, for the preservation, restoration, operation, maintenance and interpretation and related expenses incurred with respect to Fort Baker properties.

SEC. 116. A grazing permit or lease that expires (or is transferred) during fiscal year 2001 shall be renewed under section 402 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1752) or if applicable, section 510 of the California Desert Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 410aaa–50). The terms and conditions contained in the expiring permit or lease shall continue in effect under the new permit or lease until such time as the Secretary of the Interior completes processing of such permit or lease in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, at which time such permit or lease may be canceled, suspended or modified, in whole or in part, to meet the requirements of such applicable laws and regulations. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to alter the Secretary's statutory authority.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of reducing the backlog of Indian probate cases in the Department of the Interior, the hearing requirements of chapter 10 of title 25, United States Code, are deemed satisfied by a proceeding conducted by an Indian probate judge, appointed by the Secretary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing the appointments in the competitive service, for such period of time as the Secretary determines necessary: Provided, That the basic pay of an Indian probate judge so appointed may be fixed by the Secretary without regard to the provisions of chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, governing the classification and pay of General Schedule employees, except that no such Indian probate judge may be paid at a level which exceeds the maximum rate payable for the highest grade of the General Schedule, including locality pay.

SEC. 118. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to amounts made available for tribal priority allocations in Alaska, such amounts shall only be provided to tribes the membership of which on June 1, 2000 is composed of at least 25 individuals who are Natives (as such term is defined in section 3(b) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act).

(b) Amounts that would have been made available for tribal priority allocations in Alaska but for the limitation contained in subsection (a) shall be provided to the respective Alaska Native regional nonprofit corporation (as listed in section 103(a)(2) of Public Law 104–193, 110 Stat. 2159) for the respective region in which a tribe subject to subsection (a) is located, notwithstanding any resolution authorized under federal law to the contrary.

SEC. 119. None of the funds in this Act may be used to establish a new National Wildlife Refuge in the Kankakee River basin that is inconsistent with the United States Army Corps of Engineers' efforts to control flooding and siltation in that area. Written certification of consistency shall be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations prior to refuge establishment.

SEC. 120. (a) In this section—

(1) the term ''Huron Cemetery'' means the lands that form the cemetery that is popularly

known as the Huron Cemetery, located in Kansas City, Kansas, as described in subsection (b)(3); and

(2) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b)(1) The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to ensure that the lands comprising the Huron Cemetery (as described in paragraph (3)) are used only in accordance with this subsection.

(2) The lands of the Huron Cemetery shall be used only—

(A) for religious and cultural uses that are compatible with the use of the lands as a cemetery; and

(B) as a burial ground.

(3) The description of the lands of the Huron Cemetery is as follows:

The tract of land in the NW quarter of sec. 10, T. 11 S., R. 25 E., of the sixth principal meridian, in Wyandotte County, Kansas (as surveyed and marked on the ground on August 15, 1888, by William Millor, Civil Engineer and Surveyor), described as follows:

''Commencing on the Northwest corner of the Northwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 10;

''Thence South 28 poles to the 'true point of beginning';

''Thence South 71 degrees East 10 poles and 18 links;

''Thence South 18 degrees and 30 minutes West 28 poles;

''Thence West 11 and one-half poles;

''Thence North 19 degrees 15 minutes East 31 poles and 15 feet to the 'true point of beginning', containing 2 acres or more.''.

SEC. 121. None of the Funds provided in this Act shall be available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the Department of the Interior to transfer land into trust status for the Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe in Clark County, Washington, unless and until the tribe and the county reach a legally enforceable agreement that addresses the financial impact of new development on the county, school district, fire district, and other local governments and the impact on zoning and development.

SEC. 122. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior to implement the provisions of Principle 3(C)ii and Appendix section 3(B)(4) in Secretarial Order 3206, entitled ''American Indian Tribal Rights, Federal-Tribal Trust Responsibilities, and the Endangered Species Act''.

SEC. 123. No funds appropriated for the Department of the Interior by this Act or any other Act shall be used to study or implement any plan to drain Lake Powell or to reduce the water level of the lake below the range of water levels required for the operation of the Glen Canyon Dam.

SEC. 124. Funds appropriated for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for postsecondary schools for fiscal year 2001 shall be allocated among the schools proportionate to the unmet need of the schools as determined by the Postsecondary Funding Formula adopted by the Office of Indian Education Programs.

SEC. 125. On the date of enactment, the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service shall continue consultation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to develop a comprehensive plan to eliminate Caspian Tern nesting at Rice Island in the Columbia River Estuary. The agencies shall develop a report on the significance of tern predation in limiting salmon recovery and their roles and recommendations for the Rice Island colony relocation by March 31, 2001. This report shall address all available options for successfully completing the Rice Island colony relocation.

SEC. 126. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in conveying the Twin Cities Research Center under the authority provided by Public Law 104–134, as amended by Public Law 104–208, the Secretary may accept and retain land and other forms of reimbursement: Provided, That the Secretary may retain and use any such reimbursement until expended and without further appropriation: (1) for the benefit of the National Wildlife Refuge System within the State of Minnesota; and (2) for all activities authorized by Public Law 100–696; 16 U.S.C. 460zz.

SEC. 127. Section 112 of Public Law 103–138 (107 Stat. 1399) is amended by striking ''permit LP–GLBA005–93'' and inserting ''permit LP–GLBA005–93 and in connection with a corporate reorganization plan, the entity that, after the corporate reorganization, holds entry permit CP–GLBA004–00 each''.

SEC. 128. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior shall designate Anchorage, Alaska, as a port of entry for the purpose of section 9(f)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1538(f)(1)).

SEC. 129. (a) The first section of Public Law 92–501 (86 Stat. 904) is amended by inserting after the first sentence ''The park shall also include the land as generally depicted on the map entitled 'subdivision of a portion of U.S. Survey 407, Tract B, dated May 12, 2000' ''.

(b) Section 3 of Public Law 92–501 is amended to read as follows: ''There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the terms of this Act.''.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses of forest and rangeland research as authorized by law, $221,966,000, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For necessary expenses of cooperating with and providing technical and financial assistance to States, territories, possessions, and others, and for forest health management, cooperative forestry, and education and land conservation activities, $226,266,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by law.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, for management, protection, improvement, and utilization of the National Forest System, $1,233,824,000, to remain available until expended, which shall include 50 percent of all moneys received during prior fiscal years as fees collected under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, in accordance with section 4 of the Act (16 U.S.C. 460l–6a(i)): Provided, That unobligated balances available at the start of fiscal year 2001 shall be displayed by extended budget line item in the fiscal year 2002 budget justification: Provided further, That of the amount available for vegetation and watershed management, the Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer of such sums as necessary to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management for removal, preparation, and adoption of excess wild horses and burros from National Forest System lands: Provided further, That $5,000,000 shall be allocated to the Alaska Region, in addition to its normal allocation for the purposes of preparing additional timber for sale, to establish a 3-year timber supply and such funds may be transferred to other appropriations accounts as necessary to maximize accomplishment: Provided further, That of funds available for Wildlife and Fish Habitat Management, $400,000 shall be provided to the State of Alaska for cooperative monitoring activities, and of the funds provided for Forest Products, $700,000 shall be provided to the State of Alaska for monitoring activities at Forest Service log transfer facilities, both in the form of an advance, direct lump sum payment.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for forest fire presuppression activities on National Forest System lands, for emergency fire suppression on or adjacent to such lands or other lands under fire protection agreement, and for emergency rehabilitation of burned-over National Forest System lands and water, $618,500,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That such funds are available for repayment of advances from other appropriations accounts previously transferred for such purposes: Provided further, That not less than 50 percent of any unobligated balances remaining (exclusive of amounts for hazardous fuels reduction) at the end of fiscal year 2000 shall be transferred, as repayment for post advances that have not been repaid, to the fund established pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 71–319 (16 U.S.C. 576 et seq.): Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, up to $5,000,000 of funds appropriated under this appropriation may be used for Fire Science Research in support of the Joint Fire Science Program: Provided further, That all authorities for the use of funds, including the use of contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements, available to execute the Forest Service and Rangeland Research appropriation, are also available in the utilization of these funds for Fire Science Research.

For an additional amount to cover necessary expenses for emergency rehabilitation, presuppression due to emergencies, and wildfire suppression activities of the Forest Service, $150,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: Provided further, That these funds shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, $448,312,000, to remain available until expended for construction, reconstruction, maintenance and acquisition of buildings and other facilities, and for construction, reconstruction, repair and maintenance of forest roads and trails by the Forest Service as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 532–538 and 23 U.S.C. 101 and 205: Provided, That $5,000,000 of the funds provided herein for roads shall be for the purposes of section 502(e) of Public Law 15–83: Provided further, That up to $15,000,000 of the funds provided herein for road maintenance shall be available for the decommissioning of roads, including unauthorized roads not part of the transportation system, which are no longer needed: Provided further, That no funds shall be expended to decommission any system road until notice and an opportunity for public comment has been provided on each decommissioning project: Provided further, That any unobligated balances of amounts previously appropriated to the Forest Service ''Reconstruction and Construction'' account as well as any unobligated balances remaining in the ''National Forest System'' account for the facility maintenance and trail maintenance extended budget line items may be transferred to and merged with the ''Capital Improvement and Maintenance'' account.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l–4 through 11), including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the Forest Service, $76,320,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds provided not less than $5,000,000 but not to exceed $10,000,000

shall be made available to Kake Tribal Corporation to implement the Kake Tribal Corporation Land Transfer Act upon its enactment into law.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS SPECIAL ACTS

For acquisition of lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cache, Uinta, and Wasatch National Forests, Utah; the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; and the Angeles, San Bernardino, Sequoia, and Cleveland National Forests, California, as authorized by law, $1,068,000, to be derived from forest receipts.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES

For acquisition of lands, such sums, to be derived from funds deposited by State, county, or municipal governments, public school districts, or other public school authorities pursuant to the Act of December 4, 1967, as amended (16 U.S.C. 484a), to remain available until expended.

RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement, 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year, as fees for grazing domestic livestock on lands in National Forests in the 16 Western States, pursuant to section 401(b)(1) of Public Law 94–579, as amended, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed 6 percent shall be available for administrative expenses associated with on-the-ground range rehabilitation, protection, and improvements.

GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For expenses authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1643(b), $92,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the fund established pursuant to the above Act.

MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS FOR SUBSISTENCE USES

SUBSISTENCE MANAGEMENT, FOREST SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service to manage federal lands in Alaska for subsistence uses under title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96–487), $5,500,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (1) purchase of not to exceed 132 passenger motor vehicles of which 13 will be used primarily for law enforcement purposes and of which 129 shall be for replacement; acquisition of 25 passenger motor vehicles from excess sources, and hire of such vehicles; operation and maintenance of aircraft, the purchase of not to exceed six for replacement only, and acquisition of sufficient aircraft from excess sources to maintain the operable fleet at 192 aircraft for use in Forest Service wildland fire programs and other Forest Service programs; notwithstanding other provisions of law, existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft; (2) services pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2225, and not to exceed $100,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; (3) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (7 U.S.C. 2250); (4) acquisition of land, waters, and interests therein, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 428a; (5) for expenses pursuant to the Volunteers in the National Forest Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 558a, 558d, and 558a note); (6) the cost of uniforms as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; and (7) for debt collection contracts in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3718(c).

None of the funds made available under this Act shall be obligated or expended to abolish any region, to move or close any regional office for National Forest System administration of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture without the consent of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be transferred to the Wildland Fire Management appropriation for forest firefighting, emergency rehabilitation of burned-over or damaged lands or waters under its jurisdiction, and fire preparedness due to severe burning conditions if and only if all previously appropriated emergency contingent funds under the heading ''Wildland Fire Management'' have been released by the President and apportioned.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for assistance to or through the Agency for International Development and the Foreign Agricultural Service in connection with forest and rangeland research, technical information, and assistance in foreign countries, and shall be available to support forestry and related natural resource activities outside the United States and its territories and possessions, including technical assistance, education and training, and cooperation with United States and international organizations.

None of the funds made available to the Forest Service under this Act shall be subject to transfer under the provisions of section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257) or 7 U.S.C. 147b unless the proposed transfer is approved in advance by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in House Report No. 105–163.

None of the funds available to the Forest Service may be reprogrammed without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the procedures contained in House Report No. 105–163.

No funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund of the Department of Agriculture without the approval of the Chief of the Forest Service.

Funds available to the Forest Service shall be available to conduct a program of not less than $2,000,000 for high priority projects within the scope of the approved budget which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps as authorized by the Act of August 13, 1970, as amended by Public Law 93–408.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, $1,500 is available to the Chief of the Forest Service for official reception and representation expenses.

To the greatest extent possible, and in accordance with the Final Amendment to the Shawnee National Forest Plan, none of the funds available in this Act shall be used for preparation of timber sales using clearcutting or other forms of even-aged management in hardwood stands in the Shawnee National Forest, Illinois.

Pursuant to sections 405(b) and 410(b) of Public Law 101–593, of the funds available to the Forest Service, up to $2,250,000 may be advanced in a lump sum as Federal financial assistance to the National Forest Foundation, without regard to when the Foundation incurs expenses, for administrative expenses or projects on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: Provided, That of the Federal funds made available to the Foundation, no more than $400,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: Provided further, That the Foundation shall obtain, by the end of the period of Federal financial assistance, private contributions to match on at least one-for-one basis funds made available by the Forest Service: Provided further, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds: Provided further, That hereafter, the National Forest Foundation may hold Federal funds made available but not immediately disbursed and may use any interest or other investment income earned (before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act) on Federal funds to carry out the purposes of Public Law 101–593: Provided further, That such investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

Pursuant to section 2(b)(2) of Public Law 98–244, $2,650,000 of the funds available to the Forest Service shall be available for matching funds to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 3701–3709, and may be advanced in a lump sum as Federal financial assistance, without regard to when expenses are incurred, for projects on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: Provided, That the Foundation shall obtain, by the end of the period of Federal financial assistance, private contributions to match on at least one-for-one basis funds advanced by the Forest Service: Provided further, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for interactions with and providing technical assistance to rural communities for sustainable rural development purposes.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, 80 percent of the funds appropriated to the Forest Service in the ''National Forest System'' and ''Capital Improvement and Maintenance'' accounts and planned to be allocated to activities under the ''Jobs in the Woods'' program for projects on National Forest land in the State of Washington may be granted directly to the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife for accomplishment of planned projects. Twenty percent of said funds shall be retained by the Forest Service for planning and administering projects. Project selection and prioritization shall be accomplished by the Forest Service with such consultation with the State of Washington as the Forest Service deems appropriate.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for payments to counties within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, pursuant to sections 14(c)(1) and (2), and section 16(a)(2) of Public Law 99–663.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements as appropriate with the Pinchot Institute for Conservation, as well as with public and other private agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals, to provide for the development, administration, maintenance, or restoration of land, facilities, or Forest Service programs, at the Grey Towers National Historic Landmark: Provided, That, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, any such public or private agency, organization, institution, or individual may solicit, accept, and administer private gifts of money and real or personal property for the benefit of, or in connection with, the activities and services at the Grey Towers National Historic Landmark: Provided further, That such gifts may be accepted notwithstanding the fact that a donor conducts business with the Department of Agriculture in any capacity.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available, as determined by the Secretary, for payments to Del Norte County, California, pursuant to sections 13(e) and 14 of the Smith River National Recreation Area Act (Public Law 101–612).

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service not to exceed $500,000 may be used to reimburse the Office of the General Counsel (OGC), Department of Agriculture, for travel and related expenses incurred as a result of OGC assistance or participation requested by the Forest Service at meetings, training sessions, management reviews, land purchase negotiations and similar non-litigation related matters. Future budget justifications for both the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture

should clearly display the sums previously transferred and the requested funding transfers.

No employee of the Department of Agriculture may be detailed or assigned from an agency or office funded by this Act to any other agency or office of the department for more than 30 days unless the individual's employing agency or office is fully reimbursed by the receiving agency or office for the salary and expenses of the employee for the period of assignment.

The Forest Service shall fund overhead, national commitments, indirect expenses, and any other category for use of funds which are expended at any units, that are not directly related to the accomplishment of specific work on-the-ground (referred to as ''indirect expenditures''), from funds available to the Forest Service, unless otherwise prohibited by law: Provided, That the Forest Service shall implement and adhere to the definitions of indirect expenditures established pursuant to Public Law 105–277 on a nationwide basis without flexibility for modification by any organizational level except the Washington Office, and when changed by the Washington Office, such changes in definition shall be reported in budget requests submitted by the Forest Service: Provided further, That the Forest Service shall provide in all future budget justifications, planned indirect expenditures in accordance with the definitions, summarized and displayed to the Regional, Station, Area, and detached unit office level. The justification shall display the estimated source and amount of indirect expenditures, by expanded budget line item, of funds in the agency's annual budget justification. The display shall include appropriated funds and the Knutson-Vandenberg, Brush Disposal, Cooperative Work-Other, and Salvage Sale funds. Changes between estimated and actual indirect expenditures shall be reported in subsequent budget justifications: Provided, That during fiscal year 2001 the Secretary shall limit total annual indirect obligations from the Brush Disposal, Cooperative Work-Other, Knutson-Vandenberg, Reforestation, Salvage Sale, and Roads and Trails funds to 20 percent of the total obligations from each fund.

Any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be used for necessary expenses in the event of law enforcement emergencies as necessary to protect natural resources and public or employee safety: Provided, That such amounts shall not exceed $750,000.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall pay $4,449 from available funds to Joyce Liverca as reimbursement for various expenses incurred as a Federal employee in connection with certain high priority duties performed for the Forest Service.

The Forest Service shall submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by March 1, 2001 indicating the anticipated timber offer level in fiscal year 2001 with the funds provided in this Act: Provided, That if the anticipated offer level is less than 3.6 billion board feet, the agency shall submit a reprogramming request to attain this offer level by the close of fiscal year 2001.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, $150,000 shall be made available in the form of an advanced, direct lump sum payment to the Society of American Foresters to support conservation education purposes in collaboration with the Forest Service.

The Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the sale of excess buildings, facilities, and other properties owned by the Forest Service and located on the Green Mountain National Forest, the revenues of which shall be retained by the Forest Service and available to the Secretary without further appropriation and until expended for maintenance and rehabilitation activities on the Green Mountain National Forest.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds made available under this heading for obligation in prior years, $67,000,000 shall not be available until October 1, 2001: Provided, That funds made available in previous appropriations Acts shall be available for any ongoing project regardless of the separate request for proposal under which the project was selected.

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out fossil energy research and development activities, under the authority of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91), including the acquisition of interest, including defeasible and equitable interests in any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition or expansion, and for conducting inquiries, technological investigations and research concerning the extraction, processing, use, and disposal of mineral substances without objectionable social and environmental costs (30 U.S.C. 3, 1602, and 1603), performed under the minerals and materials science programs at the Albany Research Center in Oregon $413,338,000, to remain available until expended, of which $12,000,000 for oil technology research shall be derived by transfer from funds appropriated in prior years under the heading ''Strategic Petroleum Reserve, SPR Petroleum Account'': Provided, That no part of the sum herein made available shall be used for the field testing of nuclear explosives in the recovery of oil and gas: Provided further, That up to 4 percent of program direction funds available to the National Energy Technology Laboratory may be used to support Department of Energy activities not included in this account.

ALTERNATIVE FUELS PRODUCTION

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances under this heading, $1,000,000 are rescinded.

NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts previously appropriated under this heading, $7,000,000 are rescinded: Provided, That the requirements of 10 U.S.C. 7430(b)(2)(B) shall not apply to fiscal year 2001 and any fiscal year thereafter: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, unobligated funds remaining from prior years shall be available for all naval petroleum and oil shale reserve activities.

ELK HILLS SCHOOL LANDS FUND

For necessary expenses in fulfilling installment payments under the Settlement Agreement entered into by the United States and the State of California on October 11, 1996, as authorized by section 3415 of Public Law 104–106, $36,000,000, to become available on October 1, 2001 for payment to the State of California for the State Teachers' Retirement Fund from the Elk Hills School Lands Fund.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out energy conservation activities, $761,937,000, to remain available until expended, of which $2,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from unobligated balances in the Biomass Energy Development account: Provided, That $172,000,000 shall be for use in energy conservation programs as defined in section 3008(3) of Public Law 99–509 (15 U.S.C. 4507): Provided further, That notwithstanding section 3003(d)(2) of Public Law 99–509, such sums shall be allocated to the eligible programs as follows: $138,000,000 for weatherization assistance grants and $34,000,000 for State energy conservation grants: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Energy may waive the matching requirement for weatherization assistance provided for by Public Law 106–113 in whole or in part for a State which he finds to be experiencing fiscal hardship or major changes in energy markets or suppliers or other temporary limitations on its ability to provide matching funds, provided that the State is demonstrably engaged in continuing activities to secure non-federal resources and that such waiver is limited to one fiscal year and that no state may be granted such waiver more than twice: Provided further, That Indian tribal grantees of weatherization assistance shall not be required to provide matching funds.

ECONOMIC REGULATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

For necessary expenses for Strategic Petroleum Reserve facility development and operations and program management activities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.), $157,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ENERGY INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses in carrying out the activities of the Energy Information Administration, $74,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Appropriations under this Act for the current fiscal year shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; and reimbursement to the General Services Administration for security guard services.

From appropriations under this Act, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of work for which the appropriation is made.

None of the funds made available to the Department of Energy under this Act shall be used to implement or finance authorized price support or loan guarantee programs unless specific provision is made for such programs in an appropriations Act.

The Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, private or foreign: Provided, That revenues and other moneys received by or for the account of the Department of Energy or otherwise generated by sale of products in connection with projects of the Department appropriated under this Act may be retained by the Secretary of Energy, to be available until expended, and used only for plant construction, operation, costs, and payments to cost-sharing entities as provided in appropriate cost-sharing contracts or agreements: Provided further, That the remainder of revenues after the making of such payments shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: Provided further, That any contract, agreement, or provision thereof entered into by the Secretary pursuant to this authority shall not be executed prior to the expiration of 30 calendar days (not including any day in which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) from the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of a full comprehensive report on such project, including the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed project.

No funds provided in this Act may be expended by the Department of Energy to prepare, issue, or process procurement documents for programs or projects for which appropriations have not been made.

In addition to other authorities set forth in this Act, the Secretary may accept fees and contributions from public and private sources, to be

deposited in a contributed funds account, and prosecute projects using such fees and contributions in cooperation with other Federal, State or private agencies or concerns.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry out the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), the Indian Self-Determination Act, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Indian Health Service, $2,184,421,000, together with payments received during the fiscal year pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 238(b) for services furnished by the Indian Health Service: Provided, That funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through contracts, grant agreements, or any other agreements or compacts authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), shall be deemed to be obligated at the time of the grant or contract award and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: Provided further, That $12,000,000 shall remain available until expended, for the Indian Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund: Provided further, That $426,756,000 for contract medical care shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2002: Provided further, That of the funds provided, up to $17,000,000 shall be used to carry out the loan repayment program under section 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act: Provided further, That funds provided in this Act may be used for 1-year contracts and grants which are to be performed in two fiscal years, so long as the total obligation is recorded in the year for which the funds are appropriated: Provided further, That the amounts collected by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under the authority of title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall remain available until expended for the purpose of achieving compliance with the applicable conditions and requirements of titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act (exclusive of planning, design, or construction of new facilities): Provided further, That funding contained herein, and in any earlier appropriations Acts for scholarship programs under the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613) shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2002: Provided further, That amounts received by tribes and tribal organizations under title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall be reported and accounted for and available to the receiving tribes and tribal organizations until expended: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amounts provided herein, not to exceed $243,781,000 shall be for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract or grant support costs associated with contracts, grants, self-governance compacts or annual funding agreements between the Indian Health Service and a tribe or tribal organization pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975, as amended, prior to or during fiscal year 2001, of which not to exceed $10,000,000 may be used for such costs associated with new and expanded contracts, grants, self-governance compacts or annual funding agreements: Provided further, That amounts appropriated to the Indian Health Service shall not be used to pay for contract health services in excess of the established Medicare and Medicaid rate for similar services: Provided further, That Indian tribes and tribal organizations that operate health care programs under contracts or compacts pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975, Public Law 93–638, as amended, may access prime vendor rates for the cost of pharmaceutical products on the same basis and for the same purposes as the Indian Health Service may access such products: Provided further, That funds available for the Indian Health Care Improvement Fund may be used, as needed, to carry out activities typically funded under the Indian Health Facilities account.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, repair, maintenance, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites, purchase and erection of modular buildings, and purchases of trailers; and for provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a), the Indian Self-Determination Act, and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and for expenses necessary to carry out such Acts and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health and facilities support activities of the Indian Health Service, $349,350,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for the planning, design, construction or renovation of health facilities for the benefit of an Indian tribe or tribes may be used to purchase land for sites to construct, improve, or enlarge health or related facilities: Provided further, That from the funds appropriated herein, $5,000,000 shall be designated by the Indian Health Service as a contribution to the Yukon-Kuskokwim Health Corporation (YKHC) to start a priority project for the acquisition of land, planning, design and construction of 79 staff quarters at Bethel, Alaska, subject to a negotiated project agreement between the YKHC and the Indian Health Service: Provided further, That this project shall not be subject to the construction provisions of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act and shall be removed from the Indian Health Service priority list upon completion: Provided further, That the Federal Government shall not be liable for any property damages or other construction claims that may arise from YKHC undertaking this project: Provided further, That the land shall be owned or leased by the YKHC and title to quarters shall remain vested with the YKHC: Provided further, That notwithstanding any provision of law governing Federal construction, $240,000 of the funds provided herein shall be provided to the Hopi Tribe to reduce the debt incurred by the Tribe in providing staff quarters to meet the housing needs associated with the new Hopi Health Center: Provided further, That $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended for the purpose of funding joint venture health care facility projects authorized under the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, as amended: Provided further, That priority, by rank order, shall be given to tribes with outpatient projects on the existing Indian Health Services priority list that have Service-approved planning documents, and can demonstrate by March 1, 2001, the financial capability necessary to provide an appropriate facility: Provided further, That joint venture funds unallocated after March 1, 2001, shall be made available for joint venture projects on a competitive basis giving priority to tribes that currently have no existing Federally-owned health care facility, have planning documents meeting Indian Health Service requirements prepared for approval by the Service and can demonstrate the financial capability needed to provide an appropriate facility: Provided further, That the Indian Health Service shall request additional staffing, operation and maintenance funds for these facilities in future budget requests: Provided further, That not to exceed $500,000 shall be used by the Indian Health Service to purchase TRANSAM equipment from the Department of Defense for distribution to the Indian Health Service and tribal facilities: Provided further, That not to exceed $500,000 shall be used by the Indian Health Service to obtain ambulances for the Indian Health Service and tribal facilities in conjunction with an existing interagency agreement between the Indian Health Service and the General Services Administration: Provided further, That not to exceed $500,000 shall be placed in a Demolition Fund, available until expended, to be used by the Indian Health Service for demolition of Federal buildings.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations in this Act to the Indian Health Service shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior-level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of medical equipment; purchase of reprints; purchase, renovation and erection of modular buildings and renovation of existing facilities; payments for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and for uniforms or allowances therefore as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; and for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities: Provided, That in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, non-Indian patients may be extended health care at all tribally administered or Indian Health Service facilities, subject to charges, and the proceeds along with funds recovered under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651–2653) shall be credited to the account of the facility providing the service and shall be available without fiscal year limitation: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other law or regulation, funds transferred from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Indian Health Service shall be administered under Public Law 86–121 (the Indian Sanitation Facilities Act) and Public Law 93–638, as amended: Provided further, That funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service in this Act, except those used for administrative and program direction purposes, shall not be subject to limitations directed at curtailing Federal travel and transportation: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds previously or herein made available to a tribe or tribal organization through a contract, grant, or agreement authorized by title I or title III of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), may be deobligated and reobligated to a self-determination contract under title I, or a self-governance agreement under title III of such Act and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: Provided further, That none of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used to implement the final rule published in the Federal Register on September 16, 1987, by the Department of Health and Human Services, relating to the eligibility for the health care services of the Indian Health Service until the Indian Health Service has submitted a budget request reflecting the increased costs associated with the proposed final rule, and such request has been included in an appropriations Act and enacted into law: Provided further, That funds made available in this Act are to be apportioned to the Indian Health Service as appropriated in this Act, and accounted for in the appropriation structure set forth in this Act: Provided further, That with respect to functions transferred by the Indian Health Service to tribes or tribal organizations, the Indian Health Service is authorized to provide goods and services to those entities, on a reimbursable basis, including payment in advance with subsequent adjustment, and the reimbursements received therefrom, along with the funds received from those entities pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act, may be credited to

the same or subsequent appropriation account which provided the funding, said amounts to remain available until expended: Provided further, That reimbursements for training, technical assistance, or services provided by the Indian Health Service will contain total costs, including direct, administrative, and overhead associated with the provision of goods, services, or technical assistance: Provided further, That the appropriation structure for the Indian Health Service may not be altered without advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation as authorized by Public Law 93–531, $15,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds provided in this or any other appropriations Act are to be used to relocate eligible individuals and groups including evictees from District 6, Hopi-partitioned lands residents, those in significantly substandard housing, and all others certified as eligible and not included in the preceding categories: Provided further, That none of the funds contained in this or any other Act may be used by the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation to evict any single Navajo or Navajo family who, as of November 30, 1985, was physically domiciled on the lands partitioned to the Hopi Tribe unless a new or replacement home is provided for such household: Provided further, That no relocatee will be provided with more than one new or replacement home: Provided further, That the Office shall relocate any certified eligible relocatees who have selected and received an approved homesite on the Navajo reservation or selected a replacement residence off the Navajo reservation or on the land acquired pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 640d–10.

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

PAYMENT TO THE INSTITUTE

For payment to the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development, as authorized by title XV of Public Law 99–498, as amended (20 U.S.C. 56 part A), $4,125,000.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by law, including research in the fields of art, science, and history; development, preservation, and documentation of the National Collections; presentation of public exhibits and performances; collection, preparation, dissemination, and exchange of information and publications; conduct of education, training, and museum assistance programs; maintenance, alteration, operation, lease (for terms not to exceed 30 years), and protection of buildings, facilities, and approaches; not to exceed $100,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; up to five replacement passenger vehicles; purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for employees, $387,755,000, of which not to exceed $47,088,000 for the instrumentation program, collections acquisition, Museum Support Center equipment and move, exhibition reinstallation, the National Museum of the American Indian, the repatriation of skeletal remains program, research equipment, information management, and Latino programming shall remain available until expended, and including such funds as may be necessary to support American overseas research centers and a total of $125,000 for the Council of American Overseas Research Centers: Provided, That funds appropriated herein are available for advance payments to independent contractors performing research services or participating in official Smithsonian presentations: Provided further, That the Smithsonian Institution may expend Federal appropriations designated in this Act for lease or rent payments for long term and swing space, as rent payable to the Smithsonian Institution, and such rent payments may be deposited into the general trust funds of the Institution to the extent that federally supported activities are housed in the 900 H Street, N.W. building in the District of Columbia: Provided further, That this use of Federal appropriations shall not be construed as debt service, a Federal guarantee of, a transfer of risk to, or an obligation of, the Federal Government: Provided further, That no appropriated funds may be used to service debt which is incurred to finance the costs of acquiring the 900 H Street building or of planning, designing, and constructing improvements to such building.

REPAIR, RESTORATION AND ALTERATION OF FACILITIES

For necessary expenses of repair, restoration, and alteration of facilities owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institution, by contract or otherwise, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), including not to exceed $10,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $57,600,000, to remain available until expended, of which $7,600,000 is provided for repair, rehabilitation and alteration of facilities at the National Zoological Park: Provided, That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and repair or restoration of facilities of the Smithsonian Institution may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for construction, $4,500,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

None of the funds in this or any other Act may be used to initiate the design for any proposed expansion of current space or new facility without consultation with the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

The Smithsonian Institution shall not use Federal funds in excess of the amount specified in Public Law 101–185 for the construction of the National Museum of the American Indian.

None of the funds in this or any other Act may be used for the Holt House located at the National Zoological Park in Washington, D.C., unless identified as repairs to minimize water damage, monitor structure movement, or provide interim structural support.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the upkeep and operations of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards, and uniforms, or allowances therefor, for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance, alteration, improvement, and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and purchase of services for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper, $64,781,000, of which not to exceed $3,026,000 for the special exhibition program shall remain available until expended.

REPAIR, RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of repair, restoration and renovation of buildings, grounds and facilities owned or occupied by the National Gallery of Art, by contract or otherwise, as authorized, $10,871,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and exterior repair or renovation of buildings of the National Gallery of Art may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses for the operation, maintenance and security of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, $14,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for capital repair and restoration of the existing features of the building and site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 1356) including hire of passenger vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $7,310,000.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $105,000,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts through assistance to organizations and individuals pursuant to sections 5(c) and 5(g) of the Act, for program support, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds previously appropriated to the National Endowment for the Arts ''Matching Grants'' account may be transferred to and merged with this account.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $104,604,000, shall be available to the National Endowment for the Humanities for support of activities in the humanities, pursuant to section 7(c) of the Act, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended.

MATCHING GRANTS

To carry out the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, $15,656,000, to remain available until expended, of which $11,656,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Humanities for the purposes of section 7(h): Provided, That this appropriation shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property accepted by the chairman or by grantees of the Endowment under the provisions of subsections 11(a)(2)(B) and 11(a)(3)(B) during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES

OFFICE OF MUSEUM SERVICES

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out subtitle C of the Museum and Library Services Act of 1996, as amended, $24,907,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

None of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used to process any grant or contract documents which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That funds from nonappropriated sources may be used as necessary for official reception and representation expenses.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), $1,078,000: Provided, That the Commission is authorized to charge fees to cover the full costs of its publications, and such fees shall be credited to this account as an offsetting collection, to remain available until expended without further appropriation.

NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses as authorized by Public Law 99–190 (20 U.S.C. 956(a)), as amended, $7,000,000.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Public Law 89–665, as amended), $3,189,000: Provided, That none of these funds shall be available for compensation of level V of the Executive Schedule or higher positions.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71–71i), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $6,500,000: Provided, That all appointed members of the Commission will be compensated at a rate not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of pay for positions at level IV of the Executive Schedule for each day such member is engaged in the actual performance of duties.

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

For expenses of the Holocaust Memorial Council, as authorized by Public Law 96–388 (36 U.S.C. 1401), as amended, $34,439,000, of which $1,900,000 for the museum's repair and rehabilitation program and $1,264,000 for the museum's exhibitions program shall remain available until expended.

PRESIDIO TRUST

PRESIDIO TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out title I of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996, $23,400,000 shall be available to the Presidio Trust, to remain available until expended. The Trust is authorized to issue obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 104(d)(3) of the Act, in an amount not to exceed $10,000,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation under this Act shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture for the leasing of oil and natural gas by noncompetitive bidding on publicly owned lands within the boundaries of the Shawnee National Forest, Illinois: Provided, That nothing herein is intended to inhibit or otherwise affect the sale, lease, or right to access to minerals owned by private individuals.

SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for any activity or the publication or distribution of literature that in any way tends to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal on which congressional action is not complete.

SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 305. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of such department or agency except as otherwise provided by law.

SEC. 306. No assessments may be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity, or project funded by this Act unless advance notice of such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such committees.

SEC. 307. None of the funds in this Act may be used to plan, prepare, or offer for sale timber from trees classified as giant sequoia (Sequoiadendron giganteum) which are located on National Forest System or Bureau of Land Management lands in a manner different than such sales were conducted in fiscal year 2000.

SEC. 308. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended by the National Park Service to enter into or implement a concession contract which permits or requires the removal of the underground lunchroom at the Carlsbad Caverns National Park.

SEC. 309. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for the AmeriCorps program, unless the relevant agencies of the Department of the Interior and/or Agriculture follow appropriate reprogramming guidelines: Provided, That if no funds are provided for the AmeriCorps program by the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, then none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for the AmeriCorps programs.

SEC. 310. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used: (1) to demolish the bridge between Jersey City, New Jersey, and Ellis Island; or (2) to prevent pedestrian use of such bridge, when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that such pedestrian use is consistent with generally accepted safety standards.

SEC. 311. (a) LIMITATION OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to accept or process applications for a patent for any mining or mill site claim located under the general mining laws.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of the Interior determines that, for the claim concerned: (1) a patent application was filed with the Secretary on or before September 30, 1994; and (2) all requirements established under sections 2325 and 2326 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 29 and 30) for vein or lode claims and sections 2329, 2330, 2331, and 2333 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 35, 36, and 37) for placer claims, and section 2337 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 42) for mill site claims, as the case may be, were fully complied with by the applicant by that date.

(c) REPORT.—On September 30, 2001, the Secretary of the Interior shall file with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on actions taken by the department under the plan submitted pursuant to section 314(c) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104–208).

(d) MINERAL EXAMINATIONS.—In order to process patent applications in a timely and responsible manner, upon the request of a patent applicant, the Secretary of the Interior shall allow the applicant to fund a qualified third-party contractor to be selected by the Bureau of Land Management to conduct a mineral examination of the mining claims or mill sites contained in a patent application as set forth in subsection (b). The Bureau of Land Management shall have the sole responsibility to choose and pay the third-party contractor in accordance with the standard procedures employed by the Bureau of Land Management in the retention of third-party contractors.

SEC. 312. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts appropriated to or earmarked in committee reports for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service by Public Laws 103–138, 103–332, 104–134, 104–208, 105–83, 105–277, and 106–113 for payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract support costs associated with self-determination or self-governance contracts, grants, compacts, or annual funding agreements with the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the Indian Health Service as funded by such Acts, are the total amounts available for fiscal years 1994 through 2001 for such purposes, except that, for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, tribes and tribal organizations may use their tribal priority allocations for unmet indirect costs of ongoing contracts, grants, self-governance compacts or annual funding agreements.

SEC. 313. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2001 the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior are authorized to limit competition for watershed restoration project contracts as part of the ''Jobs in the Woods'' component of the President's Forest Plan for the Pacific Northwest or the Jobs in the Woods Program established in Region 10 of the Forest Service to individuals and entities in historically timber-dependent areas in the States of Washington, Oregon, northern California and Alaska that have been affected by reduced timber harvesting on Federal lands.

SEC. 314. None of the funds collected under the Recreational Fee Demonstration program may be used to plan, design, or construct a visitor center or any other permanent structure without prior approval of the House and the Senate Committees on Appropriations if the estimated total cost of the facility exceeds $500,000.

SEC. 315. All interests created under leases, concessions, permits and other agreements associated with the properties administered by the Presidio Trust shall be exempt from all taxes and special assessments of every kind by the State of California and its political subdivisions.

SEC. 316. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used to designate, or to post any sign designating, any portion of Canaveral National Seashore in Brevard County, Florida, as a clothing-optional area or as an area in which public nudity is permitted, if such designation would be contrary to county ordinance.

SEC. 317. Of the funds provided to the National Endowment for the Arts—

(1) The Chairperson shall only award a grant to an individual if such grant is awarded to such individual for a literature fellowship, National Heritage Fellowship, or American Jazz Masters Fellowship.

(2) The Chairperson shall establish procedures to ensure that no funding provided through a grant, except a grant made to a State or local arts agency, or regional group, may be used to make a grant to any other organization or individual to conduct activity independent of the direct grant recipient. Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit payments made in exchange for goods and services.

(3) No grant shall be used for seasonal support to a group, unless the application is specific to the contents of the season, including identified programs and/or projects.

SEC. 318. The National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities are authorized to solicit, accept, receive, and invest in the name of the United States, gifts, bequests, or devises of money and other property or services and to use such in furtherance of the functions of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Any proceeds from such gifts, bequests, or devises, after acceptance by the National Endowment for the Arts or the National Endowment for the Humanities, shall be paid by the donor or the representative of the donor to the Chairman. The Chairman shall enter the proceeds in a special interest-bearing account to the credit of the appropriate endowment for the purposes specified in each case.

SEC. 319. (a) In providing services or awarding financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 from funds appropriated under this Act, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts shall ensure that priority is given to providing services or awarding financial assistance for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that serve underserved populations.

(b) In this section:

(1) The term ''underserved population'' means a population of individuals, including urban minorities, who have historically been outside the purview of arts and humanities programs due to factors such as a high incidence of income below the poverty line or to geographic isolation.

(2) The term ''poverty line'' means the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved.

(c) In providing services and awarding financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 with funds appropriated by this Act, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts shall ensure that priority is given to providing services or awarding financial assistance for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that will encourage public knowledge, education, understanding, and appreciation of the arts.

(d) With funds appropriated by this Act to carry out section 5 of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965—

(1) the Chairperson shall establish a grant category for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that are of national impact or availability or are able to tour several States;

(2) the Chairperson shall not make grants exceeding 15 percent, in the aggregate, of such funds to any single State, excluding grants made under the authority of paragraph (1);

(3) the Chairperson shall report to the Congress annually and by State, on grants awarded by the Chairperson in each grant category under section 5 of such Act; and

(4) the Chairperson shall encourage the use of grants to improve and support community-based music performance and education.

SEC. 320. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be expended or obligated to fund new revisions of national forest land management plans until new final or interim final rules for forest land management planning are published in the Federal Register. Those national forests which are currently in a revision process, having formally published a Notice of Intent to revise prior to October 1, 1997; those national forests having been court-ordered to revise; those national forests where plans reach the 15 year legally mandated date to revise before or during calendar year 2001; national forests within the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem study area; and the White Mountain National Forest are exempt from this section and may use funds in this Act and proceed to complete the forest plan revision in accordance with current forest planning regulations.

SEC. 321. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be expended or obligated to complete and issue the 5-year program under the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act.

SEC. 322. None of the funds in this Act may be used to support Government-wide administrative functions unless such functions are justified in the budget process and funding is approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 323. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds in this Act may be used for GSA Telecommunication Centers or the President's Council on Sustainable Development.

SEC. 324. None of the funds in this Act may be used for planning, design or construction of improvements to Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 325. Amounts deposited during fiscal year 2000 in the roads and trails fund provided for in the fourteenth paragraph under the heading ''FOREST SERVICE'' of the Act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 843; 16 U.S.C. 501), shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture, without regard to the State in which the amounts were derived, to repair or reconstruct roads, bridges, and trails on National Forest System lands or to carry out and administer projects to improve forest health conditions, which may include the repair or reconstruction of roads, bridges, and trails on National Forest System lands in the wildland-community interface where there is an abnormally high risk of fire. The projects shall emphasize reducing risks to human safety and public health and property and enhancing ecological functions, long-term forest productivity, and biological integrity. The Secretary shall commence the projects during fiscal year 2001, but the projects may be completed in a subsequent fiscal year. Funds shall not be expended under this section to replace funds which would otherwise appropriately be expended from the timber salvage sale fund. Nothing in this section shall be construed to exempt any project from any environmental law.

SEC. 326. None of the funds provided in this or previous appropriations Acts for the agencies funded by this Act or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be transferred to or used to fund personnel, training, or other administrative activities at the Council on Environmental Quality or other offices in the Executive Office of the President for purposes related to the American Heritage Rivers program.

SEC. 327. Other than in emergency situations, none of the funds in this Act may be used to operate telephone answering machines during core business hours unless such answering machines include an option that enables callers to reach promptly an individual on-duty with the agency being contacted.

SEC. 328. No timber sale in Region 10 shall be advertised if the indicated rate is deficit when appraised under the transaction evidence appraisal system using domestic Alaska values for western red cedar: Provided, That sales which are deficit when appraised under the transaction evidence appraisal system using domestic Alaska values for western red cedar may be advertised upon receipt of a written request by a prospective, informed bidder, who has the opportunity to review the Forest Service's cruise and harvest cost estimate for that timber. Program accomplishments shall be based on volume sold. Should Region 10 sell, in fiscal year 2001, the annual average portion of the decadal allowable sale quantity called for in the current Tongass Land Management Plan in sales which are not deficit when appraised under the transaction evidence appraisal system using domestic Alaska values for western red cedar, all of the western red cedar timber from those sales which is surplus to the needs of domestic processors in Alaska, shall be made available to domestic processors in the contiguous 48 United States at prevailing domestic prices. Should Region 10 sell, in fiscal year 2001, less than the annual average portion of the decadal allowable sale quantity called for in the current Tongass Land Management Plan in sales which are not deficit when appraised under the transaction evidence appraisal system using domestic Alaska values for western red cedar, the volume of western red cedar timber available to domestic processors at prevailing domestic prices in the contiguous 48 United States shall be that volume: (i) which is surplus to the needs of domestic processors in Alaska; and (ii) is that percent of the surplus western red cedar volume determined by calculating the ratio of the total timber volume which has been sold on the Tongass to the annual average portion of the decadal allowable sale quantity called for in the current Tongass Land Management Plan. The percentage shall be calculated by Region 10 on a rolling basis as each sale is sold (for purposes of this amendment, a ''rolling basis'' shall mean that the determination of how much western red cedar is eligible for sale to various markets shall be made at the time each sale is awarded). Western red cedar shall be deemed ''surplus to the needs of domestic processors in Alaska'' when the timber sale holder has presented to the Forest Service documentation of the inability to sell western red cedar logs from a given sale to domestic Alaska processors at price equal to or greater than the log selling value stated in the contract. All additional western red cedar volume not sold to Alaska or contiguous 48 United States domestic processors may be exported to foreign markets at the election of the timber sale holder. All Alaska yellow cedar may be sold at prevailing export prices at the election of the timber sale holder.

SEC. 329. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees, or orders for the purpose of implementation, or in preparation for implementation, of the Kyoto Protocol which was adopted on December 11, 1997, in Kyoto, Japan at the Third Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which has not been submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification pursuant to article II, section 2, clause 2, of the United States Constitution, and which has not entered into force pursuant to article 25 of the Protocol.

SEC. 330. The Forest Service, in consultation with the Department of Labor, shall review Forest Service campground concessions policy to determine if modifications can be made to Forest Service contracts for campgrounds so that such concessions fall within the regulatory exemption of 29 CFR 4.122(b). The Forest Service shall offer in fiscal year 2001 such concession prospectuses under the regulatory exemption, except that, any prospectus that does not meet the requirements of the regulatory exemption shall be offered as a service contract in accordance with the requirements of 41 U.S.C. 351–358.

SEC. 331. A project undertaken by the Forest Service under the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program as authorized by section 315 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1996, as amended, shall not result in—

(1) displacement of the holder of an authorization to provide commercial recreation services on Federal lands. Prior to initiating any project, the Secretary shall consult with potentially affected holders to determine what impacts the project may have on the holders. Any modifications to the authorization shall be made within the terms and conditions of the authorization and authorities of the impacted agency.

(2) the return of a commercial recreation service to the Secretary for operation when such services have been provided in the past by a private sector provider, except when—

(A) the private sector provider fails to bid on such opportunities;

(B) the private sector provider terminates its relationship with the agency; or

(C) the agency revokes the permit for noncompliance with the terms and conditions of the authorization.

In such cases, the agency may use the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program to provide for operations until a subsequent operator can be found through the offering of a new prospectus.

SEC. 332. Section 801 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287(a)(2)(D)(iii)) is amended by striking ''$750,000'' and inserting ''$10,000,000''.

SEC. 333. From the funds appropriated in Title V of Public Law 105–83 for the purposes of section 502(e) of that Act, the following amounts are hereby rescinded: $1,000,000 for snow removal and pavement preservation and $4,000,000 for pavement rehabilitation.

SEC. 334. In section 315(f) of Title III of Section 101(c) of Public Law 104–134 (16 U.S.C. 460l–6a note), as amended, strike ''September 30, 2001'' and insert ''September 30, 2002'', and strike ''September 30, 2004'' and insert ''September 30, 2005''.

SEC. 335. None of the funds in this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to issue a prospecting permit for hardrock mineral exploration on Mark Twain National Forest land in the Current River/Jack's Fork River—Eleven Point Watershed (not including Mark Twain National Forest land in Townships 31N and 32N, Range 2 and Range 3 West, on which mining activities are taking place as of the date of the enactment of this Act): Provided, That none of the funds in this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to segregate or withdraw land in the Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri under section 204 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1714).

SEC. 336. The authority to enter into stewardship and end result contracts provided to the Forest Service in accordance with Section 347 of Title III of Section 101(e) of Division A of Public Law 105–825 is hereby expanded to authorize the Forest Service to enter into an additional 28 contracts subject to the same terms and conditions as provided in that section: Provided, That of the additional contracts authorized by this section at least 9 shall be allocated to Region 1 and at least 3 to Region 6.

SEC. 337. Any regulations or policies promulgated or adopted by the Departments of Agriculture or the Interior regarding recovery of costs for processing authorizations to occupy and use Federal lands under their control shall adhere to and incorporate the following principle arising from Office of Management and Budget Circular, A–25; no charge should be made for a service when the identification of the specific beneficiary is obscure, and the service can be considered primarily as benefiting broadly the general public.

SEC. 338. LOCAL EXEMPTIONS FROM FOREST SERVICE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FEES. Section 6906 of Title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''Necessary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) LOCAL EXEMPTIONS FROM DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FEES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each unit of general local government that lies in whole or in part within the White Mountain National Forest and persons residing within the boundaries of that unit of general local government shall be exempt during that fiscal year from any requirement to pay a Demonstration Program Fee (parking permit or passport) imposed by the Secretary of Agriculture for access to the Forest.

''(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall establish a method of identifying persons who are exempt from paying user fees under paragraph (1). This method may include valid form of identification including a drivers license.''.

SEC. 339. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used by the Bureau of Land Management or the U.S. Forest Service to assess, appraise, determine, proceed to determine, or collect rents for right-of-way uses for federal lands except as such rents have been or may be determined in accordance with the linear fee schedule published on July 8, 1997 ([43 CFR 2803.1–2(c)(1)(i)]).

SEC. 340. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 2001, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to limit competition for fire and fuel treatment and watershed restoration contracts in the Giant Sequoia National Monument and the Sequoia National Forest. Preference for employment shall be given to dislocated and displaced workers in Tulare, Kern and Fresno Counties, California, for work associated with the establishment of the Sequoia National Monument.

SEC. 341. The Chief of the Forest Service, in consultation with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis, in accordance with chapter 6 of part I of title 5, United States Code, of the impact of the White River National Forest Plan on communities that are within the boundaries of the White River National Forest.

SEC. 342. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to finalize or implement the published roadless area conservation rule of the Forest Service published on May 10, 2000 (36 Fed. Reg. 30276, 30288), or any similar rule, in any inventoried roadless area in the White Mountain National Forest.

SEC. 343. From funds previously appropriated in Public Law 105–277, under the heading ''Department of Energy, Fossil Energy Research and Development'', the Secretary of Energy shall make available within 30 days after enactment of this Act $750,000 for the purpose of executing proposal #FT40770.

SEC. 344. (a) In addition to any amounts otherwise made available under this Act to carry out the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act of 1978, $1,891,000 is appropriated to carry out such Act for fiscal year 2001.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount of funds provided to a Federal agency that receives appropriations under this Act in an amount greater than $20,000,000 shall be reduced, on a pro rata basis, by an amount equal to the percentage necessary to achieve an aggregate reduction of $1,891,000 in funds provided to all such agencies under this Act. Each head of a Federal agency that is subject to a reduction under this subsection shall ensure that the reduction in funding to the agency resulting from this subsection is offset by a reduction in travel expenditures of the agency.

(c) Within 30 days of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate a listing of the amounts by account of the reductions made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

This Act may be cited as the ''Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001''.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring before the Senate the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001. The bill totals $15.474 billion in discretionary budget authority, an amount that is more than $600 million over the current year level but almost $1 billion lower than the administration's budget request. The bill is right at its 302(b) allocation, and as such any amendments must be fully offset.

Drafting this bill is always a great challenge, in large part because it funds programs and activities that have a direct and tangible impact on the constituents that we represent. This is particularly true for those of my colleagues from western States that contain large amounts of Federal and tribal lands. But aside from the usual challenges posed by the Interior bill, this year's version has been especially difficult given the lofty expectations raised by the administration's rather extravagant budget. The administration's request amounts to an increase of 11 percent overall—a hefty increase in light of our ongoing efforts to maintain some degree of control over Federal spending. The bill before the Senate contains a more reasonable increase of about 5 percent—an amount that I think is appropriate as we attempt to fashion an overall budget that protects Social Security and Medicare, reduces the national debt, and provides for sensible tax relief.

Despite the more modest funding levels contained in this bill, I can assure my colleagues that the bill is a responsible product that is responsive to the most pressing needs of the land management agencies; the agencies that provide health, education and other services to Indian people; the several cultural institutions under the subcommittee's jurisdiction; and a number of Department of Energy programs that are particularly relevant today in light of the recent rise in gasoline prices.

In drafting this bill in consultation with the ranking member of the subcommittee, Senator BYRD, I have followed a number of basic principles.

First, the bill provides nearly 100 percent of the money required to fund increases in fixed costs such as pay and benefits. These are cost increases over which the subcommittee has little or no control. Failure to provide these funds simply means agencies must reduce services or program delivery from current year levels. For the Interior bill as a whole, these fixed cost increases total more than $300 million in FY 2001. Providing this amount simply to maintain current levels of service takes a large bit out of the overall increase in the subcommittee's allocation.

Second, I have placed a high priority in those agencies and functions for which the Federal Government has sole or primary responsibility. Providing for the core operating needs of the land management agencies continues to be a central priority in this bill. We have also tried to provide adequate sums for the operation and maintenance of the Smithsonian, the National Gallery, and the Kennedy Center—institutions that are our direct responsibility. Finally, we have done our very best to provide for the core needs of the Indian peoples for whom we have trust responsibility—partiuclarly in the area of health services and education.

The third major principle that has guided me in developing this bill really flows from the second. For years, I

have listened to Senator DOMENICI, Senator DORGAN, Senator CAMPBELL, and others talk in hearings, markups, and casual conservation about the need for major investment in the construction and repair of Indian schools. I have been shown pictures of Indian schools in other States to which none of us would want to send our own children, and am aware of schools in my own State that are in desperate need of repair or replacement. Much like Department of Defense schools, these Indian schools are the direct responsibility of the Federal Government. In many cases, however, they look very little like Department of Defense schools, and are not in a condition that we would allow to occur within the DOD school system.

As chairman of the Interior subcommittee, it has been frustrating to not be able to respond to such a pressing need in anything more than an incremental manner. But given the difficult spending constraints under which the committee has been operating for a number of years, it has been impossible to make significant progress on this issue without it being identified as a priority in administration budget requests. This year, however, the administration has responded to the pleas of my colleagues—a development that apparently was spurred by the President's recent visit to Indian country. The FY 2001 budget request includes dramatic increases for both new school construction and repair and rehabilitation of existing schools. While the bill before you does not provide 100 percent of the request, it does provide an increase of $143 million for BIA school construction and repair. This amount is enough to complete the next six schools on the construction priority list, as well as provide an $84 million increase for the repair and rehabilitation account. Maintaining these funding levels will be one of my highest priorities in conference with the House.

Adhering to these fundamental principles while remaining within the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation did not leave a great deal of room for other program increases. As a result, there is perhaps less in this bill for land acquisition, grant programs, and specific member projects than some would like. I think, however, that the bill reflects the right set of priorities. I have attempted to allocate available resources to the most compelling needs identified in agency budget requests, as well as to the particular priorities identified to me in the more than 2,000 individual requests I have received from Members of this body. I regret not being able to do more of the things that my colleagues have asked me to do, but want to assure Members on both sides of the aisle that I have made every effort to treat these requests in a fair and even-handed manner.

While I do not wish to belabor the details, I do want to take a moment to point out a few highlights of the bill for the benefit of my colleagues who have not had a chance to review it closely. For the land management agencies, the bill provides significant increases for core operational needs.

The bill provides an increase of $80 million for operation of the National Park System, including more than $25 million for increases in the base operating budgets of more than 80 parks and related sites, including the U.S. Park Police. These increases build on similar increases that have been provided for the past several years. The bill also provides an increase of $11 million for the National Park Service to continue efforts to research and document fundamental scientific information on the biological, geological, and hydrological resources present in our park system.

For the Bureau of Land Management, the bill fully funds the request for noxious weed control, fully funds the budget request for annual and deferred maintenance, and provides an increase of $7.2 million for recreation programs. The bill also provides a $10 million increase for Payments In Lieu of Taxes, continuing the committee's steady effort to raise PILT funding toward the authorized level.

For the Forest Service, the bill provides increases of $10.5 million for recreation programs, and provides level funding for the timber program to prevent further erosion of timber offer levels. The bill also fully funds firefighting preparedness, provides all the funds requested to address survey and manage issues under the Northwest Forest Plan, and provides increases over the President's budget request for both road and trail maintenance.

For the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the bill provides increases of $17 million for refuge operations and maintenance to continue efforts to bolster the Service's basic operational capabilities. The bill also includes increases of $15 million for endangered species accounts, and $5 million for law enforcement programs that have been flat-funded for a number of years.

With respect to the cultural agencies funded in this bill, I am pleased to note that funding for the National Endowment for the Arts is increased by $7 million, and funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities is increased by $5 million. While these increases are fairly modest, they are indicative of the widespread support that these two agencies have within the Senate. The increases also reflect the degree to which the Endowments have responded to congressional concerns about the types of activities being funded, and the way in which project funding decisions are made. While last year we were not able to maintain the higher Senate funding levels in conference with the House, I fully intend to maintain the increases provided for the Endowments in the final FY 2001 bill. I will put the leadership of the other body on notice now that the Senate has no intention of receding on this matter.

This bill also provides funding for a portion of the Department of Energy, including programs that support research on energy conservation and fossil energy development. This research is critical to reducing our Nation's dependence on foreign oil, and to reducing harmful emissions from vehicles, power plants and other sources. The bill provides targeted increases for the most effective of these programs. Of particular not is the $11 million increase over the request level for oil technology research and development. This program, which is designed to enhance oil production from domestic sources and to develop cleaner petroleum-based fuels, was inexplicably slated for a large reduction the administration's budget request. In light of the recent and alarming rise in the price of gasoline, such a reduction seems highly imprudent at this time. The bill also provides increases for research on cleaner, more fuel-efficient vehicles, including additional funding for the Partnership for a Next Generation of Vehicles. This program was eliminated by the other body during floor debate—something which also seems imprudent in light of our growing dependence on foreign oil, and the potentially disastrous impact that rising oil prices could have on our economy.

Among the many Indian programs funded in this bill, I have already discussed the high priority that has been placed on education programs. The bill provides increases for other Indian programs, however, including an increase of $143 million for Indian Health Services. This amount includes a $41 million program increase for additional clinical services, a $20 million increase for contract health services, and a $25 million increase for facilities construction and improvement. The bill continues the committee's efforts to help the Department of the Interior reform its abysmal trust management system. As many of my colleagues are aware, the Department is making a concerted effort to deal with a trust management mess that has been building for decades, if not the entire 20th century. This bill provides the full administration request for the Office of Special Trustee, which is charged with overseeing the trust reform initiative. The bill also provides an increase of $12.5 million for trust reform activities within the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

On a more parochial level, I would like also to talk about what this bill means for the people of Washington State. The land management agencies funded through the Interior Appropriations bill have a dramatic impact on the ecological and economic health of the Pacific Northwest. With more than 25 percent of the land in Washington State owned by the Federal Government, I have taken a special interest in assuring that we have the resources and policies that promote recreational and economic opportunities, and environmental preservation.

In preparing the FY 2001 Interior appropriations bill, I focused on three

key issues for Washington State: restoring the health of our salmon runs, providing recreational opportunities, and promoting a clean Washington State.

The salmon crisis has reached new heights in the past 6 months. While greeted by the good news that some returning Columbia River runs are at their highest levels in more than a decade, the cause of decline and the goals for recovery remain a mystery. The clash between local governments and the Federal agencies responsible for addressing the listing of these species has grown increasingly tense.

Fortunately, most can agree that homegrown efforts to recover salmon will be the foundation for addressing the species' future. In this year's Interior bill, I have continued and increased the Federal Government's investment in funding volunteer salmon recovery groups that have the best track record for identifying and restoring crucial stream and river habitat for salmon.

Increasingly, the role of fish hatcheries in the larger effort to restore naturally spawning runs of salmon has come under scrutiny. A group of key scientists from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife have joined forces to develop standards for the more than 100 hatcheries located in the State. I have secured funding to continue this effort to redesign hatchery practices and retrofit the facilities to ultimately enhance salmon runs rather than detract from the larger recovery goals.

The Northwest continues to be a hot spot for recreation. Whether you are a day hiker from downtown Seattle or a back country horseman from Okanogan, all of us have a desire to preserve and enhance the recreation opportunities on our public lands. This year, I have focused my attention on improving camping and hiking opportunities in the Middle Fork Snoqualmie Valley and preserving the history of Ebey's Landing on Whidbey Island.

Finally, the health and beauty of our public lands are assets we cannot ignore. The diversity of wildlife that resides in our forests, refuges and parks must be preserved in the future. I have dedicated funding to acquiring key tracts of land that will provide connective habitat in the Cascade Range. Our children deserve a clean Washington State, and the fiscal year 2001 Interior appropriations bill makes a strong investment in the public lands we depend on for ecological and economic stability.

In the interests of expediting debate on this bill, I will not spend more of the Senate's time describing its many noteworthy features. I do, however, wish to make one final observation regarding the bill as a whole. The bill will soon be open to amendment. Any Senator may offer an amendment to move funding from one program to another. Some of these proposals I may support, as I do not claim to know all there is to know about programs funded in this bill. Many such amendments I will oppose, however, because I think the bill before you represents an appropriate balance among competing priorities. But whatever the case, the point is that the process of amendment is available to us—to all Senators.

The administration's budget request includes a proposal that would greatly diminish the right of Senators to offer amendments to change spending priorities in this bill. The ''Lands Legacy'' initiative would fence off a significant number of the programs in this bill and provide a set amount of funding for those programs. An amendment to move funding from this Lands Legacy pot to other programs would not be possible. For instance, one could not propose to shift funds from Urban and Community Forestry to Tribally Controlled Community Colleges, or from the Cooperative Endangered Species Fund to the National Park Service operations account. Regardless of what individual Senators might think about such amendments, to prohibit the simple offering of the amendment is absurd. That is why the committee has rejected the administration proposal entirely. And that is why this Senator is vehemently opposing efforts being made elsewhere in Congress to take land acquisition and a handful of favored grant programs off budget, thereby preventing the Appropriations Committee and the Senate as a whole from weighing the merits of those programs against the other critical—but sometimes less visible or popular—activities funded in this bill.

On one further matter, I know several of my colleagues have inquired about emergency items that were included in the supplemental portion of the Agriculture appropriations bill, but which were not included in the supplemental title of the military construction bill that was sent to the President prior to the recess. This category includes funding for hurricane damage to National Park Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service facilities, and funding championed by Senator GRAMS that would address a major timber blowdown in Minnesota and Wisconsin. While I can not now say exactly how we will address these issues, I want to assure my colleagues that this senator is committed to seeing that these previously identified emergency needs are addressed.

Before I turn to Senator BYRD for his opening remarks, I want to state for the record how much I continue to enjoy working with him in putting this bill together year after year. He is a forceful and eloquent advocate for the interests of the State of West Virginia, as well as for the interests of Members on his side of the aisle and I may say, my side of the aisle. He is always cognizant, however, of the need to put forward a well balanced bill that adequately addresses the pressing national priorities that come under the subcommittee's jurisdiction. It is a great pleasure to work with him and his able staff. I also want to thank my own staff for the many hours they have put into this bill. It is often a grueling process, and I know I speak for all Senators in expressing appreciation for the work that has been done to get us this far.

With that, I will only add the comment that I hope we will be able to deal with this bill relatively promptly and deal with it within the parameters set by the bill itself. I think it is not nearly as controversial a proposal as sometimes has been the case in the past. The House has, of course, already passed its Interior appropriations bill, and I have every hope we can finish our task relatively promptly and send not only an acceptable but an absolutely first-rate bill to the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure to join with the distinguished Senator from Washington in presenting this bill. He is an extraordinarily fine chairman. I have chaired this subcommittee now for, oh, a good many years, but Senator GORTON is really one of the best subcommittee chairmen in this Senate. I say that without any hesitation. I have no compunctions about saying he is one of the finest chairmen with whom I have ever served in these 42 years in the Senate. I mean every word of it.

I have found him always to be very courteous, very considerate, very cooperative; and he is this way with all Senators—not just with me but with all of our colleagues. I could not hope to have a better chairman than he. And if it were not for the honor that goes along with the chairmanship, I would just as soon he kept this. But there is a certain honor with it, so I look forward to the time when I will be chairman of the full committee and subcommittee again. But my hat is always off to this chairman, Senator GORTON.

This is an important piece of legislation that provides for the management of our natural resources, undertakes important energy research, supports vital Indian health and education programs, and works to protect and preserve our national and cultural heritage. It is a bill on which Senator GORTON and I cooperate very closely on a bipartisan basis. We know no party in our relationship in this Senate. And that is said without any reservations whatsoever. There is no Republican Party, no Democratic Party where SLADE GORTON and I are concerned in working on this subcommittee. And I can say the same with respect to the full committee with respect to TED STEVENS, the distinguished Senator from Alaska. There is no party line in that committee.

The programs and activities funded under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee are treated in a fair and balanced way, as is customary for the annual Interior appropriations bills under the chairmanship of Senator SLADE GORTON. He is one of the best—if not the best—subcommittee chairman with whom I have had the opportunity to serve. The bill was reported unanimously by the committee, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

I will not repeat the summary of the bill just provided by the subcommittee chairman, except to say that, as it currently stands, this measure provides $15.4 billion in new discretionary budget authority. This amount, while less than the administration's request, is nevertheless $628 million above last year's enacted level. The bill, as reported by the committee, has fully utilized the subcommittee's entire 302(b) allocation of $15.4 billion in discretionary budget authority. Consequently, to remain consistent with the Budget Act, any amendments that propose increased funding will have to be fully offset.

So if any Senator has any amendment in mind that seeks to add money, that Senator or his staff, or both, should busy themselves about finding an offset because Peter is going to have to pay Paul in this instance. It is going to come out of somebody's funding, and I am determined it will not be mine. So I suggest that Senators look for an offset because they have to have it.

In terms of total spending, the Interior bill is by no means the largest of the 13 annual appropriations measures. Yet, despite its relatively modest size, the Interior appropriations bill commands significant attention from Members of the Senate. As is the case every year, the subcommittee received more than 2,000 Member requests seeking consideration of a particular project, or account, or activity under the jurisdiction of one agency or another in this bill. All of these requests are very important to our colleagues and the people that they represent. Unfortunately, because of the constrained spending level under the allocations provided to the Congress, it is not possible to adequately respond to all of these requests. That is what makes the crafting of this bill so difficult. Trying to balance the specific needs addressed by the Member requests on one hand, while remaining within the budgetary allocations on the other hand, is an arduous task, indeed—not as arduous, perhaps, as the problem that Solomon had, but sometimes I wonder.

Nevertheless, it is our responsibility—the responsibility of our chairman and myself—to undertake that very difficult assignment, and I commend him for his splendid efforts in meeting the highest priority needs of all Senators. For months now, he has gone to great lengths to work with me and to keep me informed, and to work with my staff to keep my staff informed, of his recommendations throughout the process of marking up and reporting this bill. Throughout this process, Senator GORTON's graciousness—that word is key, ''graciousness''—and his dedication to duty have never wavered, and I am personally grateful to him for all his courtesies.

I also express my appreciation to the fine staff members on the majority staff side, as well as members on the minority staff side. We have a new staff person on this side of the aisle—Peter Kiefhaber, German to the core, smart as they come, and hard working. That is what I like about him. He is hard working, he is courteous, and he is extremely efficient.

So with that, I think I shall join my chairman in asking Senators, if they have them, to bring their amendments to the floor. It would be my hope, as I used to do when I was chairman, to urge, with the approval of the chairman of the subcommittee, our floor staffs to contact Senators and see if they have any amendments. If they have them, let's draw up a list. Let's know which Senators have what amendments, and let's draw up a list. It would be my hope that at a time not too far away we could get unanimous consent that that be a finite list. Then we could go from there.

But I will not suggest that at the moment. I have not discussed that with the chairman. Whenever he is ready to ask his staff on that side of the aisle, I will do the same over here. We will have our leadership make calls to Senators and let us know if we are to anticipate any problems from them. If we are to anticipate such, let us know about it. And because we do have other business, we must get on with it.

I again thank my chairman, Mr. GORTON. I thank our staffs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, once again, I thank my friend and colleague, Senator BYRD, not only for his kind words but substantively for the fact that I believe we have brought to the floor a bill that can command wide respect and that is not likely to be faced with profound amendments that change the direction or the philosophy of the bill itself.

We have put together a list of rumored amendments as well as some en bloc amendments that we can accept in closing. It is relatively modest in length. It will be good if some of them can be brought today, of course, in the course of the next less than 2 hours. But I do hope that by tomorrow we will be in a position to get a unanimous consent agreement for a finite number of amendments and can develop a way in which to deal with them very promptly.

The majority leader has told us how much he has to accomplish for the week. It will be a wonderful tribute to us, and a great help to us, if we are able to be in conference on this committee well before the week is over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Washington and Senator BYRD, who I know want to expedite the matter, for allowing me to speak about an amendment that I am now drafting. I want to make sure this works out well. This is in response to something, as the Senator mentioned, that is a priority for both myself and Senator GRAMS. What happened is that we in Minnesota were hit with a once-in-a-thousand-years storm, literally. It was on July 4, 1999. Over 400,000 acres in Minnesota were damaged, including the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, as well as the Gunflint Corridor, in Superior National Forest. This started in the Boundary Waters Wilderness area, which is really a national treasure.

What we are worried about is the blow-down to which Senator GORTON referred. We had a hearing in Grand Rapids on Friday. Senator CRAIG chaired the hearing, and I thought he did a superb job. Basically, what people are focused on right now is how to deal with this blow-down and the possibility of a conflagration. Everybody is very worried about what could happen. The Forest Service—I think there was also consensus on this—is doing a very good job. I think that is what people across the spectrum were saying.

What happened is we had $9.2 million in emergency funding that came out of the Senate Appropriations Committee, however we lost much of that funding when the MILCON bill got put together. The funding went from $9.2 million to $2 million. This additional $7.2 million—and I know you heard from Senator GRAMS on this as well—is critically important to us. It is important also for some of the work that the Forest Service is trying to do just by way of education.

It is incredible how few minor fires we have had; people have been paying very careful attention and are doing everything they can to prevent them. It also goes to the whole question of how we deal with the trees that are down and the underbrush and whether or not we can do the prescribed burns on what kind of schedule. This is critically important to my State of Minnesota.

So what I want to do is take 10 minutes or so to outline what we are dealing with in Minnesota, and then I will have an amendment that I will send to the desk, or I can get it to staff and Senators and see whether we can just reach some agreement.

Again, this was an unbelievable storm that hit our State. In many ways, what I think has happened is that it has brought Minnesotans together; it has brought the best out in people. We are talking about our beloved national forests. This is a critically important area; 400,000 acres in 7 counties were hit by a storm that damaged as much as 70 percent of the trees in certain areas and wiped out numerous rows. The damage of this storm has

presented unbelievable challenges, not only to land managers but all Minnesotans—people who depend on the national forest for their jobs, family incomes, industrial materials such as paper and pulp, and family vacations and recreation.

Mr. President, I do think that the Forest Service, as I said, has begun to implement a significant and important effort. In particular, what they are trying to deal with is the dead and downed timber, which is a great threat to people in the State, and really, I think, a great threat to the country because we are talking about a crown jewel wilderness area.

My intention is to have an amendment—we are working on it right now, drafting it in such a way that we clearly make the case for emergency funding, which I think we can. We really should have had this additional money. I want to make sure it is OK with colleagues on both sides. And then later on maybe we will have a vote or maybe it can be accepted. I hope we can get an agreement on this amendment. I wanted to signal my intention to you and spell out what I want to do.

Mr. President, I heard my colleague refer to this blow-down amendment. I wonder whether he might respond.

Mr. GORTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Yes, but I would like to hold the floor a few more minutes. I yield temporarily.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the emergency, the task, the unprecedented nature of the storm damage that is described by the Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct. There is not a single thing he has said that meets with any resistance or disagreement on the part of this Senator.

I wish that money had been included in the bill that is now law. As I believe the Senator knows, it remains in the Agriculture appropriations bill. I guess, procedurally at least, the principal challenge or principal question is which one of these two bills is going to get to the President and actually be signed first because I know the Senator from Minnesota wishes to have this money in hand.

I make this suggestion to the Senator from Minnesota. If he would get together in just the next few hours or over the evening with the junior Senator from Minnesota and present us with a joint project, I will discuss the matter with Senator BYRD and with the leadership and tell the Senator that I think he is absolutely right; I want to get this job done as quickly as I possibly can. I will be delighted—and I am sure Senator BYRD will be delighted as well—to see to it that we do this in a way in which it becomes law and the money becomes available as quickly as possible.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the Senator's comments. As far as I am concerned, this request should come from both Senators. I would be delighted if Senator GRAMS joined me. We will get the wording of the amendment to you. We will do this together. We want to just get it done for our State. I think the Senator from Washington can appreciate that sentiment. That is his modus operandi. I will let other Senators come forward with amendments now. I will get the amendment to you. We will have Senator GRAMS join in, and we will try to get it done on this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to talk about the energy conservation programs in this Interior appropriations bill that we are now considering. First, I want to thank Chairman GORTON and Senator BYRD for their fine work on this bill. In particular, I am very glad to see that funding for energy conservation is 5 percent above last year's level. I firmly believe that every dollar spent on research and development for energy efficiency pays back many times in the real value for the American consumer. These programs are saving the Nation an estimated $20 billion per year in energy costs at this time.

I would like to focus my comments today on one particular program in the energy conservation budget, and that is, the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles. This is generally referred to as PNGV. It is a cost-shared, industry-government partnership.

It is working to improve the fuel economy of passenger cars with the ultimate goal of developing midsized cars that will get up to 80 miles per gallon.

Talking about energy efficiency in the transportation sector I believe is especially timely given the high gasoline prices that we are all concerned about throughout the Nation. I believe every Senator needs to understand why gasoline prices are rising, why the days of cheap oil are unlikely to return anytime soon, and why programs such as PNGV are so important to our economic competitors.

During the last couple of weeks, we have heard a lot on the Senate floor about the decline in domestic oil production and various proposals to stimulate new production. But production is only one side of the coin. A far more important factor in the long-term increase in oil prices is the dramatic upsurge in worldwide demand for petroleum products. The steep increase in consumption here in the United States compounds the worldwide situation.

Today, the U.S. transportation sector—this includes air, boat, rail, and highway travel, all of our transportation sector—is 95-percent dependent on oil. Transportation accounts for two-thirds of our Nation's oil consumption and a quarter of our total energy use. While over the last 25 years the residential, the commercial, and industrial sectors have all been able to reduce their dependence on oil, the transportation sector consumption of oil has skyrocketed.

I show you this chart. This shows petroleum use increases mainly occurring in the transportation sector. This chart goes back 30 years—from 1970 to the year 2000—and then forward for 20 years. If you look at these other areas, it tries to show the industrial use, and the residential, commercial, or electric generation use of petroleum products. They are all relatively stable. The increases are not excessive in those areas. In fact, there are declines in electric generation and residential and commercial. But in transportation the increase is very substantial.

From the first gas price shock in 1973 until 1998, oil use for transportation grew an astounding 37 percent. If that is not bad enough, according to this chart from the Energy Information Agency—let me show you this second chart. The demand for oil in the transportation sector is anticipated to increase another 46 percent over the next 20 years.

Another key point from the chart is that over half of our oil consumption for transportation is used for light-duty vehicles; that is, passenger vehicles and pickup trucks. Today, more people are driving more miles in vehicles that use more fuel per mile. As you can see, unless something is done, our passenger cars will consume half again more fuel in 2020 than they do today.

I think all Senators agree on the need to reduce our dependence on imported oil. Today, America imports more than half of its oil. The cost of importing oil is a dangerous drag on our economy.

Reducing our dependence on imported oil is a daunting and long-term challenge that will require a variety of measures. Surely efforts to increase domestic production need to play a role in that strategy. However, I am afraid there is no silver bullet. Increased domestic production alone will not meet America's skyrocketing demand for oil.

With transportation accounting for two-thirds of our oil use, I believe the key is to reduce transportation demand through a wide range of measures, including technology advances that squeeze more useful energy out of every drop of oil.

That's where PNGV comes in. Started in 1993, PNGV brings together the expertise of the nation's colleges and universities, government agencies, national laboratories, suppliers, and the auto industry in a 10-year effort to dramatically improve the fuel efficiency of passenger vehicles. PNGV research efforts are focused on developing breakthrough technologies that are key to improving fuel economy. Work is underway on lightweight materials, aerodynamics, tires, power electronics, energy storage, combustion science, fuel cells, and hybrid propulsion systems.

The long-term goal of the program is to develop mid-size passenger sedans with up to three-times better fuel economy in a vehicle that retains all the

performance, comfort, safety, and cost of today's comparable models.

In the past seven years, a number of PNGV's innovations have started to improve the fuel economy of today's production vehicles. Many of these innovations originated in our national laboratories. I am pleased to see our laboratories are playing a major role in PNGV. Let me cite a few examples of recent accomplishments:

One automaker is now using a technology developed at Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque, in my state of New Mexico, to produce axle shafts that are stronger, lighter, and less expensive.

The Pacific Northwest Laboratory in the Chairman's home state of Washington helped develop a hydroforming technique that is being used to shape door, deck and hood panels in current model vehicles.

Using analytical methods developed at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, automakers are now producing pickup truck boxes from lightweight composite materials.

And Los Alamos National Laboratory, also in my state, is one of the world leaders in fuel cell technology. Through PNGV, the lab's unique capabilities are being brought to bear on what may well be the automobile technology of the future. A fuel cell offers the highest possible efficiency with near zero emissions—certainly a goal worth striving for.

In addition to producing immediate fuel savings, PNGV is a program that is meeting its milestones. Earlier this year, and on schedule, all three domestic automakers rolled out high efficiency concept vehicles: the Ford Prodigy, DaimlerChrysler's ESX–3, and GM's Precept. These cars demonstrated, for the first time, the technical feasibility of a 5-passenger, 80-mile per gallon vehicle. This is truly a remarkable achievement.

I believe all Senators agree that the views of the National Academy of Sciences carry considerable weight in this body. Just last month, the Academy's National Research Council completed its sixth annual review of PNGV. It had this to say about the program:

Though confronted with enormous technological problems, PNGV has made significant progress in meeting its objectives, and reaching the 2000 milestones represents an outstanding effort.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the National Research Council's sixth report on PNGV be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, the NRC's report went on to describe the major challenges that remain in the final four years of the program. PNGV's goal is ambitious but achievable: to develop production vehicles that meet all safety and emissions standards while simultaneously maintaining current vehicle cost levels. The increase in federal funding in the bill before us today will help ensure that PNGV can meet its goal.

Last month, Chairman GORTON lead a debate here on the Senate floor about fuel efficiency standards, and I want to thank him for his effort. I do believe it is an important issue. How ever that debate eventually plays out, it should be clear that we are not going to be able to reduce our dangerous dependence on imported foreign oil without vehicles that are more efficient. And the American public is not going to stand for vehicles that do not provide the same levels of safety, comfort, and performance they've come to expect. That's exactly what PNGV is all about.

I'd like to make one last point. Both Europe and Japan have recently taken steps to raise the average fuel economy of their vehicles. In Europe, automakers are committed to increasing fuel economy by 33 percent by 2008. In Japan, fuel economy levels are set to increase 23 percent by 2010. I do believe fuel efficiency is an issue of international economic competitiveness. We must aggressively pursue efforts like PNGV, or risk falling behind in the global automotive market.

In closing, I am pleased that the Senate bill provides adequate funding for PNGV. However, I am concerned this year about maintaining the Senate's funding level for PNGV in conference. In what I believe was a very wrongheaded action, the House all but eliminated funding for this vital program. Mr. President, this is not the time to reduce our commitment to cutting-edge research that offers the promise of dramatic reductions in our need for oil. I hope all senators will want to work with the committee to maintain the Senate's funding level for PNGV as the bill moves to conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Secretary Richardson opposing the House's actions be printed the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, PNGV represents the best of America's minds working together on one of the most important issues we face today.

I again thank Chairman GORTON, and Senator BYRD for their work on this bill and especially for the funding they've provided for energy conservation and PNGV.

EXHIBIT I

[From the National Academies, June 15, 2000]

FUEL ECONOMY, COST MAY BE COMPROMISED TO MEET TOUGHER EMISSION STANDARDS IN NEXT-GENERATION CARS

WASHINGTON.—A public-private partnership to create a highly fuel-efficient car reached a major milestone earlier this year with the unveiling of concept vehicles, but the ability to meet both fuel-economy objectives and emission standards by a 2004 deadline remains a monumental challenge, says a new report from the National Academies' National Research Council.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's new emissions standards for vehicle exhaust, which will be phased in beginning in 2004, are significantly more stringent than those that were in place when the public-private program, called the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles (PNGV), was initiated six years ago. All of the demonstrated concept vehicles—DaimlerChrysler's ESX3, Ford's Prodigy, and GM's Precept—use hybrid electric technology, which incorporates electric power from a battery with a small diesel engine. While the concept vehicles can achieve a fuel economy in the range of 70 to 80 miles per gallon, none meet the new emission standards.

''Though confronted with enormous technological problems, PNGV has made significant progress in meeting its objectives, and reaching the 2000 milestone represents an outstanding effort,'' said Trevor O. Jones, chair of the committee that wrote the report and chairman and chief executive officer of Biomec Inc., Cleveland. ''As the program moves toward the 2004 deadline to introduce production prototype vehicles, major attention will need to be devoted to meeting the new emissions standards while simultaneously attaining cost and fuel economy objectives, which continue to elude PNGV engineers.''

In the committee's judgment, EPA's ''Tier 2'' standards for nitrogen oxides and particulate matter will delay the use of the diesel engine—and its significant fuel-economy benefit—until systems can be developed that meet the new standards. PNGV also may have to shift its attention to other internal combustion engine designs with greater potential for extremely low emissions and high fuel efficiency.

The partnership should develop models that can predict the type and amount of emissions for a variety of engines and exhaust treatment systems in different versions of hybrid electric vehicles, the report says. These efforts will assist researchers in evaluating the feasibility of meeting the Tier 2 standards and provide data that could then be used to establish an appropriate plan for the next phase of the program.

Currently, fuel cells—an alternative power source—have the greatest potential to meet emissions standards and energy-efficiency requirements. All of the vehicle manufacturers are building concept vehicles powered by fuel cells that are estimated to get up to an equivalent of 100 mpg. Though notable progress has been made, the automotive fuel cell remains a long-range development facing significant hurdles, including the need to substantially reduce costs, which are running about five times higher than the program projected. The fuel cells are targeted for production automobiles sometime after 2004 by some vehicle builders.

New types of fuel and the infrastructure of refineries, distribution systems, and service stations are extremely important considerations in developing both internal combustion engines and fuel cells. The committee recommends that PNGV and the petroleum industry more fully address fuel issues and strengthen their cooperative programs.

As the program moves closer to commercially viable vehicles, the National Highway and Traffic Safety Administration should support major safety studies to determine how lightweight cars perform in collisions with heavier vehicles, the report says. These activities are critically important because PNGV vehicles, although similar in size to today's vehicles, will weigh much less with lighter bodies, frames, interior components, and window glass.

Although substantial accomplishments have been made, high cost is a serious problem in almost every area of the PNGV program, the committee said. The costs of most components of the concept vehicles are higher than their target values. For example, research continues to be conducted on aluminum and other composite materials for use in major vehicle components, but costs still are not competitive with steel. Battery costs are at least three times greater than the program's target. And DaimlerChrysler has estimated that its ESX3 concept vehicle would cost $7,500 more than a traditional vehicle in its class.

Given the complexity of the assignment and the tight timeline, the committee lauded PNGV's technical teams for their overall achievements and effectiveness in meeting project goals and their ability to develop solid industry-government-academia working relationships despite their competitive positions. And while the individual car manufacturers took different approaches in building their concept vehicles, all have made significant contributions and benefited by using technologies developed through the collaborative program. Further, many of the technologies—such as lightweight body materials—are being incorporated into vehicles that are in production today.

The Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles is an alliance of U.S. government agencies and the U.S. Council for Automotive Research (USCAR), whose members are the country's three major automakers—DaimlerChrysler, Ford, and General Motors. PNGV was formed in late 1993 to develop an affordable midsize vehicle by 2004 with a fuel economy of up to 80 mpg—three times more efficient than today's vehicles—while meeting or exceeding government safety and emission requirements. Since 1994, the Research Council has conducted annual reviews of the program's goals and progress at the request of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The study was sponsored by the U.S. departments of Commerce, Energy, and Transportation. The Research Council is the principal operating arm of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering. It is a private, nonprofit institution that provides independent advice on science and technology issues under a congressional charter. A committee roster follows.

STANDING COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE RESEARCH PROGRAM OF THE PARTNERSHIP FOR A NEW GENERATION OF VEHICLES

Trevor O. Jones (chair), Chair and Chief Executive Officer, Biomec Inc., Cleveland.

Craig Marks (vice chair), President, Creative Management Solutions, Bloomfield Hills, Mich.

William Agnew, Director, Programs and Plans, General Motors Research Laboratories (retired), Washington, Mich.

Alexis T. Bell, Professor, Department of Chemical Engineering, University of California, Berkeley.

W. Robert Epperly, President, Epperly Associates Inc., Mountain View, Calif.

David E. Foster, Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Norman A. Gjostein, Clinical Professor of Engineering, University of Michigan, Dearborn.

David F. Hagen, General Manager of Alpha Simultaneous Engineering, Ford Technical Affairs, Ford Motor Co. (retired), Dearborn, Mich.

John B. Heywood, Sun Jae Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.

Fritz Kalhammer, Consultant, Strategic Science and Technology, and Transportation Groups, and Former Vice President, Strategic Research and Development, Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, Calif.

John G. Kassakian, Professor, Department of Electrical Engineering, and Director, Laboratory for Electromagnetic and Electronic Systems, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.

Harold H. Kung, Professor, Department of Chemical Engineering, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

John Scott Newman, Professor, Department of Chemical Engineering, University of California, Berkeley.

Roberta Nichols, Manager, Electric Vehicles External Strategy and Planning Department, Ford Motor Co. (retired), Plymouth, Mich.

Vernon P. Roan, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, and Director, Center for Advanced Studies in Engineering, University of Florida, Palm Beach Gardens.

Research Council Staff

James Zucchetto, Director, Board on Energy and Environmental Systems.

EXHIBIT 2

THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY,
Washington, DC, June 15, 2000.

Hon. RALPH REGULA,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express my concern regarding yesterday's House action to effectively terminate Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles (PNGV) activities. I thank you for your efforts to defeat this amendment. I know you agree that especially now, during this current spike in energy prices, is not the time to reduce the U.S. commitment to cutting-edge research and development that will reduce our dependence on petroleum.

The Sununu amendment virtually eliminates the entire budget for the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles (PNGV). This is a matter of great concern to the Department, since PNGV has been a highly successful program aimed at reducing our country's growing consumption of petroleum products for transportation. As gasoline prices exceed $2.00 per gallon in the midwest, we are reminded that the United States has become increasingly vulnerable to oil price shocks and supply disruptions. Other impacts of this growing petroleum consumption are greater air pollution and increasing greenhouse gas emissions.

Technologies from PNGV results have already appeared in cars available for sale today. Earlier this year, the three PNGV year 2000 concept cars demonstrated the technical feasibility of 80 mile per gallon 5-passenger sedans. Each of these cars represents a unique approach to the challenges addressed by PNGV and showcases the progress made in advanced technology research and development through the partnership. The work is not finished, however.

Major challenges remain to be addressed during the final four years of this program, especially the size, weight, cost and emissions performance of individual components. The reliability of these technologies, both individually and in the context of a system, also needs to be demonstrated.

In its sixth review of the PNGV, released today, the National Research Council (NRC) notes that, measured against the magnitude of the challenge, ''PNGV is making good progress.'' The NRC characterizes meeting the PNGV 2000 concept vehicle milestone as ''an outstanding . . . effort.''

Given projections of substantial growth in the number of vehicles worldwide in the years ahead, combined with uncertainty about the ability of worldwide petroleum production to keep up, it would be extremely unwise to terminate this program that is key to developing high energy efficiency vehicles without compromising the features that make them attractive to U.S. consumers.

Also, it is vital, during a period of increasing worldwide competition to produce more fuel-efficient vehicles, that we maintain support for U.S. producers. In view of significant support being provided by governments in Europe and Japan, it seems particularly ill-advised for us to abandon our leadership. Any reduction in PNGV funding would jeopardize achievement of our objectives.

I appreciate your leadership in protecting energy research and development funding. If you have further questions, you may contact me or have a member of your staff contact Mr. John C. Angell, Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, at (202) 586–5450.

Yours sincerely,

BILL RICHARDSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from New Mexico on his presentation and I ask if he will return to the two charts.

I appreciate the kind words of the Senator from New Mexico on this general field. My own view is we do need to do what we can to produce more petroleum products from sources that are within the control of the United States. I am convinced we also, in meeting this challenge, need to move aggressively toward the development and increased use of alternative fuels for our automobiles. Even if we are relatively successful in both of those courses of action, the challenge of an increased dependence and increased use of fossil fuels in transportation, or of even alternative fuels, is simply going to continue to grow.

The Senator from New Mexico, in stressing the importance of a greater degree of efficiency in the use of energy for transportation purposes, is directly on point. As he stated, this appropriations bill includes a modest increase in its appropriation for the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles, a program I have supported ever since I took the chairmanship of this subcommittee. I think it is very important to the country as a whole. I think it is a constructive partnership between government and the private sector.

I am delighted to have a Member speak on this specific element of the bill that I had to pass over rather quickly. The top line on the chart indicates the nature of the problem.

The Senator from New Mexico also mentioned my effort in a different appropriations bill, once again, to go back to mandated, better fuel efficiency standards on the part of automobiles and small trucks. That is at least a first cousin, if not closer, to the proposition to which the Senator from New Mexico is speaking.

If we are to be successful, if we are to turn that rapidly rising line in the chart and even flatten it out, it seems

to me we have to engage in all of these. The subject about which he spoke is particularly important.

I can assure the Senator from New Mexico that in a conference committee with the House on this subject, I will hold out as eloquently as I possibly can for the full Senate appropriation.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I respond by thanking the Senator from Washington for his comments and indicate that I think his leadership on this issue is extremely important, particularly so given the wrongheaded action the House of Representatives has taken in their bill of essentially zeroing out the funding for this very important program after 6 successful years of progress in a 10-year program.

I am encouraged by the Senator's statements. I will certainly do anything I can to assist the Senator in seeing to it that this is adequately funded in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I take a few minutes to comment on the bill and some of the areas of particular concern.

First, I recognize and thank the chairman and Senator BYRD for their good work. It is a tough job on any appropriations bill to hold down spending and keep it within the budget. Yet it is very difficult to set the priorities. This is one of the hardest jobs in the Congress. I appreciate the work they have done.

Particularly in this Interior bill, it is very hard to put together a bill that gets support throughout the entire Congress, representing all the States in the country, when a large part of the activity goes on, of course, in the public land States.

I want to comment on a few of those areas that are of particular concern to those who live in the West, where much of the State is owned by the Federal Government, ranging from 25 to nearly 90 percent of some States belonging to the Federal Government. Our economy, our future, all those things are tied very closely to what happens with the management of Federal lands. Much of that is within this budget of Interior.

I am particularly pleased, as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, that the funding for national parks is in this budget, as well. Certainly we would all like to see as much support as possible for parks, but there is an increase here, as there has been over the past several years. There are some 379 parks in this country, national parks, all of which are quite different—from Yellowstone to the Statue of Liberty—parks that are unique.

The idea, of course, is to have the basic support for parks come from appropriations. We have developed over the past several years some alternative support, supplemental sources of funding that are not meant to replace, of course, but simply to supplement. These are such things as demonstration fees, which are then used in the park in which they are collected, or highway funds which come from the highways and go to the parks. I am thinking particularly in this case of Yellowstone Park, where highways are a very important part of their funding. Much of that goes there. We encourage contributions that can be made from the private sector.

There are several areas of concern, of course. One of them is PILT—payment in lieu of taxes. This is a program designed for a county where much of the land is owned by the Federal Government, where they would normally have real estate taxes that would come in through the operations of the county. Of course, when the Federal Government owns the land, those taxes are not collected and therefore this is a replacement and one that has been there for a very long time. It is quite important. It is very important because, in most cases, the counties provide the kinds of services on the public lands that they would provide on the private lands, even though the Federal Government, by its nature, does not pay the taxes. So these are payments that are made in lieu of.

There are some increases in this budget over the last year, but not nearly equal to the taxes that would be collected if the Federal Government did not own the land. So to the extent that is some measurement of fairness, then we are still quite below where we ought to be in the PILT area. We raised the authorization a number of years ago. Now it is tied to some kind of growth in the economy. We are, of course, quite below what the authorized level would be. We have some increases. We would like to have some consideration given to them.

Large amounts of land in Wyoming belong to the Federal Government—in the entire West. It creates some responsibility. Last week I met with county commissioners in Big Horn, WY, and their primary concern was what we are going to do with PILT because much of their county is Federal land. We have a unique relationship with the Federal Government. The Government depends on local communities to provide this infrastructure. Without the support of these counties, the Federal Government would be unable to manage theirs. I am talking about highways; I am talking about police protection; I am talking about health care and emergency care. All these things are provided without the basis of support that is usually there. So that is what the payment in lieu of taxes is all about. I know it is very difficult, but I think it is a program that merits some consideration and perhaps we will have the opportunity to increase those payments somewhat.

Actually, it is not confined to Western States. About 49 different States participate in the PILT program throughout the country, including the District of Columbia and three territories, so, of course, it is widespread in support.

Earlier this year, we had 57 Senators join in a letter supporting an increase in PILT funding. I will submit, a little later, for consideration some opportunity perhaps to give a little boost to that kind of funding. It is something that has a real meaning.

Let me give a little example. We have 23 counties in my State of Wyoming. Teton County is 96 percent Federally owned, Park County, 82 percent federally owned, on down the line; in Big Horn County, which I mentioned a little while ago, 80 percent of that county belongs to the Federal Government. It goes on. So I think there is a great deal of interest in that, and in the question of fairness.

Let me say, too, even though the appropriations are not actually the area where these kinds of decisions are often made, I think it is important to recognize this administration has made a drive towards the end. I understand the President is seeking to change the legacy to be one of a sort of Theodore Roosevelt thing, with land acquisition, the proposal to have 40 million acres roadless, in addition to the Antiquities Act and other things. This is going on currently.

One of the difficulties is not so much the idea of controlling roads. I have no problem with that. There should not be roads everywhere; we need to take a look at them. I am more concerned about the method in which it has been undertaken. Rather than having a major decision made by bureaucrats in Washington, we ought to go through the process. We have what are called forest studies over several years, and we have forest planning. That is where it ought to be done, so the people locally can participate.

We have talked about all the meetings we have had, and I have attended some of them, but the problem is, because this was done on a nationwide basis, hardly anyone who came to the meetings knew what they were talking about, including many of the people from the Forest Service. So there needs to be some real input. Perhaps there is something we can do to slow down that area.

Going back to parks, there are some 27 or 28 parks where one of the access functions that people enjoy is using snow machines in the wintertime in places such as Teton Park and Yellowstone Park and in Minnesota—there are a number there. Now we have another one of these bureaucratic kneejerk responses that we are going to eliminate the use of snowmobiles in national parks.

I do not argue there ought not be some control. There should be, and there can be. There ought to be some control over the machines themselves. The manufacturers have said they are willing to do that, to lower the noise and do something about the emissions. The problem is the EPA has never set up any standards with which they need to comply. I understand if you are going to put a great deal of money into

research to change these machines, you have to know where you need to be to be able to comply. We have never done this.

In addition, even though it seems as if a lot of people are using them, there are many fewer using the facilities in the wintertime. So it would have been possible, if the park had managed the snow machines rather than just letting them go, to separate the uses if they conflict with one another. If you have snow machines conflicting with cross-country skiers, in most parts you can have some space in between them. The park is never managed. Instead of seeking to manage these kinds of things, they simply say: Now we are going to do away with them.

The real issue there is access. Parks and public lands at least have two major functions. One is to preserve the resource. The second is to give the owners, who are the taxpayers, an opportunity to enjoy them. One of the ways of enjoying them is, in this case, a snow machine. Rather than simply eliminate it, it seems to me we ought to take a little bit more time and find some ways to fit that into what we are doing, whether it is used for hunting or hiking or sightseeing.

We were talking about energy over here. One of the reasons we are having energy problems is that our domestic production is down. One of the reasons it is down is we have made it more difficult to have access in the public lands. In Wyoming, that is a real problem because half the land belongs to the Federal Government.

So I think there are a lot of things we can do to be able to still protect the resource yet provide for multiple use of those resources.

Finally, there is grazing. A year ago, the Senate bill had language in it that if the Bureau of Land Management, didn't have the resources to go in and investigate and take a look at a grazing allotment—if the BLM did not get there, as they were supposed to, then they could cancel the allotment of this grazing. All we are saying is, when the BLM can't get to it, until they are able to, they ought to be able to go on as they have before, under their original contract. That is language that should be there. We would like to make sure it is there as we go through this.

Finally, there is a wild horse problem. We have a large number of wild horses in Wyoming. Not many people have to deal with that problem. The administration has requested $9 million for the next 4 years as part of an effort to bring the wild horses back to manageable levels. As a matter of fact, in the Red Desert of Wyoming, about 10 years ago, there was a lawsuit which required that these numbers be brought down. The BLM has never done that. Now they say: We can't do it unless we have some additional funding. The House funded the administration's request, but an amendment on the floor brought it down to $5 million. The Senate bill does not fund the administration's request. Now we have the possibility of BLM taking money away from other uses unless they have some more resources to handle these wild horses.

I hope we can talk about some of these issues. I understand they are unique problems. I do not think there are many wild horses in Rhode Island, but they are in other places. This is the kind of bill where we have to deal with the unique things that happen in the West.

Again, I appreciate very much the work of the chairman. I know he comes from a western State with a considerable amount of unique and public resources as well. I also know that he is very interested in dealing with them fairly.

I compliment that effort. I want to work with him to see if we can deal with some of these other unique problems that arise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. My colleague from Missouri is very gracious and I can do this in 30 seconds.

AMENDMENT NO. 3772

(Purpose: To increase funding for emergency expenses resulting from wind storms)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], for himself and Mr. GRAMS, proposes an amendment numbered 3772.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 165, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

For an additional amount for emergency expenses resulting from damage from windstorms, $7,249,000 to become available upon enactment of this Act and, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that the President submits to Congress an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.): *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, this amendment, again, is to restore $7.2 million in emergency funding. My colleague from Washington made a helpful suggestion. Senator GRAMS is coming back from Minnesota today. I believe we can do this together. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be laid aside, and when Senator GRAMS comes back, we will talk tonight. We will both come out together. He will join me.

I thank my colleague from Washington and my colleague from West Virginia as well for their support. It is terribly important to get this additional money to deal with the blowdown. I thank my colleagues.

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

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 4 minutes as in morning business.

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

NATIONAL WOMEN'S SMALL BUSINESS SUMMIT REPORT

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, on a number of occasions, I have come to this floor to talk about the importance of women-owned businesses. Women-owned businesses employ more than 27.5 million people and generate over $3.6 billion in sales and have grown by 103 percent in the past 4 years.

As one of the fastest growing segments of the economy, women-owned small businesses are essential to America's future prosperity, as well as the prosperity and the well-being of the individual communities and particularly the families of those women who own businesses.

In recognition of this growth and contribution to our economic life, I convened with a bipartisan group of policymakers a national women's small business summit entitled ''New Leaders for a New Century,'' which was held in Kansas City, MO, on June 4 and 5 of this year. The cosponsors of that conference were my ranking member on the Small Business Committee, Senator JOHN KERRY, along with Senators DIANNE FEINSTEIN, KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, OLYMPIA SNOWE, and MARY LANDRIEU.

Today I am very pleased to announce that we are releasing a report of the recommendations of the women who attended this summit. Copies will be available in every office. It will be available through the Small Business Committee, and later I will also ask that portions be printed in the RECORD.

Because the conference was designed to elicit directly the views, concerns, and policy recommendations of women business owners, we learned more about the obstacles women entrepreneurs face and the specific issues which are of the utmost importance to them.

It is interesting; what we learned is this: Despite the advances women have made in the entrepreneurial area, their top priorities remain, first, procuring their fair share of Federal contracts. We have already dealt with that on this floor, and in a bipartisan, overwhelming vote on a resolution said the Federal Government needs to live up to its legislatively mandated responsibility to set aside 5 percent of small

business contracts for women small business owners. They have not even come halfway to the goal.

Second, the women business owners who met with us are very much concerned about taxes. They said their top priority was getting rid of the death tax. Small business owners do not know when they will owe the estate or death tax or how much they will owe, so they have enormously high compliance costs.

A survey by the National Association of Women Business Owners found that the estate tax imposed almost $60,000 in death-tax-related cost on women business owners. That is not taxes imposed; that is how much it cost the average woman-owned small business to figure out what the death tax implication would be.

As a congressman colleague in Missouri once said, there ought be no taxation without respiration. That was the overwhelming view of the women in this conference.

In addition, the report outlines the women's views on what the Federal Government can do to help women entrepreneurs in areas such as access to capital, pensions and retirement, expanding markets, and health care. By asking women small business owners themselves to identify their professional concerns and make corresponding policy recommendations, we as policymakers, as legislators, should be able to craft our agenda much more effectively, and that agenda is oversight of the Small Business Administration and other Government agencies complying with the law, as well as legislative recommendations. This, we think, should facilitate even greater success on the part of current women small business owners and also offer incentives to more women to consider becoming business owners themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the conclusion of the report be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONCLUSION

The Summit participants were a diverse group of experienced women business owners who presented their candid views in response to the challenge from the Summit's sponsors. The participants' discussions focused on a vast number of wide-ranging issues and problems in seven areas confronting women-owned small businesses. There was no script directing the agenda. The Summit was participant-driven—the participants identified problems, they formulated solutions, and they put the recommendations in priority order.

Each participant brought a unique perspective to the Summit. One half of all participants had companies that had been in business for at least 10 years. Eighty-six percent of the women small-business owners were between the ages of 35 and 64. These seasoned executives and entrepreneurs brought years of experience to the table, and they are the best source for ideas on and solutions to the pressing problems confronting women-owned businesses in America today.

The issue singled out as the top priority by the Summit participants were Federal procurement. The participants at the highly attended Procurement session made a series of 13 recommendations. From this list, the participants' number one priority was that Federal agencies must begin awarding 5% of their contract dollars to women-owned small businesses. This 5% goal was established by Congress in 1994, and Federal agencies have failed to reach even one-half of the goal—2.5%—every year since the goal was enacted into law.

The second highest-ranked priority area for women business owners was the availability of capital, with a particular emphasis on their inability to raise equity investment capital. For start-up and fast-growing companies, the ability to raise equity capital is often critical to building a successful business. Equity infusions are designed to strengthen a company's balance sheet, which enables it to borrow money from banks and other commercial lenders in order to meet the company's day-to-day operating needs. The door to equity capital has been effectively shut and locked for the vast majority of women business owners.

The Summit's goal was to ensure that the recommendations from the participants receive serious scrutiny from the 107th Congress and the new Administration as they are sworn-in this coming January. New incentives should be developed in some areas to help women-owned small businesses continue to thrive. But in other areas, government must simply stay out of the way and let these entrepreneurs do what they do best—run successful companies. At the same time, the heads of Federal agencies need to be held accountable when their agency fails to do its part under the law, such as with the requirement that the Federal government must award 5% of its contracts to women-owned small businesses.

With all of the participants' specific recommendations in each of the respective topic areas, the Congress and the Executive Branch have a new mandate—listen to what women shall-business owners have said and answer their call to action. In that vein, this report will be distributed to every Member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives and to the President of the United States in order to ensure that the Summit's recommendations are in the forefront of what needs to be done to help small businesses. The major issues singled out by the Summit participants must be the focus of the Congress and the Administration as they work to support and assist women-owned small businesses, which are so critical to the continued economic prosperity of this country.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—Continued

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the committee, for allowing me this time. I thank the ranking member, Senator BYRD, for having done an excellent job on this bill. There are many items in the bill before us that I, along with the Senator from Wyoming, believe are very important. We wish them Godspeed.

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

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

THE GREENBRIER

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, tucked into a sheltered green valley in Southern West Virginia is a magical place, a place where fascinating history, natural majesty, and sumptuous comfort have combined since the first days of our nation's founding to create a spot that is justly world-renowned. That place, Mr. President, is called The Greenbrier, in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia. It has been a special place for several decades now, overflowing with game for the Shawnee Indians, a spa since colonial days, a place of high society idylls and balls, fought over during the Civil War, a World War II diplomatic internment site and then a rest and recuperation hospital for wounded soldiers, and a secret government relocation site—all cloaked behind the well-bred, white-columned face of a grand southern belle of a resort.

Mr. President, in May, my wife Erma and I celebrated our 63rd anniversary. Erma is my childhood sweetheart, the former Erma Ora James. We have written a lot of history together over the past 63 years, and I could not ask for a better coauthor.

This year, as we have in the last several years, we celebrated at the fabled Greenbrier resort in White Sulphur Springs. I am certainly not original in my inspiration to celebrate moments of marital bliss there—President John Tyler, the first President to be married in office, spent part of his 1844 honeymoon in White Sulphur Springs. Actors Debbie Reynolds and Eddie Fisher spent part of their 1955 honeymoon there, and Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy arrived at the Greenbrier on October 11, 1914, for a two-week honeymoon. Many, many, other famous names are inscribed in the Greenbrier's guest register. The history that Erma and I have created together is a blink of the eye compared to that of The Greenbrier, whose healing waters were first enjoyed by hardy colonists in 1778, as they had been by Shawnee Indians for untold years before that.

The Greenbrier has been a resort almost since the day in 1778 that Mrs. Anderson, one of the first homesteaders in the Greenbrier area of the ''Endless Mountains,'' as the region was identified on colonial maps, first tested the wondrous mineral waters on her chronic rheumatism. Word of Mrs. Anderson's recovery spread rapidly, and numerous log cabins were soon erected near the spring. The ''summer season'' at the spring was born, albeit in a somewhat primitive state.

Still, the fame of the spring along Howard's Creek continued to spread. Thomas Jefferson mentioned ''Howard's Creek of Green Briar'' in his

''Notes on the State of Virginia'' in 1784; that same year, George Washington focused the Virginia legislature's attention on the commercial prospects of the ''Old State Road'' running between the Kanawha River valley, through The Greenbrier's lands, to the piedmont and tidewater sections of Virginia. Along the route of today's roadway between the hotel and the golf clubhouse stands a monument to this vision. The Buffalo Trail monument commemorates the point at which the pre-colonial Indian Buffalo Trail crossed the Allegheny Mountains on its way from the Atlantic Coast to Ohio. This trail became the James River and Kanawha Turnpike, which for over a century carried commerce and development from the settled East to the future states of West Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri. By 1809, a tavern with a dining room, a barn, a stable, mills, and numerous cabins constituted a hospitable stopping place along the still-rugged route West. And rheumatism sufferers were joined at this watering hole by others more interested in the creature comforts and social interaction than in relieving joint pain.

By 1815, the first spring house was built over the spring head, and a thriving resort was attracting visitors who typically stayed for several weeks at a time. A hotel and many surrounding cottages, some quite sumptuous, were erected over the years. Commodore Stephen Decatur, hero of the Barbary Wars, brought his wife for a 16-day stay in 1817, and Henry Clay of Kentucky, Speaker of the House of Representatives, spent some time at White Sulphur Springs during several summers over some 30 years. The cool mountain breezes under the shelter of ancient oaks, combined with stylish fans and gentle rocking chairs on a shady porch, made the Greenbrier a comfortable spot in those sweltering summers before air conditioning.

In many ways, the Greenbrier has changed little over the years. The gracious sweep of lawn, the stately trees, the ranks of white cottages and imposing hotel facades hark back to that earlier era. Many of the cottages, most too sumptuous to be called merely ''cottages,'' have their own special histories. One of the cottages was owned by Jerome Napoleon Bonaparte, who was a nephew of the French Emperor. General John J. Pershing, Commander of the Allied Forces in World War I completed his memoirs in the cottage named ''Top Notch.'' Early morning horseback rides are still popular, and Erma and I recently enjoyed the romantic carriage ride through the grounds. Hunting, fishing, and even falconry are still practiced. But more golf courses, tennis courts, and swimming pools encourage a more active lifestyle than in those early days. The Greenbrier is justly famous for its golf and for the Sam Snead Golf School. Though I do not play, I still enjoy the beautifully landscaped courses with their wide sweeps of lawn and water dotted with sandy island obstacles. The partaking of the sulfur water, that elemental component of the original spa experience, is now complemented by health and beauty facilities and services that pamper every part of you. A visit to the Greenbrier has grown ever more restorative over the years.

Henry Clay, that great man from Kentucky, the State of the Senator who now presides over the Senate with a dignity and degree of charm and skill and poise as rare as a day in June, often visited at the Greenbrier, as I have said.

Henry Clay was an early political fan of the Greenbrier, surely the most gracious and comfortable stopping place on his many trips between Washington and his home in Kentucky. Other well-known figures and luminaries who visited the resort prior to the Civil War were Presidents Martin Van Buren, Andrew Jackson, Millard Fillmore, Franklin Pierce, and James Buchanan. I have already noted that President John Tyler honeymooned at the Greenbrier. Dolly Madison, Daniel Webster, Davy Crockett, Francis Scott Key, and John C. Calhoun, and many other political notables have also contributed to engrossing dinner conversations there in more recent years, including Senate greats such as Everett Dirksen, Sam Ervin, Jacob Javits, and Barry Goldwater. Other politicians preferred the outstanding golf at the resort, including President Eisenhower, President Nixon (as a Vice President), and Vice President Hubert Humphrey. President Woodrow Wilson has also graced the Greenbrier, though I do not know if he was a golfer.

The Greenbrier has always been a favorite spot of other celebrities, as well. The Vanderbilts, Astors, Hearsts, Forbes, Luces, DuPonts, and the Kennedys have sojourned there, as did Prince Ranier and Princess Grace with their children Albert and Caroline. The Duke and Duchess of Windsor danced the night away in the grand ballroom. Bing Crosby has sung there, and Johnny Carson, Steve Allen, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, Rudi Valle, Art Buchwald, Dr. Jonas Salk, Cyrus Eaton, and the Reverend Billy Graham have all made mealtime conversations there sparkle more than the crystal chandeliers in the dining room. Babe Ruth and Lou Gehrig are just two of the sporting greats who have autographed the guest register. Clare Booth Luce wrote the first draft of her most enduring play, ''The Women'', during a three-day stay in 1936. Like Tennyson's brook, the fascinating list of notables could go on and on forever. People watching—that is watching people—has always been a spectator sport at Greenbrier functions!

The Greenbrier has experienced trauma as well as galas. During the Civil War, the Greenbrier's location astride a strategic rail line into Richmond, Virginia, put her in the line of fire. Troops were billeted in her guest rooms, but both sides spared a favorite pre-war vacation site and fighting raged along the Greenbrier River. Being in what became Southern West Virginia, during the debate over succession in 1863, the Greenbrier's fate as a West Virginia or a Virginia citizen was uncertain. I am surely glad that West Virginia was the winner!

During Reconstruction, the hotel's healing waters also helped to heal the wounds of war, as grand society from both sides of the conflict continued to meet at the Greenbrier. General Robert E. Lee was a frequent visitor. In General Robert E. Lee's single post-war political statement, he led a group of prominent Southern leaders vacationing at the Greenbrier in drafting and signing what became known as ''The White Sulphur Manifesto'' of 1868. This document, widely reprinted in newspapers across the country, declared that, in the minds of these men, questions of secession from the Union and slavery ''were decided by war,'' and that, upon the reestablishment of self-governance in the South, the Southern people would ''faithfully obey the Constitution and laws of the United States, treat the Negro populations with kindness and humanity and fulfill every duty incumbent on peaceful citizens, loyal to the Constitution of their country.'' The war was truly over.

In 1869, one of the most famous photographs ever taken at White Sulphur Springs included Robert E. Lee and a group of former Confederate Generals, among them Henry Wise of Virginia, P.G.T. Beauregard of Louisiana, and Bankhead Magruder of Virginia. Other ex-Confederate officers who visited the resort were Alexander Lawton of Georgia, Joseph Brent of Maryland, James Conner of South Carolina, Martin Gary of South Carolina, and Robert Lilley of Virginia. Former Union General William S. Rosecrans visited General Lee while Lee was vacationing one summer at the Greenbrier.

The Greenbrier has served the nation well in two other wars, as well—World War II and the Cold War. At the outbreak of World War II, the hotel served as a rather gilded cage for several thousand foreign diplomats and their families, from Germany, Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, and, later, Japan. It was then taken over by the federal government for the Army's use as a rest and recuperation hospital for wounded soldiers, before returning, like the soldiers it housed, to civilian life.

Much has been made, in recent years, of the Greenbrier's secret life as a covert agent of the U.S. government. In 1992, the existence of an emergency government relocation center built secretly deep beneath the Greenbrier was revealed. The result of an extraordinary partnership between the CSX Corporation and the federal government, the bunker contained facilities to house and operate the entire United States Congress in the event of nuclear attack. It had its origin in plans created by President Eisenhower to ensure

the survival of the constitutional system of checks and balances. The President had to convince Congressional leaders, including Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson, to go along with the plan, which was carried out in the greatest secrecy for over forty years. The secrecy was necessary, because the bunker at the Greenbrier was not designed to withstand a direct hit, but, rather, to ensure security through a combination of physical design and camouflage. The remote shelter of the West Virginia hills proved a perfect combination of cover, concealment, and denial.

Now, the bunker is open to the public for tours. It is fascinating to see the level of detail that was included in the bunker, but it is also sobering to reflect upon the real fear of Armageddon that existed in this country during those years and which justified this kind of contingency planning. As you finish the tour and return to the sunlit world of golf, lazy country walks, luxurious settings, and fine dining that is the hallmark of the Greenbrier experience, it is difficult to recall those not-so-distant times when school children practiced hiding under their desks in the event of a conventional or nuclear exchange.

I encourage my fellow Senators, and, indeed, anyone listening, to visit the Greenbrier, to tour the bunker, and to relish the history and the service that are so much a part of this precious piece of West Virginia. Avoid the current high gas prices and road congestion, and take the train as so many have before you. Leave steamy, contentious, Washington behind for a time, and step out at the Greenbrier's rail depot wondering at the beauty, the cool breezes that smell of fresh, clean air and wildflowers. Allow yourself to be swept along by the attentive, unobtrusive service of an earlier age and be deposited in a bright, flower-bedecked room before a pre-dinner stroll about the grounds. You will be walking with the celebrities of the past as you write a wonderful new chapter in your own history.

I was mentioning the Amtrak train. My recollection went back to a time in England when the distinguished Senator from Washington, SLADE GORTON, and his nice wife Sally, and Erma and I rode the train from London up to York. Oh, my, what a wonderful time we had in York, visiting through the countryside with its narrow roads and its hedges and having our meetings with the British. Those were most enjoyable days and memorable ones.

But riding the train in itself is a real treat. I like to ride trains, and I know SLADE GORTON does, too. Has he ever told about his bicycle journey across the United States? He and his wife and their children traveled by bicycle, a bicycle odyssey, across the United States of America, all the way from the Pacific to the Atlantic. That would be something worth reading about. Better still, talk with him in person about it.

I close with the immortal words and images of the poet William Wordsworth, who lived from 1770 to 1850, when the Greenbrier was yet in its early days. But his lines eloquently capture the sights one can now happen upon when strolling through the magical grounds of this wonderful outpost of gentle civilization amid the mountains, and they capture the happiness such beauty inspires:

I wandered lonely as a cloud
That floats on high o'er vales and hills,
When all at once I saw a crowd,
A host, of golden daffodils;
Beside the lake, beneath the trees,
Fluttering and dancing in the breeze.

Continuous as the stars that shine
And twinkle on the milky way,
They stretched in never-ending line
Along the margin of a bay:
Ten thousand saw I at a glance,
Tossing their heads in sprightly dance.

The waves beside them danced; but they
Out-did the sparkling waves in glee:
A poet could not but be gay,
In such a jocund company:
I gazed—and gazed—but little thought
What wealth the show to me had brought:

For oft, when on my couch I lie
In vacant or in pensive mood,
They flash upon that inward eye
Which is the bliss of solitude;
And then my heart with pleasure fills,
And dances with the daffodils.

Like the Greenbrier, the forests in West Virginia.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 20 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I say to the Senator from West Virginia how much I appreciate that rendition and bringing us back to a better reality here from time to time.

I remember the comments by that same poet who once said:

Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers,
Little we see in nature that is ours.

I don't think anyone can ever say that about the senior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. He said, ''we lay waste our powers.'' But I can assure you that the Senator from Tennessee doesn't lay awaste his powers. He is a busy man, and he serves his country and his State in a great fashion.

I thank the Senator for his kind words.

Mr. THOMPSON. I appreciate that very much.

PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I rose on the floor on June 22 to address a matter of great concern to everyone, the issue of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

A couple of years ago, I was watching late night television and ran across a seminar being conducted by former Senator Sam Nunn. Someone asked him during a question and answer period what he considered to be the greatest threat to the United States of America. He mentioned terrorism and the new emerging threat of weapons of mass destruction.

A short time after that, I was watching the Charlie Rose Show late one night with former Secretary of State Warren Christopher. When asked the same question, he gave the same answer: That post cold war, we have not concerned ourselves perhaps very much with some of these issues but that we should, and there are emerging threats out there.

I think the Senator from West Virginia is contemplating a proposal that deals with this very issue.

I have been specifically concerned with that issue with regard to China for a couple of reasons: One, they continue to lead the nations of the world in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, according to our intelligence community; two, because we are now getting ready to embark on the issue of permanent normal trade relations with China.

Many of us are free traders; many of us believe in open markets; many of us want to support that. I think the majority of the Senate certainly does. Is there not any better time, and is it not incumbent upon us in the same general timeframe and the same general debate, that we couldn't, shouldn't, consider something so vitally important to this country as the issue of our nuclear trading partner, that we are being asked to embrace in a new world regime, that sits with us on the Security Council of the United Nations? Is it too much to ask of them to cease this dangerous proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the supplying of these rogue nations with weapons of mass destruction—be they chemical, biological, or nuclear—which pose a threat to us?

We are considering now the issue of the national missile defense system. Many people in this Nation, I think a majority of people in this Congress, are very concerned that we have no defense against such a terrorist attack, an accidental attack, an attack by a rogue nation with weapons of mass destruction, and that we need such a missile defense.

One of the primary reasons we need a national missile defense system has to do with the activities of the Chinese and their supplying of rogue nations with these materials, expertise, capabilities, military parts that have nuclear capabilities which we are so concerned that, by the year of 2005, could be turned against us. Must we not consider this as we consider permanent normal trade relations? As important as trade is, is it more important than our national security? I think that question answers itself.

I pointed out on June 22 that the Rumsfeld Commission reported in July

of 1998 that: China poses a threat as a significant proliferator of ballistic missiles, weapons of mass destruction, and enabling technology. The commission went on to say China's behavior thus far makes it appear unlikely that it will soon effectively reduce its country's sizable transfer of critical technologies, experts, or expertise to the emerging missile powers.

A little later, on June 22 of this year, the Far Eastern Economic Review reported:

Robert Einhorn, the U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Nonproliferation, left Hong Kong on June 11 with a small delegation bound for Beijing.

The article said:

Neither the American nor Chinese side reported this trip. Einhorn is on a delicate mission to get a commitment from Beijing not to export missile technology and components to Iran and Pakistan.

It went on to say:

. . . U.S. intelligence reports suggest that China may have begun building a missile plant in Pakistan. If true, it would be the second Chinese-built plant there.

If that article is indeed true, it would certainly be consistent with what we know about other Chinese activities. There is a recent report that there is growing Chinese support for Libya and their missile program. We know they have supported the Iranian missile program. We know they have supported the North Korean missile program. So those are some of the things we discussed back on June 22.

Let's bring ourselves up to date now. Just this last Sunday, Sunday a week, July 2, the New York Times reported:

American intelligence agencies have told the Clinton administration and Congress that China has continued to aid Pakistan's effort to building long-range missiles that could carry nuclear weapons, according to several officials with access to intelligence reports.

The story goes on to say:

. . . how China stepped up the shipment of specialty steels, guidance systems, and technical expertise to Pakistan . . . since 1998.

That is very recent activity. Shipments to Pakistan have been continued over the past 8 to 18 months, according to this story.

This, of course, would be in violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime to which the Chinese Government agreed to adhere. Strangely enough, weeks ago, our Secretary of State praised the Chinese for complying with the MTCR. It is pretty obvious now they are not complying. Some answers need to be forthcoming from the Secretary of State with regard to that.

But things are more serious than that because we now know, because of these recent developments and, perhaps, because of some of the issues we are considering in this Senate, the administration sent another envoy to the Chinese for 2 days of talks concerning some of these proliferation problems. On July 9, we got a report back from that latest trip, where our people went over there to plead with the Chinese to change their behavior at a time when we are about to consider permanent normal trade relations. We have gotten the results back. According to the New York Times on July 9, this visiting American official, who is Mr. J.D. Holum, adviser to the Secretary of State on arms control, said:

After 2 days of talks, the Chinese would not allay concerns about recent Chinese help for Pakistan's ballistic missile program.

He is quoted here as saying:

We raised our concern that China has provided aid to Pakistan and other countries . . .

That is according to Mr. Holum.

The article goes on to say:

Some Chinese arms experts say that China is unlikely to promise to end exports of missile technology anytime soon because such trade, or the threat of it, gives China a bargaining chip over the scale of American weapons sold to Taiwan.

Apparently, what the Chinese Government is saying is that as long as we assist Taiwan—which we are determined to do—for defensive purposes against the aggression of the Chinese Government, they are going to continue to assist these outlaw nations in their offensive designs that might be targeted toward the United States.

That bears some serious consideration. The Chinese Government is saying if you continue to be friendly with Taiwan and assist them in defending themselves against us, we are going to continue to make the world more dangerous for you and the rest of the world by continuing to assist these nations of great concern. We have to ask ourselves: Are we willing to acquiesce to that kind of blackmail? We have a policy with regard to Taiwan. It is well stated. Are we going to withdraw our support for Taiwan, which might assist in doing something about this proliferation? I don't think so. I would certainly oppose it. I think most every Member of this body would oppose that. So you can take that option off the table.

What are we going to do? The other option would be to continue to sit pat, continue our policy, and see the continued proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We will try to build a missile defense system that will catch them. While they are building up over there, we will build up over here.

There is a third option, of course. That is to tell the Chinese Government that, yes, we will trade with you; yes, we want to engage with you; yes, we will help you see progress in human rights and other issues; yes, we acknowledge you have taken a lot of people out of poverty and opened up your markets somewhat; yes, we will do all those things, but if you continue to do things that pose a mortal threat to the United States of America, we will respond to that in an economic way. There will be consequences to you.

It does not have to be directly related to trade. We can do some other things that would not hurt our people. For example, the Chinese have access to our capital markets. They raise billions of dollars in our capital markets. It is free and open to them. It is not transparent at all. We don't know what they do with that money. Some people think they use it to build up their army. But Chinese interests raise billions of dollars in our capital markets. Should we allow them to continue to doing that when they are supplying these rogue nations with weapons that are a threat to us? It makes no sense at all.

Must we read in the paper someday that the North Koreans or the Iranians, sure enough, have a missile and have the nuclear capability of send a nuclear missile to the United States of America?

People say: They know they would be wiped off the face of the Earth. We could retaliate and they would never do something like that. No. 1, we made a lot of mistakes in this country by assuming other people think the same way we do. No. 2, I am not sure we are always going to be able to detect the source of a missile such as that. The United States would not likely, as some people say—having it trip off their tongue so easily—wipe a nation off the face of the Earth unless we were absolutely sure. So there is no need to go down that road. We must do something on the front end that will ameliorate the possibility of our ever getting into that situation and that condition. That is why 17 of my colleagues and I have proposed a bill called the Chinese Nonproliferation Act, which basically calls for an annual assessment of the activities of the Chinese Government and Chinese Government-controlled entities within China, to see how they are doing on a yearly basis in terms of their proliferation activity. Then, if there is a finding that they continue their proliferation activity, the President has the authority to take action.

I believe that is the least we can do under the circumstances. Our bill has become quite controversial because many people think it complicates the issue of permanent normal trade relations with China. They do not want to do anything—No. 1, they say—to hurt our exporters. We have made changes. No one can arguably say our bill hurts U.S. exporters now. We don't want to hurt our agricultural industry. We have made changes to accommodate that concern. We are not designing this in order to hurt our agricultural industry, so that is not an issue anymore.

When you get right down to it, the opponents of this bill are primarily concerned about doing anything to agitate the Chinese at a time in which we are trying to get permanent normal trade relations passed. I don't think we ought to gratuitously aggravate them. But if we are not prepared to risk the displeasure of a nation that is doing things that pose a mortal threat to our national security, what are we prepared to do?

What is more important than that? I am not saying let's cut off trade with

them. I am not saying let's take action against them for precipitous reasons or reasons that are not well thought out. I am saying we must respond to these continued reports from the Rumsfeld Commission, from the Cox Commission, from our biennial intelligence assessments, from these reports from our own envoys coming back saying the Chinese are basically telling us to get lost. We know what they are doing, and they are apparently not even denying it anymore. And we are going to approve PNTR without even taking up this issue?

We are trying to get a vote on this bill. So far we have been unable to do so. I ask my colleagues to seriously consider what kind of signal we are going to be sending. We talk a lot about signals around here. I ask what kind of signal we are going to be sending to the Chinese Government, to our allies, to the rest of the world, if we are not willing to take steps to defend ourselves? A great country that is unwilling to defend itself will not be a great country forever.

I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, in less than 10 minutes, under the previous order, the Senate will move on to another subject. We have completed opening statements on the Interior appropriations bill. The two Senators from Minnesota have offered an amendment, and we have had notice of several others.

This is simply to announce to my colleagues that sometime tomorrow—I hope relatively early tomorrow—we trust we will be in a position to make a unanimous consent request stating that there is a deadline for the filing of amendments. I do believe we will be able to begin to discuss actual amendments fairly promptly tomorrow morning, but as the majority leader said, in the evenings from now on, we will move to the Defense authorization bill. So Members who wish their amendments to be considered should notify both managers as promptly as possible, should file those amendments as promptly as possible, and should begin to arrange with the managers for times relatively convenient to all concerned to bring them up.

The majority leader would like to finish this bill tomorrow. I must say that I join him fervently in that wish, a wish that is not, however, a prediction. Nonetheless, a great deal remains to be done this week. The more promptly Members can come to the floor with their amendments and see whether or not we can deal with them informally or whether they will require a vote the better off all Members of the Senate will be. It is doubtful we will get anything more accomplished between now and 3:30, however. So at this point I will suggest the absence of a quorum and will ask that it be called off at 3:30 so we can move to the next matter of business. 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. DASCHLE. Madam 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. Madam President, I will use my leader time to make a couple of comments.

SENATE AGENDA

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I welcome everyone back from our week away for the Fourth of July recess. I did not have an opportunity to talk this morning with the majority leader, and I understand he was able to come to the floor and indicate there is a lot of work to be done, and I share his view about the extent to which work should be done.

I hope we can work as productively this coming work period as we worked in the last work period. We had an arrangement that I think worked very well following an unfortunate confrontation prior to the time we went away for the Memorial Day recess. The cooperation and partnership that was demonstrated over this last work period is one that I hope we can model again.

I say that because I am concerned about the precarious way with which we are starting this week. Senator LOTT has filed a cloture motion on the motion to proceed to the estate tax, and then it is my understanding his intention is to file a cloture motion on the bill itself. I remind my colleagues that is exactly what got us into the position we were in prior to the Memorial Day recess. I hope we can work through that.

I have offered Senator LOTT a limit on the number of amendments to the estate tax bill and a time limit on the amendment. I am very disappointed that we are not able to do what we have been able to do on so many bills, and that is reach some sort of accommodation for both sides. We still have some time this week, and I am hopeful that will happen.

Let me also say that I am increasingly not only concerned but alarmed that we have yet to schedule a date certain for the consideration of permanent normal trade relations with China. I had a clear understanding we would take up the bill this month. Yet I am told now that at a Republican staff meeting today there was a good deal of discussion about the need to move it to September.

I inform my colleagues that we will ask unanimous consent to take up PNTR. If that fails, at some point this week, we will actually make a motion to proceed to PNTR by a time certain this month. We cannot fail to act on that issue any longer. We must act. So we will make that motion to proceed to PNTR if the majority leader chooses not to make the motion for whatever reason.

I will also say that, as he has indicated, there is a good deal of business left undone that, for whatever reason, has been blocked by some of our colleagues on the other side. We will want to address those issues as well.

We will offer a motion to proceed to the Patients' Bill of Rights. We will certainly want to do that, as well as prescription drugs, minimum wage, and a number of issues relating to common sense gun legislation, such as closing the so-called gun show loophole and dealing with the incremental approaches to gun safety that the Senate supported as part of the juvenile justice bill.

I will say, we will also want to move to proceed to the H–1B legislation that passed in the House overwhelmingly. We want to be able to offer amendments. We would like to take it up. It should happen this week; if not this week, next week. But we ought to take up H–1B as well.

You could call this week the ''Trillion Dollar Week,'' the Trillion Dollar Week because our Republican colleagues are choosing to ignore all of the legislation I have just noted, given the limited time we have, and instead commit this country to $1 trillion in two tax cuts relating, first, to the marriage penalty, which we are told by CBO would cost a little over $250 billion over a 10-year period of time; and the estate tax repeal, which, over a fully implemented 10-year period, costs $750 billion.

That is $1 trillion dealing with just two issues: the estate tax and the marriage penalty. It does not even go to the array of other tax-related questions that some of our Republican colleagues have addressed in the past. We could be up into $3 or $4 trillion worth of tax cuts if all of the tax proposals made by our Republican colleagues were enacted. But we may want to call this the ''Trillion Dollar Week'' if our Republican colleagues have their way: $750 billion on the estate tax; $250 billion on the marriage tax penalty—and, I will say, $1 trillion, with very limited debate, with no real opportunity to offer amendments, with no real suggestion about whether or not we ought to have at least the right to offer alternatives to spending that much money.

The Democrats believe very strongly in the need to ensure that small businesses and farms are protected and that the ability is provided to transfer small businesses and farms. But we can do that for a lot less than $750 billion. We believe very strongly in the importance of the elimination of the marriage tax penalty. But we do not have to spend $250 billion to deal with it.

In fact, the regular order right now is the marriage tax penalty. We have offered a limit on amendments, a limit on time on those 10 amendments. We could take it up and deal with it this week—or could have last week, last month, the month before. Instead, what our Republicans colleagues are doing—and, I might add, all the time calling for our cooperation—is saying: No, we are not going to do that. We are not going to give you relevant amendments on the marriage penalty. We are going to go to the first reconciliation bill so you can't have amendments. We are going to take up the bill that way. But we still want your cooperation.

Now we are told that we will have an opportunity to vote on cloture because we are given the same mandate, the same ultimatum, when it comes to amendments on estate taxes.

So let me end where I started. I really do hope that we can have as productive a time this coming month as we had last month. I thought it was a good month. But I must say, this is a precarious beginning with this Trillion Dollar Week. It is a precarious beginning when, with all of the people's business the majority leader referred to, we are not actually going to deal with the people's business. We are going to deal with 2 percent of the population affected by the estate tax, and we are going to deal with a marriage penalty bill that goes way beyond repealing the marriage penalty, that actually gives a bonus to some taxpayers, all the time denying Democratic Senators the right to offer amendments on other directions that we might take.

So I look forward to talking and working with the majority leader, and I look forward to a good and rigorous debate about all of the issues having to do with the people's business.

Mr. REID. Would the Senator yield for a question before he yields the floor?

Mr. DASCHLE. I would be happy to yield to the assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. I have listened to the Democratic leader outline what we have not been able to do. I fully support, as does the entire Democratic caucus, what the Senator is trying to accomplish. The one thing the Democratic leader did not mention, though, I say to my leader—there has been a tremendous furor from the Republican side about how they want to help the high-tech community, but the one thing that has not been accomplished is a simple little bill to change the Export Administration Act so our high-tech industry can compete with the rest of the world.

As we speak, we are losing our business position in the world in selling computers. We lead the world in building and selling high-tech computers. That is being taken from us as a result of four or five people on the Republican side who are holding up this most important legislation.

I say to my leader, I hope this is something on which we can also move forward. We would be willing to debate it for 30 minutes, for an hour. There is all this talk about helping the high-tech industry. In my opinion, the most important thing we could do is to get some attention focused on what has not been done regarding the high-tech industry. H–1B visas, of course, that is important.

On the airplane ride back from Las Vegas, I had the good fortune to read a book the Democratic leader has already read and told me how much he has enjoyed called ''The New New Thing.'' That book indicates how important it is that we have the people to do the work of this scientific nature. We need to change the H–1B. We agree there. But we also need to change our ability to have more exports to improve our balance of trade.

I close by saying, 44 Senators are willing to come in early in the morning, to stay late at night, to give up our weekends, to do whatever is necessary these next 3 weeks to move this legislation the Democratic leader has outlined.

Mr. DASCHLE. The assistant Democratic leader has made a very important point. The list I referred to certainly is not all inclusive. He listed one important omission; that is the export administration bill. In fact, I do not know of anyone who has put more time in trying to get that bill scheduled than the assistant Democratic leader. I thank him publicly for his willingness to try to find a way with which to bring this legislation up.

He is absolutely right. As we consider our huge deficit in our balance of payments, it is the only real black eye we have in an otherwise extraordinary economic record. As we consider that, I cannot think of anything more important than ensuring we stay competitive in the international marketplace today. There is no better way to do that than to address export enhancement legislation, as the assistant Democratic leader has noted.

I also say to the assistant Democratic leader, today, again, the president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Tom Donohue, has called upon the Senate to act. He has called upon the Senate to act on PNTR immediately. I am sure he would also call upon the Senate to act on the export administration bill.

But there is a growing crescendo of people out there concerned that this is a Senate which has done little, which has blocked the people's business, not enacted it. Prescription drugs, the Patients' Bill of Rights, the minimum wage, effective gun legislation, China PNTR, and H–1B—all of those ought to be done. All of those ought to be done this month. We will have very little time left when we get back after the August recess. So we have to make every day count. We want to work with the majority to make that happen.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MADELYN R. CREEDON, OF INDIANA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR DEFENSE PROGRAMS, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KYL. Madam President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 473, the nomination of Madelyn Creedon to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, under the terms of the consent agreement reached June 14.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Madelyn R. Creedon, of Indiana, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administration.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, it is my intention in a moment to ask unanimous consent to speak on a different subject. Perhaps Senator LEVIN would like to comment briefly. I know he has a more lengthy statement he would like to make at a later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my good friend from Arizona. I can withhold my statement. It is not that long, but I will be here in any event. I am happy to yield to Senator KYL for his statement on this or any other matter.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

THE DEATH TAX ELIMINATION ACT

Mr. KYL. Madam President, tomorrow the Senate is expected to vote on a motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the consideration of the House-passed Death Tax Elimination Act, H.R. 8. I want to take a few minutes today to explain a key element of that legislation, one that wasn't discussed much during the House debate but which I think is critical to Senators understanding actually how the legislation works.

The bill which passed the House on June 9 by a vote of 279–136—incidentally, 65 House Democrats joined Republicans in very bipartisan support for the bill—ultimately repeals the Federal estate tax. But the change in policy is really more substantial than just that. The details are very important because they offer a way for both

sides of the aisle to bridge past differences with respect to the estate tax, specifically with respect to how transfers at death are taxed.

Although it is true that H.R. 8, the bill that passed the House, would repeal the estate tax at the end of a 10-year phaseout period, the appreciation and inherited assets would not go untaxed. That is a very important point, Madam President. This is a departure from previous estate tax repeal proposals.

Under H.R. 8, a tax would still be imposed, but it would be imposed when the inherited property is sold; that is, after the income is actually realized, rather than at the artificial moment of death. The House bill, therefore, removes death from the calculation of the imposition of the tax. Earnings from an asset would be taxed the same whether the asset were earned or inherited.

The plan broadens the capital gains tax base by using the decedent's basis in the property to calculate the tax. That differs from current law where the basis can be stepped up to the fair market value at the time of death. In exchange for the broader tax base, a lower tax rate would apply. The capital gains tax rate would be the general rate that would apply.

I also note that a limited step-up in basis would be preserved to assure that small estates bear no new tax liability as a result of these changes.

What we have done is to ensure that nobody who would escape paying the estate tax would ever have to pay a capital gains tax on that amount of money, so everybody would be treated the same in terms of avoiding liability from any tax; and only those who choose to sell an asset at a later point in time, after the property is inherited, would pay a tax. They would pay a capital gains tax—a much lower rate than the estate tax—and they would have the benefit of an exemption even more generous from the estate tax today.

Here is how the bill would actually work. The estate tax would essentially be replaced by a capital gains tax. That tax would be imposed on the gain or the increase in value of the inherited property relative to its original basis or cost, plus any cost of improvements. As with the estate tax, as I said, there would be an amount of property exempt from taxation. In the case of the new capital gains tax, the exemption would be $1.3 million of gain. That is, the decedent's basis would be exempt, whatever that amount of money is, plus $1.3 million. That exemption would be divided among all of the heirs. Now, $1.3 million is the amount that can be currently shielded from the estate tax by family-owned businesses or farms. So we have provided a basic exemption here that is the same as the most generous exemption under today's law.

In addition to that, we provide an additional exemption. A surviving spouse will be entitled to $3 million more, in addition to the exemption I just mentioned; that means the decedent's basis—his cost of the property—plus $3 million for the property transferred by the decedent to him or her. For married couples, there is an additional $1.3 million in exempt gains that can be added for the second spouse, for a total exemption of $5.6 million above the decedent's basis in the property, $1.3 million for the first spouse, plus $1.3 million for the second spouse, plus $3 million for spousal transfers.

In each case, the exempt amount is added to the basis. It, of course, cannot exceed the fair market value of the property at the time of death. That is the way these exemptions add up. They provide a significant exemption from the payment of any capital gains tax even when the property was inherited and later sold.

Why is this change important? For one thing, it removes death as the trigger for the tax. That is the object that most of us want to achieve—to take death out of the equation. It is an artificial event. People are certainly not making plans based upon death. I don't think anybody can justify death being a taxable event. Ordinarily, we see taxable events as the earning of income, the gain of profit from an investment, the sale of property, and the result of income from that. Those are taxable kinds of events. Death is purely an artificial event which should not be a trigger for any payment of tax. In fact, we all appreciate that it creates a great hardship on families at the very time of death.

For example, frequently the owner of the business—the person who started the business—has to figure out at that very difficult time in their life how to pay the estate tax. Frequently, the only way to do that is actually to sell the business, sell the farm, or sell the assets in order to acquire enough liquid assets to pay the estate tax. It takes death out of the equation.

That is the first object of this. I think it is the most important.

But a tax would be imposed on the beneficiaries of an estate just as it would have been imposed if someone had realized a capital gain during his or her lifetime. The beneficiaries of an estate would not only inherit assets but they would also inherit the decedent's tax basis on that property. The trigger for the tax is, therefore, the sale of the assets and the realization of income. That is the appropriate time to levy a tax—not when someone dies.

Advocates of the death tax often note that it serves as a backstop for the income tax by imposing taxes at death on income that previously escaped taxation. They are referring to capital gains that have never been realized. It is theoretically possible for that to be the case, although it is ordinarily true that you have spent ordinary income to acquire an asset and you have already paid income taxes on that ordinary income. But for someone who may have come into property in some other way, there could theoretically be unrealized gains that would escape taxation, except for the proposal that we have.

It is true that under current law those gains, but for the estate tax, would go untaxed forever because of the step-up basis. In other words, under current law, you acquire the market value as of the date of death, and that is the value of the property. So if you later dispose of it, there is very little gain if you dispose of it quickly. But of course you have to pay a 55-percent or lower percent death tax on that property.

The House-passed bill addresses this concern of unrealized gains never being taxed head on. It not only eliminates the death tax but also the step-up basis. So unrealized gains will ultimately be taxed if and when the inherited property is sold off. Therefore, nothing escapes taxation.

This concept, I must confess, was one which I heard Senator MOYNIHAN talking about when I first presented the death tax repeal to the Finance Committee. There was some concern. While we all appreciate that it is not good tax policy to impose a tax at the time of death, there has to be some way to recapture a tax on these unrealized gains. This is the proposal that does that. Therefore, it is not only eminently fair but it conforms the tax policy for everyone—people who acquire a decedents' estate or people who simply earn money—and it doesn't contain this bad element of taxing at the time of death. Instead, when you make the economic decision to sell property you have inherited—if you make that decision—you know what the tax consequences are. You know how much income you are going to receive. You can figure out how much tax you are going to pay. If you decide to go ahead and sell at that point, then you pay a capital gains tax using the original basis. But it is your decision based upon your timing and your economic circumstance and not because of a fortuitous event of death.

It is interesting; President Clinton's fiscal year 2001 budget, on page 109 of the analytical perspectives, scores the existing step-up basis in capital gains and death at $28.2 billion in fiscal year 2001, and a total of $152.96 billion over 5 years. So elimination of the step-up basis as proposed in H.R. 8 can, therefore, be expected to recoup a portion of the revenue lost from the death tax repeal. That reduces the cost of the death tax repeal substantially.

To say it another way, when you eliminate the death tax altogether, you are eliminating all of that revenue. But if you come back and collect a capital gains tax using the original basis on any of the inherited assets that are later sold, the Federal Government is at least going to recoup some of that revenue. Will it be 40 percent? Will it be 30 percent? I don't know.

But it is interesting that the President's own people score the step-up

basis of capital gains at death at over $28 billion in fiscal year 2001. That is roughly the amount of the estate tax that is going to be collected.

So if you assume that all of the property would be immediately sold, then the Government theoretically would recoup all of that money.

That won't happen. Obviously, people will wait a while to sell assets. But the point is that it illustrates the Government is not going to have a total loss of revenue as a result of the repeal of the estate tax. There will be revenue coming in from the capital gains tax that replaces it.

I think whatever revenue losses are associated with repeal, of course, also needs to be put in perspective. This is the point that is most important to me.

The President's budget, on page 2, estimates that revenues for 2001 will amount to over $2 trillion, rising to $2.92 trillion—almost $3 trillion—by the year 2010, the year that the death tax repeal would actually be implemented. In other words, by 2010, the Federal Government will collect an additional $840 billion in just that 1 year. Surely, with an $840 billion surplus in just that tenth year that the estate tax is repealed, we can afford to eliminate this unfair tax and still satisfy pressing national needs with the additional $840 billion.

It is pretty clear when you put that in perspective that no one should vote against estate tax repeal on the basis that the Federal Government can't afford it. Clearly, it can afford it.

One final point: I call Senators' attention to a letter that should be reaching their offices from the National Association of Women Business Owners, or NAWBO as it is sometimes called. The organization is writing in very strong support of death tax elimination. They write that women business owners in the country employ one out of every four workers.

By the way, about half of the small businesses in the country are women owned. So this is a very important point to the National Association of Women Business Owners. It is one of the groups that very strongly supported us when we had the White House conference, and repeal of the death tax was No. 4 on the list of legislative items.

In any event, here is what they write with respect to the point that one out of over four workers, or about 27 million workers in the United States, are employed by women business owners:

When a woman-owned business has to be sold to pay the death tax, jobs are lost.

This was written by president Barbara Stanbridge and vice president for public policy, Sheila Brooks.

They say, ''on average, 39 jobs per business, or 11,000 jobs, have already been lost due to the planning and payment of the death tax.''

It is not only the payments that will suffer, but it is also the planning. The payments that go to the lawyers, estate planners, and insurance also increases expenses and results in job loss.

NAWBO projects on average 103 jobs per business—or a total of 28,000 jobs—will be lost as a result of the tax over the next 5 years.

Ms. Stanbridge and Ms. Brooks note that women businesses are just starting to grow. Many are first-generation businesses, and they have just begun to realize that, due to the death tax, their business will not be passed on to the next generation—at least not without a 55-percent estate tax and perhaps a 55-percent gift tax during life. Most of the businesses can't afford to pay the tax. As I said before, they are sold off frequently to big corporations that are not subject to the death tax.

Let me make this point.

I was asked by a reporter today what the original theory of death tax was. The reporter said it doesn't seem to make any sense. It doesn't make sense. But the original theory was they would prevent the accumulation of wealth. It was put in at a time when it was kind of the progressive or populist time, and there was a feeling that we should prevent the accumulation of wealth.

Let me give you a story of a friend of mine in Phoenix, AZ. He came to Arizona from New York and built a printing business. Eventually, he employed about 200 people. He was a very successful entrepreneur. A lot of people depended on Jerry Wisotsky, a pillar of the community, who contributed huge sums of money to all kinds of causes. He was a very rough and gruff guy on the exterior. On the interior, he had a heart of gold. He could not turn down any request for a charity in town. He was very generous. All of his family were. When he died, the family found that everything had been plowed back into the business—the latest of printing equipment and so on. He had no hard cash to pay the huge estate tax. They had to sell the business.

To whom did they sell it? It was some big conglomerate—a big German company, I think. But it was a big corporation.

So much for the death tax preventing the accumulation of wealth. It took a whole bunch of wealth from one family in Phoenix, AZ, and transferred it to a big international corporation.

It doesn't prevent the accumulation of wealth. It concentrates wealth in the big companies that end up being able to afford to buy the business—frequently at bargain basement prices. It is unfair. It is not good for communities.

I made the point about contributions of this one family. As I said, that family used to contribute to every charity in Arizona. They are still very generous, but they don't have the assets they used to have when Jerry owned the business. This argument that charities are going to suffer if we repeal the estate tax I know to be wrong.

I am waiting for the first executive director of some big charity organization in the community to come back to me and lobby against the repeal of the estate tax on the grounds that it will hurt contributions to charity. I will immediately call every member of that person's board of directors and say: Do you know what your hired person is lobbying for back here? They are lobbying to pay 55 percent of the estate tax to the U.S. Government because it might be an incentive to contribute more to their charity.

I think these folks will turn tail and go home. The reality is people who are big hearted will make big contributions, as the Wisotsky family, and they can do it if they have an income stream coming, rather than if they have to sell the business to somebody else.

I talked about the women-owned businesses. Minority-owned businesses are in the same position, which is why we have strong support from various minority business organizations. However, the point of repeal of the estate tax is it is in keeping with the American dream. The American dream is to work hard, be successful, and give your children a greater opportunity than you had. That is the American dream. The estate tax works counter to the American dream, the ability to pass on something to your children and grandchildren after you have worked very hard during your lifetime to save that money.

That is another point. The death tax penalizes savers. We talk about tax policy and trying to promote savings and investment. The estate tax is exactly contrary to that. On the one hand, the Federal Government seeks to encourage people to save through IRAs, Roth IRAs, 401(k)'s, education savings accounts, and lower tax rates on capital gains. Yet on the other hand, it penalizes savers upon their death with death tax rates as high as 55 percent.

Consider two couples with similar lifetime earnings. One spends lavishly during their lifetime and leaves only a small estate. That couple is not subject to the death tax. The second couple who foregoes lavish spending and sets money aside for family, for the future, for contingencies in the future—as the Government policy seeks to have them do—gets hit with a substantial tax on death degree. That is not right. It is not good tax policy or good national economic policy.

It is particularly not fair because there is a better way: Tax the gains when they are realized; don't tax at death. That is what the Death Tax Elimination Act is all about. I urge Senators to take a very close look at this when we have this issue of the cloture vote. Think very carefully about not allowing us to proceed. There is some notion that politically some people will want to use the death tax repeal legislation to offer all kinds of nongermane amendments to make whatever other points they may want to make. Everybody around here knows the Senate schedule is very tight. Everybody knows the death tax repeal is

extremely popular around the country. A very high percentage, 70 to 80 percent of the American people, support its repeal. It passed the House of Representatives. If everyone had been there, it would be a veto-proof vote. I believe it will be a veto-proof vote. It is pretty clear the death tax repeal is going to pass. It will be successful if it comes to a vote.

I don't know whether some people plan to play political games and use this vehicle to score political points on totally unrelated matters. I urge those Members to think very carefully about that strategy. If we are not able to get the clean version of the House bill, H.R. 8, to a vote, I will be standing on the floor pointing fingers at those people who have prevented the Senate from doing that. I think that is very fair. It is very appropriate.

The House of Representatives overwhelmingly repealed the death tax. The American people want it repealed. We will have an opportunity to consider it in the Senate. Those Senators who stand in the way of this, playing parliamentary games, using amendment tactics with amendments that are not germane to the estate tax, we are going to be on the floor pointing out the results of their efforts. If they stop this with those tactics, they will have to accept the consequences of their actions. It is fine with me to have people try to amend the bill. I don't think they will be successful. This bill, written by Chairman BILL ARCHER and Representative DUNN and others in the House of Representatives, including members of the minority, is very well put together. It reduces rates for the first 10 years and has a repeal at the end of the 10-year period. By then it is all gone. That should give everybody time to adjust to the fact that it is going to be repealed, however it will be repealed.

I hope my colleagues will not decide to try to derail the opportunity to repeal the death tax through a strategy either of denying cloture—in other words, the ability to bring the bill to a final vote on the floor of the Senate—or alternatively, to require the majority leader to agree to nongermane amendments, which obviously would sink the ship.

It is my understanding from talking to the majority leader today that he does not yet have an agreement to permit bringing the bill to the floor with a limited number of germane amendments, with a clear vote before the end of this week. If that can't be accomplished, we will have to move for cloture and we will have a cloture vote. I believe we will get cloture. When we do, then only germane amendments are allowed. There will be a vote by the end of the week. Members can't say they are for repeal of the death tax and then engage in tactics which prevent the Senate from ever getting to that vote.

Let me make a couple of other points. This is a very bipartisan approach both in terms of outside groups and the strong support we have had both in the House and in the Senate from Members on both side of the aisle. That is why I do not make a blanket action over who might use dilatory tactics. Many members of the minority are cosponsors of this legislation. When I originally developed this concept, Senator BOB KERREY of Nebraska was very supportive and immediately became a cosponsor of what is now known as the Kyl-Kerrey bill. We have 29 cosponsors. Frankly, we could have more. Nine are members of the minority party. The rest are members of the majority party.

Let me single out these members of the minority party who have been willing to support us. I am sure there will be more, but cosponsors include Senators BOB KERREY, JOHN BREAUX, CHUCK ROBB, BLANCHE LINCOLN, RON WYDEN, MARY LANDRIEU, MAX CLELAND, EVAN BAYH, and PATTY MURRAY. These are all Senators who I think have studied this and realize there is a tax on the unrealized gains incorporated in this bill, so it becomes a very fair bill just taking death out of the equation. I particularly thank those Senators for putting aside any partisanship in recognizing the importance of this repeal.

For those who are not totally familiar with the overall essence of the bill, let me describe the key elements of it.

As amended, H.R. 8 would, first, in the year 2001 convert the unified credit to a true exemption and repeal the so-called 5-percent bubble and expand the availability of qualified conservation easements. It would also repeal rates in excess of 53 percent in that first year.

Between 2002 and 2009 it would phase down the estate tax rates by 1 percent to 2 percent each year.

Third, in 2010 it would implement the Kyl-Kerrey language eliminating the death tax and implementing a carry-over-basis regime, as I discussed earlier.

Over the Fourth of July, I had occasion to attend some ceremonies and hear our Founding Fathers quoted. Of course Benjamin Franklin is always one of the most fun to quote, but he is one who, some 200 years ago, said: Nothing in this world is certain but death and taxes.

It should come as no surprise that after 200 years the Federal Government would find a way to put those two inevitabilities together to create a death tax which is not only confiscatory but also offensive to the American sense of fairness and also harmful to small business and to the economy. It was also harmful to the environment, and this is so because what happens is families find, in order to pay the tax, they have to sell land they would like to keep in the family for its environmental value. But they find they have to sell it to generate income. Inevitably what happens is the property is developed. That development is the reason why there are conservation groups who have also joined us in opposition to the estate tax and in favor of its repeal.

There is another point I want to mention. Opponents of our legislation say this only affects a few people. First of all, it is not true; it affects a lot of people. It is true in the end only a few people have to end up paying. But a lot of people have spent a lot of money preparing various tax shelters to escape the payment of the estate tax.

Who benefits, of course, are the lawyers and the estate tax planners and the insurance companies. I have nothing against any of those folks, but I don't think we need to create tax policy just to create jobs for lawyers. I am a lawyer. I know I always had plenty to do without having to get into this. So I don't think any of those folks would have real grounds for suggesting that in order to keep them in business we have to keep the estate tax. So it is not just the people who pay, it is also the people who have to try to avoid paying.

There is another thing. The Chair is well aware of this because she and I share the same concern about this problem, as a result of which I understand either tomorrow or Wednesday there is going to be a hearing before the Aging Committee, talking about senior citizens who end up getting bilked or scammed because of people who come to them and say to avoid the death tax they have to give them a bunch of money to set up some kind of trust to save their assets. Most of these people are people who would not have to pay the tax; their estates are just not big enough to be taxed. They fall within the exemption. But they are afraid. They have heard about this death tax and they are susceptible to these scams which take large amounts of money from them under the guise of estate planning which is not necessary for them.

So you not only have the people who have to pay the tax, you not only have the people who have to pay not to pay the tax, but you also have people who get scammed into paying some of these unscrupulous folks, setting up trusts they do not need because they would never be subject to the tax.

You also find—again I go back to the example I cited before—when businesses are sold, frequently jobs are lost, and those jobs are also affected, as I pointed out, by the reduced income from the businesses that have to prepare not to pay the tax. So it is just not true the tax only affects a limited number of people. In fact, I believe it was 3 years ago that we had the latest statistics for the amount of money spent to avoid paying the estate tax. It was almost exactly the same as the amount of tax paid in that particular year. In effect, it is a double taxation and a very inefficient tax when you have to pay that much money to avoid paying the tax.

Edward McCaffrey—I don't think he would mind me putting this label on him—who is a liberal, a professor of law at the University of Southern California, put it this way.

Polls and practices show that we like sin taxes, such as on alcohol and cigarettes. . . . The estate tax is an anti-sin, or virtue tax. It is a tax on work and savings without consumption, on thrift, on long-term savings.

He is exactly right. We may all be for sin taxes. But one of the reasons why the bulk of Americans, whether they will ever have to pay the tax or not, oppose the estate tax is they realize it is contrary to everything we believe in America. It is not a tax on sin; it is a tax on virtue—saving something for your kids when you die.

Let me also cite economists Henry Aaron and Alicia Munnell, making the very same point. Writing in a 1992 study, they said that death taxes:

[H]ave failed to achieve their intended purposes. They raise little revenue. They impose large excess burdens. They are unfair.

As I noted, opinion polls constantly show between 70 percent and 80 percent of Americans favor repeal of the death tax. When Californians had the chance to weigh in with a ballot proposition, they voted 2 to 1 to repeal their State's death tax. I think that is a very important point because that vote was very recent.

The legislatures of six other States have enacted legislation since 1997 that would either eliminate or significantly reduce the burden of their States' death taxes. In fact, the minority leader was here a moment ago. I note on the ballot in the home State of the distinguished minority leader, South Dakota, there will be a proposition this fall for the elimination of the death tax.

If you talk to the men and women who run small businesses around the country, if you talk to people who join in meetings, gatherings that I talk to all the time, you will find very strong support for repeal of the tax. Remember, it is a tax that is imposed on a family business when it is least able to afford the payment, on the death of the person with the greatest practical and institutional knowledge of that business' operations. That is the reason why so many businesses cannot make it to the second generation or the third.

I mentioned before the women- and minority-owned businesses. Instead of passing hard-earned and successful businesses on to the next generation, many of these families have had to sell their companies in order to pay the death tax. That certainly stops the upward mobility that is so important to some of these groups. It is why death tax repeal is supported by groups such as the National Association of Women Business Owners, the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, the National Black Chamber of Commerce, the National Indian Business Association, and the National Association of Neighborhoods.

This is a very wide spectrum of organizations representing a very broad spectrum of the American community. I cannot think of a policy that has come to the Senate in recent times that has a more broad appeal to it than the repeal of this very unfortunate and unfair tax.

I mentioned before the argument about concentration of wealth. I just want to go back to that for a moment. There is a February 2000 study by the National Association of Women Business Owners, the Independent Women's Forum and the Center for the Study of Taxation combined. It found the death tax costs female entrepreneurs nearly $60,000 on death tax planning, obviously money they could use to put back into their businesses. They report that 39 jobs were lost per business due to the costs of death tax planning during the last 5 years. Think about that. Women business owners report that the cost of death tax planning will create 103 new jobs per business in the next 5 years.

Think about that statistic. Most of the businesses we think about are much smaller than that to begin with, but we know small businesses can grow to 200 or 300 employees if they are successful. These numbers are staggering when you stop to think about the amount of job loss that results, just from the costs of planning to avoid the estate tax. It is an incredible statistic.

There is a June 1999 survey of the impact of the death tax on family business employment levels in upstate New York which found that the average spending for death tax planning was as much as $125,000 per company. Think of that. For the 365 businesses surveyed, the total number of jobs lost already as a result of the cost of death tax planning was over 5,100 jobs.

The average estimated number of jobs these businesses would lose over the next 5 years if they actually had to pay the death tax exceeds 80 per business, with the numbers of jobs at risk at a minimum of 15,000 jobs. This is just among something like 300 companies in upstate New York. These are staggering statistics. If you expand that to the rest of the country, it is impossible to argue that the estate tax is not my problem, that it is just for a few rich folks. It affects everybody in this country.

What it suggests to me is that although it is paid by only a small number of individual taxpayers, it has a disproportionately large negative impact on the economy. As someone said, it is the tax with the longest shadow of any on the books.

The adverse consequences are compounded over time, too. A December 1998 report by the Joint Economic Committee concluded that the existence of a death tax in this century has reduced the stock of capital in the economy by nearly half a trillion dollars.

Think about what a half of a trillion dollars of capital stock infused into the economy in the future could mean. These surpluses that are projected now would be expanded even more significantly because the growth in capital would obviously provide a lot more return on investment.

It is really staggering when one stops to think about the impact of this one tax and how pernicious it is, all the way from the individual minority-owned business to the economy of the United States losing half a trillion dollars in capital stock. Just think, by repealing the death tax and putting those resources to better use, the joint committee estimates that as many as 240,000 jobs could be created just over a period of 7 years. Americans would have an additional $24.4 billion in disposable personal income over that period of time. If we said to the American people: We have a great deal for you; how would you like another $25 billion in the next 7 years and all we have to do is repeal this tax that does not bring in revenues to the United States proportionate to the cost that it imposes on the economy, I think they would say that is a very good deal.

It seems to me almost all of the arguments for those who used to favor the tax have been pretty well laid to the side, and the only question now is how we are going to get this to a vote in the Senate and how we are then going to be able to send it to the President.

I mentioned the cost to the environment a moment ago. Maybe those who have in mind offering amendments would like to consider this for just a moment: An increasing number of families who own environmentally sensitive lands, as I said before, have had to sell property for development to raise the money to pay the death tax, which destroys natural habitats as a result. With that in mind, Michael Bean of The Nature Conservancy observed that the death tax is highly regressive in the sense that it encourages the destruction of ecologically important land. So maybe folks who were planning to speak in opposition to this would like to take that into consideration.

Because it tends to encourage development and sprawl, a lot of environmental organizations have endorsed its repeal. Among those organizations: The Izaak Walton League, the Wildlife Society, Quail Unlimited, the Wildlife Management Institute, and the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

Incidentally, pending repeal in 2010, as I noted before, H.R. 8 expands the availability of qualified conservation easements, which is something I am sure all of these conservation organizations support.

For all of these reasons, it is going to be very hard to explain why we would not support repeal of this tax. It overwhelmingly passed in the House of Representatives.

The repeal portion of the death tax recaptures taxes on unrealized gains, something that had been a problem for some Members of the other side of the aisle. I understand why, and I was happy to include that compromise in this legislation, and Representative ARCHER did the same.

In the meantime, it enhances conservation easements, reduces rates. I really cannot think of a good argument against this. And yet constituents may ask: Why can't you get it to a vote? Why do you need to worry about this?

The reason is, frankly, because of the rules of the Senate, any Senator has the ability to raise nongermane matters until we have had a cloture motion voted on and approved. There are those who would like to take advantage of this opportunity to raise their favorite issue in that way. If enough people do that with these nongermane riders which we have all heard so much about, it can sink the ship that otherwise would carry the legislative business to the President for his signature.

I hope that will not happen. I hope very much we can reach an agreement to quickly take up and consider any amendments and then vote for the repeal of the estate tax, vote for the House-passed bill, H.R. 8. I hope we can do that tomorrow at the very latest. If we cannot, then obviously we are going to have to file cloture and have that vote on Thursday.

I encourage all of my colleagues to look at this legislation very carefully because there is some misinformation about it. I know I talked for some time today, but hopefully I have been able to answer some of the questions that have been raised in my remarks. I stand ready to work with Senators who want to understand better exactly what we are trying to do here, what the effect of it will be, and what the many organizations are that support this legislation because they are significant. I certainly hope they will make their feelings known during the course of the next few days, too, because it is important for our colleagues to understand the depth and breadth of support for repeal of the estate tax.

I conclude by thanking Senator LEVIN, again, for allowing me to take this time and to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 8, to agree to a time agreement that will enable us to take it up in a timely fashion, to get it disposed of with germane amendments as quickly as possible so we can have a vote on repeal sometime this week.

That is something the American people would feel very proud we accomplished. Everyone can go back to their constituencies and brag about it. It is not partisan; it is bipartisan. Republicans cannot brag they did it all alone because many Democrats in the House made it possible with a veto-proof margin. Without the support of our Democratic colleagues in the Senate, I know we would not have gotten this far today.

I am very hopeful people on both sides of the aisle will see not just the fairness of it but the political benefit in responding to our constituents, which is, after all, what we are supposed to be doing around here. We know they would like to see repeal, and I think it is time for us to show them we can get something done here; we can do this and not hide behind all of the usual parliamentary maneuvers that are so common in the Senate.

I am very hopeful we will be able to finish this bill by the end of this week, send it on to the President, and go back to our constituents and say we did something very important for them: We repealed the death tax.

I thank the Chair, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF MADELYN R. CREEDON, OF INDIANA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR DEFENSE PROGRAMS, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—Continued

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the nomination of Madelyn Creedon to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administration.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I am pleased to come to the floor today and support the nomination of a very talented and a highly qualified member of the Armed Services Committee staff to be the Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs of the newly created National Nuclear Security Administration.

Madelyn Creedon has served her country for her entire professional life in a variety of important national security positions. She has served as Associate Deputy Secretary of Energy, working closely and directly with Deputy Secretary Charles Curtis. She was the general counsel for the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, and she has served as minority counsel to the Committee on Armed Services and counsel under my predecessor, Senator Sam Nunn. She spent 10 years as a trial attorney in the Department of Energy.

Madelyn Creedon's nomination for this important position was unanimously reported to the full Senate by the Armed Services Committee on April 13. After working with her for more than 8 years on the Armed Services Committee, I know firsthand of her extraordinary understanding of the national security programs of the Department of Energy and of her passionate commitment to the success of these programs and to the national security of the United States.

There are few people who have Madelyn Creedon's depth of experience and her knowledge in the nuclear weapons programs of the Department of Energy.

Last month the Senate confirmed the nomination of Gen. John Gordon to be the Under Secretary of the Department of Energy and the head of the new National Nuclear Security Administration. All of us are aware of the significant challenges General Gordon is facing in this position. The Administrator of the new National Nuclear Security Administration is responsible for maintaining the safety, security and reliability of our Nation's nuclear warheads; for managing the Department of Energy laboratories; for cleaning up some of the worst environmental problems in the country; and for addressing security problems that continue to undermine pubic confidence in the Department of Energy. As one of the senior deputies in the National Nuclear Security Administration, Madelyn Creedon's knowledge and experience in all of these areas will be of great assistance in helping General Gordon address the challenges he is facing.

I had a discussion with General Gordon last week. He told me that he wants Madelyn Creedon to be his deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, and he is anxious for Madelyn Creedon to get to work as his Deputy Administrator.

Madelyn Creedon is well known and respected by Senators on both sides of the aisle. Prior to her confirmation hearing in the Armed Services Committee, Senator WARNER and I received a letter from Senator LUGAR. I would like to quote just a few sentences from Senator LUGAR's letter:

> As you know, Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of U.S. nonproliferation efforts in the former Soviet Union. These programs have continually garnered bipartisan support because of the outstanding efforts of dedicated Members of Congress and staff on both sides of the aisle. Madelyn's efforts in this area have made tremendous contributions to the successful implementation of these important programs. Her oversight and legislative analyses of these programs have improved our country's national security. I am confident that she will provide the same level of expertise and dedication if confirmed as Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs at the Department of Energy.
>
> It is with great enthusiasm that I offer my strong support for Madelyn's nomination, and I am hopeful that members of the Armed Services Committee and the full Senate will concur.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Senator LUGAR's letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEVIN. If confirmed today, I understand that Madelyn Creedon will be the first woman to be placed in charge of the safety and reliability of America's nuclear deterrent. I cannot imagine any individual who would be better qualified to handle this awesome responsibility. We will miss Madelyn Creedon on the Armed Services Committee, but I think we all know that the committee's and the Senate's loss will be the country's gain.

In closing, I first thank Madelyn Creedon for her dedicated service on the staff of the Armed Services Committee. I congratulate her on her nomination by the President to this important position in the Department of Energy. Finally, I thank Madelyn Creedon for her continued willingness to serve the country. And I thank her family—her husband Jim, her daughter Meredith, and her son John—for their sacrifices in supporting her in this demanding position.

EXHIBIT NO. 1

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, DC, April 11, 2000.

Hon. JOHN WARNER,
Chairman,
Hon. CARL LEVIN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND SENATOR LEVIN: I regret that I am unable to appear before your committee today to introduce a fellow Hoosier and offer my support for the nomination of Madelyn Creedon to the position of Deputy Administrator of Defense Programs at the Department of Energy. My responsibilities as Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee have required my presence at an important oversight hearing.

It is always a source of great pride to see Hoosiers making valuable contributions to our country's security. Madelyn has an outstanding record of service to the U.S. government. She has served with distinction as Associate Deputy Secretary for National Security Programs at the Department of Energy, as General Counsel for the Base Realignment and Closure Commission, and here in the Senate as Minority Council of the Senate Armed Services Committee. It has been in the fulfillment of this last assignment that I have had the opportunity to observe and work with Madelyn.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of U.S. nonproliferation efforts in the former Soviet Union. These programs have continually garnered bipartisan support because of the outstanding efforts of dedicated Members of Congress and staff on both sides of the aisle. Madelyn's efforts in this area have made tremendous contributions to the successful implementation of these important programs. Her oversight and legislative analyses of these programs have improved our country's national security. I am confident that she will provide the same level of expertise and dedication if confirmed as Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs at the Department of Energy.

It is with great enthusiasm that I offer my strong support for Madelyn's nomination, and I am hopeful that members of the Armed Services Committee and the full Senate will concur.

Sincerely,

RICHARD G. LUGAR,
United States Senator.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOMENICI. It is good to see you, Madam President, and to be back today. I just arrived from New Mexico, which accounts for my failure to put a more conventional tie on, but if I took the time to do that I would have missed an opportunity to speak on this issue.

I am going to take a few minutes to discuss the way I see the matter, the pending nomination of Madelyn Creedon for Deputy Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration for Defense Programs.

Let me start by suggesting that everyone should know, and I believe the nominee understands, that she does not work for the Secretary of Energy. She works for the new National Nuclear Security Administrator for Defense Programs within the Department of Energy. We might hearken back to only a few months ago when we had a very lengthy, multiday debate with reference to what we should do to reorganize the Department of Energy in the aftermath of the Wen Ho Lee incident, and a very major report by the President's most significant security group headed by former Senator Warren Rudman of New Hampshire.

They recommended, and we adopted by law, a total reorganization within the Department of Energy of the matters that pertain to nuclear weaponry and nonproliferation on the basis that the Department of Energy had been built up just topsy-turvy and we had, within a very dysfunctional multilayered department, a most, most significant American concern, to wit: the nuclear weaponry of America. Believe it or not, a Department called Energy is in charge of the nuclear laboratories that produce all the science with reference to nuclear weapons and the three or four sites within America that used to produce weapons when we produced them. They are now part of a very dramatically changed effort called science-based stockpile stewardship, which means we are going to make every effort to make sure our nuclear weapons are safe and secure without ever doing another nuclear test. We are trying diligently to do that.

Now we have a new department within the Department. Let me repeat that, because we are having so much difficulty getting out the message that we have already created a new entity, just let it start working. It is called the National Nuclear Security Administration. It is a hard name. In fact, I remembered it by carrying around to hearings a coffee cup that had ''NNSA'' on it. Then I was able to remember the name. But across the country they were all asking about 6 weeks ago: What are we going to do in the aftermath of Wen Ho Lee, finding some other secrets that had been misplaced in very peculiar circumstances?

The first thing we ought to say is that we have already done something about it. We have created a semiautonomous agency that, in the not too distant future, will be running all of that. We have already selected the person in charge, thank God, a very distinguished general—that means he is a four-star—who was with the CIA, worked at Sandia National Laboratories and was an adviser to two Presidents on security. He has agreed to take this job. In other words, he will be running, within the Department of Energy, under his own power, all the nuclear weapons activities. This nominee will work for him.

It was very important that we find out, since he did not select her, whether he wanted her for this job. I would think that would be the most logical question we would have; if the new man, General Gordon, who is going to run this, was not part of her selection and she was going to be his deputy, we surely ought to ask: Do you want her?

So I am first reporting to the Senate that I had a responsibility of finding that out, because she also wanted to know.

I can report to the Senate that he said: As matters are going now, I would not want to stand in the way—in fact, I will support her confirmation by the Senate. So let's not expand much on that. Let's just say that the man for whom she will work, because he is going to be in charge of all this—she is not going to be working for the Secretary of Energy—has said: OK, even though I did not pick her, let's try her.

I also want to tell the Senate that she had a lot to do, staffwise, with opposing this new law. She was the one helping Senators who opposed the creation of the National Nuclear Security Administration. So I have talked with her at length and I have said: Will you enforce this law? And she said: I will.

Do you understand, you are working for the general who runs the new National Nuclear Security Administration?

She said: I do. I work for him. I will try to help him be a success.

Do you understand that the Secretary of Energy has created a number of positions that violate this law, to wit: He has put dual-hatted some people to work for him and the new man, when Congress did not intend that?

They intended that all the people who worked for the general worked only for him, not the Secretary; that there not be 10, 12, 14 people who worked for both of them.

She said: I understand that.

He said: Did you hear the Secretary of Energy say he would fight that no longer?

She said: I did.

Did you hear him say he would support amendments to totally clarify this so there are no dual-hatted people who worked for both the Secretary of Energy and the general in charge of trying to create some decent management within our nuclear weapons complex, including the laboratories and the manufacturing centers and the nonproliferation activities that go with the laboratories?

She said she understands that.

Everybody seems to be on board.

The problem is the general was just sworn in. There were a few months of

delay for various reasons, not the least of which was that right after signing the bill into law, the President and Secretary of Energy, Bill Richardson, did not seek to implement the law very quickly. As a matter of fact, they went very slowly.

We are now at a point where the general is in office, and he needs to build his team. She will be part of his team. If Senators are worried about whether she will work in that regard, they can vote for her or against her. I did not come to the floor to fight her nomination because I satisfied myself that she understood the law and pledged to enforce it and understood she worked for the general, not for the Secretary of Energy, for the foreseeable future. I do not know how long she will be in office. I do not know how long he will be in office, although we intend to make his term a 3-year term.

With that, and given this background, I will vote for her. I am clearly of the opinion she has sufficient talent and expertise based on background and who she worked for and what she did. I do say it will be very challenging, based on her experience, for her to truly help this general make this work because she will be working for him, a very distinguished American retiring from the Air Force where he was a four-star general to undertake this job. It was a true act of patriotism on his part. He decided to take one of the most challenging jobs in Government, hardly understood as of today. But I assume that if it all works out, he will be very well known in a few years. If it really works out, he will be known for having set the nuclear weapons part of our Government on the right path, with the right management, not only with reference to security—for that will be his job also—but he will set it on a management path that something as refined as our nuclear weapons should have in place for the American people.

That has not been the case. There have been at least three major studies just crying out for us to fix this, the last one done by the President's board on national security matters, headed by Warren Rudman with four other distinguished Americans, recommended this, and we helped draft the first law. We had five chairmen on the Republican side sponsoring the legislation which worked its way through the Senate and through the House and has now created this semiautonomous agency that I just described to the Senate and to those who are interested in where the security is going to come from for the nuclear weapons complex and our laboratories.

We have created a whole new management effort. It is not going to be setting new boxes within the Department of Energy, which I have predicted will never work, but rather a total semi-independent agency with its own national administrator who will have total power and control.

For those who are fearful of this, we have indicated on the environmental side that they must comply with NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act. But as to other rules and regulations, it is clear they can make their own, consistent with good judgment, preserving and protecting the safety of our nuclear weapons and preservation of these great National Laboratories.

We banter around the security problems that have occurred, but everybody knows, since the Manhattan Project, we have always had the best—not the second best—we have had the very best laboratories in the world in charge of our nuclear designs, the nuclear weapons breakthroughs, and Los Alamos has always been the leader.

They are having problems. Instead of saying, here are new rules we are going to pass in Congress, let's just make sure we are going to give the new administrator of that semiautonomous agency, General Gordon, everything he needs to take it out from under the dysfunctional Department of Energy and run it in a semiautonomous manner as described by law.

Madelyn Creedon will be a big part of that. I came to the floor to speak so she will know that many of us have a genuine interest in this working, and we will have our minds and ears and eyes wide open and paying attention, and the Secretary of Energy knows we will, too. We want this general to have as much as he needs to do this job right. She will be his first assistant. Everybody should understand it is a big job.

I do not need anymore time. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE). The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, first, I thank my good friend from New Mexico for support of the Creedon nomination. It is important his support be there and his voting for her is a very significant step on his part. I know how deeply involved he is in the issue and how hard he fought for the creation of the semiautonomous agency, the National Nuclear Security Administration. She has satisfactorily assured him and all of us she will fully carry out this law.

As a matter of fact, when she was helping the staff when this bill was in the Senate, she helped us work out the bipartisan bill that passed the Senate by a vote of 97–1. The good Senator from New Mexico was very much in the forefront of that effort to create the bipartisan effort that we successfully created in the Senate. Again, there was only one vote against the bill as it passed the Senate, and she helped us perfect that bill. I want to give her some credit.

Perhaps even more importantly, the responsibility of whatever bumps that have been along this road are ours, not hers, because she staffs us. Just the way we want her to be the right arm of General Gordon, so she has been staffing us as well and carried out that role very well.

We are, as Senators, responsible for our staff's work. If there is disagreement on this with some of the difficulties in creation of this particular semiautonomous agency or in the way it has been implemented, those disagreements lie with the Secretary of Energy or, to the extent they are legislative, lie with perhaps some Senators but not surely with our staffs who are carrying out our wishes, as we want and expect her to carry out General Gordon's wishes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, can I make sure the Senator from Michigan and I have one thing clear because he has been so honest with me once we got past this problem? We are both going to see to it, to the best of our ability, that the semiautonomous agency, as created by law, is carried out. He told us that the other day when he was meeting with Republicans.

I am very pleased because I think we all have to watch it. Clearly, General Gordon is going to need a lot of help. I think the Senator from Michigan would concur it is not easy to set up a semiautonomous agency within the Department of Energy. He told us: Let's go. And so did Senator LIEBERMAN: Let's get it done. Is that a fair assessment?

Mr. LEVIN. It is a fair assessment, and I think General Gordon is ready to have Madelyn there assisting him and will be a big boost. That is what he told me on the phone. The Senator from New Mexico recounted a conversation with General Gordon. I had a similar conversation with him. I wanted to be sure he truly wanted Madelyn Creedon because he was not the administrator at the time that nomination was forthcoming. I wanted to be sure he was, in fact, desirous of having her as his deputy, and he is so desirous and very much supports the nomination. We now can proceed to that vote, and, hopefully, she will receive an overwhelming vote of support.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of Ms. Madelyn Creedon, who has been nominated by the President to become the Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs of the new National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) at the Department of Energy.

Ms. Creedon has a distinguished career with broad and deep experience regarding Department of Energy defense programs over which she will have oversight and management responsibilities in her position as ''second in command'' at the NNSA.

My colleagues should be aware that before joining the staff of the Armed Services Committee in 1990, Ms. Creedon worked for ten years with the Office of the General Counsel at the Department of Energy (DOE).

She returned to DOE after serving as counsel to the Armed Services Committee during 1990 through 1994 during which time she had oversight and review responsibilities of DOE national security and environmental programs.

At DOE, Ms. Creedon served as Associate Deputy Secretary of Energy for

National Security Programs from 1995 to 1997 when she resumed her position on the Armed Services Committee, once again with oversight responsibilities for DOE defense and environmental programs.

In short, Mr. President, Ms. Creedon's professional credentials for this position are impeccable.

Let me add, Mr. President, that I have worked closely with her during the past several years in my capacity as ranking member of the Strategic and Emerging Threats Subcommittees of the Armed Services Committee.

I've found Ms. Creedon to be fully knowledgeable about the issues we have discussed, and to be a person of sound judgment regarding possible solutions in the interest of improving our national security.

Her professional capabilities and commitment to public service and national security are plain to see for all of us on both sides of the aisle who have worked with her.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of Ms. Creedon's nomination to assume this important new position as Deputy Administrator to NNSA. Her experience and know-how will be key to ensuring a smooth transition to a successful NNSA.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I inquire either of the Chair or Senator LEVIN, is there time remaining or is the vote scheduled to occur right at 5:30?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is time remaining; 4 minutes on the Republican side.

Mr. KYL. In that event, Mr. President, I would like to conclude with some remarks in opposition to the nominee.

With all due respect to Senator LEVIN—he knows I have the utmost respect for him—I believe Madelyn Creedon is not qualified for this very important position, one of the most important positions in our Government. She has never held the kind of positions, as her predecessors have, that would qualify her to head this particular agency.

The Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs has the direct authority over the Directors of the three National Laboratories, the head of the Nevada Test Site, and the heads of the four nuclear weapons production facilities. This is the person who is in charge of our nuclear weapons production facilities, as well as the nuclear weapons laboratories and programs.

While Ms. Creedon has worked as Senator LEVIN's counsel, before that and in between working for Senator LEVIN, she has also served as general counsel on the Base Closure Commission. She also served for a little over a year as an assistant to the Deputy Secretary of Energy. And she was counsel for special litigation at the Department of Energy from 1980 to 1990.

She has never had the kind of educational background or administrative background that would qualify her for this position. The Deputy Administrator will be called upon to manage numerous large and very technically complex projects that are expanding the limits of America's scientific knowledge. Experience in managing large organizations and a technical background are highly desirable.

The previous holder of this position, for example, Dr. Victor Reis, has a Ph.D. in physics and previously headed the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency—or DARPA, as we know it—and also served as Director of Defense Research and Engineering at the Department of Defense.

We have known for a long time that our nuclear weapons program has had great problems. With the appointment now of General Gordon to head the security side of this program, as Senator DOMENICI has just talked about, I think it is important that we have somebody really well qualified as the Deputy Administrator. I do not believe it is accurate to say that Ms. Creedon is his nominee. I think it is accurate to say he has no objection to her nomination.

But as was pointed out, her nomination was made prior to the time he took his position. While I am certain that her nomination will be confirmed here today, I think for those of us who believe very strongly in national security, a strong nuclear weapons program, and a future that will ensure that our weapons are safe and reliable, it requires us to vote ''no'' on a nomination which is clearly inferior.

There are 50 people who could readily be identified who have far superior qualifications to serve in this highly technical, very important post. For that reason, again, with all due deference to Senator LEVIN, and with deference to the nominee, I will be voting ''no'' and urging my colleagues to do the same.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Do I have 1 minute left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 11 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I will just use one of my minutes to fill in part of the record, and then we want to proceed to a vote.

Madelyn Creedon has also served as Associate Deputy Secretary of Energy for National Security Programs. It is a very important part of her background where she worked directly with then-Deputy Secretary of Energy Charles Curtis. In addition to being minority counsel for the Armed Services Committee, she served as counsel under my predecessor, Senator Nunn, when he was chairman of the committee.

So there are some additional important facets of her experience. As the Senator from Arizona mentioned, and as the Senator from New Mexico mentioned, General Gordon, who is the new person to run the agency, to run this new semiautonomous entity, specifically told me not just that he has no objection, but he supports her being both appointed and confirmed, and he had no objection to my putting it that way.

So the person for whom we have voted and confirmed overwhelmingly to run this semiautonomous agency is anxious to get her on board and very much supports her nomination and confirmation.

With that, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield back any time we might have. I understand we will proceed to vote when time is yielded back.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Madelyn R. Creedon, of Indiana, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administration? The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Abraham	Domenici	Levin
Ashcroft	Dorgan	Lieberman
Baucus	Edwards	Lugar
Bayh	Feingold	Moynihan
Bingaman	Feinstein	Murray
Bond	Gorton	Reed
Boxer	Graham	Reid
Breaux	Hagel	Robb
Bryan	Hollings	Rockefeller
Burns	Hutchison	Roth
Byrd	Inouye	Sarbanes
Chafee, L.	Jeffords	Schumer
Cleland	Johnson	Snowe
Collins	Kennedy	Stevens
Conrad	Kerrey	Thurmond
Daschle	Kohl	Warner
DeWine	Landrieu	Wellstone
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wyden

NAYS—30

Allard	Cochran	Frist
Bennett	Coverdell	Gramm
Brownback	Craig	Grams
Bunning	Crapo	Grassley
Campbell	Enzi	Gregg

Hatch	Mack	Shelby
Helms	McConnell	Smith (NH)
Hutchinson	Nickles	Smith (OR)
Kyl	Roberts	Thomas
Lott	Sessions	Thompson

NOT VOTING—16

Akaka	Kerry	Santorum
Biden	Leahy	Specter
Durbin	Lincoln	Torricelli
Fitzgerald	McCain	Voinovich
Harkin	Mikulski	
Inhofe	Murkowski	

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. LOTT. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, what is the pending business now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Interior appropriations bill, H.R. 4578.

Mr. LOTT. I believe we are working to go forward tonight on the Defense authorization bill. I see the managers are on the floor, the chairman and ranking member, and I presume that will be something we can do around 6:30 or 7 o'clock.

I will check with the managers of the Interior appropriations bill and see if there is any further business they need to do on that bill tonight before we go to Defense authorization.

I see the distinguished Senator from West Virginia on the floor. As one of the managers, does Senator BYRD know if there is further business on the Interior appropriations bill tonight?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in talking a little earlier with the distinguished Senator from Washington, Mr. GORTON, he indicated to me that we had completed our work today on that bill and we would be back on it tomorrow. I assume he did not anticipate anything further today.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, that was my understanding also, but I wanted to doublecheck. We will make one last check with Senator GORTON on that. We are hoping good progress can be made on the Interior appropriations bill tomorrow, hopefully even finish it tomorrow, if at all possible, and we will be glad to work with the managers on that.

I yield to Senator KENNEDY.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the leader.

Mr. LOTT. I yield to Senator KENNEDY.

Mr. KENNEDY. Just for a question.

As I understand it, the majority leader is going to propound a unanimous consent request to consider the Defense authorization bill. I will not object to that. But I hope the leader would consider moving back to the consideration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act at an evening session following the disposition.

I do not want to object to moving to this particular proposal, but I expect to object to going to other proposals if we are not given at least some assurance that we are going to revisit the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I commend the leader for having the night sessions. I think this is challenging all of us. I think we ought to be responsive to that. I certainly welcome the leader's determination to move the process forward in the Senate, but I hope at least the leader could work out, with our leadership, some opportunity for an early return to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I will not object on this particular request this evening, but I do want to indicate, as that debate is going on for tonight and tomorrow evening, I hope we will have the opportunity for the leader to speak with Senator DASCHLE and work out a process. If we are not going to do that, then I will be constrained to object in the future, until we have some opportunity, with certainty, of revisiting the elementary and secondary education legislation, which is so basic and fundamentally important to families in this country.

I thank the leader for yielding.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could respond to Senator KENNEDY's question, first of all, I, too, would very much like to see us complete the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The committee did very good work on that legislation. The Senate spent a week, over a week perhaps, having amendments offered and voted on.

With regard to the underlying Elementary and Secondary Education Act and other nongermane amendments that were offered, that delayed our ability to complete that legislation. But I feel very strongly about getting it done. I am very pleased with the condition the bill is in. I think it might be a good idea that we workout an arrangement on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for next week, perhaps similar to what we have done with the DOD authorization bill, hoping to work on that bill tonight and having votes on amendments, if any are ordered, in the morning; the same thing tomorrow night with votes occurring the next morning. We could do the same thing on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

But there is a key thing here. On the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, some nongermane amendments were offered delaying our ability to complete our work on that, and some that were germane. But we reached a point where we needed to try to find an agreement to complete our work.

After being abused severely by both sides of the aisle, perhaps, depending on your point of view—the Defense authorization bill had all kinds of nongermane amendments offered to it—after a period of time, there was an agreement that we needed to see if we could complete action on this very important Department of Defense authorization bill; it provides very important changes in the law, things that cannot be done just with the Defense appropriations bill, including improvements in the health care benefits for our military men and women and their families, and our retirees. We have to do this bill to get it done.

Therefore, under the persistent leadership of the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Michigan, the managers, we came to an agreement last week, a unanimous consent agreement, that nongermane amendments would not be offered any longer and all amendments had to be offered by the close of business Friday.

While they have a long list of amendments they have to work through, I am satisfied they can get it done now that they are focused on amendments related to the Department of Defense authorization bill.

I would be glad to pursue a similar type arrangement with the Democratic leadership, with Senator KENNEDY involved, where we could maybe get a list of amendments by the close of business Friday, work on the bill at night but limit it to germane amendments that could be debated and voted on and complete action, hopefully, in a relatively reasonable period of time.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the Senator can yield for a very brief observation?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to Senator KENNEDY.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think that is a very reasonable request, with the understanding that school safety and security is also of fundamental importance to families and to schools. I think we have had good debates on class size, on afterschool programs, on well-trained teachers, new technologies, on accountability, measures about training programs and other programs. We can debate all of those matters. If we do not have safety in the schools as well, those matters will have much less relevance than they otherwise might.

I guess we still have some differences with the majority leader on the issue of school safety. I think most parents in the country believe that is a relevant amendment. Under the particular procedures of the Senate, it might be declared not to be, but certainly I think, for most Members of the Senate, it would be.

I, for one, would be willing to let that decision be made by the Senate, if we could have a vote up or down on that issue, about whether it is relevant or not relevant. I have not mentioned it or talked it over with the sponsors of the amendment or the leader, but I would think we could have a judgment made on that by the Senate itself in a very quick order and have that resolved and then move to the other amendments, if it is agreeable with the majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. As I say, we will work with the Democratic leadership and see if we can work out an agreement similar to the one we have on the Department of Defense authorization bill.

Let me make it clear. Being the son of a schoolteacher—in public schools, I might add—I know the importance of safety. I also know the importance of discipline because I have been the beneficiary of discipline from my mother, the schoolteacher.

I also know Americans all over this country, in every State, would like to have our schools be safe and drug free. So the idea that we would have metal detector devices where that is called for in certain schools, and where we would have other efforts to make sure the schools are safer, that is something, certainly, we should all work toward. Hopefully, we could do that when we take up the legislation.

I understand there was a suggestion earlier that there had been some delay in calling up the legislation referred to generally as H–1B legislation, that is, S. 2045, which would allow for certain high-tech workers to come into the country on a limited basis and for a limited period of time, and that, for some reason, had not been called up because of something that we had not been doing.

Let me emphasize that I want this legislation to be considered. I would like us to move it as quickly as possible. The problem we got into earlier when we were trying to work out an agreement was we were told there would have to be numerous amendments—I don't know, six or eight amendments, that were nongermane that would be in order for us to consider this very important legislation that I think has bipartisan support and that many people in this country, in business and industry and high tech, say addresses a major problem because the number that is allowed is now being reached and we need this legislation. I want to make it very clear we are not only willing to move it; we are anxious.

I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 490, S. 2045, the H–1B legislation, and I further ask unanimous consent the committee substitute be agreed to, the bill be read the third time and passed, the title amendment be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill appear in the RECORD.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, the leader, I know how difficult his job is, but, in spite of the difficulty of his job, H–1B is something that we on the minority side believe should have its day in the Senate. I have been assigned by our leader to come up with a number of amendments on our side. We have whittled it down from 10. I think we could get back on six or seven amendments. We would have short time agreements on every one of those. Most of them would be relevant, would be germane. They relate to the subject at issue.

I say to my friend from Mississippi, it reminds me of Senator MOYNIHAN. He wrote a very nice piece called ''Defining Deviancy Down'' a few years ago, indicating although we believed some things were real bad, with the encroachment of time and change of mores, we started accepting those things that at one time were bad. That does not make it good that we are accepting it, but that is what Senator MOYNIHAN wrote about, and I am confident he was right.

I say to my friend, the majority leader, that is kind of what we have here—not defining deviancy, but defining Senate procedure down. We are not filibustering H–1B. We want to have this. We believe it could be completed in 1 day.

If you look at the definition of ''filibuster,'' we are not filibustering anything. This is the definition from the dictionary: The use of irregular or obstructive tactics, such as exceptionally long speeches by a member of a minority in a legislative assembly to prevent the adoption of a measure generally favored or to force a decision almost unanimously disliked.

We are not filibustering. We want H–1B to come before this body. We want to work with you. We agree it is important legislation, but can't we have a few amendments? We are going to have short time agreements. We are not asking that things that are not relevant be brought up. We have matters that relate to immigration in this country.

As I say, I have been given the assignment by our leader to see how we can squeeze down these amendments. I feel almost as if we have lost by doing this. We do not like that, but we have agreed to work with the leader and have a number of amendments, have time agreements, to move this legislation forward.

I hope the leader will allow us that luxury, and I say ''luxury'' in the sense recognizing what Senator MOYNIHAN wrote. A year or two ago, we would never have considered this because that was not the way we did things in the Senate. We believe matters should be brought up and handled as they have for over 200 years in this body, unless someone else wants to speak.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. Reserving my objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator be willing to go to H–1B tonight, ask consent to go without the restrictions? I certainly urge our Democratic leadership to go to it. If he wants to go to it, let's go to H–1B.

Mr. REID. We have a number of amendments, I say to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let the Senate work its will. He indicated he would. After he objects, our Democratic leader will ask to go to that, will move to go to H–1B, put it before the Senate, and let's go ahead and consider it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I did ask consent, as a matter of fact. That is what the reservation is on: that we go to this bill, and we pass this bill tonight.

I might also add, earlier I asked consent that we go to the bill and that there be five relevant amendments on each side of the aisle, that second-degree amendments be in order, which would have brought it to 20 amendments, and that was objected to on the Democratic side of the aisle. Even the idea of 10 amendments with second-degree amendments in order was objected to.

First of all, I assume this is not controversial. I assume it has broad support on both sides of the aisle. I assume it is something the Senate wants to get done. That is all I am trying to do. I heard today the Democratic leaders saying they want to do this bill; that we were holding it up. I am trying to find a way to move it. Let me emphasize this, too.

Some people say: Why don't you just call it up and let it go the way Senators would like to handle it, amendments and everything else.

Here is what we have to do this week alone: The Interior appropriations bill; we are going to be doing the Defense authorization bill at night; we are going to have a procedure to finally eliminate the death tax; we are going to have a procedure to get a vote on eliminating the marriage penalty tax. That is all this week.

Also along the way, we are going to try to get an agreement to take up the Thompson nonproliferation language with regard to China so that we can find a time to go to the China PNTR bill. We also have to do the Agriculture appropriations bill, the energy and water appropriations bill, Housing and Urban Development and Veterans appropriations bill, the Commerce- State-Justice appropriations bill, and the DC appropriations bill.

We should do all of those before we recess for the August recess. We have done six so far, and that has been with a lot of cooperation on both sides and a lot of pushing and pleading because every time an appropriations bill is offered, 100 amendments appear. On the Defense authorization bill, I think there are 200 amendments.

As far as this job of trying to coordinate all these different interests being a problem, I do not view it that way. It is just we have to have some reasonable understanding of how we are going to proceed to get four major bills done this week, to get five more appropriations bills done before the August recess, to get the Thompson nonproliferation language considered, and to get the China PNTR legislation considered as soon as possible.

We would like to find a way to work in among that, maybe at night, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I would love to pass that legislation just as it is or even after some more amendments, but we have to find

a time. We can do that at night. We can work day and night for the next 3 weeks.

I would like to do the H–1B. I tried to offer an agreement that could have led to 20 amendments. That was objected to on the other side. I am trying to find a way to get all these good things done. I will continue to try and hopefully we will be able to work out an agreement to consider them all. These appropriations bills are high priority. That is the people's business.

If we do not get the appropriations bills done, Housing and Urban Development is going to have a problem with housing in which they are involved. The energy and water appropriations bill has a lot of very important energy-and-water-related issues. Certainly both sides of the aisle would like to see us get to the Agriculture appropriations bill at the earliest possible date, hopefully next Tuesday at the latest. Those are all the things we have to do.

I want to make sure—I am willing to go to H–1B right away, pass it or to get some agreement that will not take 3, 4 days on one bill in among all these other urgent bills we have to do.

Mr. REID. If my friend will allow me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. If I may make a statement on my reservation. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. We really should have H–1B passed. It does not mean everybody is in favor of it, but it is something that needs to be done. It is very important legislation. We need to have the matter debated. I hope the leader will take back the colloquy today. The Senator misspoke. He said 20 amendments. I think he meant 10 amendments with five on each side. Ten on each side would be a deal. We can do that this instant. I think the majority leader made a mistake.

Mr. LOTT. Actually, it is five on each side, which would be 10, plus second-degree amendments would have been in order, which could have brought it to 20.

Mr. REID. I hope the Senator will withdraw his unanimous consent request; otherwise, we will object to it. We first should see if it can be brought up and debated as any other matter. I think I know the answer to that question. Then the Senator should review his suggestion that we have five amendments per side and, of course, if relevant includes immigration-related and training-related amendments, we may not be able to do five. But I did indicate to the Senator, we were already down to seven. We are down to seven amendments on our side. We would agree——

Mr. LOTT. Seven amendments on H–1B or seven amendments on estate tax.

Mr. REID. H–1B. We should revisit this issue. If the Senator wants to reintroduce his unanimous consent request tomorrow, fine. Let's see if we can come up with something that will meet the timeframe of what the majority leader wishes. As I have indicated, this is not my preference in doing business, but this legislation is very important, and I want to spread upon the RECORD the fact we are not trying to hold up this legislation. The minority wants to move forward, as Senator DASCHLE indicated today. If the Senator persists in his unanimous consent request, I will object. I hope the Senator will withdraw that and see if in the next 24 hours we can work something out on this important legislation.

Mr. LOTT. So the record will be clear, I am trying hard to find a way to get this considered. I won't insist on my unanimous consent request, but since we are working night and day and looking for ways to get these things done, if you are down to seven, if you can get it down to five relevant amendments, and we can continue to work on this, maybe this would be a bill we could do at night the third week, but we are willing to see if we can find a way to get it done.

Mr. REID. I think this is Mississippi math because we started at 10 and kind of split the difference.

Mr. LOTT. No, no. It was 5 and 5.

Mr. REID. No, but it was 10 on our side. We said 10; you said 5. But now I said we are down to 7.

Mr. LOTT. You are headed in the right direction. Just keep working. You are making progress.

Mr. REID. So I hope we can work something out on this. In the meantime, Mr. President——

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. I am a little uncomfortable with the discussion here. The discussion is: Under what conditions will the majority leader allow us to consider this bill? I understand that amendments are inconvenient, but the rules of the Senate allow people to be elected to the Senate and offer amendments and consider legislation.

The unanimous consent request offered by the majority leader was to take up this bill and pass it without any discussion or any amendments. Now there is a negotiation here saying: Maybe I will allow it to be brought to the floor if the Senator from Nevada would, on behalf of his side, agree to no more than five amendments.

The fact is, it seems to me if we fretted a little less about what someone might do when they bring something to the floor and started working through it, it would probably take a whole lot less time.

I happen to be supportive of the H–1B legislation, but I am not very supportive of some notion of anybody in the Senate saying: Here are the conditions under which we will consider it—and only these conditions—and if you don't like it, we won't consider it.

I hope the Senator from Nevada—if the majority leader insists on his unanimous consent request—will make a unanimous consent request following that similar to the one suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, a unanimous consent request to bring the issue to the floor under the regular order at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. REID. If the Senator would withhold, I do ask unanimous consent that the H–1B legislation be brought before the Senate at this time, that we be allowed to proceed on that.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I withhold that UC request I made, but I object to the one that was just made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous consent request that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, while the distinguished leader is on the floor, there was some hope we could bring up the military authorization bill tonight. Senator LEVIN and I consulted with you on this, I say to the majority leader. We will have for our joint leadership tomorrow a list of amendments, with time agreements, and be ready to go. I say to the majority leader, you can splice this in as you see fit. I assure the majority leader—I see my distinguished colleague from Michigan on the floor—my colleague from Michigan is ready to join me on this. We will present to our joint leadership specific germane amendments on the list, and move along on this bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator would yield, I am not sure what that means. That means, I think, you are not going to be able to consider any amendments tonight.

Mr. WARNER. That is correct. We made a strong effort.

Mr. LOTT. When you say you will present a list of amendments, and will try to work them through the process, that does mean, I take it, the amendments still would be debated, if they have to be debated.

Mr. WARNER. That is correct.

Mr. LOTT. Tuesday night.

Mr. WARNER. Tuesday night.

Mr. LOTT. The votes would occur on Wednesday morning, if any?

Mr. WARNER. That is correct.

Mr. LOTT. Do you have any amendments where there would be a need for a vote in the morning?

Mr. WARNER. Not tomorrow morning, I say to the leadership.

Mr. LOTT. Can you give me an idea about how many nights might be involved here because we are already beginning to think about another bill next week.

Mr. WARNER. I listened to that very carefully. I would say that with three evenings we can do it. And there may be a juncture during the course of the day when there could be an hour or two. If you give us a ring, we will have an amendment to plug in for that brief period of time.

Mr. LEVIN. If the leader will yield, it would be very helpful—I know it is difficult, and I have not had a chance to speak to my chairman about this, but if we knew in advance about when we would start the evening proceeding, I think that would help us line up some amendments.

Mr. LOTT. I believe sort of the gentlemen's agreement we were talking about last week was that we would start at about 6:30 or 7 o'clock, but not later than 7, and hopefully as early as 6:30 tomorrow night, possibly even Wednesday night. Thursday night is not likely. So then you might have to look at next Monday night for the third night, if a third night in fact is used.

There is a possibility we will reach a moment of lull or we will see an hour or two coming sometime during the day, and we will call quickly and ask for the managers to come over and do some of their work.

Mr. LEVIN. That would be good.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could, just being involved on the fringes of this legislation, I think with the work of Senator LEVIN and Senator WARNER, they will complete this in two nights.

Mr. LOTT. I like the sound of that. Good luck.

Mr. WARNER. I thank our distinguished leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I understood we are in morning business at this time. Are we moving toward the Defense authorization bill? If we are moving on the Defense authorization bill, I will withhold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

Mr. KENNEDY. I see my friends from Michigan and Virginia. Anytime they are prepared to request the floor, I will yield time.

H–1B VISAS AND ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I just want to take a moment of the Senate's time to speak about the two issues that have been talked about recently. One is the H–1B visa issue, to which the majority leader referred, as did Senator REID and Senator DORGAN, which will lift the caps so that we can have available to American industry some of the able, gifted, and talented individuals who have come to this country and who can continue to make a difference in terms of our economy.

We are in the process—at least I thought so, as a member of the Immigration Subcommittee—of working with Senator ABRAHAM from the State of Michigan, in working that process through to try to respond to the concerns that the leadership have; and that is that we debate that issue in a timely way, with a limited number of amendments, and that we reach a final conclusion in a relatively short period of time.

I had believed that those negotiations, at least from our side, were very much on track. During the negotiations, we had talked to the White House as well as with the House Judiciary Committee members, all of whom have an obvious interest.

So it did come as kind of a surprise—not that we are not prepared to move ahead. I would be prepared to move ahead even this evening. I do not know where the Senator from Michigan, who has the prime responsibility for that legislation, is this evening. He is not on the floor. But he has been conscientious in addressing that question.

One of the fundamental concerns—as we move toward permitting a number of individuals who have special skills to come in and fill in with the special slots that are crying out for need in our economy—is a recognition that, within our society, these are jobs that eventually should be available to American workers. There is nothing magical about these particular jobs—that if Americans have the opportunity for training, for additional kinds of education, they would be well qualified to hold these jobs.

Many of us have believed, as we have addressed the immediate need for the increase, that we also ought to address additional kinds of training programs, so that in the future we will have these kinds of high-paying jobs which offer enormous hope and opportunity to individuals, as well as the companies for whom they work, being made available to Americans. We discussed and debated those issues with the Judiciary Committee. We made pretty good progress on those issues. So I think there is a broad degree of support in terms of trying to address that issue.

But there are also some particular matters that cry out for justice as well. When you look back on the immigration issues, there were probably 350,000, perhaps 400,000 individuals who qualified for an amnesty program that was part of the law. As a result of a court holding that was actually overturned, all of these individuals' lives have been put at risk and, without any degree of certainty, subject to instances of deportation. So we wanted to try to address this issue. It seems to me that could be done in a relatively short period of time. It is a question of fundamental decency and fundamental justice.

We treat individuals who come from Central American countries differently, depending upon which country they come from. Therefore, there was some desire we would have a common position with regard to individuals. Senator MOYNIHAN had introduced legislation to that effect. That is basically a question of equity. There are really no surprises. It is not a new subject to Members of the Senate. It is something about which many of us have heard, on different occasions, when we have been back to see our constituencies.

These are some of the items that I think we could reach, if there were differences, a reasonable time agreement. But they are fundamental in terms of justice and fairness to individuals and their families.

If we are going to consider one aspect of change in the immigration law, it is not unreasonable to say if we are going to address that now, we ought to at least have the Senate vote in a responsible way on these other matters in a relatively short period of time so the Senate can be meeting its responsibilities in these other areas. So I look forward to the early consideration of this bill.

This isn't the first time we have dealt with the H–1B issue. We made some changes a few years ago. We were able to work it out in a bipartisan way. There is no reason that American industry should have concern that we are not going to take action. We will take action. Hopefully, we will do it in the next 3 weeks. There is no reason we should not.

The other issue is the question of elementary and secondary education. I certainly understand the responsibilities we have in completing Defense authorization, which is enormously important legislation. I am heartened by what the majority leader has said with regard to the follow-on in terms of elementary and secondary education. That is a priority for all American families. We ought to debate it. The principal fact is that we have debated it for 6 days and we have had seven amendments. Three of them were virtually unanimous. We didn't have to have any rollcall votes. On 2 of the 6 days, we were restricted because we were forbidden to offer amendments and have votes. We haven't had a very busy time with that as compared to the bankruptcy legislation, where we had 15 days and more than 55 amendments.

In allocating time, we are asking for fairness to the American families on education. If the Senate is going to take 15 days and have 55 amendments on bankruptcy legislation, we can take a short period of time—2 or 3 days—and have good debate on the question of elementary and secondary education,

which is so important to families across the country.

With all respect to the majority leader, the issue of school safety is out there. We need to ensure that we will do everything we possibly can to make sure we are not only going to have small class sizes, well-trained teachers, afterschool programs, efforts to try to help to respond to the needed repairs that are so necessary to so many schools across this country, and strong accountability provisions but make sure that, even if we are able to get those, the schools are going to be safe. We have measures we believe the Senate should address to make them safe.

If the majority is going to continue to, in a real way, filibuster, effectively, the consideration of elementary and secondary education by never bringing the matter before the Senate, they bear the responsibility of doing so. It is their responsibility. Every family in this country ought to understand that because they have the power, the authority, and the responsibility to put that before the Senate. If there is a question in terms of the relevancy or nonrelevancy of a particular amendment, the Senate can make that decision. But when we are denying families in this country the opportunity to address that and respond to it, we do a disservice to the families and to the children in this country, and, I believe, to the Senate itself.

This issue isn't going to go away. It will not go away. We may have only 3 more weeks, but we are going to continue to press it. We are going to press it all during July and all during September as well. It will not go away. Elementary and secondary education needs to be addressed. We have to take action. We owe it to the American families, and we have every intention of pursuing it.

I thank the Chair.

BRIGADIER GENERAL PAUL M. HANKINS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding officer in the United States Air Force who is an individual we have each come to know over the past two-years—Brigadier General Paul M. Hankins.

As those of us who work on national security matters know, General Hankins has been serving as the Deputy Director of Legislative Liaison, where he has worked closely with us on a variety of issues of great importance to the defense of the nation. As he has done in all his previous assignments, General Hankins distinguished himself as an individual of selflessness who possesses a strong sense of service and an unflagging dedication to executing his duties to the best of his abilities.

General Hankins arrived at the job of Deputy Director of Legislative Liaison well prepared for the position. A graduate of the United States Air Force Academy, he is a career personnel officer whose assignments are a mix of operational, joint, and high-level staff duties. Included among his tours are assignments at Tactical Air Command, Air Training Command, Air Combat Command, and the Air Force Personnel Center. The General has also served previously in the Secretary of the Air Force's Office of Legislative Liaison and with the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. He commanded the 6th Support Group at MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, and he served as chief of the Air Force Colonels' Group.

During the 106th Congress, General Hankins has been a valuable intermediary between the Congress and the Air Force on any number of vital matters. He always provided clear, concise, and timely information that was beneficial in supporting our deliberations on national security matters. Clearly, the leadership, professional abilities, experiences, and expertise of General Hankins enabled him to foster excellent working relationships that benefitted the Air Force and the Untied States Senate.

On a personal note, I am pleased to point out that I have known General Hankins since his days as a young captain, when he first demonstrated his skills at building ties with the Legislative Branch. At the time, he was serving at Kelly Air Force Base near San Antonio when he met a young woman who was a member of my Washington staff and visiting that facility. To make a long story short, Paul Hankins and the former Donna Folse fell in love, had a whirlwind romance, and got married approximately one-year after they began dating. Today, they have been married for fifteen years and together, they have raised two fine children, Priscilla and Clark.

The reward that the Air Force is giving General Hankins for doing a difficult and demanding job well is to give him an even more challenging assignment, solving the recruiting and retention issues facing the Air Force. Then again, given how the General has repeatedly demonstrated his ability to successfully meet and complete any assignment with which he has been tasked, it should not be surprising that the Secretary and Chief of Staff would select him to head-up this effort.

I am confident that I speak for all my colleagues when I say that we are grateful and appreciative for the hard work of General Hankins during his tenure as Deputy Director of Air Force Legislative Liaison. He is a credit to the Air Force and he can be proud of both the record of accomplishment he has created and the high regard in which he is held. We wish the General the best of luck in his new assignment and continued success in the years to come.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read some of the names of those who lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is in session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

July 10, 1999:

Thomas Carson, 72, Houston, TX;

Vincent Coleman, 22, Irvington, NJ;

Joseph Horter, 79, Philadelphia, PA;

Gregory Jones, 29, Miami-Dade County, FL;

Ricky Lane, 38, Mesquite, TX;

Edler Monestime, 51, Miami-Dade County, FL;

Cashonda Miller, 18, Kansas City, MO;

Gene Pailin, 17, Dallas, TX;

Michael Perry, 31, Miami-Dade County, FL;

Tristan Thompson, 23, Houston, TX;

David Woods, 21, Kansas City, MO;

Unidentified male, 27, Newark, NJ;

Unidentified male, 31, Portland, OR.

In addition, Mr. President, since the Senate was not in session last week, I ask unanimous consent that the names also be printed in the RECORD of some of those who were killed by gunfire last year on the days from June 30th through July 9th.

June 30:

Edwin Cruz, 23, Chicago, IL;

Jermaine Demps, 26, Detroit, MI;

Stephen Gawel, 37, Detroit, MI;

Arron Green, 19, Detroit, MI;

Herth Hawks, 25, Charlotte, NC;

Blake King, 17, Gary, IN;

Donte A. Marshall, 22, Gary, IN;

Benjamin McCoy, 18, Gary, IN;

Edward Perry, Jr., 27, Baltimore, MD;

Sharon P. Robinson, 51, Oklahoma City, OK;

Jessie Wilburn, 48, Dallas, TX;

Unidentified male, 50, Nashville, TN.

July 1:

CRAIG Butler, 44, Philadelphia, PA;

James Hopkins, 20, Baltimore, MD;

Michael Okarma, 56, Seattle, WA;

Derrick Owens, 26, Bridgeport, CT;

Gloria Pickett, Detroit, MI;

Angel Rivera, 23, Philadelphia, PA;

Frankie Rivera, 29, Philadelphia, PA;

Mark Spann, 18, Baltimore, MD;

Anthony Stroud, 12, Houston, TX;

Unidentified male, 14, Chicago, IL.

July 2:

Antonio Baker, 21, Charlotte, NC;

Keith Carter, 34, Detroit, MI;

Eric Harvey, 14, Nashville, TN;

Tae-Dong Kim, 59, San Antonio, TX;

Ahmed Massey, 14, Rock Hill, SC;

Derren Minnick, 30, Philadelphia, PA;

James Ortiz, 39, Houston, TX;

Michael A. Smith, 25, Chicago, IL;

Unidentified male, 18, Newark, NJ.

July 3:

J.C. Addington, 81, Dallas, TX;

Kelton R. Austin, 24, Chicago, IL;
Patricia Austin, 38, Akron, OH;
Norberta Bachiller, 48, Miami-Dade County, FL;
Raymond Castillo, 19, Dallas, TX;
William Brock Crews, 24, Washington, DC;
Gerald Crowder, 21, Atlanta, GA;
Ronald V. Daily, 56, Oklahoma City, OK;
Ricky Davis, 22, Chicago, IL;
Augustine Garza, 18, Chicago, IL;
George Green, Jr., 47, Dallas, TX;
Reginald Griffin, 15, St. Louis, MO;
Anthony Hawkins, 16, Houston, TX;
James Jones, 40, Baltimore, MD;
Carl Peterson, 45, Superior, WI;
Luis Rebolledo, 25, Chicago, IL;
Salvador Romero, 35, Detroit, MI;
Kenny Sharpless, Detroit, MI;
Jeremy Thalley, 16, Denver, CO;
Shawn Washington, 28, Oakland, CA.
July 4:
Souksevenh Bounphithack, 34, Minneapolis, MN;
Charles Butler, 52,Washington, DC;
Quinn Johnson, 28, Miami-Dade County, FL;
Eric McCara, 39, Detroit, MI;
Kenneth C. Rutledge, 22, Chicago, IL;
Mark Russell, 35, Akron, OH;
Gerardo Silva, 21, Chicago, IL;
Demario Stephens, 18, Oakland, CA;
Won J. Yoon, 26, Bloomington, IN.
July 5:
Dewayne Allen, 21, New Orleans, LA;
Jason Anderson, Pine Bluff, AR;
Jill H. Barringham, 53, Seattle, WA;
Melvin Blagman, 19, Philadelphia, PA;
Davattah Brown, 37, Gainesville, FL;
Lewis J. Fennell, 52, Oklahoma City, OK;
Brian Paylor, 18, Baltimore, MD;
Jose Pantoja, 27, Houston, TX;
Unidentified female, 67, Nashville, TN;
Unidentified male, 74, Honolulu, HI;
Unidentified male, 18, Newark, NJ.
July 6:
Alicia Arellano, 23, Elkhart, IN;
John Thomas Crowder, 34, Washington, DC;
Darren Franklin, 13, New Orleans, LA;
Eugene Glass, 29, Detroit, MI;
James Hartsock, 66, Houston, TX;
Raymond E. Johnson, Pine Bluff, AR;
Doffice Kelly, 48, Fort Wayne, IN;
Mark Kingsbury, 25, Washington, DC;
Ronald Powell, 26, Kansas City, MO;
Tamica Tyler, Pine Bluff, AR;
Kevin Walter, 40, Detroit, MI;
Linda A. Winters, 35, Chicago, IL.
July 7:
Lugene Akins, 41, Rochester, NY;
Allen G. Barrousse, 40, New Orleans, LA;
Imon T. Boyce, 20, Oklahoma City, OK;
Theodore M. Goode, 26, Oklahoma City, OK;
Eric Goodloe, 20, Gary, IN;
Kevin Gore, 17, Philadelphia, PA;
Duskie M. Murrow, 20, Oklahoma City, OK;
Angel Ortiz, 26, Holyoke, MA;
Peter Quattro, 24, Miami-Dade County, FL;
Delfino Vega, 21, Chicago, IL;
Unidentified male, 43, Bellingham, WA;
Unidentified male, 57, San Jose, CA.
July 8:
Renee Battle, 29, Chicago, IL;
Bruce Bensch, 52, Miami-Dade County, FL;
Devon Campbell, 19, Louisville, KY;
Roberto Carmona, Jr., 17, Chicago, IL;
Curtis J. Crawley, 19, Rochester, NY;
Jerrod Crump, Pine Bluff, AR;
Vickie A. Owensboro, 36, Memphis, TN;
Jesus Gomez, 24, Seattle, WA;
Nathan Goodman, 17, Dallas, TX;
Julia Matlock, 39, Nashville, TN;
Curlenzo Stith, 29, Baltimore, MD;
Francisco Terrazas, 19, Chicago, IL;
Maurice Thomas, 26, Chicago, IL;
Margie Villarreal, 24, San Antonio, TX;
Juan Yanes, 80, Miami-Dade County, FL.
July 9:
John Amado, 22, San Bernardino, CA;
Mark Barton, San Francisco, CA;
Michael Day, 20, Washington, DC;
Michael Gloria, 17, Mesquite, TX;
John Hendricks, Detroit, MI;
Lindell Kendall, 16, Macon, GA;
Russell H. Lee, 39, Seattle, WA;
Benjamin Lindsey, 34, Atlanta, GA;
Miguel McElroy, 18, Minneapolis, MN;
Oren W. Nevins, 69, Oklahoma City, OK;
Tony Paxton, 28, Miami-Dade County, FL;
Freddie Poyner, 15, Baltimore, MD;
Michael Randell, 33, Tulsa, OK;
Anthony Whitney, 27, Kansas City, MO;
Unidentified male, San Francisco, CA.

IMPACT AID SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AMENDMENT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, last week, I was successful in achieving the inclusion of a bipartisan amendment in the Manager's Amendment on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriation bill, on one of the most important issues we will deal with in this Congress—the poor condition of our Nation's school buildings.

Let me briefly describe this amendment before I talk about the larger problem this amendment is seeking to address.

This amendment is co-sponsored by Senator BINGAMAN, Senator DOMENICI, and Senator HUTCHISON from Texas—this bipartisan group should send a very strong signal that this amendment is worthy of support.

This is a very simple amendment. Both the House and Senate versions of the Labor-HHS Appropriations bill set aside $25 million for Impact Aid school construction. This amendment increases that amount to $10 million.

It offsets the increase by reducing the administrative and related expenses of the Departments of Health and Human Services, Labor, and Education on a pro rata basis by $10 million.

Allow me to explain why this amendment is so important to me and to the bi-partisan group of Senators that support this amendment.

As you know, there are a number of pending bills that address our nation's school construction needs. And in the past days, we have voted on a number of amendments addressing school construction issues generally.

These funds assist local school districts who are then able to raise the remainder of their construction funds through bond issues. Like other school costs, the bonds are paid for by taxes on local property.

Issuing bonds is a time-honored approach to school construction. But in the heated national debate, one group of children is continually left out in the cold—students who live on federally owned land, usually an Indian reservation or a military installation.

In Montana, some 12,000 children fall into this category.

These schools are located in areas where much of the local property can't be taxed because of Federal activities. This tax-exempt property may be a military base or an Indian reservation.

In many cases, the local public schools have to educate the children of families that live on the property. These so-called ''Federal Students'' could come from military families. They could come from civilian families. They could come from Native American families.

The Congress has recognized its responsibility for these schools through payments authorized by Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The House and Senate bills allocate $25 million for school construction to be distributed under Section 8007 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

This is simply insufficient to meet the needs of these federally impacted schools.

In fiscal year 2000, Montana had 28 school districts that were 50 percent or more impacted with either Indian land children or military students. Nationwide, there were 249 such districts.

In FY2000, the average allocation per school district in Montana of Impact Aid funds is just below $18,000. The average dollar received per student is $57.

Think about that for a moment. $57 for construction is not going to do a heck of a lot of good for schools that are literally falling down.

Now, under the FY2001 appropriations bill, funding would increase to approximately $90 per student. And while that's better than $57, it still falls way short of meeting the needs of our students.

Let me tell you a couple of stories to illustrate this point.

I remember talking last year with the Superintendent for the Harlem School District Don Bidwell. His district is so crowded, he has students

using a closet, where they used to keep the snow blower, for a classroom. Now the snow blower is in the hall and the students are in the closet.

And let me tell you about a recent visit with Steve Smyth, the Superintendent of the Browning school district in Montana.

Browning is situated in one of the windiest areas of Montana. Mr. Smyth informed me that a year ago, the students, teachers, administrators and community watched the roof on the high school building literally curl up like the lid on a sardine can because of the harsh winds.

Just to replace that roof, the district spent $115,881. And yet, they only received $27,000 for school construction and repairs in FY 2000. How can we justify giving them only enough money to pay for one-fourth of their roof? That is a disgrace.

Let me give you another example. In 1998, the Box Elder school received $13,000 in Impact Aid construction funding. In FY 2000, they received $19,500. That might be enough to give half the building a paint job, but not for much more.

It's like trying to put out a fire with squirt gun. What this school really needs is a new building or a major renovation.

The condition of these schools is not a Montana problem. Nor a Nebraska problem. Nor a partisan problem.

Instead, it's a national problem.

As a nation, we can no longer pretend that this is a problem in a few schools in a few states that can be solved with a few scraps from our federal education appropriation.

Every child in the United States deserves a healthy learning environment. An important and vital part of that environment is the physical structure the learning takes place in. Our children should be confident their school will still be standing by the end of the day. Our children shouldn't fear that their school is going to burn down because of faulty wiring.

Mothers and fathers should know that when they drop their children off at school or send them off to the school bus, that they are sending them to a safe place.

I am pleased the managers of this bill saw this amendment fit to be included in their amendment. I thank Senators BINGAMAN, DOMENICI, and HUTCHISON from Texas for their support. I hope that the conferees will maintain this increased level of funding.

REFORMING UNILATERAL SANCTIONS ON FOOD AND MEDICINE

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to address recent developments in the effort to reform our sanctions policy towards food and medicine.

Let me recall a bit of recent history. Late last year, the Senate passed legislation to end the use of food and medicine as a weapon of foreign policy. We passed it by a substantial margin—70 to 28—as an amendment to the FY 2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill.

We have both moral and commercial concerns. It is just wrong to inflict suffering on innocent people by withholding food and medicine because we oppose the policies of their government. This goes against the core values of our nation.

Commercially, the reform legislation would open markets to American producers, especially American farmers. They have been struggling through a long and terrible crisis brought on by low prices and bad weather. Opening new foreign markets would especially help our family farms.

The sanctions reform amendment ran into stiff opposition from House members in conference. Their main objection was that the bill would allow food and medicine sales to Cuba. Unfortunately, they prevailed, and the amendment was struck from the conference report.

That was last year. What about this year? We've had two important developments.

On the Senate side, the Agriculture Committee included sanctions reform in the FY 2001 Agriculture Appropriations bill, which was reported out in May. It is the section of the bill entitled the ''Food and Medicine for the World Act.'' I would like to acknowledge the work of my colleagues on this important legislation, especially Senators DODD, DORGAN, ROBERTS, ASHCROFT and HAGEL.

It is very similar to the amendment the Senate passed last year. I would note that it contains a new provision which weakens the sanctions reform effort. This provision requires one-year licenses for sales of food or medicine to governments on the State Department's terrorism list. Currently this list covers seven countries, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Sudan, North Korea and Cuba. I believe that this provision is an unnecessary restriction on our agricultural exporters.

But I am much more concerned about recent developments on the House side.

In late June, House members struck a deal to accommodate the same small group which fights against sanctions reform every year. Those members now have one main target: Cuba.

This recent House deal is billed as a move to lift unilateral sanctions on food and medicine. In fact, it does just the opposite. Let me explain.

First, it would outlaw all finance and insurance of food sales to Cuba, even sales to private groups. This would essentially prohibit all U.S. exports. In today's world, nobody trades without some sort of finance. It takes at least a letter of credit. What is the alternative? Only to ride along on the cargo ship to exchange your wheat for cash in Havana harbor. Everybody requires some sort of commercial insurance. In fact, the House agreement is so broadly written that it might even make third-country finance illegal. This is very bad legislation.

Second, the House agreement would impose even stricter licensing requirements than are in effect today on sales of food and medicine. These new restrictions would apply not just to Cuba, but also to Iran, Iraq, Libya, Sudan, Syria and North Korea.

Third, it would make it harder for U.S. exporters to travel to Cuba to explore the market.

Fourth, it would prohibit any food assistance, such as Food for Peace, to Cuba, as well as to Iran.

Accepting these provisions would be a major setback for the Senate.

The House agreement goes beyond sanctions for food and medicine. It includes provisions on travel to Cuba, an entirely unrelated issue. It would remove all flexibility from the current travel regulations in two ways. First, it would make them statutory. They could only be changed in the future by new legislation. Second, it would deny the Treasury Department any discretion in issuing travel licenses.

I understand that the current House plan is to strip this bad legislation from their version of the FY 2001 Agriculture Appropriations bill, and then bring it up in conference. We must not let a small group of House members prevail again this year. I firmly oppose the House agreement, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise. We should work to ensure passage of the Food and Medicine for the World Act.

Last year, the Senate took action that was correct and sound. We should continue to press forward.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, July 7, 2000, the Federal debt stood at $5,664,950,120,488.65 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty-four billion, nine hundred fifty million, one hundred twenty thousand, four hundred eighty-eight dollars and sixty-five cents).

One year ago, July 7, 1999, the Federal debt stood at $5,627,556,000,000 (Five trillion, six hundred twenty-seven billion, five hundred fifty-six million).

Five years ago, July 7, 1995, the Federal debt stood at $4,929,459,000,000 (Four trillion, nine hundred twenty-nine billion, four hundred fifty-nine million).

Twenty-five years ago, July 7, 1975, the Federal debt stood at $528,168,000,000 (Five hundred twenty-eight billion, one hundred sixty-eight million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,136,782,120,488.65 (Five trillion, one hundred thirty-six billion, seven hundred eighty-two million, one hundred twenty thousand, four hundred eighty-eight dollars and sixty-five cents) during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

• Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, each year the American Immigration Law Foundation and the American Immigration Lawyers Association sponsor a national writing contest on immigration. Thousands of fifth grade students across the country participate in the competition, answering the question, ''Why I'm Glad America is a Nation of Immigrants.''

In fact, ''A Nation of Immigrants'' was the title of a book that President Kennedy wrote in 1958, when he was a Senator. In this book, and throughout his life, he celebrated America's great heritage and history of immigration as a principal source of the nation's progress and achievements.

As one of the judges of this year's contest, I was impressed by the quality of writing that was presented and the great pride of these students in America's immigrant heritage. Many of these essays told the story of their own family's immigration to the United States.

The winner of this year's contest is Kaitlin Young, a fifth grader at St. Anne Elementary School in Warren, Michigan. She wrote about her diverse immigrant background and how this diversity enriches her life. Other students honored for their creative essays were Shayna Walton of Arizona, John Klaasen of Washington, Allison Paige Sigmon of North Carolina, and Christa Conway of Connecticut.

I believe that these award winning essays from the ''Celebrate America'' contest will be of interest to all of us in the Senate, and I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD.

The essays are as follow.

IMMIGRATION & ME

(By Kaitlin Young, Warren, MI, grand prize winner)

If it weren't for immigration, the diversity in me
I might be a Who-not on my family tree.
English, Irish, Dutch, American Indian too
Italian ancestry in the mix, a family tree in bloom.

America welcomed my ancestors–a promise to be free
Ellis Island & the Statue of Liberty are symbols dear to me.
Our country's promise, the freedom to worship here
Practice our family customs and belief we hold dear.

The promise of America rings throughout me
The Torch of Freedom helped shape my family tree.
My Grandmas and Grandpas are from here and there
So when Mom married Dad, I came from everywhere.

I eat different foods from across the world
Irish stew, potatoes and pasta that is curled.
Salmon steak, pot roast, and Dutch Apple pie
Egg rolls, pizza, a menu diversified.

Soccer, Bocce Ball, and Cricket too.
Without immigration, you might not play the sports you do.
Without immigration what would you hear?
The same old sounds filling your ear.

If it were not for immigration, what would we see?
All the leaves the same on my family tree.
That is why I am so happy for diversity,
Because of Immigration—I am me!

WHY I'M GLAD AMERICA IS A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

(By Shayna Walton, Tucson, AZ, finalist)

Hooray Hooray for the U.S.A.
Life is good the American Way.

Immigrants come from far and near
To have a much better life right here.

They come in hopes of a freer life.
Sometimes they come to leave their strife.

What a better place we have become
because of all that immigrants have done.

They've shared their different ways they cook
and written many stories in a book.

The unique styles that they wear—
now you see them everywhere.

They've brought us lots of delicious foods
which certainly has improved our moods!

They've created dances, songs and art
Which has caused happiness in my heart.

All the immigrants' different languages are so neat
To learn them all would be quite a feat!

In this country you can have your say
You can give your opinion and talk all day!

We are all immigrants in our own way—
I'm so glad that we're all here to stay!

WHY I AM GLAD THAT AMERICA IS A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

(By John Klaasen, Olympia, WA, finalist)

Iceland
Madagascar
Mexico
India
Germany
Russia
Afghanistan
Nepal
Taiwan
South Korea

Oceania
Finland

Thailand
Haiti
Ecuador

Uruguay
New Zealand
Indonesia
Turkey
Egypt
Denmark

Spain
Tanzania
Albania
Togo
Ethiopia
Sri Lanka

Oman
France

Algeria
Mongolia
Eritrea
Romania
Iraq
Canada
Argentina

All
Refugees
Enter Looking for

Freedom,
Respect and
Open arms into our
Merry nation

Asylum
Legal residence and
Liberty

Offer
Values,
Education,
Rights,

Traditions,
Honor and
Equal treatment.

We
Offer
Refugees
Lasting
Democracy.

WHY I AM GLAD AMERICA IS A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

(By Allison Paige Sigmon, Sparta, NC, finalist)

Intelligence, inventions
Movies, medicine, music, melting pot
Medical breakthroughs, marketing
Innovations, instruments (musical)
Global diversity, gods, government
Racial equality, restaurants, religion
Ancestors, agriculture, architecture, artists
News, Nobel Peace Prize, nationalities
Teachers, theatre, trade, technology, transportation
Space travel, sports, science

All of these words are what I think immigrants have brought to our country to make us a strong and powerful nation.

WHY I'M GLAD AMERICA IS A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

(By Christa Conway, Manchester, CT, finalist)

What do the people bring when they come to America's shores?
What do the people bring on their boats rowing with oars?
What do the people bring in their trunks, bags, and cases?
What do the people bring?
They bring a world of new faces.

The first sight that they get of land, is like a cavern of gold
They see all brand new faces, all both young and old.
They see the green fresh grass, or see the glittering snow,
What do the immigrants see?
They see a new world to know.

What were the gifts they brought?
They weren't gold, riches and powers!
They brought just simply their culture,
Which now we proclaim as ours.

Music, festivals, stories,
Which we can now enjoy.
Everyone will enjoy it!!
Every girl and every boy!!

So why I'm glad America
Is a nation of immigrants true,
Is something that really matters,
It matters to me and you.
Immigrants are what make America whole,
What makes it pure and unique.
This melting pot of cultures,
Will never spring a leak!!!•

''THE WONDERS OF WARD 8''

• Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, it gives me pleasure to bring to my colleagues' attention a truly remarkable program that, unfortunately, is not located in my home state of Vermont, but nonetheless, does great work for Vermonters. Let me talk for a moment about the ''Wonders of Ward 8.'' To enlighten my colleagues, ''Ward 8'' houses the inpatient Post Traumatic

Stress Disorder (PTSD) treatment program at the Northhampton VA hospital. According to Friends of Ward 8, a group of veterans whose lives have taken on new meaning as a result of their treatment at this facility, there is no better place on earth to deal with the psychological wounds of war.

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) is recognized worldwide as a true leader in the area of PTSD research and I applaud my friend Dr. Matt Friedman and his staff at the National Center for PTSD for the incredible work they have done to bring this often debilitating condition to the forefront of public recognition and scholarly research. Thanks also go to Dr. Friedman for making treatment of PTSD a priority for the VA. Ward 8 is a shining example of what an inpatient program specializing in trauma treatment should look like. Although Ward 8 is located in Massachusetts, veterans from all over the country have benefitted from this program—including many, many Vermonters. It was established to offer inpatient rehabilitative treatment to veterans suffering from PTSD as a result of their wartime service and is one of eight inpatient VA programs. Ward 8 provides this high quality service while running one of the most efficient and cost effective inpatient treatment program in the VA system.

According to the Friends of Ward 8, the staff at this facility are the reason for its success. I would like to recognize and thank the ''heroes'' of Ward 8 beginning with the Program Director Dr. Sonny Monteiro and his dedicated staff of men and women including Dr. Richard Pearlstein, Bruce Bennett, Sherrill Ashton, John Christopher, Ken Zerneri, Gary Kuck, Fran Lunny, Joe Polito, Brooks Ryder, Judy Zahn, Heather White, Wayne Lynch, Alec Provost, Mike Connor, Barbara Graf and Delores Elliott. I hear again and again from Vermonters about how they bring compassion and healing to the science of mental health. It is the human touch that they so generously dispense that makes such a difference in the lives of veterans who struggle to recuperate from their wounds of war. Their dedication to their jobs and to the lives they touch has built a legacy for this program unrivaled by any other PTSD program in the country.

I thank you, Ward 8, and the many veterans from around the country who have crossed your threshold, thank you.●

RECOGNIZING QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL

● Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I rise to comment on some significant developments that have recently taken place in my home state of Colorado that will positively benefit the entire world of telecommunications.

Qwest Communications International, Inc. of Denver, a young, worldwide leader in broadband Internet-based communications, continues to expand its technologies and vision for the coming century. Just three and one-half years ago, this innovative company catapulted the world into the Information Age beginning by branding its nation-wide fiber-optic network and developing connections into Mexico, intercontinental cable to Europe and transpacific submarine capacity to the Pacific Rim. The Company's services provide a full range of leading-edge data, voice, video, e-commerce, web-hosting and related services to consumers and business customers, including a variety of multimillion dollar government contracts recently awarded to Qwest, such as the Treasury Department and DOE's Energy Sciences Network.

Qwest has positioned itself for the new Information Age economy by combining its strengths and forming numerous strategic alliances, partnerships and evolving its next-generation infrastructure through a variety of acquisitions.

About one year ago Qwest and U.S. WEST announced their intent to merge. On Friday, June 30 that merger became reality.

I applaud the FCC, the states and other appropriate agencies for reviewing and approving this complementary merger in a respectable timeframe and in accordance with the 1996 Telecommunications Act. This now allows the ''new'' Qwest to bring a different competitive dynamic to the global marketplace.

I ask my colleagues today to join me in commending the regulatory bodies for enhancing the process of this merger and to the Companies' merger review team, led by Drake Tempest and Steve Davis, as well as other Company officials. In closing, I extend my best wishes for continued success to Qwest and its Chairman and CEO, Joe Nacchio. Mr. Nacchio will resume the leadership of the ''new'' Qwest to bring the benefits of this global Company to all of our constituents.●

RECOGNITION OF THE YOUTH INVESTMENT PROGRAM OF THE TUKWILA SCHOOL DISTRICT

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, in February of 1999, I awarded my first Innovation in Education Award to the Tukwila School District for their ''Friends and Family Program.'' Now, over a year later, I am standing on the Senate floor again to recognize an innovative program in this same district, the Youth Investment Program at Cascade View Elementary. As both these awards indicate, great things are coming out of the Tukwila School District and this innovative summer school program is no exception.

Teachers and educators at Cascade View Elementary realized that many of their students were in need of additional help to be ready for their upcoming school year. Cascade Valley wanted to take advantage of the summer months to target students who need extra help in reading, math, and writing skills. Thus, the Youth Investment Program was created. Last week, I visited with teachers and students from this program and witnessed first-hand the tremendous impact that it has on its students.

In classes where approximately 22-percent of the students speak English as a second language and skill levels range across the board, these teachers have produced spectacular results in their students' academic achievements and social development.

Michael Silver, Superintendent of the Tukwila District, says ''There is a high percentage of kids from different ethnic groups who are at different skill levels. Our program has been able to streamline their learning to catch them up for their new grade level.''

The Youth Investment Program is also preparing students to succeed in the 21st century by incorporating computer training into many of the traditional academic subjects. The computer skills of each child are monitored throughout program. Teachers have also used computers to teach non-traditional courses such as drama and music which has enabled students and teachers to bring new meaning to the classroom. I am positive that these students will return to school in the fall not only equipped with renewed confidence but also with the skills and knowledge demanded by the new technology age.

After spending a time with the students and teachers involved in the Youth Investment Program, it was not hard for me to see why the efforts of the Tukwila School District continue to stand out among local education in Washington State. Mr. President, the Youth Investment Program demonstrates once again that our local educators know how to meet the needs of their students. I applaud the work of the staff and teachers at Cascade View and I am pleased to present my 44th Innovation in Education Award to the Youth Investment Program.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. McCathran, 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.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:09 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 148. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to provide assistance in the conservation of neotropical migratory birds.

The bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

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–9598. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report entitled ''Equitable Relief Granted By The Secretary Of Veterans Affairs In Calendar Year 1999''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–9599. A communication from the Vice-Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Election Cycle Reporting by Authorized Committees'', received on July 6, 2000; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–9600. A communication from the Director of Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Jurisdictional change for the Los Angeles and San Francisco asylum offices'' (RIN1115–AF18 (INS No. 1949–98)) received on June 27, 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–9601. A communication from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of the United States Parole Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–9602. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Office of Police Corps and Law Enforcement Education for Calendar Year 1999; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–9603. A communication from the Associate Deputy Attorney General and White House Liaison, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Attorney General, Tax Division, Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–9604. A communication from the Legislative Liaison of the Trade and Development Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to funding obligations dated June 22, 2000; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–9605. A communication from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of all expenditures during the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–9606. A communication from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the texts of international agreements, other than treaties, and background statements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–9607. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the transmittal of the certification of the proposed issuance of an export license relative to the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–9608. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the transmittal of the certification of the proposed issuance of an export license relative to Egypt; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–9609. A communication from the Acting Chief Counsel (Foreign Assets Control), Department of Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Sanctions Regulations'' (RIN CFR Part 598) received on June 2, 2000; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–9610. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Passport Procedures-Amendment to Execution of Passport Application Regulation'' received on June 21, 2000; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–9611. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the transmittal of the certification of the proposed issuance of an export license relative to French Guiana; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–9612. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the transmittal of the certification of the proposed issuance of an export license relative to Australia and Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–9613. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the transmittal of the certification of the proposed issuance of an export license relative to Canada and Sweden; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–9614. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the transmittal of the certification of the proposed issuance of an export license relative to Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–9615. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the transmittal of the certification of the proposed issuance of an export license relative to Australia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–9616. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the transmittal of the certification of the proposed issuance of an export license relative to France and Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–9617. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the transmittal of the certification of the proposed issuance of an export license relative to France and the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–9618. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to ''Overseas Surplus Property'' for fiscal years 2000 through 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of June 30, 2000, the following reports of committees were submitted on July 5, 2000:

By Mr. ROTH, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 3916: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on telephone and other communication services (Rept. No. 106–328).

By Mr. ROTH, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 2839: A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide marriage tax relief by adjusting the standard deduction, 15-percent and 28-percent rate brackets, and earned income credit, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–329).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1438: A bill to establish the National Law Enforcement Museum on Federal land in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 106–330).

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 1670: A bill to revise the boundary of Fort Matanzas National Monument, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–331).

S. 2020: A bill to adjust the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, Mississippi, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–332).

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 2511: A bill to establish the Kenai Mountains-Turnagain Arm National Heritage Area in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–333).

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of substitute:

H.R. 2879: A bill to provide for the placement at the Lincoln Memorial of a plaque commemorating the speech of Martin Luther King, Jr., known as the ''I have A Dream'' speech (Rept. No. 106–334).

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. BREAUX:

S. 2840. A bill to establish a Commission on the Bicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase and the Lewis and Clark Expedition; to the Committee on Government Affairs.

By Mr. ROBB (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2841. A bill to ensure that the business of the Federal Government is conducted in the public interest and in a manner that provides for public accountability, efficient delivery of services, reasonable cost savings, and prevention of unwarranted Government expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Affairs.

By Mr. REID:

S. 2842. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to Lander County, Nevada, for continued use as a cemetery; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BREAUX:

S. 2843. A bill for the relief of Antonio Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. Res. 334. A resolution expressing appreciation to the people of Okinawa for hosting United States defense facilities, commending the Government of Japan for choosing Okinawa as the site for hosting the summit meeting of the G–8 countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REID:

S. 2842. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to Lander County, Nevada, for continued use as a cemetery; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE LANDER COUNTY CEMETERY CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Lander County Cemetery Conveyance Act.

The settlement of Kingston, Nevada was destination and home to pioneers that settled the isolated high desert valleys of the central Great Basin. The inhabitants of this community set aside a specific community cemetery to provide the final resting place for friends and family who passed away. The early settlers established and managed the cemetery in the late 1800's. The Kingston cemetery is on land now managed by the United States Forest Service (FS). The FS is selling approximately one acre to the Town of Kingston, but this conveyance does not allow for the long-term use and expansion beyond the undisturbed historic graves, the implementation of the community's original 10 acre site plan, nor the protection of the uncharted graves.

Mr. President, the site of this historic cemetery was established prior to the designation of the Forest Reserve surrounding the Town of Kingston. The surrounding Forest Reserve was established in 1908. Under current law, the agency must sell the encumbered land at fair market value to this community for continued use. My bill provides for the conveyance of the balance of the original, recognized cemetery location to Lander County, at no cost, contingent on the completed sale of the acre to the Town of Kingston. It is unconscionable to me that this landlocked, rural community is required to buy their ancestors back from the Federal government.

I sincerely hope that members of Congress recognize the benefit to the local community that the conveyance would provide and pass this legislation.

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. 2842

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the historical use by settlers and travelers since the late 1800's of the cemetery known as ''Kingston Cemetery'' in Kingston, Nevada, predates incorporation of the land on which the cemetery is situated within the jurisdiction of the Forest Service;

(2) it is appropriate that that use be continued through local public ownership of the parcel rather than through the permitting process of the Federal agency; and

(3) to ensure that all areas that may have unmarked gravesites are included and to ensure the availability of adequate gravesite space in future years, a parcel of approximately 10 acres, the acreage included in the original permit issued by the Forest Service for the cemetery, should be conveyed for that purpose.

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE TO LANDER COUNTY, NEVADA.

(a) CONVEYANCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary''), simultaneously with or as soon as practicable after the conveyance of the core parcel under subsection (b), shall convey, without consideration, subject to valid existing rights, to Lander County, Nevada (referred to in this section as the ''county''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the remaining parcel of the land described in subsection (c).

(b) CONVEYANCE OF CORE PARCEL.—The making of the conveyance under subsection (a) is contingent on the making of a conveyance, under Public Law 85–569 (commonly known as the ''Townsite Act'') (16 U.S.C. 478a), of 1.25 acres of the land described in subsection (c) in which gravesites have been identified.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The parcel of land referred to in subsection (a) is the parcel of National Forest System land (including any improvements on the land) known as ''Kingston Cemetery,'' consisting of approximately 10 acres and more particularly described as SW1/4SE1/4SE1/4 of section 36, T. 16N., R. 43E., Mount Diablo Meridian.

(d) USE OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The county (including its successors) shall continue the use of the parcel conveyed under subsection (a) as a cemetery.

(2) REVERSION.—If the Secretary, after notice to the county and an opportunity for a hearing, makes a finding that the county has discontinued the use of the parcel conveyed under subsection (a) as a cemetery, title to the parcel shall revert to the Secretary.

(e) ACCESS.—At the time of the conveyance under subsection (a), the Secretary shall grant the county an easement granting access for persons desiring to visit the cemetery and other cemetery purposes over Forest Development Road #20307B, notwithstanding any future closing of the road for other use.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 662

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 662, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide medical assistance for certain women screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer under a federally funded screening program.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to implement the Hague Convention on Protection of Children and Co-operation in Respect of Intercounty Adoption, and for other purposes.

S. 702

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 702, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit discrimination in the payment of wages on account of sex, race, or national origin, and for other purposes.

S. 1333

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1333, a bill to expand homeownership in the United States.

S. 1485

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1485, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to confer United States citizenship automatically and retroactively on certain foreign-born children adopted by citizens of the United States.

S. 1810

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1810, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify and improve veterans' claims and appellate procedures.

S. 1900

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1900, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to holders of qualified bonds issued by Amtrak, and for other purposes.

S. 1935

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1935, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of community attendant services and supports under the medicaid program.

S. 2061

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) were added as cosponsors of S. 2061, a bill to establish a crime prevention and computer education initiative.

S. 2287

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2287, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to make

grants for the development and operation of research centers regarding environmental factors that may be related to the etiology of breast cancer.

S. 2408

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors 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. 2588

At the request of Mr. BENNETT, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2588, a bill to assist the economic development of the Ute Indian Tribe by authorizing the transfer to the Tribe of Oil Shale Reserve Numbered 2, to protect the Colorado River by providing for the removal of the tailings from the Atlas uranium milling site near Moab, Utah, and for other purposes.

S. 2598

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2598, a bill to authorize appropriations for the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, and for other purposes.

S. 2608

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2608, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain expenses of rural letter carriers.

S. 2609

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2609, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act to enhance the funds available for grants to States for fish and wildlife conservation projects, and to increase opportunities for recreational hunting, bow hunting, trapping, archery, and fishing, by eliminating chances for waste, fraud, abuse, maladministration, and unauthorized expenditures for administration and implementation of those Acts, and for other purposes.

S. 2612

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2612, a bill to combat Ecstasy trafficking, distribution, and abuse in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2700

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2700, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to promote the cleanup and reuse of brownfields, to provide financial assistance for brownfields revitalization, to enhance State response programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2703

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2703, a bill to amend the provisions of title 39, United States Code, relating to the manner in which pay policies and schedules and fringe benefit programs for postmasters are established.

S. 2729

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2729, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to restore stability and equity to the financing of the United Mine Workers of America Combines Benefit Fund by eliminating the liability of reachback operations, to provide additional sources of revenue to the Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 2739

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2739, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, toprovide for the issuance of a semipostal stamp in order to afford the public a convenient way to contribute to funding for the establishment of the World War II Memorial.

S. 2769

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2769, a bill to authorize funding for National Instant Criminal Background Check System improvements.

S. 2793

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2793, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen the limitation on holding and transfer of broadcast licenses to foreign persons, and to apply a similar limitation to holding and transfer of other telecommunications media by or to foreign governments.

S. 2806

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2806, a bill to amend the National Housing Act to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to terminate mortgagee origination approval for poorly performing mortgagees.

S. 2807

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) and the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2807, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a Medicare Prescription Drug and Supplemental Benefit Program and to stabilize and improve the Medicare+Choice program, and for other purposes.

S. 2815

At the request of Mr. CLELAND, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2815, a bill to provide for the nationwide designation of 2–1–1 as a toll-free telephone number for access to information and referrals on human services, to encourage the deployment of the toll-free telephone number, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 60

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) 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. 123

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 123, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding manipulation of the mass and intimidation of the independent press in the Russian Federation, expressing support for freedom of speech and the independent media in the Russian Federation, and calling on the President of the United States to express his strong concern for freedom of speech and the independent media in the Russian Federation.

S. CON. RES. 128

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 128, a concurrent resolution to urge the Nobel Commission to award the Nobel Prize for Peace to His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, for his dedication to fostering peace throughout the world.

S. RES. 268

At the request of Mr. EDWARDS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 268, a resolution designating July 17 through July 23 as ''National Fragile X Awareness Week.''

S. RES. 294

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 294, a resolution designating the month of October 2000 as ''Children's Internet Safety Month.''

S. RES. 304

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico

(Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 304, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the development of educational programs on veterans' contributions to the country and the designation of the week that includes Veterans Day as ''National Veterans Awareness Week'' for the presentation of such educational programs.

S. RES. 332

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 332, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to the peace process in Northern Ireland.

AMENDMENT NO. 3751

At the request of Mr. BENNETT, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3751 proposed to S. 2549, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 334—EXPRESSING APPRECIATION TO THE PEOPLE OF OKINAWA FOR HOSTING UNITED STATES DEFENSE FACILITIES, COMMENDING THE GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN FOR CHOOSING OKINAWA AS THE SITE FOR HOSTING THE SUMMIT MEETING OF THE G–8 COUNTRIES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. INOUYE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 334

Whereas the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan, signed at Washington January 19, 1960 (11 UST 1632), serves the common security needs of the United States and Japan and is the foundation of peace and stability in East Asia;

Whereas the maintenance of the forward-based elements of the Armed Forces of the United States gives credibility to the United States role in the region;

Whereas the largest United States military bases in East Asia are in Okinawa;

Whereas, in attending the summit meeting of the G-8 countries in Okinawa in July 2000, President Clinton will be making the first visit by a United States President to Okinawa;

Whereas the late Keizo Obuchi, former Prime Minister of Japan, strongly supported the choice of Okinawa as the site for the summit meeting of the G-8 countries and devoted much energy to Okinawan affairs;

Whereas Prime Minister Yoshiro Mori of Japan is deeply committed to the successful hosting of the summit meeting of the G-8 countries in Okinawa and to the development of the prefecture of Okinawa; and

Whereas Governor Keichi Inamine of Okinawa and the people of Okinawa have shown their desire to play a significantly greater role in regional and global affairs through their hosting of the summit meeting of the G-8 countries and other initiatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its deep appreciation to the people of Okinawa for hosting the United States military facilities in Okinawa, which are of vital importance to peace and stability in East Asia;

(2) commends the Government of Japan for its choice of Okinawa as the site for hosting the leaders of the G-8 countries;

(3) expresses hope for a successful summit meeting of the G-8 countries; and

(4) urges the President to work with the leaders of Japan to devise a joint United States-Japan education initiative that strengthens the human resource base in Okinawa, particularly with a view to meeting Okinawa's economic needs and Asia-Pacific aspirations.

SEC. 2. In this resolution, the term ''G-8 countries'' means the group of countries consisting of France, Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Italy, and Russia established to facilitate economic cooperation among the eight major economic powers.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

WELLSTONE (AND GRAMS) AMENDMENT NO. 3771

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself and Mr. GRAMS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H.R. 4578) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For an additional amount for 'National Forest System' for emergency expenses resulting from damages from wind storms, $7,249,000, to become available upon enactment of this act and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined by such Act, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

WELLSTONE AMENDMENT NO. 3772

Mr. WELLSTONE (for himself and Mr. GRAMS) proposed an amendment to the bill 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 165, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

For an additional amount for emergency expenses resulting from damage from windstorms, $7,249,000, to become available upon enactment of this Act, and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that the President submits to Congress an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.): *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)).

GORTON AMENDMENT NO. 3773

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. GORTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 167, line 15 of the bill, insert the number ''0'' between the numbers ''1'' and ''5''.

STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 3774

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. STEVENS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . Sections 5104, 5106 and 5109 of division B of H.R. 4425 as presented to the President on July 1, 2000 (106th Congress), are repealed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 3775

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DOMENICI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2549) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 353, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SEC. 914. COORDINATION AND FACILITATION OF DEVELOPMENT OF DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES, SYSTEMS, AND WEAPONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Directed energy systems are available to address many current challenges with respect to military weapons, including offensive weapons and defensive weapons.

(2) Directed energy weapons offer the potential to maintain an asymmetrical technological edge over adversaries of the United States for the foreseeable future.

(3) It is in the national interest that funding for directed energy science and technology programs be increased in order to support priority acquisition programs and to develop new technologies for future applications.

(4) It is in the national interest that the level of funding for directed energy science and technology programs correspond to the level of funding for large-scale demonstration programs in order to ensure the growth

of directed energy science and technology programs and to ensure the successful development of other weapons systems utilizing directed energy systems.

(5) The industrial base for several critical directed energy technologies is in fragile condition and lacks appropriate incentives to make the large-scale investments that are necessary to address current and anticipated Department of Defense requirements for such technologies.

(6) It is in the national interest that the Department of Defense utilize and expand upon directed energy research currently being conducted by the Department of Energy, other Federal agencies, the private sector, and academia.

(7) It is increasingly difficult for the Federal Government to recruit and retain personnel with skills critical to directed energy technology development.

(8) The implementation of the recommendations contained in the High Energy Laser Master Plan of the Department of Defense is in the national interest.

(9) Implementation of the management structure outlined in the Master Plan will facilitate the development of revolutionary capabilities in directed energy weapons by achieving a coordinated and focused investment strategy under a new management structure featuring a joint technology office with senior-level oversight provided by a technology council and a board of directors.

(b) COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT UNDER HIGH ENERGY LASER MASTER PLAN.—(1) Subchapter II of Chapter 8 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 204. Joint Technology Office

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—(1) There is in the Department of Defense a Joint Technology Office (in this section referred to as the 'Office'). The Office shall be considered an independent office within the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

''(2) The Secretary of Defense may delegate responsibility for authority, direction, and control of the Office to the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Science and Technology.

''(b) DIRECTOR.—(1) The head of the Office shall be a civilian employee of the Department of Defense in the Senior Executive Service who is designated by the Secretary of Defense for that purpose. The head of the Office shall be known as the 'Director of the Joint Technology Office'.

''(2) The Director shall report directly to the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Science and Technology.

''(c) OTHER STAFF.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide the Office such civilian and military personnel and other resources as are necessary to permit the Office to carry out its duties under this section.

''(d) DUTIES.—The duties of the Office shall be to—

''(1) develop and oversee the management of a Department of Defense-wide program of science and technology relating to directed energy technologies, systems, and weapons;

''(2) serve as a point of coordination for initiatives for science and technology relating to directed energy technologies, systems, and weapons from throughout the Department of Defense;

''(3) develop and promote a program (to be known as the 'National Directed Energy Technology Alliance') to foster the exchange of information and cooperative activities on directed energy technologies, systems, and weapons between and among the Department of Defense, other Federal agencies, institutions of higher education, and the private sector;

''(4) initiate and oversee the coordination of the high-energy laser and high power microwave programs and offices of the military departments; and

''(5) carry out such other activities relating to directed energy technologies, systems, and weapons as the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Science and Technology considers appropriate.

''(e) COORDINATION WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—(1) The Director of the Office shall assign to appropriate personnel of the Office the performance of liaison functions with the other Defense Agencies and with the military departments.

''(2) The head of each military department and Defense Agency having an interest in the activities of the Office shall assign personnel of such department or Defense Agency to assist the Office in carrying out its duties. In providing such assistance, such personnel shall be known collectively as 'Technology Area Working Groups'.

''(f) JOINT TECHNOLOGY BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—(1) There is established in the Department of Defense a board to be known as the 'Joint Technology Board of Directors' (in this section referred to as the 'Board').

''(2) The Board shall be composed of 9 members as follows:

''(A) The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, who shall serve as chairperson of the Board.

''(B) The Director of Defense Research and Engineering, who shall serve as vice-chairperson of the Board.

''(C) The senior acquisition executive of the Department of the Army.

''(D) The senior acquisition executive of the Department of the Navy.

''(E) The senior acquisition executive of the Department of the Air Force.

''(F) The senior acquisition executive of the Marine Corps.

''(G) The Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

''(H) The Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization.

''(I) The Director of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency.

''(3) The duties of the Board shall be—

''(A) to review and comment on recommendations made and issues raised by the Council under this section; and

''(B) to review and oversee the activities of the Office under this section.

''(g) JOINT TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL.—(1) There is established in the Department of Defense a council to be known as the 'Joint Technology Council' (in this section referred to as the 'Council').

''(2) The Council shall be composed of 8 members as follows:

''(A) The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Science and Technology, who shall be chairperson of the Council.

''(B) The senior science and technology executive of the Department of the Army.

''(C) The senior science and technology executive of the Department of the Navy.

''(D) The senior science and technology executive of the Department of the Air Force.

''(E) The senior science and technology executive of the Marine Corps.

''(F) The senior science and technology executive of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

''(G) The senior science and technology executive of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization.

''(H) The senior science and technology executive of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency.

''(3) The duties of the Council shall be—

''(A) to review and recommend priorities among programs, projects, and activities proposed and evaluated by the Office under this section;

''(B) to make recommendations to the Board regarding funding for such programs, projects, and activities; and

''(C) to otherwise review and oversee the activities of the Office under this section.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter II of chapter 8 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''204. Joint Technology Office.''.

(3)(A) The Secretary of Defense shall locate the Joint Technology Office under section 204 of title 10, United States Code (as added by this subsection), at a location determined appropriate by the Secretary, not later than October 1, 2000.

(B) In determining the location of the Office, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Science and Technology, evaluate whether to locate the Office at a site at which occur a substantial proportion of the directed energy research, development, test, and evaluation activities of the Department of Defense.

(c) TECHNOLOGY AREA WORKING GROUPS UNDER HIGH ENERGY LASER MASTER PLAN.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the implementation of the portion of the High Energy Laser Master Plan relating to technology area working groups.

(d) ENHANCEMENT OF INDUSTRIAL BASE.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall develop and undertake initiatives, including investment initiatives, for purposes of enhancing the industrial base for directed energy technologies and systems.

(2) Initiatives under paragraph (1) shall be designed to—

(A) stimulate the development by institutions of higher education and the private sector of promising directed energy technologies and systems; and

(B) stimulate the development of a workforce skilled in such technologies and systems.

(e) ENHANCEMENT OF TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITIES.—The Secretary of Defense shall consider modernizing the High Energy Laser Test Facility at White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, in order to enhance the test and evaluation capabilities of the Department of Defense with respect to directed energy weapons.

(f) COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall evaluate the feasibility and advisability of entering into cooperative programs or activities with other Federal agencies, institutions of higher education, and the private sector, including the national laboratories of the Department of Energy, for the purpose of enhancing the programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Defense relating to directed energy technologies, systems, and weapons. The Secretary shall carry out the evaluation in consultation with the Joint Technology Board of Directors established by section 204 of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (b) of this section).

(2) The Secretary shall enter into any cooperative program or activity determined under the evaluation under paragraph (1) to be feasible and advisable for the purpose set forth in that paragraph.

(g) PARTICIPATION OF JOINT TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL IN ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of Defense shall, to the maximum extent practicable, carry out activities under subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f), through the Joint Technology Council established pursuant to section 204 of title 10, United States Code.

(h) FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—(1)(A) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, up to $50,000,000 may be available for science and technology activities relating to directed energy technologies, systems, and weapons.

(2) The Director of the Joint Technology Office established pursuant to section 204 of title 10, United States Code, shall allocate amounts available under paragraph (1) among appropriate program elements of the Department of Defense, and among cooperative programs and activities under this section, in accordance with such procedures as the Director shall establish.

(3) In establishing procedures for purposes of the allocation of funds under paragraph (2), the Director shall provide for the competitive selection of programs, projects, and activities to be the recipients of such funds.

(i) DIRECTED ENERGY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''directed energy'', with respect to technologies, systems, or weapons, means technologies, systems, or weapons that provide for the directed transmission of energies across the energy and frequency spectrum, including high energy lasers and high power microwaves.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SHELBY AMENDMENT NO. 3776

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. SHELBY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 163, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. 1___. MIGRATORY BIRD TREATY ACT PENALTIES.

Section 6 of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 707) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''$15,000'' and inserting ''$5,000''; and

(2) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

''(c) PLACEMENT OF BAIT.—Notwithstanding section 3571 of title 18, United States Code—

''(1) an individual who violates section 3(b)(2) shall be fined not more than $5,000, imprisoned not more than 180 days, or both; and

''(2) a person, other than an individual, that violates section 3(b)(2) shall be fined not more than $10,000, imprisoned not more than 180 days, or both.''.

DISABLED VETERANS' LIFE MEMORIAL LEGISLATION

THOMAS AMENDMENT NO. 3777

Mr. WARNER (for Mr. THOMAS) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 311) to authorize the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 2, line 1, strike ''American''.

On page 2, line 10, strike ''American''.

On page 3, after line 16, insert the following new section and redesignate the following sections accordingly:

''SEC. 201 SHORT TITLE.

''This title may be cited as the ''Commemorative Works Clarification and Revision Act of 2000''.

4. On page 8, line 6, through page 9, line 6, strike subsection (h) in its entirety and insert the following:

''(h) Section 8 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1008) is amended as follows:

''(1) In subsection (a)(3) and (a)(4) and in subsection (b) by striking ''person'' each place it appears and inserting ''sponsor'';

''(2) By amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) In addition to the foregoing criteria, no construction permit shall be issued unless the sponsor authorized to construct the commemorative work has donated an amount equal to 10 percent of the total estimated cost of construction to offset the costs of perpetual maintenance and preservation of the commemorative work. All such proceeds shall be available for the nonrecurring repair of the sponsor's commemorative work pursuant to the provisions of this subsection. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply in instances when the commemorative work is constructed by a Department or agency of the Federal Government and less than 50 percent of the funding for such work is provided by private sources.

''(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, money on deposit in the Treasury on the date of enactment of this subsection provided by a sponsor for maintenance pursuant to this subsection shall be credited to a separate account in the Treasury.

''(2) Money provided by a sponsor pursuant to the provisions of this subsection after the date of enactment of the Commemorative Works Clarification and Revision Act of 2000 shall be credited to a separate account with the National Park Foundation.

''(3) Upon request, the Secretary of the Treasury or the National Park Foundation shall make all or a portion of such moneys available to the Secretary or the Administrator (as appropriate) for the maintenance of a commemorative work. Under no circumstances may the Secretary or Administrator request funds from a separate account exceeding the total money in the account established under paragraph (1) or (2). The Secretary and the Administrator shall maintain an inventory of funds available for such purposes. Funds provided under this paragraph shall be available without further appropriation and shall remain available until expended.''; and

''(3) By amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) The sponsor shall be required to submit to the Secretary or the Administrator (as appropriate) an annual report of operations, including financial statements audited by an independent certified public accountant, paid for by the sponsor authorized to construct the commemorative work.''.

5. On page 10, after line 17, insert the following:

''SEC. 204. PREVIOUSLY APPROVED MEMORIALS.

''Nothing in this title shall apply to a memorial whose site was approved, in accordance with the Commemorative Works Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–652; 40 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), prior to the date of enactment of this title.''.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Wednesday, July 12, 2000 at 2:30 p.m. in room 485 of the Russell Senate Building to conduct an oversight hearing on the reports of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the General Accounting Office on Risk Management and Tort Liability.

Those wishing additional information may contact committee staff at 202/224–2251.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sheila Sweeney and Scott Dalzell, detailees to the Appropriations Committee, be granted floor privileges for the duration of debate on the fiscal year 2001 Interior appropriations bill.

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dan Alpert, a fellow in my office, be allowed floor privileges during the pendency of this bill.

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

ELECTRIC RELIABILITY 2000 ACT

On June 30, 2000, the Senate passed S. 2071. the Electric Reliability 2000 Act, as follows:

S. 2071

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 ''Electric Reliability 2000 Act''.

SEC. 2. ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part II of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 215. ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) AFFILIATED REGIONAL RELIABILITY ENTITY.—The term 'affiliated regional reliability entity' means an entity delegated authority under subsection (h).

''(2) BULK-POWER SYSTEM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'bulk-power system' means all facilities and control systems necessary for operating an interconnected electric power transmission grid or any portion of an interconnected transmission grid.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'bulk-power system' includes—

''(i) high voltage transmission lines, substations, control centers, communications, data, and operations planning facilities necessary for the operation of all or any part of the interconnected transmission grid; and

''(ii) the output of generating units necessary to maintain the reliability of the transmission grid.

''(3) BULK-POWER SYSTEM USER.—The term 'bulk-power system user' means an entity that—

''(A) sells, purchases, or transmits electric energy over a bulk-power system; or

''(B) owns, operates, or maintains facilities or control systems that are part of a bulk-power system; or

''(C) is a system operator.

''(4) ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.—The term 'electric reliability organization' means the organization designated by the Commission under subsection (d).

''(5) ENTITY RULE.—The term 'entity rule' means a rule adopted by an affiliated regional reliability entity for a specific region and designed to implement or enforce 1 or more organization standards.

''(6) INDEPENDENT DIRECTOR.—The term 'independent director' means a person that—

''(A) is not an officer or employee of an entity that would reasonably be perceived as having a direct financial interest in the outcome of a decision by the board of directors of the electric reliability organization; and

''(B) does not have a relationship that would interfere with the exercise of independent judgment in carrying out the responsibilities of a director of the electric reliability organization.

''(7) INDUSTRY SECTOR.—The term 'industry sector' means a group of bulk-power system users with substantially similar commercial interests, as determined by the board of directors of the electric reliability organization.

''(8) INTERCONNECTION.—The term 'interconnection' means a geographic area in which the operation of bulk-power system components is synchronized so that the failure of 1 or more of the components may adversely affect the ability of the operators of other components within the interconnection to maintain safe and reliable operation of the facilities within their control.

''(9) ORGANIZATION STANDARD.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'organization standard' means a policy or standard adopted by the electric reliability organization to provide for the reliable operation of a bulk-power system.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'organization standard' includes—

''(i) an entity rule approved by the electric reliability organization; and

''(ii) a variance approved by the electric reliability organization.

''(10) PUBLIC INTEREST GROUP.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'public interest group' means a nonprofit private or public organization that has an interest in the activities of the electric reliability organization.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'public interest group' includes—

''(i) a ratepayer advocate;

''(ii) an environmental group; and

''(iii) a State or local government organization that regulates participants in, and promulgates government policy with respect to, the market for electric energy.

''(11) SYSTEM OPERATOR.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'system operator' means an entity that operates or is responsible for the operation of a bulk-power system.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'system operator' includes—

''(i) a control area operator;

''(ii) an independent system operator;

''(iii) a transmission company;

''(iv) a transmission system operator; and

''(v) a regional security coordinator.

''(12) VARIANCE.—The term 'variance' means an exception from the requirements of an organization standard (including a proposal for an organization standard in a case in which there is no organization standard) that is adopted by an affiliated regional reliability entity and is applicable to all or a part of the region for which the affiliated regional reliability entity is responsible.

''(b) COMMISSION AUTHORITY.—

''(1) JURISDICTION.—Notwithstanding section 201(f), within the United States, the Commission shall have jurisdiction over the electric reliability organization, all affiliated regional reliability entities, all system operators, and all bulk-power system users, including entities described in section 201(f), for purposes of approving organization standards and enforcing compliance with this section.

''(2) DEFINITION OF TERMS.—The Commission may by regulation define any term used in this section consistent with the definitions in subsection (a) and the purpose and intent of this Act.

''(c) EXISTING RELIABILITY STANDARDS.—

''(1) SUBMISSION TO THE COMMISSION.—Before designation of an electric reliability organization under subsection (d), any person, including the North American Electric Reliability Council and its member Regional Reliability Councils, may submit to the Commission any reliability standard, guidance, practice, or amendment to a reliability standard, guidance, or practice that the person proposes to be made mandatory and enforceable.

''(2) REVIEW BY THE COMMISSION.—The Commission, after allowing interested persons an opportunity to submit comments, may approve a proposed mandatory standard, guidance, practice, or amendment submitted under paragraph (1) if the Commission finds that the standard, guidance, or practice is just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest.

''(3) EFFECT OF APPROVAL.—A standard, guidance, or practice shall be mandatory and applicable according to its terms following approval by the Commission and shall remain in effect until it is—

''(A) withdrawn, disapproved, or superseded by an organization standard that is issued or approved by the electric reliability organization and made effective by the Commission under subsection (e); or

''(B) disapproved by the Commission if, on complaint or upon motion by the Commission and after notice and an opportunity for comment, the Commission finds the standard, guidance, or practice to be unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory or preferential, or not in the public interest.

''(4) ENFORCEABILITY.—A standard, guidance, or practice in effect under this subsection shall be enforceable by the Commission.

''(d) DESIGNATION OF ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.—

''(1) REGULATIONS.—

''(A) PROPOSED REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Commission shall propose regulations specifying procedures and requirements for an entity to apply for designation as the electric reliability organization.

''(B) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—The Commission shall provide notice and opportunity for comment on the proposed regulations.

''(C) FINAL REGULATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Commission shall promulgate final regulations under this subsection.

''(2) APPLICATION.—

''(A) Submission.—Following the promulgation of final regulations under paragraph (1), an entity may submit an application to the Commission for designation as the electric reliability organization.

''(B) CONTENTS.—The applicant shall describe in the application—

''(i) the governance and procedures of the applicant; and

''(ii) the funding mechanism and initial funding requirements of the applicant.

''(3) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—The Commission shall—

''(A) provide public notice of the application; and

''(B) afford interested parties an opportunity to comment.

''(4) DESIGNATION OF ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.—The Commission shall designate the applicant as the electric reliability organization if the Commission determines that the applicant—

''(A) has the ability to develop, implement, and enforce standards that provide for an adequate level of reliability of bulk-power systems;

''(B) permits voluntary membership to any bulk-power system user or public interest group;

''(C) ensures fair representation of its members in the selection of its directors and fair management of its affairs, taking into account the need for efficiency and effectiveness in decisionmaking and operations and the requirements for technical competency in the development of organization standards and the exercise of oversight of bulk-power system reliability;

''(D) ensures that no 2 industry sectors have the ability to control, and no 1 industry sector has the ability to veto, the applicant's discharge of its responsibilities as the electric reliability organization (including actions by committees recommending standards for approval by the board or other board actions to implement and enforce standards);

''(E) provides for governance by a board wholly comprised of independent directors;

''(F) provides a funding mechanism and requirements that—

''(i) are just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential and in the public interest; and

''(ii) satisfy the requirements of subsection (l);

''(G) has established procedures for development of organization standards that—

''(i) provide reasonable notice and opportunity for public comment, taking into account the need for efficiency and effectiveness in decisionmaking and operations and the requirements for technical competency in the development of organization standards;

''(ii) ensure openness, a balancing of interests, and due process; and

''(iii) includes alternative procedures to be followed in emergencies;

''(H) has established fair and impartial procedures for implementation and enforcement of organization standards, either directly or through delegation to an affiliated regional reliability entity, including the imposition of penalties, limitations on activities, functions, or operations, or other appropriate sanctions;

''(I) has established procedures for notice and opportunity for public observation of all meetings, except that the procedures for public observation may include alternative procedures for emergencies or for the discussion of information that the directors reasonably determine should take place in closed session, such as litigation, personnel actions, or commercially sensitive information;

''(J) provides for the consideration of recommendations of States and State commissions; and

''(K) addresses other matters that the Commission considers appropriate to ensure that the procedures, governance, and funding of the electric reliability organization are just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest.

''(5) EXCLUSIVE DESIGNATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall designate only 1 electric reliability organization.

''(B) MULTIPLE APPLICATIONS.—If the Commission receives 2 or more timely applications that satisfy the requirements of this subsection, the Commission shall approve only the application that the Commission determines will best implement this section.

''(e) ORGANIZATION STANDARDS.—

''(1) SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS TO COMMISSION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The electric reliability organization shall submit to the Commission proposals for any new or modified organization standards.

''(B) CONTENTS.—A proposal submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

''(i) a concise statement of the purpose of the proposal; and

''(ii) a record of any proceedings conducted with respect to the proposal.

''(2) REVIEW BY THE COMMISSION.—

''(A) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—The Commission shall—

''(i) provide notice of a proposal under paragraph (1); and

''(ii) allow interested persons 30 days to submit comments on the proposal.

''(B) ACTION BY THE COMMISSION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—After taking into consideration any submitted comments, the Commission shall approve or disapprove a proposed organization standard not later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the deadline for the submission of comments, except that the Commission may extend the 60-day period for an additional 90 days for good cause.

''(ii) FAILURE TO ACT.—If the Commission does not approve or disapprove a proposal within the period specified in clause (i), the proposed organization standard shall go into effect subject to its terms, without prejudice to the authority of the Commission to modify the organization standard in accordance with the standards and requirements of this section.

''(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—An organization standard approved by the Commission shall take effect not earlier than 30 days after the date of the Commission's order of approval.

''(D) STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall approve a proposed new or modified organization standard if the Commission determines the organization standard to be just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest.

''(ii) CONSIDERATIONS.—In the exercise of its review responsibilities under this subsection, the Commission—

''(I) shall give due weight to the technical expertise of the electric reliability organization with respect to the content of a new or modified organization standard; but

''(II) shall not defer to the electric reliability organization with respect to the effect of the organization standard on competition.

''(E) REMAND.—A proposed organization standard that is disapproved in whole or in part by the Commission shall be remanded to the electric reliability organization for further consideration.

''(3) ORDERS TO DEVELOP OR MODIFY ORGANIZATION STANDARDS.—The Commission, on complaint or on motion of the Commission, may order the electric reliability organization to develop and submit to the Commission, by a date specified in the order, an organization standard or modification to an existing organization standard to address a specific matter if the Commission considers a new or modified organization standard appropriate to carry out this section, and the electric reliability organization shall develop and submit the organization standard or modification to the Commission in accordance with this subsection.

''(4) VARIANCES AND ENTITY RULES.—

''(A) PROPOSAL.—An affiliated regional reliability entity may propose a variance or entity rule to the electric reliability organization.

''(B) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—If expedited consideration is necessary to provide for bulk-power system reliability, the affiliated regional reliability entity may—

''(i) request that the electric reliability organization expedite consideration of the proposal; and

''(ii) file a notice of the request with the Commission.

''(C) FAILURE TO ACT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If the electric reliability organization fails to adopt the variance or entity rule, in whole or in part, the affiliated regional reliability entity may request that the Commission review the proposal.

''(ii) ACTION BY THE COMMISSION.—If the Commission determines, after a review of the request, that the action of the electric reliability organization did not conform to the applicable standards and procedures approved by the Commission, or if the Commission determines that the variance or entity rule is just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest and that the electric reliability organization has unreasonably rejected or failed to act on the proposal, the Commission may—

''(I) remand the proposal for further consideration by the electric reliability organization; or

''(II) order the electric reliability organization or the affiliated regional reliability entity to develop a variance or entity rule consistent with that requested by the affiliated regional reliability entity.

''(D) PROCEDURE.—A variance or entity rule proposed by an affiliated regional reliability entity shall be submitted to the electric reliability organization for review and submission to the Commission in accordance with the procedures specified in paragraph (2).

''(5) IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVENESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, a new or modified organization standard shall take effect immediately on submission to the Commission without notice or comment if the electric reliability organization—

''(i) determines that an emergency exists requiring that the new or modified organization standard take effect immediately without notice or comment;

''(ii) notifies the Commission as soon as practicable after making the determination;

''(iii) submits the new or modified organization standard to the Commission not later than 5 days after making the determination; and

''(iv) includes in the submission an explanation of the need for immediate effectiveness.

''(B) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—The Commission shall—

''(i) provide notice of the new or modified organization standard or amendment for comment; and

''(ii) follow the procedures set out in paragraphs (2) and (3) for review of the new or modified organization standard.

''(6) COMPLIANCE.—Each bulk power system user shall comply with an organization standard that takes effect under this section.

''(f) COORDINATION WITH CANADA AND MEXICO.—

''(1) RECOGNITION.—The electric reliability organization shall take all appropriate steps to gain recognition in Canada and Mexico.

''(2) INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall use best efforts to enter into international agreements with the appropriate governments of Canada and Mexico to provide for—

''(i) effective compliance with organization standards; and

''(ii) the effectiveness of the electric reliability organization in carrying out its mission and responsibilities.

''(B) COMPLIANCE.—All actions taken by the electric reliability organization, an affiliated regional reliability entity, and the Commission shall be consistent with any international agreement under subparagraph (A).

''(g) CHANGES IN PROCEDURE, GOVERNANCE, OR FUNDING.—

''(1) SUBMISSION TO THE COMMISSION.—The electric reliability organization shall submit to the Commission—

''(A) any proposed change in a procedure, governance, or funding provision; or

''(B) any change in an affiliated regional reliability entity's procedure, governance, or funding provision relating to delegated functions.

''(2) CONTENTS.—A submission under paragraph (1) shall include an explanation of the basis and purpose for the change.

''(3) EFFECTIVENESS.—

''(A) CHANGES IN PROCEDURE.—

''(i) CHANGES CONSTITUTING A STATEMENT OF POLICY, PRACTICE, OR INTERPRETATION.—A proposed change in procedure shall take effect 90 days after submission to the Commission if the change constitutes a statement of policy, practice, or interpretation with respect to the meaning or enforcement of the procedure.

''(ii) OTHER CHANGES.—A proposed change in procedure other than a change described in clause (i) shall take effect on a finding by the Commission, after notice and opportunity for comment, that the change—

''(I) is just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest; and

''(II) satisfies the requirements of subsection (d)(4).

''(B) CHANGES IN GOVERNANCE OR FUNDING.—A proposed change in governance or funding shall not take effect unless the Commission finds that the change—

''(i) is just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest; and

''(ii) satisfies the requirements of subsection (d)(4).

''(4) ORDER TO AMEND.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission, on complaint or on the motion of the Commission, may require the electric reliability organization to amend a procedural, governance, or funding provision if the Commission determines that the amendment is necessary to meet the requirements of the section.

''(B) FILING.—The electric reliability organization shall submit the amendment in accordance with paragraph (1).

''(h) DELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF COMPLIANCE.—At the request of an entity, the electric reliability organization shall enter into an agreement with the entity for the delegation of authority to implement and enforce compliance with organization standards in a specified geographic area if the electric reliability organization finds that—

''(i) the entity satisfies the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), (F), (J), and (K) of subsection (d)(4); and

''(ii) the delegation would promote the effective and efficient implementation and administration of bulk-power system reliability.

''(B) OTHER AUTHORITY.—The electric reliability organization may enter into an agreement to delegate to an entity any other authority, except that the electric reliability organization shall reserve the right to set and approve standards for bulk-power system reliability.

''(2) APPROVAL BY THE COMMISSION.—

''(A) SUBMISSION TO THE COMMISSION.—The electric reliability organization shall submit to the Commission—

''(i) any agreement entered into under this subsection; and

''(ii) any information the Commission requires with respect to the affiliated regional reliability entity to which authority is delegated.

''(B) STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL.—The Commission shall approve the agreement, following public notice and an opportunity for comment, if the Commission finds that the agreement—

''(i) meets the requirements of paragraph (1); and

''(ii) is just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest.

''(C) REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION.—A proposed delegation agreement with an affiliated regional reliability entity organized on an interconnection-wide basis shall be rebuttably presumed by the Commission to

promote the effective and efficient implementation and administration of the reliability of the bulk-power system.

''(D) INVALIDITY ABSENT APPROVAL.—No delegation by the electric reliability organization shall be valid unless the delegation is approved by the Commission.

''(3) PROCEDURES FOR ENTITY RULES AND VARIANCES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A delegation agreement under this subsection shall specify the procedures by which the affiliated regional reliability entity may propose entity rules or variances for review by the electric reliability organization.

''(B) INTERCONNECTION-WIDE ENTITY RULES AND VARIANCES.—In the case of a proposal for an entity rule or variance that would apply on an interconnection-wide basis, the electric reliability organization shall approve the entity rule or variance unless the electric reliability organization makes a written finding that the entity rule or variance—

''(i) was not developed in a fair and open process that provided an opportunity for all interested parties to participate;

''(ii) would have a significant adverse impact on reliability or commerce in other interconnections;

''(iii) fails to provide a level of reliability of the bulk-power system within the interconnection such that the entity rule or variance would be likely to cause a serious and substantial threat to public health, safety, welfare, or national security; or

''(iv) would create a serious and substantial burden on competitive markets within the interconnection that is not necessary for reliability.

''(C) NONINTERCONNECTION-WIDE ENTITY RULES AND VARIANCES.—In the case of a proposal for an entity rule or variance that would apply only to part of an interconnection, the electric reliability organization shall approve the entity rule or variance if the affiliated regional reliability entity demonstrates that the proposal—

''(i) was developed in a fair and open process that provided an opportunity for all interested parties to participate;

''(ii) would not have an adverse impact on commerce that is not necessary for reliability;

''(iii) provides a level of bulk-power system reliability that is adequate to protect public health, safety, welfare, and national security and would not have a significant adverse impact on reliability; and

''(iv) in the case of a variance, is based on a justifiable difference between regions or subregions within the affiliated regional reliability entity's geographic area.

''(D) ACTION BY THE ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The electric reliability organization shall approve or disapprove a proposal under subparagraph (A) within 120 days after the proposal is submitted.

''(ii) FAILURE TO ACT.—If the electric reliability organization fails to act within the time specified in clause (i), the proposal shall be deemed to have been approved.

''(iii) SUBMISSION TO THE COMMISSION.—After approving a proposal under subparagraph (A), the electric reliability organization shall submit the proposal to the Commission for approval under the procedures prescribed under subsection (e).

''(E) DIRECT SUBMISSIONS.—An affiliated regional reliability entity may not submit a proposal for approval directly to the Commission except as provided in subsection (e)(4).

''(4) FAILURE TO REACH DELEGATION AGREEMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If an affiliated regional reliability entity requests, consistent with paragraph (1), that the electric reliability organization delegate authority to it, but is unable within 180 days to reach agreement with the electric reliability organization with respect to the requested delegation, the entity may seek relief from the Commission.

''(B) REVIEW BY THE COMMISSION.—The Commission shall order the electric reliability organization to enter into a delegation agreement under terms specified by the Commission if, after notice and opportunity for comment, the Commission determines that—

''(i) a delegation to the affiliated regional reliability entity would—

''(I) meet the requirements of paragraph (1); and

''(II) would be just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest; and

''(ii) the electric reliability organization unreasonably withheld the delegation.

''(5) ORDERS TO MODIFY DELEGATION AGREEMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—On complaint, or on motion of the Commission, after notice to the appropriate affiliated regional reliability entity, the Commission may order the electric reliability organization to propose a modification to a delegation agreement under this subsection if the Commission determines that—

''(i) the affiliated regional reliability entity—

''(I) no longer has the capacity to carry out effectively or efficiently the implementation or enforcement responsibilities under the delegation agreement;

''(II) has failed to meet its obligations under the delegation agreement; or

''(III) has violated this section;

''(ii) the rules, practices, or procedures of the affiliated regional reliability entity no longer provide for fair and impartial discharge of the implementation or enforcement responsibilities under the delegation agreement;

''(iii) the geographic boundary of a transmission entity approved by the Commission is not wholly within the boundary of an affiliated regional reliability entity, and the difference in boundaries is inconsistent with the effective and efficient implementation and administration of bulk-power system reliability; or

''(iv) the agreement is inconsistent with a delegation ordered by the Commission under paragraph (4).

''(B) SUSPENSION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Following an order to modify a delegation agreement under subparagraph (A), the Commission may suspend the delegation agreement if the electric reliability organization or the affiliated regional reliability entity does not propose an appropriate and timely modification.

''(ii) ASSUMPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES.—If a delegation agreement is suspended, the electric reliability organization shall assume the responsibilities delegated under the delegation agreement.

''(i) ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP.—Each system operator shall be a member of—

''(1) the electric reliability organization; and

''(2) any affiliated regional reliability entity operating under an agreement effective under subsection (h) applicable to the region in which the system operator operates, or is responsible for the operation of, a transmission facility.

''(j) ENFORCEMENT.—

''(1) DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with procedures approved by the Commission under subsection (d)(4)(H), the electric reliability organization may impose a penalty, limitation on activities, functions, or operations, or other disciplinary action that the electric reliability organization finds appropriate against a bulk-power system user if the electric reliability organization, after notice and an opportunity for interested parties to be heard, issues a finding in writing that the bulk-power system user has violated an organization standard.

''(B) NOTIFICATION.—The electric reliability organization shall immediately notify the Commission of any disciplinary action imposed with respect to an act or failure to act of a bulk-power system user that affected or threatened to affect bulk-power system facilities located in the United States.

''(C) RIGHT TO PETITION.—A bulk-power system user that is the subject of disciplinary action under paragraph (1) shall have the right to petition the Commission for a modification or rescission of the disciplinary action.

''(D) INJUNCTIONS.—If the electric reliability organization finds it necessary to prevent a serious threat to reliability, the electric reliability organization may seek injunctive relief in the United States district court for the district in which the affected facilities are located.

''(E) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Unless the Commission, on motion of the Commission or on application by the bulk-power system user that is the subject of the disciplinary action, suspends the effectiveness of a disciplinary action, the disciplinary action shall take effect on the 30th day after the date on which—

''(I) the electric reliability organization submits to the Commission—

''(aa) a written finding that the bulk-power system user violated an organization standard; and

''(bb) the record of proceedings before the electric reliability organization; and

''(II) the Commission posts the written finding on the Internet.

''(ii) DURATION.—A disciplinary action shall remain in effect or remain suspended unless the Commission, after notice and opportunity for hearing, affirms, sets aside, modifies, or reinstates the disciplinary action.

''(iii) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—The Commission shall conduct the hearing under procedures established to ensure expedited consideration of the action taken.

''(2) COMPLIANCE ORDERS.—The Commission, on complaint by any person or on motion of the Commission, may order compliance with an organization standard and may impose a penalty, limitation on activities, functions, or operations, or take such other disciplinary action as the Commission finds appropriate, against a bulk-power system user with respect to actions affecting or threatening to affect bulk-power system facilities located in the United States if the Commission finds, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, that the bulk-power system user has violated or threatens to violate an organization standard.

''(3) OTHER ACTIONS.—The Commission may take such action as is necessary against the electric reliability organization or an affiliated regional reliability entity to ensure compliance with an organization standard, or any Commission order affecting electric reliability organization or affiliated regional reliability entity.

''(k) RELIABILITY REPORTS.—The electric reliability organization shall—

''(1) conduct periodic assessments of the reliability and adequacy of the interconnected bulk-power system in North America; and

''(2) report annually to the Secretary of Energy and the Commission its findings and recommendations for monitoring or improving system reliability and adequacy.

''(l) ASSESSMENT AND RECOVERY OF CERTAIN COSTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The reasonable costs of the electric reliability organization, and the reasonable costs of each affiliated regional reliability entity that are related to implementation or enforcement of organization standards or other requirements contained in a delegation agreement approved under subsection (h), shall be assessed by the electric reliability organization and each affiliated regional reliability entity, respectively, taking into account the relationship of costs to each region and based on an allocation that reflects an equitable sharing of the costs among all electric energy consumers.

''(2) RULES.—The Commission shall provide by rule for the review of costs and allocations under paragraph (1) in accordance with the standards in this subsection and subsection (d)(4)(F).

''(m) APPLICATION OF ANTITRUST LAWS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the following activities are rebuttably presumed to be in compliance with the antitrust laws of the United States:

''(A) Activities undertaken by the electric reliability organization under this section or affiliated regional reliability entity operating under a delegation agreement under subsection (h).

''(B) Activities of a member of the electric reliability organizations or affiliated regional reliability entity in pursuit of the objectives of the electric reliability organization or affiliated regional reliability entity under this section undertaken in good faith under the rules of the organization of the electric reliability organization or affiliated regional reliability entity.

''(2) AVAILABILITY OF DEFENSES.—In a civil action brought by any person or entity against the electric reliability organization or an affiliated regional reliability entity alleging a violation of an antitrust law based on an activity under this Act, the defenses of primary jurisdiction and immunity from suit and other affirmative defenses shall be available to the extent applicable.

''(n) REGIONAL ADVISORY ROLE.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL ADVISORY BODY.—The Commission shall establish a regional advisory body on the petition of the Governors of at least two-thirds of the States within a region that have more than one-half of their electrical loads served within the region.

''(2) MEMBERSHIP.—A regional advisory body—

''(A) shall be composed of 1 member from each State in the region, appointed by the Governor of the State; and

''(B) may include representatives of agencies, States, and Provinces outside the United States, on execution of an appropriate international agreement described in subsection (f).

''(3) FUNCTIONS.—A regional advisory body may provide advice to the electric reliability organization, an affiliated regional reliability entity, or the Commission regarding—

''(A) the governance of an affiliated regional reliability entity existing or proposed within a region;

''(B) whether a standard proposed to apply within the region is just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest; and

''(C) whether fees proposed to be assessed within the region are—

''(i) just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, and in the public interest; and

''(ii) consistent with the requirements of subsection (l).

''(4) DEFERENCE.—In a case in which a regional advisory body encompasses an entire interconnection, the Commission may give deference to advice provided by the regional advisory body under paragraph (3).

''(o) APPLICABILITY OF SECTION.—This section does not apply outside the 48 contiguous States.

''(p) REHEARINGS; COURT REVIEW OF ORDERS.—Section 313 applies to an order of the Commission issued under this section.

''(q) PRESERVATION OF STATE AUTHORITY.—

''(1) The electric reliability organization shall have authority to develop, implement, and enforce compliance with standards for the reliable operation of only the bulk-power system.

''(2) This section does not provide the electric reliability organization or the Commission with the authority to set and enforce compliance with standards for adequacy or safety of electric facilities or services.

''(3) Nothing in this section shall be construed to preempt any authority of any State to take action to ensure the safety, adequacy, and reliability of electric service within that State, as long as such action is not inconsistent with any organization standard.

''(4) Not later than 90 days after the application of the electric reliability organization or other affected party, the Commission shall issue a final order determining whether a State action is inconsistent with an organization standard, after notice and opportunity for comment, taking into consideration any recommendations of the electric reliability organization.

''(5) The Commission, after consultation with the electric reliability organization, may stay the effectiveness of any State action, pending the Commission's issuance of a final order.''.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) GENERAL PENALTIES.—Section 316(c) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 825o(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''subsection'' and inserting ''section''; and

(B) by striking ''or 214'' and inserting ''214 or 215''.

(2) CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Section 316A of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 825o–1) is amended by striking ''or 214'' each place it appears and inserting ''214, or 215''.

THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 2001

On June 30, 2000, the Senate amended and passed H.R. 4577, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 4577) entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.'', do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Workforce Investment Act, including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, and the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Workforce Investment Act and the National Skill Standards Act of 1994; $2,990,141,000 plus reimbursements, of which $1,718,801,000 is available for obligation for the period July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002, of which $1,250,965,000 is available for obligation for the period April 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002, including $1,000,965,000 to carry out chapter 4 of the Workforce Investment Act and $250,000,000 to carry out section 169 of such Act; and of which $20,375,000 is available for the period July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2004 for necessary expenses of construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of Job Corps centers: Provided, That $9,098,000 shall be for carrying out section 172 of the Workforce Investment Act, and $3,500,000 shall be for carrying out the National Skills Standards Act of 1994: Provided further, That no funds from any other appropriation shall be used to provide meal services at or for Job Corps centers: Provided further, That funds provided to carry out section 171(d) of such Act may be used for demonstration projects that provide assistance to new entrants in the workforce and incumbent workers: Provided further, That funding provided to carry out projects under section 171 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 that are identified in the Conference Agreement, shall not be subject to the requirements of section 171(b)(2)(B) of such Act, the requirements of section 171(c)(4)(D) of such Act, or the joint funding requirements of sections 171(b)(2)(A) and 171(c)(4)(A) of such Act: Provided further, That funding appropriated herein for Dislocated Worker Employment and Training Activities under section 132(a)(2)(A) of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 may be distributed for Dislocated Worker Projects under section 171(d) of the Act without regard to the 10 percent limitation contained in section 171(d) of the Act.

For necessary expenses of the Workforce Investment Act, including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, and the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Workforce Investment Act; $2,463,000,000 plus reimbursements, of which $2,363,000,000 is available for obligation for the period October 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002, and of which $100,000,000 is available for the period October 1, 2001 through June 30, 2004, for necessary expenses of construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of Job Corps centers.

COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

To carry out the activities for national grants or contracts with public agencies and public or private nonprofit organizations under paragraph (1)(A) of section 506(a) of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, or to carry out older worker activities as subsequently authorized, $343,356,000.

To carry out the activities for grants to States under paragraph (3) of section 506(a) of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, or to carry out older worker activities as subsequently authorized, $96,844,000.

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES

For payments during the current fiscal year of trade adjustment benefit payments and allowances under part I; and for training, allowances for job search and relocation, and related State administrative expenses under part II, subchapters B and D, chapter 2, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, $406,550,000, together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent appropriation for payments for any period subsequent to September 15 of the current year.

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

For authorized administrative expenses, $153,452,000, together with not to exceed $3,095,978,000 (including not to exceed $1,228,000 which may be used for amortization payments to States which had independent retirement plans in their State employment service agencies prior to 1980), which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund including the cost of administering section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, section 7(d) of the Wagner-Peyser Act, as amended, the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, the Immigration Act of 1990, and the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, and of which the sums available in the allocation for activities authorized by title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 502–504), and the sums available in the allocation for necessary administrative expenses for carrying out 5 U.S.C. 8501–8523, shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 2001, except that funds used for automation acquisitions shall be available for obligation by the States through September 30, 2003; and of which $153,452,000, together with not to exceed $763,283,000 of the amount which may be expended from said trust fund, shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002, to fund activities under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, including the cost of penalty mail authorized under 39 U.S.C. 3202(a)(1)(E) made available to States in lieu of allotments for such purpose: Provided, That to the extent that the Average Weekly Insured Unemployment (AWIU) for fiscal year 2001 is projected by the Department of Labor to exceed 2,396,000, an additional $28,600,000 shall be available for obligation for every 100,000 increase in the AWIU level (including a pro rata amount for any increment less than 100,000) from the Employment Security Administration Account of the Unemployment Trust Fund: Provided further, That funds appropriated in this Act which are used to establish a national one-stop career center system, or which are used to support the national activities of the Federal-State unemployment insurance programs, may be obligated in contracts, grants or agreements with non-State entities: Provided further, That funds appropriated under this Act for activities authorized under the Wagner-Peyser Act, as amended, and title III of the Social Security Act, may be used by the States to fund integrated Employment Service and Unemployment Insurance automation efforts, notwithstanding cost allocation principles prescribed under Office of Management and Budget Circular A–87.

ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

For repayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by sections 905(d) and 1203 of the Social Security Act, as amended, and to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund as authorized by section 9501(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; and for nonrepayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by section 8509 of title 5, United States Code, and to the ''Federal unemployment benefits and allowances'' account, to remain available until September 30, 2002, $435,000,000.

In addition, for making repayable advances to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year after September 15, 2001, for costs incurred by the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For expenses of administering employment and training programs, $107,651,000, including $6,431,000 to support up to 75 full-time equivalent staff, the majority of which will be term Federal appointments lasting no more than 1 year, to administer welfare-to-work grants, together with not to exceed $48,507,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

PENSION AND WELFARE BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, $103,342,000.

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION FUND

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures, including financial assistance authorized by section 104 of Public Law 96–364, within limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the program through September 30, 2001, for such Corporation: Provided, That not to exceed $11,652,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: Provided further, That expenses of such Corporation in connection with the termination of pension plans, for the acquisition, protection or management, and investment of trust assets, and for benefits administration services shall be considered as non-administrative expenses for the purposes hereof, and excluded from the above limitation.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Employment Standards Administration, including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, $350,779,000, together with $1,985,000 which may be expended from the Special Fund in accordance with sections 39(c), 44(d) and 44(j) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act: Provided, That $2,000,000 shall be for the development of an alternative system for the electronic submission of reports required to be filed under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, as amended, and for a computer database of the information for each submission by whatever means, that is indexed and easily searchable by the public via the Internet: Provided further, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to accept, retain, and spend, until expended, in the name of the Department of Labor, all sums of money ordered to be paid to the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the terms of the Consent Judgment in Civil Action No. 91–0027 of the United States District Court for the District of the Northern Mariana Islands (May 21, 1992): Provided further, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to establish and, in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3302, collect and deposit in the Treasury fees for processing applications and issuing certificates under sections 11(d) and 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 211(d) and 214) and for processing applications and issuing registrations under title I of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act (29 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

SPECIAL BENEFITS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses (except administrative expenses) accruing during the current or any prior fiscal year authorized by title 5, chapter 81 of the United States Code; continuation of benefits as provided for under the heading ''Civilian War Benefits'' in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act, 1944; sections 4(c) and 5(f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. App. 2012); and 50 percent of the additional compensation and benefits required by section 10(h) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, $56,000,000 together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation and other benefits for any period subsequent to August 15 of the current year: Provided, That amounts appropriated may be used under section 8104 of title 5, United States Code, by the Secretary of Labor to reimburse an employer, who is not the employer at the time of injury, for portions of the salary of a reemployed, disabled beneficiary: Provided further, That balances of reimbursements unobligated on September 30, 2000, shall remain available until expended for the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses: Provided further, That in addition there shall be transferred to this appropriation from the Postal Service and from any other corporation or instrumentality required under section 8147(c) of title 5, United States Code, to pay an amount for its fair share of the cost of administration, such sums as the Secretary determines to be the cost of administration for employees of such fair share entities through September 30, 2001: Provided further, That of those funds transferred to this account from the fair share entities to pay the cost of administration, $30,510,000 shall be made available to the Secretary as follows: (1) for the operation of and enhancement to the automated data processing systems, including document imaging, medical bill review, and periodic roll management, in support of Federal Employees' Compensation Act administration, $19,971,000; (2) for conversion to a paperless office, $7,005,000; (3) for communications redesign, $750,000; (4) for information technology maintenance and support, $2,784,000; and (5) the remaining funds shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: Provided further, That the Secretary may require that any person filing a notice of injury or a claim for benefits under chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, or 33 U.S.C. 901 et seq., provide as part of such notice and claim, such identifying information (including Social Security account number) as such regulations may prescribe.

BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Beginning in fiscal year 2001 and thereafter, such sums as may be necessary from the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund, to remain available until expended, for payment of all benefits authorized by section 9501(d)(1) (2) (4) and (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; and interest on advances as authorized by section 9501(c)(2) of that Act. In addition, the following amounts shall be available from the Fund for fiscal year 2001 for expenses of operation and administration of the Black Lung Benefits program as authorized by section 9501(d)(5) of that Act: $30,393,000 for transfer to the Employment Standards Administration, ''Salaries and Expenses''; $21,590,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, ''Salaries and Expenses''; $318,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, ''Office of Inspector General''; and $356,000 for payments into Miscellaneous Receipts for the expenses of the Department of Treasury.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, $425,983,000, including not to exceed $88,493,000 which shall be the maximum amount available for grants to States under section 23(g) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which grants shall be no less than 50 percent of the costs of State occupational safety and health programs required to be incurred under plans approved by the Secretary under section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; and, in addition, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration may retain up to $750,000 per fiscal year of training institute

course tuition fees, otherwise authorized by law to be collected, and may utilize such sums for occupational safety and health training and education grants: Provided, That of the amount appropriated under this heading that is in excess of the amount appropriated for such purposes for fiscal year 2000, at least $22,200,000 shall be used to carry out education, training, and consultation activities as described in subsections (c) and (d) of section 21 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 670(c) and (d)): Provided further, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Secretary of Labor is authorized, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, to collect and retain fees for services provided to Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratories, and may utilize such sums, in accordance with the provisions of 29 U.S.C. 9a, to administer national and international laboratory recognition programs that ensure the safety of equipment and products used by workers in the workplace: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to prescribe, issue, administer, or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 which is applicable to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs 10 or fewer employees: Provided further, That no funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to administer or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 with respect to any employer of 10 or fewer employees who is included within a category having an occupational injury lost workday case rate, at the most precise Standard Industrial Classification Code for which such data are published, less than the national average rate as such rates are most recently published by the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in accordance with section 24 of that Act (29 U.S.C. 673), except—

(1) to provide, as authorized by such Act, consultation, technical assistance, educational and training services, and to conduct surveys and studies;

(2) to conduct an inspection or investigation in response to an employee complaint, to issue a citation for violations found during such inspection, and to assess a penalty for violations which are not corrected within a reasonable abatement period and for any willful violations found;

(3) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to imminent dangers;

(4) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to health hazards;

(5) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to a report of an employment accident which is fatal to one or more employees or which results in hospitalization of two or more employees, and to take any action pursuant to such investigation authorized by such Act; and

(6) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to complaints of discrimination against employees for exercising rights under such Act:

Provided further, That the foregoing proviso shall not apply to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs 10 or fewer employees.

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Mine Safety and Health Administration, $244,747,000, including purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work, and the hire of passenger motor vehicles; including up to $1,000,000 for mine rescue and recovery activities, which shall be available only to the extent that fiscal year 2001 obligations for these activities exceed $1,000,000; in addition, not to exceed $750,000 may be collected by the National Mine Health and Safety Academy for room, board, tuition, and the sale of training materials, otherwise authorized by law to be collected, to be available for mine safety and health education and training activities, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302; and, in addition, the Administration may retain up to $1,000,000 from fees collected for the approval and certification of equipment, materials, and explosives for use in mines, and may utilize such sums for such activities; the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private; the Mine Safety and Health Administration is authorized to promote health and safety education and training in the mining community through cooperative programs with States, industry, and safety associations; and any funds available to the department may be used, with the approval of the Secretary, to provide for the costs of mine rescue and survival operations in the event of a major disaster.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursements to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, $369,327,000, together with not to exceed $67,257,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund; and $10,000,000 which shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002, for Occupational Employment Statistics.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for Departmental Management, including the hire of three sedans, and including the management or operation, through contracts, grants or other arrangements, of Departmental bilateral and multilateral foreign technical assistance, of which the funds designated to carry out bilateral assistance under the international child labor initiative shall be available for obligation through September 30, 2002, $30,000,000 for the acquisition of Departmental information technology, architecture, infrastructure, equipment, software and related needs which will be allocated by the Department's Chief Information Officer in accordance with the Department's capital investment management process to assure a sound investment strategy; $337,964,000: Provided, That no funds made available by this Act may be used by the Solicitor of Labor to participate in a review in any United States court of appeals of any decision made by the Benefits Review Board under section 21 of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 921) where such participation is precluded by the decision of the United States Supreme Court in Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs v. Newport News Shipbuilding, 115 S. Ct. 1278 (1995), notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary contained in Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure: Provided further, That no funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Labor to review a decision under the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) that has been appealed and that has been pending before the Benefits Review Board for more than 12 months: Provided further, That any such decision pending a review by the Benefits Review Board for more than 1 year shall be considered affirmed by the Benefits Review Board on the 1-year anniversary of the filing of the appeal, and shall be considered the final order of the Board for purposes of obtaining a review in the United States courts of appeals: Provided further, That these provisions shall not be applicable to the review or appeal of any decision issued under the Black Lung Benefits Act (30 U.S.C. 901 et seq.): Provided further, That beginning in fiscal year 2001, there is established in the Department of Labor an office of disability employment policy which shall, under the overall direction of the Secretary, provide leadership, develop policy and initiatives, and award grants furthering the objective of eliminating barriers to the training and employment of people with disabilities. Such office shall be headed by an assistant secretary: Provided further, That of amounts provided under this head, not more than $23,002,000 is for this purpose.

VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Not to exceed $186,913,000 may be derived from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 4100–4110A, 4212, 4214, and 4321–4327, and Public Law 103–353, and which shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 2001. To carry out the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act and section 168 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, $19,800,000, of which $7,300,000 shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 2001, through June 30, 2002.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $50,015,000, together with not to exceed $4,770,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds appropriated in this title for the Job Corps shall be used to pay the compensation of an individual, either as direct costs or any proration as an indirect cost, at a rate in excess of Executive Level II.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 102. Not to exceed 1 percent of any discretionary funds (pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended) which are appropriated for the current fiscal year for the Department of Labor in this Act may be transferred between appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 3 percent by any such transfer: Provided, That the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified at least 15 days in advance of any transfer.

SEC. 103. EXTENDED DEADLINE FOR EXPENDITURE. Section 403(a)(5)(C)(viii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(5)(C)(viii)) (as amended by section 806(b) of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106–113)) is amended by striking ''3 years'' and inserting ''5 years''.

SEC. 104. ELIMINATION OF SET-ASIDE OF PORTION OF WELFARE-TO-WORK FUNDS FOR PERFORMANCE BONUSES. (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 403(a)(5) of the Social Security Act (as amended by section 806(b) of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106–113)) is amended by striking subparagraph (E) and redesignating subparagraphs (F) through (K) as subparagraphs (E) through (J), respectively.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Social Security Act (as amended by section 806(b) of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106–113)) is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 403(a)(5)(A)(i) (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(5)(A)(i)) is amended by striking ''subparagraph (I)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (H)''.

(2) Subclause (I) of each of subparagraphs (A)(iv) and (B)(v) of section 403(a)(5) (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(5)(A)(iv)(I) and (B)(v)(I)) is amended—

(A) in item (aa)—

(i) by striking ''(I)'' and inserting ''(H)''; and

(ii) by striking ''(G), and (H)'' and inserting ''and (G)''; and

(B) in item (bb), by striking ''(F)'' and inserting ''(E)''.

(3) Section 403(a)(5)(B)(v) (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(5)(B)(v)) is amended in the matter preceding subclause (I) by striking ''(I)'' and inserting ''(H)''.

(4) Subparagraphs (E), (F), and (G)(i) of section 403(a)(5) (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(5)), as so redesignated by subsection (a) of this section, are each amended by striking ''(I)'' and inserting ''(H)''.

(5) Section 412(a)(3)(A) (42 U.S.C. 612(a)(3)(A)) is amended by striking ''403(a)(5)(I)'' and inserting ''403(a)(5)(H)''.

(c) FUNDING AMENDMENT.—Section 403(a)(5)(H)(i)(II) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(5)(H)(i))(II) (as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section and as amended by section 806(b) of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(4) of Public Law 106–113)) is further amended by striking ''$1,450,000,000'' and inserting ''$1,400,000,000''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section shall take effect on October 1, 2000.

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to promulgate, issue, implement, administer, or enforce any proposed, temporary, or final standard on ergonomic protection.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

For carrying out titles II, III, VII, VIII, X, XII, XIX, and XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, section 427(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, title V and section 1820 of the Social Security Act, the Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986, as amended, and the Native Hawaiian Health Care Act of 1988, as amended, $4,572,424,000, of which $150,000 shall remain available until expended for interest subsidies on loan guarantees made prior to fiscal year 1981 under part B of title VII of the Public Health Service Act, of which $10,000,000 shall be available for the construction and renovation of health care and other facilities, of which $25,000,000 from general revenues, notwithstanding section 1820(j) of the Social Security Act, shall be available for carrying out the Medicare rural hospital flexibility grants program under section 1820 of such Act, and of which $4,000,000 shall be provided to the Rural Health Outreach Office of the Health Resources and Services Administration for the awarding of grants to community partnerships in rural areas for the purchase of automated external defibrillators and the training of individuals in basic cardiac life support: Provided, That the Division of Federal Occupational Health may utilize personal services contracting to employ professional management/administrative and occupational health professionals: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, $250,000 shall be available until expended for facilities renovations at the Gillis W. Long Hansen's Disease Center: Provided further, That in addition to fees authorized by section 427(b) of the Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986, fees shall be collected for the full disclosure of information under the Act sufficient to recover the full costs of operating the National Practitioner Data Bank, and shall remain available until expended to carry out that Act: Provided further, That fees collected for the full disclosure of information under the ''Health Care Fraud and Abuse Data Collection Program'', authorized by section 221 of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, shall be sufficient to recover the full costs of operating the Program, and shall remain available to carry out that Act until expended: Provided further, That no more than $5,000,000 is available for carrying out the provisions of Public Law 104–73: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, $253,932,000 shall be for the program under title X of the Public Health Service Act to provide for voluntary family planning projects: Provided further, That amounts provided to said projects under such title shall not be expended for abortions, that all pregnancy counseling shall be nondirective, and that such amounts shall not be expended for any activity (including the publication or distribution of literature) that in any way tends to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal or candidate for public office: Provided further, That $538,000,000 shall be for State AIDS Drug Assistance Programs authorized by section 2616 of the Public Health Service Act.

RICKY RAY HEMOPHILIA RELIEF FUND PROGRAM

For payment to the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund, as provided by Public Law 105–369, $85,000,000, of which $10,000,000 shall be for program management.

HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program, as authorized by title VII of the Public Health Service Act, as amended. For administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, including section 709 of the Public Health Service Act, $3,679,000.

VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION PROGRAM TRUST FUND

For payments from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program Trust Fund, such sums as may be necessary for claims associated with vaccine-related injury or death with respect to vaccines administered after September 30, 1988, pursuant to subtitle 2 of title XXI of the Public Health Service Act, to remain available until expended: Provided, That for necessary administrative expenses, not to exceed $2,992,000 shall be available from the Trust Fund to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

DISEASE CONTROL, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING

To carry out titles II, III, VII, XI, XV, XVII, XIX and XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, sections 101, 102, 103, 201, 202, 203, 301, and 501 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, sections 20, 21, and 22 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act and section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980; including insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries; and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, $3,204,496,000, of which $20,000,000 shall be made available to carry out children's asthma programs and $4,000,000 of such $20,000,000 shall be utilized to carry out improved asthma surveillance and tracking systems and the remainder shall be used to carry out diverse community-based childhood asthma programs including both school- and community-based grant programs, except that not to exceed 5 percent of such funds may be used by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for administrative costs or reprogramming, and of which $175,000,000 shall remain available until expended for the facilities master plan for equipment and construction and renovation of facilities, and in addition, such sums as may be derived from authorized user fees, which shall be credited to this account, and of which $25,000,000 shall be made available through such Centers for the establishment of partnerships between the Federal Government and academic institutions and State and local public health departments to carry out pilot programs for antimicrobial resistance detection, surveillance, education and prevention and to conduct research on resistance mechanisms and new or more effective antimicrobial compounds, and of which $10,000,000 shall remain available until expended to carry out the Fetal Alcohol Syndrome prevention and services program: Provided, That in addition to amounts provided herein, up to $91,129,000 shall be available from amounts available under section 241 of the Public Health Service Act: Provided further, That none of the funds made available for injury prevention and control at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention may be used to advocate or promote gun control: Provided further, That the Director may redirect the total amount made available under authority of Public Law 101–502, section 3, dated November 3, 1990, to activities the Director may so designate: Provided further, That the Congress is to be notified promptly of any such transfer: Provided further, That not to exceed $10,000,000 may be available for making grants under section 1509 of the Public Health Service Act to not more than 15 States: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, a single contract or related contracts for development and construction of facilities may be employed which collectively include the full scope of the project: Provided further, That the solicitation and contract shall contain the clause ''availability of funds'' found at 48 CFR 52.232–18: Provided further, That in addition to amounts made available under this heading for the National Program of Cancer Registries, an additional $15,000,000 shall be made available for such Program and special emphasis in carrying out such Program shall be given to States with the highest number of the leading causes of cancer mortality: Provided further, That amounts made available under this Act for the administrative and related expenses of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall be reduced by $15,000,000: Provided further, That the funds made available under this heading for section 317A of the Public Health Service Act may be made available for programs operated in accordance with a strategy (developed and implemented by the Director for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) to identify and target resources for childhood lead poisoning prevention to high-risk populations, including ensuring that any individual or entity that receives a grant under that section to carry out activities relating to childhood lead poisoning prevention may use a portion of the grant funds awarded for the purpose of funding screening assessments and referrals at sites of operation of the Early Head Start programs under the Head Start Act.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to cancer, $3,804,084,000.

NATIONAL HEART, LUNG, AND BLOOD INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to cardiovascular, lung, and blood diseases, and blood and blood products, $2,328,102,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL AND CRANIOFACIAL RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to dental disease, $309,923,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DIABETES AND DIGESTIVE AND KIDNEY DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to diabetes and digestive and kidney disease, $1,318,106,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS AND STROKE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to neurological disorders and stroke, $1,189,425,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to allergy and infectious diseases, $2,066,526,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to general medical sciences, $1,554,176,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to child health and human development, $986,069,000.

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to eye diseases and visual disorders, $516,605,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For carrying out sections 301 and 311 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health sciences, $508,263,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON AGING

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to aging, $794,625,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND MUSCULOSKELETAL AND SKIN DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to arthritis and musculoskeletal and skin diseases, $401,161,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DEAFNESS AND OTHER COMMUNICATION DISORDERS

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to deafness and other communication disorders, $303,541,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NURSING RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to nursing research, $106,848,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to alcohol abuse and alcoholism, $336,848,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DRUG ABUSE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to drug abuse, $790,038,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to mental health, $1,117,928,000.

NATIONAL HUMAN GENOME RESEARCH INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to human genome research, $385,888,000.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH RESOURCES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to research resources and general research support grants, $775,212,000: Provided, That none of these funds shall be used to pay recipients of the general research support grants program any amount for indirect expenses in connection with such grants: Provided further, That $75,000,000 shall be for extramural facilities construction grants.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR COMPLEMENTARY AND ALTERNATIVE MEDICINE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to complementary and alternative medicine, $100,089,000.

JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER

For carrying out the activities at the John E. Fogarty International Center, $61,260,000.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to health information communications, $256,953,000, of which $4,000,000 shall be available until expended for improvement of information systems: Provided, That in fiscal year 2001, the Library may enter into personal services contracts for the provision of services in facilities owned, operated, or constructed under the jurisdiction of the National Institutes of Health.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the responsibilities of the Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health, $352,165,000, of which $48,271,000 shall be for the Office of AIDS Research: Provided, That funding shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 20 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only: Provided further, That the Director may direct up to 1 percent of the total amount made available in this or any other Act to all National Institutes of Health appropriations to activities the Director may so designate: Provided further, That no such appropriation shall be decreased by more than 1 percent by any such transfers and that the Congress is promptly notified of the transfer: Provided further, That the National Institutes of Health is authorized to collect third party payments for the cost of clinical services that are incurred in National Institutes of Health research facilities and that such payments shall be credited to the National Institutes of Health Management Fund: Provided further, That all funds credited to the National Institutes of Health Management Fund shall remain available for one fiscal year after the fiscal year in which they are deposited: Provided further, That up to $500,000 shall be available to carry out section 499 of the Public Health Service Act: Provided further, That, notwithstanding section 499(k)(10) of the Public Health Service Act, funds from the Foundation for the National Institutes of Health may be transferred to the National Institutes of Health.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For the study of, construction of, and acquisition of equipment for, facilities of or used by the National Institutes of Health, including the acquisition of real property, $148,900,000, to remain available until expended, of which $47,300,000 shall be for the neuroscience research center: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, a single contract or related contracts for the development and construction of the first phase of the National Neuroscience Research Center may be employed which collectively include the full scope of the project: Provided further, That the solicitation and contract shall contain the clause ''availability of funds'' found at 48 CFR 52.232–18.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

For carrying out titles V and XIX of the Public Health Service Act with respect to substance abuse and mental health services, the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986, and section 301 of the Public Health Service Act with respect to program management, $2,730,757,000, of which $15,000,000 shall remain available until expended to carry out the Fetal Alcohol Syndrome prevention and services program, of which $10,000,000 shall be used to provide grants to local non-profit private and public entities to enable such entities to develop and expand activities to provide substance abuse services to homeless individuals: Provided, That in addition to amounts provided herein, $12,000,000 shall be available from amounts available under section 241 of the Public Health Services Act, to carry out the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse: Provided further, That within the amounts provided herein, $3,000,000 shall be available for the Center for Mental Health Services to support through grants a certification program to improve and evaluate the effectiveness and responsiveness of suicide hotlines and crisis centers in the United States and to help support and evaluate a national hotline and crisis center network.

AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY

HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY

For carrying out titles III and IX of the Public Health Service Act, amounts received from Freedom of Information Act fees, reimbursable and interagency agreements, and the sale of data shall be credited to this appropriation and shall remain available until expended: Provided, That the amount made available pursuant to section 926(b) of the Public Health Service Act shall not exceed $269,943,000.

HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION

GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act, $93,586,251,000, to remain available until expended.

For making, after May 31, 2001, payments to States under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the last quarter of fiscal year 2001 for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

For making payments to States or in the case of section 1928 on behalf of States under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002, $36,207,551,000, to remain available until expended.

Payment under title XIX may be made for any quarter with respect to a State plan or plan amendment in effect during such quarter, if submitted in or prior to such quarter and approved in that or any subsequent quarter.

PAYMENTS TO HEALTH CARE TRUST FUNDS

For payment to the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as provided under sections 217(g) and 1844 of the Social Security Act, sections 103(c) and 111(d) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, section 278(d) of Public Law 97–248, and for administrative expenses incurred pursuant to section 201(g) of the Social Security Act, $70,381,600,000.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles XI, XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act, titles XIII and XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988, not to exceed $2,018,500,000, to be transferred from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as authorized by section 201(g) of the Social Security Act; together with all funds collected in accordance with section 353 of the Public Health Service Act and such sums as may be collected from authorized user fees and the sale of data, which shall remain available until expended, and together with administrative fees collected relative to Medicare overpayment recovery activities, which shall remain available until expended: Provided, That all funds derived in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 9701 from organizations established under title XIII of the Public Health Service Act shall be credited to and available for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation: Provided further, That $18,000,000 appropriated under this heading for the managed care system redesign shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That $3,000,000 of the amount available for research, demonstration, and evaluation activities shall be available to continue carrying out demonstration projects on Medicaid coverage of community-based attendant care services for people with disabilities which ensures maximum control by the consumer to select and manage their attendant care services: Provided further, That the Secretary of Health and Human Services is directed to collect fees in fiscal year 2001 from Medicare+Choice organizations pursuant to section 1857(e)(2) of the Social Security Act and from eligible organizations with risk-sharing contracts under section 1876 of

that Act pursuant to section 1876(k)(4)(D) of that Act: Provided further, That administrative fees collected relative to Medicare overpayment recovery activities shall be transferred to the Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control (HCFAC) account, to be used for Medicare Integrity Program (MIP) activities in addition to the amounts already specified, and shall remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

For making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981, $300,000,000: Provided, That these funds are hereby designated by the Congress to be emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: Provided further, That these funds shall be made available only after submission to the Congress of a formal budget request by the President that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in such Act.

REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE

For making payments for refugee and entrant assistance activities authorized by title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act and section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–422), $418,321,000, to remain available through September 30, 2003.

For carrying out section 5 of the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–320), $7,265,000.

PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS

For making payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV–D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), $2,473,880,000, to remain available until expended; and for such purposes for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002, $1,000,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For making payments to each State for carrying out the program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children under title IV–A of the Social Security Act before the effective date of the program of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) with respect to such State, such sums as may be necessary: Provided, That the sum of the amounts available to a State with respect to expenditures under such title IV–A in fiscal year 1997 under this appropriation and under such title IV–A as amended by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 shall not exceed the limitations under section 116(b) of such Act.

For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV–D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), for the last 3 months of the current year for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

For carrying out sections 658A through 658R of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990), in addition to amounts already appropriated for fiscal year 2001, $817,328,000: Provided, That of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 2001, $19,120,000 shall be available for child care resource and referral and school-aged child care activities: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 2001, in addition to the amounts required to be reserved by the States under section 658G, $222,672,000 shall be reserved by the States for activities authorized under section 658G, of which $100,000,000 shall be for activities that improve the quality of infant and toddler child care.

SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

For making grants to States pursuant to section 2002 of the Social Security Act, $600,000,000: Provided, That notwithstanding section 2003(c) of such Act, as amended, the amount specified for allocation under such section for fiscal year 2001 shall be $600,000,000.

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act, the Head Start Act, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, the Native American Programs Act of 1974, title II of Public Law 95–266 (adoption opportunities), the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105–89), the Abandoned Infants Assistance Act of 1988, part B(1) of title IV and sections 413, 429A, 1110, and 1115 of the Social Security Act; for making payments under the Community Services Block Grant Act, section 473A of the Social Security Act, and title IV of Public Law 105–285; and for necessary administrative expenses to carry out said Acts and titles I, IV, X, XI, XIV, XVI, and XX of the Social Security Act, the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, section 5 of the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–320), sections 40155, 40211, and 40241 of Public Law 103–322 and section 126 and titles IV and V of Public Law 100–485, $7,895,723,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be made available to provide grants for early childhood learning for young children, of which $55,928,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002, shall be for grants to States for adoption incentive payments, as authorized by section 473A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 670–679); of which $134,074,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for activities authorized by sections 40155, 40211, and 40241 of Public Law 103–322; of which $606,676,000 shall be for making payments under the Community Services Block Grant Act; and of which $6,267,000,000 shall be for making payments under the Head Start Act, of which $1,400,000,000 shall become available October 1, 2001 and remain available through September 30, 2002: Provided, That to the extent Community Services Block Grant funds are distributed as grant funds by a State to an eligible entity as provided under the Act, and have not been expended by such entity, they shall remain with such entity for carryover into the next fiscal year for expenditure by such entity consistent with program purposes: Provided further, That the Secretary shall establish procedures regarding the disposition of intangible property which permits grant funds, or intangible assets acquired with funds authorized under section 680 of the Community Services Block Grant Act, as amended, to become the sole property of such grantees after a period of not more than 12 years after the end of the grant for purposes and uses consistent with the original grant: Provided further, That amounts made available under this Act for the administrative and related expenses of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Education shall be further reduced on a pro rata basis by $14,137,000.

Funds appropriated for fiscal year 2000 under section 429A(e), part B of title IV of the Social Security Act shall be reduced by $6,000,000.

Funds appropriated for fiscal year 2000 under section 413(h)(1) of the Social Security Act shall be reduced by $15,000,000.

PROMOTING SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES

For carrying out section 430 of the Social Security Act, $305,000,000.

PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE

For making payments to States or other non-Federal entities under title IV–E of the Social Security Act, $4,868,100,000.

For making payments to States or other non-Federal entities under title IV–E of the Social Security Act, for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002, $1,735,900,000.

ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

AGING SERVICES PROGRAMS

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, and section 398 of the Public Health Service Act, $954,619,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be available for activities regarding medication management, screening, and education to prevent incorrect medication and adverse drug reactions: Provided, That notwithstanding section 308(b)(1) of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, the amounts available to each State for administration of the State plan under title III of such Act shall be reduced not more than 5 percent below the amount that was available to such State for such purpose for fiscal year 1995: Provided further, That in considering grant applications for nutrition services for elder Indian recipients, the Assistant Secretary shall provide maximum flexibility to applicants who seek to take into account subsistence, local customs, and other characteristics that are appropriate to the unique cultural, regional, and geographic needs of the American Indian, Alaska and Hawaiian Native communities to be served.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, for general departmental management, including hire of six sedans, and for carrying out titles III, XVII, and XX of the Public Health Service Act, and the United States-Mexico Border Health Commission Act, $206,766,000, together with $5,851,000, to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act from the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Supplemental Medical Insurance Trust Fund: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading for carrying out title XX of the Public Health Service Act, $10,569,000 shall be for activities specified under section 2003(b)(2), of which $9,131,000 shall be for prevention service demonstration grants under section 510(b)(2) of title V of the Social Security Act, as amended, without application of the limitation of section 2010(c) of said title XX.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $33,849,000.

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For expenses necessary for the Office for Civil Rights, $20,742,000, together with not to exceed $3,314,000, to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act from the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Supplemental Medical Insurance Trust Fund: Provided, That an additional $2,500,000 shall be made available for the Office for Civil Rights: Provided further, That amounts made available under this title for the administrative and related expenses of the Department of Health and Human Services shall be reduced by $2,500,000''.

POLICY RESEARCH

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, research studies under section 1110 of the Social Security Act, $16,738,000.

RETIREMENT PAY AND MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

For retirement pay and medical benefits of Public Health Service Commissioned Officers as authorized by law, for payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan and Survivor Benefit Plan, for medical care of dependents and retired personnel under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C. ch. 55), and for payments pursuant to section 229(b) of

the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), such amounts as may be required during the current fiscal year.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES EMERGENCY FUND

For public health and social services, $264,600,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Funds appropriated in this title shall be available for not to exceed $37,000 for official reception and representation expenses when specifically approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 202. The Secretary shall make available through assignment not more than 60 employees of the Public Health Service to assist in child survival activities and to work in AIDS programs through and with funds provided by the Agency for International Development, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund or the World Health Organization.

SEC. 203. None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used to implement section 399L(b) of the Public Health Service Act or section 1503 of the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993, Public Law 103–43.

SEC. 204. None of the funds appropriated in this Act for the National Institutes of Health and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration shall be used to pay the salary of an individual, through a grant or other extramural mechanism, at a rate in excess of Executive Level II.

SEC. 205. Notwithstanding section 241(a) of the Public Health Service Act, such portion as the Secretary shall determine, but not more than 1.6 percent, of any amounts appropriated for programs authorized under the PHS Act shall be made available for the evaluation (directly or by grants or contracts) of the implementation and effectiveness of such programs.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 206. Not to exceed 1 percent of any discretionary funds (pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended) which are appropriated for the current fiscal year for the Department of Health and Human Services in this Act may be transferred between appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 3 percent by any such transfer: Provided, That the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified at least 15 days in advance of any transfer.

SEC. 207. The Director of the National Institutes of Health, jointly with the Director of the Office of AIDS Research, may transfer up to 3 percent among institutes, centers, and divisions from the total amounts identified by these two Directors as funding for research pertaining to the human immunodeficiency virus: Provided, That the Congress is promptly notified of the transfer.

SEC. 208. Of the amounts made available in this Act for the National Institutes of Health, the amount for research related to the human immunodeficiency virus, as jointly determined by the Director of the National Institutes of Health and the Director of the Office of AIDS Research, shall be made available to the ''Office of AIDS Research'' account. The Director of the Office of AIDS Research shall transfer from such account amounts necessary to carry out section 2353(d)(3) of the Public Health Service Act.

SEC. 209. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be made available to any entity under title X of the Public Health Service Act unless the applicant for the award certifies to the Secretary that it encourages family participation in the decision of minors to seek family planning services and that it provides counseling to minors on how to resist attempts to coerce minors into engaging in sexual activities.

SEC. 210. None of the funds appropriated by this Act (including funds appropriated to any trust fund) may be used to carry out the Medicare+Choice program if the Secretary denies participation in such program to an otherwise eligible entity (including a Provider Sponsored Organization) because the entity informs the Secretary that it will not provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or provide referrals for abortions: Provided, That the Secretary shall make appropriate prospective adjustments to the capitation payment to such an entity (based on an actuarially sound estimate of the expected costs of providing the service to such entity's enrollees): Provided further, That nothing in this section shall be construed to change the Medicare program's coverage for such services and a Medicare+Choice organization described in this section shall be responsible for informing enrollees where to obtain information about all Medicare covered services.

SEC. 211. (a) MENTAL HEALTH.—Section 1918(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–7(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) MINIMUM ALLOTMENTS FOR STATES.—Each State's allotment for fiscal year 2001 for programs under this subpart shall not be less than such State's allotment for such programs for fiscal year 2000.''.

(b) SUBSTANCE ABUSE.—Section 1933(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–33(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) MINIMUM ALLOTMENTS FOR STATES.—Each State's allotment for fiscal year 2001 for programs under this subpart shall not be less than such State's allotment for such programs for fiscal year 2000.''.

SEC. 212. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no provider of services under title X of the Public Health Service Act shall be exempt from any State law requiring notification or the reporting of child abuse, child molestation, sexual abuse, rape, or incest.

SEC. 213. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN ADJUDICATION PROVISIONS.—The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1990 (Public Law 101–167) is amended—

(1) in section 599D (8 U.S.C. 1157 note)—

(A) in subsection (b)(3), by striking ''1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000'' and inserting ''1997, 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001''; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking ''October 1, 2000'' each place it appears and inserting ''October 1, 2001''; and

(2) in section 599E (8 U.S.C. 1255 note) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''September 30, 2000'' and inserting ''September 30, 2001''.

SEC. 214. None of the funds provided in this Act or in any other Act making appropriations for fiscal year 2001 may be used to administer or implement in Arizona or in the Kansas City, Missouri or in the Kansas City, Kansas area the Medicare Competitive Pricing Demonstration Project (operated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services).

SEC. 215. WITHHOLDING OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE FUNDS. (a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by subsection (e) none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to withhold substance abuse funding from a State pursuant to section 1926 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–26) if such State certifies to the Secretary of Health and Human Services by March 1, 2001 that the State will commit additional State funds, in accordance with subsection (b), to ensure compliance with State laws prohibiting the sale of tobacco products to individuals under 18 years of age.

(b) AMOUNT OF STATE FUNDS.—The amount of funds to be committed by a State under subsection (a) shall be equal to 1 percent of such State's substance abuse block grant allocation for each percentage point by which the State misses the retailer compliance rate goal established by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 1926 of such Act.

(c) ADDITIONAL STATE FUNDS.—The State is to maintain State expenditures in fiscal year 2001 for tobacco prevention programs and for compliance activities at a level that is not less than the level of such expenditures maintained by the State for fiscal year 2000, and adding to that level the additional funds for tobacco compliance activities required under subsection (a). The State is to submit a report to the Secretary on all fiscal year 2000 State expenditures and all fiscal year 2001 obligations for tobacco prevention and compliance activities by program activity by July 31, 2001.

(d) ENFORCEMENT OF STATE OBLIGATIONS.—The Secretary shall exercise discretion in enforcing the timing of the State obligation of the additional funds required by the certification described in subsection (a) as late as July 31, 2001.

(e) TERRITORIES.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to withhold substance abuse funding pursuant to section 1926 from a territory that receives less than $1,000,000.

SEC. 216. Section 403(a)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 603(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) by striking ''1999, 2000, and 2001'' and inserting ''1999 and 2000''; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) for fiscal year 2001, a grant in an amount equal to the amount of the grant to the State under clause (i) for fiscal year 1998.'' and

(2) in subparagraph (G), by inserting at the end, ''Upon enactment, the provisions of this Act that would have been estimated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget as changing direct spending and receipts for fiscal year 2001 under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177), to the extent such changes would have been estimated to result in savings in fiscal year 2001 of $240,000,000 in budget authority and $122,000,000 in outlays, shall be treated as if enacted in an appropriations act pursuant to Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference accompanying Conference Report No. 105–217, thereby changing discretionary spending under section 251 of that Act.''.

SEC. 217. (a) Notwithstanding Section 2104(f) of the Social Security Act (the Act), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall reduce the amounts allotted to a State under subsection (b) of the Act for fiscal year 1998 by the applicable amount with respect to the State; and

(b) Notwithstanding Section 2104(a) of the Act, the Secretary shall increase the amount otherwise payable to each State under such subsection for fiscal year 2003 by the amount of the reduction made under paragraph (a) of this section. Funds made available under this subsection shall remain available through September 30, 2004.

(c) APPLICABLE AMOUNT DEFINED.—In subsection (a), with respect to a State, the term ''applicable amount'' means, with respect to a State, an amount bearing the same proportion to $1,900,000,000 as the unexpended balance of its fiscal year 1998 allotment as of September 30, 2000, which would otherwise be redistributed to States in fiscal year 2001 under Section 2104(f) of the Act, bears to the sum of the unexpended balances of fiscal year 1998 allotments for all States as of September 30, 2000: Provided, That, the applicable amount for a State shall not exceed the unexpended balance of its fiscal year 1998 allotment as of September 30, 2000.

SEC. 218. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PREVENTION OF NEEDLESTICK INJURIES. (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that American health care workers report 600,000 to 800,000 needlestick and sharps injuries each year;

(2) the occurrence of needlestick injuries is believed to be widely under-reported;

(3) needlestick and sharps injuries result in at least 1,000 new cases of health care workers with HIV, hepatitis C or hepatitis B every year;

(4) more than 80 percent of needlestick injuries can be prevented through the use of safer devices; and

(5) the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's November 1999 Compliance Directive has helped clarify the duty of employers to use safer needle devices to protect their workers. However, millions of State and local government employees are not covered by OSHA's bloodborne pathogen standards and are not protected against the hazards of needlesticks.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate should pass legislation that would eliminate or minimize the significant risk of needlestick injury to health care workers.

SEC. 219. (a) IN GENERAL.—There is appropriated $10,000,000 that may be used by the Director of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health to—

(1) establish and maintain a national database on existing needleless systems and sharps with engineered sharps injury protections;

(2) develop a set of evaluation criteria for use by employers, employees, and other persons when they are evaluating and selecting needleless systems and sharps with engineered sharps injury protections;

(3) develop a model training curriculum to train employers, employees, and other persons on the process of evaluating needleless systems and sharps with engineered sharps injury protections and to the extent feasible to provide technical assistance to persons who request such assistance; and

(4) establish a national system to collect comprehensive data on needlestick injuries to health care workers, including data on mechanisms to analyze and evaluate prevention interventions in relation to needlestick injury occurrence.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EMPLOYER.—The term ''employer'' means each employer having an employee with occupational exposure to human blood or other material potentially containing bloodborne pathogens.

(2) ENGINEERED SHARPS INJURY PROTECTIONS.—The term ''engineered sharps injury protections'' means—

(A) a physical attribute built into a needle device used for withdrawing body fluids, accessing a vein or artery, or administering medications or other fluids, that effectively reduces the risk of an exposure incident by a mechanism such as barrier creation, blunting, encapsulation, withdrawal, retraction, destruction, or other effective mechanisms; or

(B) a physical attribute built into any other type of needle device, or into a nonneedle sharp, which effectively reduces the risk of an exposure incident.

(3) NEEDLELESS SYSTEM.—The term ''needleless system'' means a device that does not use needles for—

(A) the withdrawal of body fluids after initial venous or arterial access is established;

(B) the administration of medication or fluids; and

(C) any other procedure involving the potential for an exposure incident.

(4) SHARP.—The term ''sharp'' means any object used or encountered in a health care setting that can be reasonably anticipated to penetrate the skin or any other part of the body, and to result in an exposure incident, including, but not limited to, needle devices, scalpels, lancets, broken glass, broken capillary tubes, exposed ends of dental wires and dental knives, drills, and burs.

(5) SHARPS INJURY.—The term ''sharps injury'' means any injury caused by a sharp, including cuts, abrasions, or needlesticks.

(c) OFFSET.—Amounts made available under this Act for the travel, consulting, and printing services for the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Education shall be reduced on a pro rata basis by $10,000,000.

SEC. 220. None of the funds made available under this Act may be made available to any entity under the Public Health Service Act after September 1, 2001, unless the Director of the National Institutes of Health has provided to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Senate Committees on Appropriations, and Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions a proposal to require a reasonable rate of return on both intramural and extramural research by March 31, 2001.

SEC. 221. (a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study to examine—

(1) the experiences of hospitals in the United States in obtaining reimbursement from foreign health insurance companies whose enrollees receive medical treatment in the United States;

(2) the identity of the foreign health insurance companies that do not cooperate with or reimburse (in whole or in part) United States health care providers for medical services rendered in the United States to enrollees who are foreign nationals;

(3) the amount of unreimbursed services that hospitals in the United States provide to foreign nationals described in paragraph (2); and

(4) solutions to the problems identified in the study.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than March 31, 2001, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations, a report concerning the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), including the recommendations described in paragraph (4) of such subsection.

SEC. 222. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT. Section 448 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 285g) is amended by inserting ''gynecologic health,'' after ''with respect to''.

SEC. 223. In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated under this title for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, $37,500,000, to be utilized to provide grants to States and political subdivisions of States under section 317 of the Public Health Service Act to enable such States and political subdivisions to carry out immunization infrastructure and operations activities: Provided, That of the total amount made available in this Act for infrastructure funding for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, not less than 10 percent shall be used for immunization projects in areas with low or declining immunization rates or areas that are particularly susceptible to disease outbreaks, and not more than 14 percent shall be used to carry out the incentive bonus program: Provided further, That amounts made available under this Act for the administrative and related expenses of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Education shall be further reduced on a pro rata basis by $37,500,000.

SEC. 224. None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be expended by the National Institutes of Health on a contract for the care of the 288 chimpanzees acquired by the National Institutes of Health from the Coulston Foundation, unless the contractor is accredited by the Association for the Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care International or has a Public Health Services assurance, and has not been charged multiple times with egregious violations of the Animal Welfare Act.

SEC. 225. (a) In addition to amounts made available under the heading ''Health Resources and Services Administration-Health Resources and Services'' for poison prevention and poison control center activities, there shall be available an additional $20,000,000 to provide assistance for such activities and to stabilize the funding of regional poison control centers as provided for pursuant to the Poison Control Center Enhancement and Awareness Act (Public Law 106–174).

(b) Amounts made available under this Act for the administrative and related expenses of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Education shall be further reduced on a pro rata basis by $20,000,000.

SEC. 226. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE DELIVERY OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES. (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Several States have developed and implemented a unique 2-tiered emergency medical services system that effectively provides services to the residents of those States.

(2) These 2-tiered systems include volunteer and for-profit emergency medical technicians who provide basic life support and hospital-based paramedics who provide advanced life support.

(3) These 2-tiered systems have provided universal access for residents of those States to affordable emergency services, while simultaneously ensuring that those persons in need of the most advanced care receive such care from the proper authorities.

(4) One State's 2-tiered system currently has an estimated 20,000 emergency medical technicians providing ambulance transportation for basic life support and advanced life support emergencies, over 80 percent of which are handled by volunteers who are not reimbursed under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

(5) The hospital-based paramedics, also known as mobile intensive care units, are reimbursed under the medicare program when they respond to advanced life support emergencies.

(6) These 2-tiered State health systems save the lives of thousands of residents of those States each year, while saving the medicare program, in some instances, as much as $39,000,000 in reimbursement fees.

(7) When Congress requested that the Health Care Financing Administration enact changes to the emergency medical services fee schedule as a result of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, including a general overhaul of reimbursement rates and administrative costs, it was in the spirit of streamlining the agency, controlling skyrocketing health care costs, and lengthening the solvency of the medicare program.

(8) The Health Care Financing Administration is considering implementing new emergency medical services reimbursement guidelines that may destabilize the 2-tier system that has developed in these States.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Health Care Financing Administration should—

(1) consider the unique nature of 2-tiered emergency medical services delivery systems when implementing new reimbursement guidelines for paramedics and hospitals under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; and

(2) promote innovative emergency medical service systems enacted by States that reduce reimbursement costs to the medicare program while ensuring that all residents receive quick and appropriate emergency care when needed.

SEC. 227. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING IMPACTS OF THE BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1997. (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Since its passage in 1997, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 has drastically cut payments under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act in the areas of hospital, home health, and skilled nursing care, among others. While Congress intended to cut approximately $100,000,000,000 from the medicare program over 5 years, recent estimates put the actual cut at over $200,000,000,000.

(2) A recent study on home health care found that nearly 70 percent of hospital discharge

planners surveyed reported a greater difficulty obtaining home health services for medicare beneficiaries as a result of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

(3) According to the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, rural hospitals were disproportionately affected by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, dropping the inpatient margins of such hospitals over 4 percentage points in 1998.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress and the President should act expeditiously to alleviate the adverse impacts of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 on beneficiaries under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act and health care providers participating in such program.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

EDUCATION REFORM

For carrying out activities authorized by title IV of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act as in effect prior to September 30, 2000, and sections 3122, 3132, 3136, and 3141, parts B, C, and D of title III, and part I of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, $1,434,500,000, of which $40,000,000 shall be for the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and of which $192,000,000 shall be for section 3122: Provided, That up to one-half of 1 percent of the amount available under section 3132 shall be set aside for the outlying areas, to be distributed on the basis of their relative need as determined by the Secretary in accordance with the purposes of the program: Provided further, That if any State educational agency does not apply for a grant under section 3132, that State's allotment under section 3131 shall be reserved by the Secretary for grants to local educational agencies in that State that apply directly to the Secretary according to the terms and conditions published by the Secretary in the Federal Register: Provided further, That, notwithstanding part I of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 or any other provision of law, a community-based organization that has experience in providing before- and after-school services shall be eligible to receive a grant under that part, on the same basis as a school or consortium described in section 10904 of that Act, and the Secretary shall give priority to any application for such a grant that is submitted jointly by such a community-based organization and such a school or consortium.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For carrying out title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and section 418A of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $8,986,800,000, of which $2,729,958,000 shall become available on July 1, 2001, and shall remain available through September 30, 2002, and of which $6,223,342,000 shall become available on October 1, 2001 and shall remain available through September 30, 2002, for academic year 2000–2001: Provided, That $7,113,403,000 shall be available for basic grants under section 1124: Provided further, That up to $3,500,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary on October 1, 2000, to obtain updated local educational agency level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census: Provided further, That $1,222,397,000 shall be available for concentration grants under section 1124A: Provided further, That grant awards under sections 1124 and 1124A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be made to each State and local educational agency at no less than 100 percent of the amount such State or local educational agency received under this authority for fiscal year 2000: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, grant awards under section 1124A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be made to those local educational agencies that received a Concentration Grant under the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2000, but are not eligible to receive such a grant for fiscal year 2001: Provided further, That each such local educational agency shall receive an amount equal to the Concentration Grant the agency received in fiscal year 2000, ratably reduced, if necessary, to ensure that these local educational agencies receive no greater share of their hold-harmless amounts than other local educational agencies: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in calculating the amount of Federal assistance awarded to a State or local educational agency under any program under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) on the basis of a formula described in section 1124 or 1124A of such Act (20 U.S.C. 6333, 6334), any funds appropriated for the program in excess of the amount appropriated for the program for fiscal year 2000 shall be awarded according to the formula, except that, for such purposes, the formula shall be applied only to States or local educational agencies that experience a reduction under the program for fiscal year 2001 as a result of the application of the 100 percent hold harmless provisions under the heading ''Education for the Disadvantaged'': Provided further, That the Secretary shall not take into account the hold harmless provisions in this section in determining State allocations under any other program administered by the Secretary in any fiscal year.

IMPACT AID

For carrying out programs of financial assistance to federally affected schools authorized by title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, $1,030,000,000, of which $818,000,000 shall be for basic support payments under section 8003(b), $50,000,000 shall be for payments for children with disabilities under section 8003(d), $82,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for payments under section 8003(f), $35,000,000 shall be for construction under section 8007, $47,000,000 shall be for Federal property payments under section 8002 and $8,000,000 to remain available until expended shall be for facilities maintenance under section 8008: Provided, That amounts made available under this Act for the administrative and related expenses of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Education shall be further reduced on a pro rata basis by $10,000,000.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

For carrying out school improvement activities authorized by titles II, IV, V–A and B, VI, IX, X, and XIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (''ESEA''); the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and part B of title VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965; $4,672,534,000, of which $1,100,200,000 shall become available on July 1, 2001, and remain available through September 30, 2002, and of which $2,915,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2001 and shall remain available through September 30, 2002 for academic year 2001–2002: Provided, That of the amount appropriated, $435,000,000 shall be for Eisenhower professional development State grants under title II–B and $3,100,000,000 shall be for title VI and up to $750,000 shall be for an evaluation of comprehensive regional assistance centers under title XIII of ESEA: Provided further, That of the amount made available for Title VI, $2,700,000,000 shall be available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes consistent with title VI to be determined by the local education agency as part of a local strategy for improving academic achievement: Provided further, That these funds may also be used to address the shortage of highly qualified teachers to reduce class size, particularly in early grades, using highly qualified teachers to improve educational achievement for regular and special needs children; to support efforts to recruit, train and retrain highly qualified teachers; to carry out part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.); or for school construction and renovation of facilities, at the sole discretion of the local educational agency: Provided further, That funds made available under this heading to carry out section 6301(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be available for education reform projects that provide same gender schools and classrooms, consistent with applicable law: Provided further, That of the amount made available under this heading for activities carried out through the Fund for the Improvement of Education under part A of title X, $10,000,000 shall be made available to enable the Secretary of Education to award grants to develop and implement school dropout prevention programs.

READING EXCELLENCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the Reading Excellence Act, $91,000,000, which shall become available on July 1, 2001 and shall remain available through September 30, 2002 and $195,000,000 which shall become available on October 1, 2001 and remain available through September 30, 2002.

INDIAN EDUCATION

For expenses necessary to carry out, to the extent not otherwise provided, title IX, part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, $115,500,000.

OFFICE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND MINORITY LANGUAGES AFFAIRS

BILINGUAL AND IMMIGRANT EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, bilingual, foreign language and immigrant education activities authorized by parts A and C and section 7203 of title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, without regard to section 7103(b), $443,000,000: Provided, That State educational agencies may use all, or any part of, their part C allocation for competitive grants to local educational agencies.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

SPECIAL EDUCATION

For carrying out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, $7,352,341,000, of which $2,464,452,000 shall become available for obligation on July 1, 2001, and shall remain available through September 30, 2002, and of which $4,624,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2001 and shall remain available through September 30, 2002, for academic year 2001–2002: Provided, That $1,500,000 shall be for the recipient of funds provided by Public Law 105–78 under section 687(b)(2)(G) of the Act to provide information on diagnosis, intervention, and teaching strategies for children with disabilities: Provided further, That the amount for section 611(c) of the Act shall be equal to the amount available for that section under Public Law 106–113, increased by the rate of inflation as specified in section 611(f)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act.

REHABILITATION SERVICES AND DISABILITY RESEARCH

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Assistive Technology Act of 1998, and the Helen Keller National Center Act, $2,799,519,000: Provided, That notwithstanding section 105(b)(1) of the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (''the AT Act''), each State shall be provided $50,000 for activities under section 102 of the AT Act: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 105(b)(1) and section 101(f)(2) and (3) of the Assistive Technology Act of 1998, each State shall be provided a minimum of $500,000 for activities under section 101: Provided further, That $7,000,000 shall be used to support grants for up to three years to states under title III of the AT Act, of which the Federal share shall not exceed 75 percent in the first year, 50 percent in the second year, and 25 percent in the third year, and that the requirements in section 301(c)(2) and section 302 of that Act shall not apply to such grants.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

For carrying out the Act of March 3, 1879, as amended (20 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), $12,500,000.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

For the National Technical Institute for the Deaf under titles I and II of the Education of the Deaf Act of 1986 (20 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.), $54,366,000, of which $7,176,000 shall be for construction and shall remain available until expended: Provided, That from the total amount available, the Institute may at its discretion use funds for the endowment program as authorized under section 207.

GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

For the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School, the Model Secondary School for the Deaf, and the partial support of Gallaudet University under titles I and II of the Education of the Deaf Act of 1986 (20 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.), $87,650,000: Provided, That from the total amount available, the University may at its discretion use funds for the endowment program as authorized under section 207.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and title VIII–D of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, and Public Law 102–73, $1,726,600,000, of which $1,000,000 shall remain available until expended, and of which $929,000,000 shall become available on July 1, 2001 and shall remain available through September 30, 2002 and of which $791,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2001 and shall remain available through September 30, 2002: Provided, That of the amounts made available for the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, $5,600,000 shall be for tribally controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institutions under section 117: Provided further, That $9,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 118 of such Act: Provided further, That up to 15 percent of the funds provided may be used by the national entity designated under section 118(a) to cover the cost of authorized activities and operations, including Federal salaries and expenses: Provided further, That the national entity is authorized, effective upon enactment, to charge fees for publications, training, and technical assistance developed by that national entity: Provided further, That revenues received from publications and delivery of technical assistance and training, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, may be credited to the national entity's account and shall be available to the national entity, without fiscal year limitation, so long as such revenues are used for authorized activities and operations of the national entity: Provided further, That of the funds made available to carry out section 204 of the Perkins Act, all funds that a State receives in excess of its prior-year allocation shall be competitively awarded: Provided further, That in making these awards, each State shall give priority to consortia whose applications most effectively integrate all components under section 204(c): Provided further, That of the amounts made available for the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, $5,000,000 shall be for demonstration activities authorized by section 207: Provided further, That of the amounts made available for the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, $14,000,000 shall be for national leadership activities under section 243 and $6,500,000 shall be for the National Institute for Literacy under section 242: Provided further, That $22,000,000 shall be for Youth Offender Grants, of which $5,000,000 shall be used in accordance with section 601 of Public Law 102–73 as that section was in effect prior to the enactment of Public Law 105–220: Provided further, That of the amounts made available for title I of the Perkins Act, the Secretary may reserve up to 0.54 percent for incentive grants under section 503 of the Workforce Investment Act, without regard to section 111(a)(1)(C) of the Perkins Act: Provided further, That of the amounts made available for the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, the Secretary may reserve up to 0.54 percent for incentive grants under section 503 of the Workforce Investment Act, without regard to section 211(a)(3) of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.

OFFICE OF STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

For carrying out subparts 1, 3 and 4 of part A, part C and part E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, $10,624,000,000, which shall remain available through September 30, 2002.

The maximum Pell Grant for which a student shall be eligible during award year 2001–2002 shall be $3,650: Provided, That notwithstanding section 401(g) of the Act, if the Secretary determines, prior to publication of the payment schedule for such award year, that the amount included within this appropriation for Pell Grant awards in such award year, and any funds available from the fiscal year 2000 appropriation for Pell Grant awards, are insufficient to satisfy fully all such awards for which students are eligible, as calculated under section 401(b) of the Act, the amount paid for each such award shall be reduced by either a fixed or variable percentage, or by a fixed dollar amount, as determined in accordance with a schedule of reductions established by the Secretary for this purpose.

FEDERAL FAMILY EDUCATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For Federal administrative expenses to carry out guaranteed student loans authorized by title IV, part B, of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, $48,000,000.

OFFICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

HIGHER EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, section 121 and titles II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, and the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961; $1,694,520,000, of which $10,000,000 for interest subsidies authorized by section 121 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, shall remain available until expended: Provided, That $11,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2002, shall be available to fund fellowships under part A, subpart 1 of title VII of said Act, of which up to $1,000,000 shall be available to fund fellowships for academic year 2001–2002, and the remainder shall be available to fund fellowships for academic year 2002–2003: Provided further, That $3,000,000 is for data collection and evaluation activities for programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, including such activities needed to comply with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993: Provided further, That section 404F(a) of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 is amended by striking out ''using funds appropriated under section 404H that do not exceed $200,000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''using not more than 0.2 percent of the funds appropriated under section 404H''.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

For partial support of Howard University (20 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), $224,000,000, of which not less than $3,530,000 shall be for a matching endowment grant pursuant to the Howard University Endowment Act (Public Law 98–480) and shall remain available until expended.

COLLEGE HOUSING AND ACADEMIC FACILITIES LOANS PROGRAM

For Federal administrative expenses authorized under section 121 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $737,000 to carry out activities related to existing facility loans entered into under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAPITAL FINANCING PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The total amount of bonds insured pursuant to section 344 of title III, part D of the Higher Education Act of 1965 shall not exceed $357,000,000, and the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of such bonds shall not exceed zero.

For administrative expenses to carry out the Historically Black College and University Capital Financing Program entered into pursuant to title III, part D of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, $208,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT

For carrying out activities authorized by the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994, including part E; the National Education Statistics Act of 1994, including sections 411 and 412; section 2102 of title II, and parts A, B, and K and section 10102, section 10105, and 10601 of title X, and part C of title XIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, and title VI of Public Law 103–227, $506,519,000, of which $250,000 shall be for the Web-Based Education Commission: Provided, That of the funds appropriated under section 10601 of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, $1,500,000 shall be used to conduct a violence prevention demonstration program: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated $5,000,000 shall be made available for a high school State grant program to improve academic performance and provide technical skills training, $5,000,000 shall be made available to provide grants to enable elementary and secondary schools to provide physical education and improve physical fitness: Provided further, That $50,000,000 of the funds provided for the national education research institutes shall be allocated notwithstanding section 912(m)(1)(B–F) and subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 931(c)(2) of Public Law 103–227 and $20,000,000 of that $50,000,000 shall be made available for the Interagency Education Research Initiative: Provided further, That the amounts made available under this Act for the administrative and related expenses of the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Education shall be further reduced on a pro rata basis by $10,000,000: Provided further, That of the funds available for section 10601 of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, $150,000 shall be awarded to the Center for Educational Technologies to complete production and distribution of an effective CD–ROM product that would complement the ''We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution'' curriculum: Provided further, That, in addition to the funds for title VI of Public Law 103–227 and notwithstanding the provisions of section 601(c)(1)(C) of that Act, $1,000,000 shall be available to the Center for Civic Education to conduct a civic education program with Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland and, consistent with the civics and Government activities authorized in section 601(c)(3) of Public Law 103–227, to provide civic education assistance to democracies in developing countries. The term ''developing countries'' shall have the same meaning as the term ''developing country'' in the Education for the Deaf Act: Provided further, That of the amount made available under this heading for activities carried out through the Fund for the Improvement of Education under part A of title X, $50,000,000 shall be made available to enable the Secretary of Education to award grants to develop, implement, and strengthen programs to teach American history (not social studies) as a separate subject within school curricula.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Department of Education Organization Act, including rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and hire of two passenger motor vehicles, $396,671,000.

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For expenses necessary for the Office for Civil Rights, as authorized by section 203 of the Department of Education Organization Act, $73,224,000.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of Inspector General, as authorized by section 212 of the Department of Education Organization Act, $35,456,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No funds appropriated in this Act may be used for the transportation of students or teachers (or for the purchase of equipment for such transportation) in order to overcome racial imbalance in any school or school system, or for the transportation of students or teachers (or for the purchase of equipment for such transportation) in order to carry out a plan of racial desegregation of any school or school system.

SEC. 302. None of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to require, directly or indirectly, the transportation of any student to a school other than the school which is nearest the student's home, except for a student requiring special education, to the school offering such special education, in order to comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For the purpose of this section an indirect requirement of transportation of students includes the transportation of students to carry out a plan involving the reorganization of the grade structure of schools, the pairing of schools, or the clustering of schools, or any combination of grade restructuring, pairing or clustering. The prohibition described in this section does not include the establishment of magnet schools.

SEC. 303. No funds appropriated under this Act may be used to prevent the implementation of programs of voluntary prayer and meditation in the public schools.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 304. Not to exceed 1 percent of any discretionary funds (pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended) which are appropriated for the Department of Education in this Act may be transferred between appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 3 percent by any such transfer: Provided, That the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified at least 15 days in advance of any transfer.

SEC. 305. IMPACT AID. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) the total amount appropriated under this title to carry out title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be $1,075,000,000;

(2) the total amount appropriated under this title for basic support payments under section 8003(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall be $853,000,000; and

(3) amounts made available for the administrative and related expenses of the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, shall be further reduced on a pro rata basis by $35,000,000.

SEC. 306. (a) In addition to any amounts appropriated under this title for the loan forgiveness for child care providers program under section 428K of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078–11), an additional $10,000,000 is appropriated to carry out such program.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, amounts made available under titles I and II, and this title, for salaries and expenses at the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, respectively, shall be reduced on a pro rata basis by $10,000,000.

SEC. 307. TECHNOLOGY AND MEDIA SERVICES. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) the total amount appropriated under this title under the heading ''OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES'' under the heading ''SPECIAL EDUCATION'' to carry out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act shall be $7,353,141,000, of which $35,323,000 shall be available for technology and media services; and

(2) the total amount appropriated under this title under the heading ''DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT'' under the heading ''PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION'' shall be further reduced by $800,000.

SEC. 308. (a) In addition to any amounts appropriated under this title for the Perkin's loan cancellation program under section 465 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087ee), an additional $15,000,000 is appropriated to carry out such program.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, amounts made available under titles I and II, and this title, for salaries and expenses at the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, respectively, shall be further reduced on a pro rata basis by $15,000,000.

SEC. 309. The Comptroller General of the United States shall evaluate the extent to which funds made available under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are allocated to schools and local educational agencies with the greatest concentrations of school-age children from low-income families, the extent to which allocations of such funds adjust to shifts in concentrations of pupils from low-income families in different regions, States, and substate areas, the extent to which the allocation of such funds encourages the targeting of State funds to areas with higher concentrations of children from low-income families, the implications of current distribution methods for such funds, and formula and other policy recommendations to improve the targeting of such funds to more effectively serve low-income children in both rural and urban areas, and for preparing interim and final reports based on the results of the study, to be submitted to Congress not later than February 1, 2001, and April 1, 2001.

SEC. 310. The amount made available under this title under the heading ''OFFICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION'' under the heading ''HIGHER EDUCATION'' to carry out section 316 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is increased by $5,000,000, which increase shall be used for construction and renovation projects under such section; and the amount made available under this title under the heading ''OFFICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION'' under the heading ''HIGHER EDUCATION'' to carry out part B of title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is decreased by $5,000,000.

TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

For expenses necessary for the Armed Forces Retirement Home to operate and maintain the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home and the United States Naval Home, to be paid from funds available in the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund, $69,832,000, of which $9,832,000 shall remain available until expended for construction and renovation of the physical plants at the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home and the United States Naval Home: Provided, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, a single contract or related contracts for development and construction, to include construction of a long-term care facility at the United States Naval Home, may be employed which collectively include the full scope of the project: Provided further, That the solicitation and contract shall contain the clause ''availability of funds'' found at 48 CFR 52.232–18 and 252.232–7007, Limitation of Government Obligations. In addition, for completion of the long-term care facility at the United States Naval Home, $6,228,000 to become available on October 1, 2001, and remain available until expended.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE PROGRAMS, OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Corporation for National and Community Service to carry out the provisions of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973, as amended, $302,504,000: Provided, That none of the funds made available to the Corporation for National and Community Service in this Act for activities authorized by part E of title II of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 shall be used to provide stipends or other monetary incentives to volunteers or volunteer leaders whose incomes exceed 125 percent of the national poverty level.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

For payment to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, as authorized by the Communications Act of 1934, an amount which shall be available within limitations specified by that Act, for the fiscal year 2003, $365,000,000: Provided, That no funds made available to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting by this Act shall be used to pay for receptions, parties, or similar forms of entertainment for Government officials or employees: Provided further, That none of the funds contained in this paragraph shall be available or used to aid or support any program or activity from which any person is excluded, or is denied benefits, or is discriminated against, on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, or sex: Provided further, That in addition to the amounts provided above, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for digitalization, pending enactment of authorizing legislation.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 171–180, 182–183), including hire of passenger motor vehicles; for expenses necessary for the Labor-Management Cooperation Act of 1978 (29 U.S.C. 175a); and for expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Civil Service Reform Act, Public Law 95–454 (5 U.S.C. ch. 71), $38,200,000, including $1,500,000, to remain available through September 30, 2002, for activities authorized by the Labor-Management Cooperation Act of 1978 (29 U.S.C. 175a): Provided, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, fees charged, up to full-cost recovery, for special training activities and other conflict resolution services and technical assistance, including those provided to foreign governments and international organizations, and for arbitration services shall be credited to and merged with this account, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That fees for arbitration services shall be available only for education, training, and professional development of the agency workforce: Provided further, That the Director of the Service is authorized to accept and use on behalf of the United States gifts of services and real, personal, or other property in the aid of any projects or functions within the Director's jurisdiction.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission (30 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), $6,320,000.

INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES

OFFICE OF LIBRARY SERVICES: GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out subtitle B of the Museum and Library Services Act, $168,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MEDICARE PAYMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out section 1805 of the Social Security Act, $8,000,000, to be transferred to this appropriation from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, established by the Act of July 20, 1970 (Public Law 91–345, as amended), $1,495,000.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the National Council on Disability as authorized by title IV of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, $2,615,000.

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

For expenses necessary for the National Education Goals Panel, as authorized by title II, part A of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, $2,350,000.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended (29 U.S.C. 141–167), and other laws, $216,438,000: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2(3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (29 U.S.C. 152), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and as defined in section 3(f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203), and including in said definition employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on a mutual, nonprofit basis and at least 95 percent of the water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming purposes.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U.S.C. 151–188), including emergency boards appointed by the President, $10,400,000.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission (29 U.S.C. 661), $8,720,000.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

DUAL BENEFITS PAYMENTS ACCOUNT

For payment to the Dual Benefits Payments Account, authorized under section 15(d) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974, $160,000,000, which shall include amounts becoming available in fiscal year 2001 pursuant to section 224(c)(1)(B) of Public Law 98–76; and in addition, an amount, not to exceed 2 percent of the amount provided herein, shall be available proportional to the amount by which the product of recipients and the average benefit received exceeds $160,000,000: Provided, That the total amount provided herein shall be credited in 12 approximately equal amounts on the first day of each month in the fiscal year.

FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS

For payment to the accounts established in the Treasury for the payment of benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act for interest earned on unnegotiated checks, $150,000, to remain available through September 30, 2002, which shall be the maximum amount available for payment pursuant to section 417 of Public Law 98–76.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for the Railroad Retirement Board for administration of the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, $92,500,000, to be derived in such amounts as determined by the Board from the railroad retirement accounts and from moneys credited to the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund.

LIMITATION ON THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of Inspector General for audit, investigatory and review activities, as authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, not more than $5,700,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement accounts and railroad unemployment insurance account: Provided, That none of the funds made available in any other paragraph of this Act may be transferred to the Office; used to carry out any such transfer; used to provide any office space, equipment, office supplies, communications facilities or services, maintenance services, or administrative services for the Office; used to pay any salary, benefit, or award for any personnel of the Office; used to pay any other operating expense of the Office; or used to reimburse the Office for any service provided, or expense incurred, by the Office.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS

For payment to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and the Federal Disability Insurance trust funds, as provided under sections 201(m), 228(g), and 1131(b)(2) of the Social Security Act, $20,400,000.

SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS

For carrying out title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, $365,748,000, to remain available until expended.

For making, after July 31 of the current fiscal year, benefit payments to individuals under title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, for costs incurred in the current fiscal year, such amounts as may be necessary.

For making benefit payments under title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002, $114,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME PROGRAM

For carrying out titles XI and XVI of the Social Security Act, section 401 of Public Law 92–603, section 212 of Public Law 93–66, as amended, and section 405 of Public Law 95–216, including payment to the Social Security trust funds for administrative expenses incurred pursuant to section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act, $23,053,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That any portion of the funds provided to a State in the current fiscal year and not obligated by the State during that year shall be returned to the Treasury.

From funds provided under the previous paragraph, not less than $100,000,000 shall be available for payment to the Social Security trust funds for administrative expenses for conducting continuing disability reviews.

In addition, $210,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002, for payment to the Social Security trust funds for administrative expenses for continuing disability reviews as authorized by section 103 of Public Law 104–121 and section 10203 of Public Law 105–33. The term ''continuing disability reviews'' means reviews and redeterminations as defined under section 201(g)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act, as amended.

For making, after June 15 of the current fiscal year, benefit payments to individuals under title XVI of the Social Security Act, for unanticipated costs incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

For making benefit payments under title XVI of the Social Security Act for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002, $10,470,000,000, to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including the hire of two passenger motor vehicles, and not to exceed $10,000 for official reception and representation expenses, not more than $6,469,800,000 may be expended, as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein: Provided, That not less than $1,800,000 shall be for the Social Security Advisory Board: Provided further, That unobligated balances at the end of fiscal year 2001 not needed for fiscal year 2001 shall remain available until expended to invest in the Social Security Administration information technology and telecommunications hardware and software infrastructure, including related equipment and non-payroll administrative expenses.

From funds provided under the first paragraph, not less than $200,000,000 shall be available for conducting continuing disability reviews.

In addition to funding already available under this heading, and subject to the same terms and conditions, $450,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002, for continuing disability reviews as authorized by section 103 of Public Law 104–121 and section 10203 of Public Law 105–33. The term ''continuing disability reviews'' means reviews and redeterminations as defined under section 201(g)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act, as amended.

In addition, $91,000,000 to be derived from administration fees in excess of $5.00 per supplementary payment collected pursuant to section 1616(d) of the Social Security Act or section 212(b)(3) of Public Law 93–66, which shall remain available until expended. To the extent that the amounts collected pursuant to such section 1616(d) or 212(b)(3) in fiscal year 2001 exceed $91,000,000, the amounts shall be available in fiscal year 2002 only to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

From funds previously appropriated for this purpose, any unobligated balances at the end of fiscal year 2000 shall be available to continue Federal-State partnerships which will evaluate means to promote Medicare buy-in programs targeted to elderly and disabled individuals under titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary for the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $16,944,000, together with not to exceed $52,500,000, to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund.

In addition, an amount not to exceed 3 percent of the total provided in this appropriation may be transferred from the ''Limitation on Administrative Expenses'', Social Security Administration, to be merged with this account, to be available for the time and purposes for which this account is available: Provided, That notice of such transfers shall be transmitted promptly to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Institute of Peace as authorized in the United States Institute of Peace Act, $12,951,000.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. The Secretaries of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education are authorized to transfer unexpended balances of prior appropriations to accounts corresponding to current appropriations provided in this Act: Provided, That such transferred balances are used for the same purpose, and for the same periods of time, for which they were originally appropriated.

SEC. 502. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 503. (a) No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, for the preparation, distribution, or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television, or video presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress or any State legislature, except in presentation to the Congress or any State legislature itself.

(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any grant or contract recipient, or agent acting for such recipient, related to any activity designed to influence legislation or appropriations pending before the Congress or any State legislature.

SEC. 504. The Secretaries of Labor and Education are authorized to make available not to exceed $20,000 and $15,000, respectively, from funds available for salaries and expenses under titles I and III, respectively, for official reception and representation expenses; the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is authorized to make available for official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $2,500 from the funds available for ''Salaries and expenses, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service''; and the Chairman of the National Mediation Board is authorized to make available for official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $2,500 from funds available for ''Salaries and expenses, National Mediation Board''.

SEC. 505. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to carry out any program of distributing sterile needles or syringes for the hypodermic injection of any illegal drug unless the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that such programs are effective in preventing the spread of HIV and do not encourage the use of illegal drugs.

SEC. 506. (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(c) PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS FALSELY LABELING PRODUCTS AS MADE IN AMERICA.—If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 507. When issuing statements, press releases, requests for proposals, bid solicitations and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part with Federal money, all grantees receiving Federal funds included in this Act, including but not limited to State and local governments and recipients of Federal research grants, shall clearly state: (1) the percentage of the total costs of the program or project which will be financed with Federal money; (2) the dollar amount of Federal funds for the project or program; and (3) percentage and dollar amount of the total costs of the project or program that will be financed by nongovernmental sources.

SEC. 508. (a) None of the funds appropriated under this Act, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are appropriated under this Act, shall be expended for any abortion.

(b) None of the funds appropriated under this Act, and none of the funds in any trust fund to which funds are appropriated under this Act, shall be expended for health benefits coverage that includes coverage of abortion.

(c) The term ''health benefits coverage'' means the package of services covered by a managed care provider or organization pursuant to a contract or other arrangement.

SEC. 509. (a) The limitations established in the preceding section shall not apply to an abortion—

(1) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

(2) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed.

(b) Nothing in the preceding section shall be construed as prohibiting the expenditure by a State, locality, entity, or private person of State, local, or private funds (other than a State's or locality's contribution of Medicaid matching funds).

(c) Nothing in the preceding section shall be construed as restricting the ability of any managed care provider from offering abortion coverage or the ability of a State or locality to contract separately with such a provider for such coverage with State funds (other than a State's or locality's contribution of Medicaid matching funds).

SEC. 510. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for—

(1) the creation of a human embryo or embryos for research purposes; or

(2) research in which a human embryo or embryos are destroyed, discarded, or knowingly subjected to risk of injury or death greater than that allowed for research on fetuses in utero under 45 CFR 46.208(a)(2) and section 498(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 289g(b)).

(b) For purposes of this section, the term ''human embryo or embryos'' includes any organism, not protected as a human subject under 45 CFR 46 as of the date of the enactment of this Act, that is derived by fertilization, parthenogenesis, cloning, or any other means from one or more human gametes or human diploid cells.

SEC. 511. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PROMOTION OF LEGALIZATION OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any activity that promotes the legalization of any drug or other substance included in schedule I of the schedules of controlled substances established by section 202 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812).

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply when there is significant medical evidence of a therapeutic advantage to the use of such drug or other substance or that federally sponsored clinical trials are being conducted to determine therapeutic advantage.

SEC. 512. None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended to enter into or renew a contract with an entity if—

(1) such entity is otherwise a contractor with the United States and is subject to the requirement in section 4212(d) of title 38, United States Code, regarding submission of an annual report to the Secretary of Labor concerning employment of certain veterans; and

(2) such entity has not submitted a report as required by that section for the most recent year for which such requirement was applicable to such entity.

SEC. 513. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2000 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2000 in this Act, shall remain available through December 31, 2001, for each such account for the purposes authorized: Provided, That the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations shall be notified at least 15 days prior to the obligation of such funds.

SEC. 514. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to promulgate or adopt any final standard under section 1173(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320d–2(b)) providing for, or providing for the assignment of, a unique health identifier for an individual (except in an individual's capacity as an employer or a health care provider), until legislation is enacted specifically approving the standard.

SEC. 515. Section 410(b) of The Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–170) is amended by striking ''2009'' both places it appears and inserting ''2001''.

SEC. 516. Amounts made available under this Act for the administrative and related expenses for departmental management for the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Education shall be reduced on pro rata basis by $50,000,000.

SEC. 517. (a) None of the funds appropriated under this Act to carry out section 330 or title X of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b, 300 et seq.), title V or XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 701 et seq., 1396 et seq.), or any other provision of law, shall be used for the distribution or provision of postcoital emergency contraception, or the provision of a prescription for postcoital emergency contraception, to an unemancipated minor, on the premises or in the facilities of any elementary school or secondary school.

(b) This section takes effect 1 day after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) In this section:

(1) The terms ''elementary school'' and ''secondary school'' have the meanings given the terms in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

(2) The term ''unemancipated minor'' means an unmarried individual who is 17 years of age or younger and is a dependent, as defined in section 152(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 518. Title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290aa et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART G—REQUIREMENT RELATING TO THE RIGHTS OF RESIDENTS OF CERTAIN FACILITIES

''SEC. 581. REQUIREMENT RELATING TO THE RIGHTS OF RESIDENTS OF CERTAIN FACILITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A public or private general hospital, nursing facility, intermediate care facility, residential treatment center, or other health care facility, that receives support in any form from any program supported in whole or in part with funds appropriated to any Federal department or agency shall protect and promote the rights of each resident of the facility, including the right to be free from physical or mental abuse, corporal punishment, and any restraints or involuntary seclusions imposed for purposes of discipline or convenience.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Restraints and seclusion may only be imposed on a resident of a facility described in subsection (a) if—

''(1) the restraints or seclusion are imposed to ensure the physical safety of the resident, a staff member, or others; and

''(2) the restraints or seclusion are imposed only upon the written order of a physician, or other licensed independent practitioner permitted by the State and the facility to order such restraint or seclusion, that specifies the duration and circumstances under which the restraints are to be used (except in emergency circumstances specified by the Secretary until such an order could reasonably be obtained).

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) RESTRAINTS.—The term 'restraints' means—

''(A) any physical restraint that is a mechanical or personal restriction that immobilizes or reduces the ability of an individual to move his or her arms, legs, or head freely, not including devices, such as orthopedically prescribed devices, surgical dressings or bandages, protective helmets, or any other methods that involves the physical holding of a resident for the purpose of conducting routine physical examinations or tests or to protect the resident from falling out of bed or to permit the resident to participate in activities without the risk of physical harm to the resident; and

''(B) a drug or medication that is used as a restraint to control behavior or restrict the resident's freedom of movement that is not a standard treatment for the resident's medical or psychiatric condition.

''(2) SECLUSION.—The term 'seclusion' means any separation of the resident from the general population of the facility that prevents the resident from returning to such population if he or she desires.

''SEC. 582. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.— Each facility to which the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986 applies shall notify the appropriate agency, as determined by the Secretary, of each death that occurs at each such facility while a patient is restrained or in seclusion, of each death occurring within 24 hours after the patient has been removed from restraints and seclusion, or where it is reasonable to assume that a patient's death is a result of such seclusion or restraint. A notification under this section shall include the name of the resident and shall be provided not later than 7 days after the date of the death of the individual involved.

''(b) FACILITY.—In this section, the term 'facility' has the meaning given the term 'facilities' in section 102(3) of the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 10802(3)).''.

''SEC. 583. REGULATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.

''(a) TRAINING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this part, the Secretary, after consultation with appropriate State and local protection and advocacy organizations, physicians, facilities, and other health care professionals and patients, shall promulgate regulations that require facilities to which the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 10801 et seq.) applies, to meet the requirements of subsection (b).

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations promulgated under subsection (a) shall require that—

''(1) facilities described in subsection (a) ensure that there is an adequate number of qualified professional and supportive staff to evaluate patients, formulate written individualized, comprehensive treatment plans, and to provide active treatment measures;

''(2) appropriate training be provided for the staff of such facilities in the use of restraints and any alternatives to the use of restraints; and

''(3) such facilities provide complete and accurate notification of deaths, as required under section 582(a).

''(c) ENFORCEMENT.—A facility to which this part applies that fails to comply with any requirement of this part, including a failure to provide appropriate training, shall not be eligible for participation in any program supported in whole or in part by funds appropriated to any Federal department or agency.''.

SEC. 519. It is the sense of the Senate that each entity carrying out an Early Head Start program under the Head Start Act should—

(1) determine whether a child eligible to participate in the Early Head Start program has received a blood lead screening test, using a test that is appropriate for age and risk factors, upon the enrollment of the child in the program; and

(2) in the case of an child who has not received such a blood lead screening test, ensure that each enrolled child receives such a test either by referral or by performing the test (under contract or otherwise).

SEC. 520. (a) Whereas sexual abuse in schools between a student and a member of the school staff or a student and another student is a cause for concern in America;

(b) Whereas relatively few studies have been conducted on sexual abuse in schools and the extent of this problem is unknown;

(c) Whereas according to the Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act, a school administrator is required to report any allegation of sexual abuse to the appropriate authorities;

(d) Whereas an individual who is falsely accused of sexual misconduct with a student deserves appropriate legal and professional protections;

(e) Whereas it is estimated that many cases of sexual abuse in schools are not reported;

(f) Whereas many of the accused staff quietly resign at their present school district and are then rehired at a new district which has no knowledge of their alleged abuse;

(g) Therefore, it is the Sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Education should initiate a study and make recommendations to Congress and State and local governments on the issue of sexual abuse in schools.

TITLE VI—CHILDREN'S INTERNET PROTECTION

SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE. This title may be cited as the ''Childrens' Internet Protection Act''.

SEC. 602. REQUIREMENT FOR SCHOOLS AND LIBRARIES TO IMPLEMENT FILTERING OR BLOCKING TECHNOLOGY FOR COMPUTERS WITH INTERNET ACCESS AS CONDITION OF UNIVERSAL SERVICE DISCOUNTS. (a) SCHOOLS.—Section 254(h) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254(h)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (7); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

''(5) REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN SCHOOLS WITH COMPUTERS HAVING INTERNET ACCESS.—

''(A) INTERNET FILTERING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), an elementary or secondary school having computers with Internet access may not receive services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B) unless the school, school board, or other authority with responsibility for administration of the school—

''(I) submits to the Commission a certification described in subparagraph (B); and

''(II) ensures the use of such computers in accordance with the certification.

''(ii) APPLICABILITY.—The prohibition in paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to a school that receives services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B) only for purposes other than the provision of Internet access, Internet service, or internal connections.

''(B) CERTIFICATION.—A certification under this subparagraph is a certification that the school, school board, or other authority with responsibility for administration of the school—

''(i) has selected a technology for its computers with Internet access in order to filter or block Internet access through such computers to—

''(I) material that is obscene; and

''(II) child pornography; and

''(ii) is enforcing a policy to ensure the operation of the technology during any use of such computers by minors.

''(C) ADDITIONAL USE OF TECHNOLOGY.—A school, school board, or other authority may also use a technology covered by a certification under subparagraph (B) to filter or block Internet access through the computers concerned to any material in addition to the material specified in that subparagraph that the school, school board, or other authority determines to be inappropriate for minors.

''(D) TIMING OF CERTIFICATIONS.—

''(i) SCHOOLS WITH COMPUTERS ON EFFECTIVE DATE.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclause (II), in the case of any school covered by this paragraph as of the effective date of this paragraph under section 602(h) of the Childrens' Internet Protection Act, the certification under subparagraph (B) shall be made not later than 30 days after such effective date.

''(II) DELAY.—A certification for a school covered by subclause (I) may be made at a date that is later than is otherwise required by that subclause if State or local procurement rules or regulations or competitive bidding requirements prevent the making of the certification on the date otherwise required by that subclause. A school, school board, or other authority with responsibility for administration of the school shall notify the Commission of the applicability of this subclause to the school. Such notice shall specify the date on which the certification with respect to the school shall be effective for purposes of this clause.

''(ii) SCHOOLS ACQUIRING COMPUTERS AFTER EFFECTIVE DATE.—In the case of any school that first becomes covered by this paragraph after such effective date, the certification under subparagraph (B) shall be made not later than 10 days after the date on which the school first becomes so covered.

''(iii) NO REQUIREMENT FOR ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATIONS.—A school that has submitted a certification under subparagraph (B) shall not be required for purposes of this paragraph to submit an additional certification under that subparagraph with respect to any computers having Internet access that are acquired by the school after the submittal of the certification.

''(E) NONCOMPLIANCE.—

''(i) FAILURE TO SUBMIT CERTIFICATION.—Any school that knowingly fails to submit a certification required by this paragraph shall reimburse each telecommunications carrier that provided such school services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B) after the effective date of this paragraph under section 602(h) of the Childrens' Internet Protection Act in an amount equal to the amount of the discount provided such school by such carrier for such services during the period beginning on such effective date and ending on the date on which the provision of such services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B) is determined to cease under subparagraph (F).

''(ii) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH CERTIFICATION.—Any school that knowingly fails to ensure the use of its computers in accordance with a certification under subparagraph (B) shall reimburse each telecommunications carrier that provided such school services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B) after the date of such certification in an amount equal to the amount of the discount provided such school by such carrier for such services during the period beginning on the date of such certification and ending on the date on which the provision of such services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B) is determined to cease under subparagraph (F).

''(iii) TREATMENT OF REIMBURSEMENT.—The receipt by a telecommunications carrier of any

reimbursement under this subparagraph shall not affect the carrier's treatment of the discount on which such reimbursement was based in accordance with the third sentence of paragraph (1)(B).

''(F) CESSATION DATE.—

''(i) DETERMINATION.—The Commission shall determine the date on which the provision of services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B) shall cease under this paragraph by reason of the failure of a school to comply with the requirements of this paragraph.

''(ii) NOTIFICATION.—The Commission shall notify telecommunications carriers of each school determined to have failed to comply with the requirements of this paragraph and of the period for which such school shall be liable to make reimbursement under subparagraph (E).

''(G) RECOMMENCEMENT OF DISCOUNTS.—

''(i) RECOMMENCEMENT.—Upon submittal to the Commission of a certification under subparagraph (B) with respect to a school to which clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (E) applies, the school shall be entitled to services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B).

''(ii) NOTIFICATION.—The Commission shall notify the school and telecommunications carriers of the recommencement of the school's entitlement to services at discount rates under this subparagraph and of the date on which such recommencement begins.

''(iii) ADDITIONAL NONCOMPLIANCE.—The provisions of subparagraphs (E) and (F) shall apply to any certification submitted under clause (i).

''(H) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF POLICY.—A school, school board, or other authority that enforces a policy under subparagraph (B)(ii) shall take appropriate actions to ensure the ready availability to the public of information on such policy and on its policy, if any, relating to the use of technology under subparagraph (C).

''(I) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL ACTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—No agency or instrumentality of the United States Government may—

''(I) establish any criteria for making a determination under subparagraph (C);

''(II) review a determination made by a school, school board, or other authority for purposes of a certification under subparagraph (B); or

''(III) consider the criteria employed by a school, school board, or other authority for purposes of determining the eligibility of a school for services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B).

''(ii) ACTION BY COMMISSION.—The Commission may not take any action against a school, school board, or other authority for a violation of a provision of this paragraph if the school, school board, or other authority, as the case may be, has made a good faith effort to comply with such provision.''.

(b) LIBRARIES.—Such section 254(h) is further amended by inserting after paragraph (5), as amended by subsection (a) of this section, the following new paragraph:

''(6) REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN LIBRARIES WITH COMPUTERS HAVING INTERNET ACCESS.—

''(A) INTERNET FILTERING.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A library having one or more computers with Internet access may not receive services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B) unless the library—

''(I) submits to the Commission a certification described in subparagraph (B); and

''(II) ensures the use of such computers in accordance with the certification.

''(ii) APPLICABILITY.—The prohibition in paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to a library that receives services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B) only for purposes other than the provision of Internet access, Internet service, or internal connections.

''(B) CERTIFICATION.—

''(i) ACCESS OF MINORS TO CERTAIN MATERIAL.—A certification under this subparagraph is a certification that the library—

''(I) has selected a technology for its computer or computers with Internet access in order to filter or block Internet access through such computer or computers to—

''(aa) material that is obscene;

''(bb) child pornography; and

''(cc) any other material that the library determines to be inappropriate for minors; and

''(II) is enforcing a policy to ensure the operation of the technology during any use of such computer or computers by minors.

''(ii) ACCESS TO CHILD PORNOGRAPHY GENERALLY.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—A certification under this subparagraph with respect to a library is also a certification that the library—

''(aa) has selected a technology for its computer or computers with Internet access in order to filter or block Internet access through such computer or computers to child pornography; and

''(bb) is enforcing a policy to ensure the operation of the technology during any use of such computer or computers.

''(II) SCOPE.—For purposes of identifying child pornography under subclause (I), a library may utilize the definition of that term in section 2256(8) of title 18, United States Code.

''(III) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER CERTIFICATIONS.—The certification under this clause is in addition to any other certification applicable with respect to a library under this subparagraph.

''(C) ADDITIONAL USE OF TECHNOLOGY.—A library may also use a technology covered by a certification under subparagraph (B) to filter or block Internet access through the computers concerned to any material in addition to the material specified in that subparagraph that the library determines to be inappropriate for minors.

''(D) TIMING OF CERTIFICATIONS.—

''(i) LIBRARIES WITH COMPUTERS ON EFFECTIVE DATE.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any library covered by this paragraph as of the effective date of this paragraph under section 602(h) of the Childrens' Internet Protection Act, the certifications under subparagraph (B) shall be made not later than 30 days after such effective date.

''(II) DELAY.—The certifications for a library covered by subclause (I) may be made at a date than is later than is otherwise required by that subclause if State or local procurement rules or regulations or competitive bidding requirements prevent the making of the certifications on the date otherwise required by that subclause. A library shall notify the Commission of the applicability of this subclause to the library. Such notice shall specify the date on which the certifications with respect to the library shall be effective for purposes of this clause.

''(ii) LIBRARIES ACQUIRING COMPUTERS AFTER EFFECTIVE DATE.—In the case of any library that first becomes subject to the certifications under subparagraph (B) after such effective date, the certifications under that subparagraph shall be made not later than 10 days after the date on which the library first becomes so subject.

''(iii) NO REQUIREMENT FOR ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATIONS.—A library that has submitted the certifications under subparagraph (B) shall not be required for purposes of this paragraph to submit an additional certifications under that subparagraph with respect to any computers having Internet access that are acquired by the library after the submittal of such certifications.

''(E) NONCOMPLIANCE.—

''(i) FAILURE TO SUBMIT CERTIFICATION.—Any library that knowingly fails to submit the certifications required by this paragraph shall reimburse each telecommunications carrier that provided such library services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B) after the effective date of this paragraph under section 602(h) of the Childrens' Internet Protection Act in an amount equal to the amount of the discount provided such library by such carrier for such services during the period beginning on such effective date and ending on the date on which the provision of such services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B) is determined to cease under subparagraph (F).

''(ii) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH CERTIFICATION.—Any library that knowingly fails to ensure the use of its computers in accordance with a certification under subparagraph (B) shall reimburse each telecommunications carrier that provided such library services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B) after the date of such certification in an amount equal to the amount of the discount provided such library by such carrier for such services during the period beginning on the date of such certification and ending on the date on which the provision of such services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B) is determined to cease under subparagraph (F).

''(iii) TREATMENT OF REIMBURSEMENT.—The receipt by a telecommunications carrier of any reimbursement under this subparagraph shall not affect the carrier's treatment of the discount on which such reimbursement was based in accordance with the third sentence of paragraph (1)(B).

''(F) CESSATION DATE.—

''(i) DETERMINATION.—The Commission shall determine the date on which the provision of services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B) shall cease under this paragraph by reason of the failure of a library to comply with the requirements of this paragraph.

''(ii) NOTIFICATION.—The Commission shall notify telecommunications carriers of each library determined to have failed to comply with the requirements of this paragraph and of the period for which such library shall be liable to make reimbursement under subparagraph (E).

''(G) RECOMMENCEMENT OF DISCOUNTS.—

''(i) RECOMMENCEMENT.—Upon submittal to the Commission of a certification under subparagraph (B) with respect to a library to which clause (i) or (ii) of subparagraph (E) applies, the library shall be entitled to services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B).

''(ii) NOTIFICATION.—The Commission shall notify the library and telecommunications carriers of the recommencement of the library's entitlement to services at discount rates under this paragraph and of the date on which such recommencement begins.

''(iii) ADDITIONAL NONCOMPLIANCE.—The provisions of subparagraphs (E) and (F) shall apply to any certification submitted under clause (i).

''(H) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF POLICY.—A library that enforces a policy under clause (i)(II) or (ii)(I)(bb) of subparagraph (B) shall take appropriate actions to ensure the ready availability to the public of information on such policy and on its policy, if any, relating to the use of technology under subparagraph (C).

''(I) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL ACTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—No agency or instrumentality of the United States Government may—

''(I) establish any criteria for making a determination under subparagraph (C);

''(II) review a determination made by a library for purposes of a certification under subparagraph (B); or

''(III) consider the criteria employed by a library purposes of determining the eligibility of the library for services at discount rates under paragraph (1)(B).

''(ii) ACTION BY COMMISSION.—The Commission may not take any action against a library for a violation of a provision of this paragraph if the library has made a good faith effort to comply with such provision.''.

(c) MINOR DEFINED.—Paragraph (7) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1) of this section, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) MINOR.—The term 'minor' means any individual who has not attained the age of 17 years.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by striking ''paragraph (5)(A)'' and inserting ''paragraph (7)(A)''.

(e) SEPARABILITY.—If any provision of paragraph (5) or (6) of section 254(h) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by this section, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of such paragraph and the application of such paragraph to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

(f) REGULATIONS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Federal Communications Commission shall prescribe regulations for purposes of administering the provisions of paragraphs (5) and (6) of section 254(h) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by this section.

(2) DEADLINE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the requirements prescribed under paragraph (1) shall take effect 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) AVAILABILITY OF RATES.—Discounted rates under section 254(h)(1)(B) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254(h)(1)(B))—

(1) shall be available in amounts up to the annual cap on Federal universal service support for schools and libraries only for services covered by Federal Communications Commission regulations on priorities for funding telecommunications services, Internet access, Internet services, and Internet connections that assign priority for available funds for the poorest schools; and

(2) to the extent made available under paragraph (1), may be used for the purchase or acquisition of filtering or blocking products necessary to meet the requirements of section 254(h)(5) and (6) of that Act, but not for the purchase of software or other technology other than what is required to meet those requirements.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 603. FETAL TISSUE. The General Accounting Office shall conduct a comprehensive study into Federal involvement in the use of fetal tissue for research purposes within the scope of this Act to be completed by September 1, 2000. The study shall include but not be limited to—

(1) the annual number of orders for fetal tissue filled in conjunction with federally funded fetal tissue research or programs over the last 3 years;

(2) the costs associated with the procurement, dissemination, and other use of fetal tissue, including but not limited to the costs associated with the processing, transportation, preservation, quality control, and storage of such tissue;

(3) the manner in which Federal agencies ensure that intramural and extramural research facilities and their employees comply with Federal fetal tissue law;

(4) the number of fetal tissue procurement contractors and tissue resource sources, or other entities or individuals that are used to obtain, transport, process, preserve, or store fetal tissue, which receive Federal funds and the quantity, form, and nature of the services provided and the amount of Federal funds received by such entities;

(5) the number and identity of all Federal agencies within the scope of this Act expending or exchanging Federal funds in connection with obtaining or processing fetal tissue or the conduct of research using such tissue;

(6) the extent to which Federal fetal tissue procurement policies and guidelines adhere to Federal law;

(7) the criteria that Federal fetal tissue research facilities use for selecting their fetal tissue sources, and the manner in which the facilities ensure that such sources comply with Federal law.

SEC. 604. PROVISION OF INTERNET FILTERING OR SCREENING SOFTWARE BY CERTAIN INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDERS. (a) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE.—Each Internet service provider shall at the time of entering an agreement with a residential customer for the provision of Internet access services, provide to such customer, either at no fee or at a fee not in excess of the amount specified in subsection (c), computer software or other filtering or blocking system that allows the customer to prevent the access of minors to material on the Internet.

(b) SURVEYS OF PROVISION OF SOFTWARE OR SYSTEMS.—

(1) SURVEYS.—The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission shall jointly conduct surveys of the extent to which Internet service providers are providing computer software or systems described in subsection (a) to their subscribers. In performing such surveys, neither the Department nor the Commission shall collect personally identifiable information of subscribers of the Internet service providers.

(2) FREQUENCY.—The surveys required by paragraph (1) shall be completed as follows:

(A) One shall be completed not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) One shall be completed not later than two years after that date.

(C) One shall be completed not later than three years after that date.

(c) FEES.—The fee, if any, charged and collected by an Internet service provider for providing computer software or a system described in subsection (a) to a residential customer shall not exceed the amount equal to the cost of the provider in providing the software or system to the subscriber, including the cost of the software or system and of any license required with respect to the software or system.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—The requirement described in subsection (a) shall become effective only if—

(1) 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Office and the Commission determine as a result of the survey completed by the deadline in subsection (b)(2)(A) that less than 75 percent of the total number of residential subscribers of Internet service providers as of such deadline are provided computer software or systems described in subsection (a) by such providers;

(2) 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Office and the Commission determine as a result of the survey completed by the deadline in subsection (b)(2)(B) that less than 85 percent of the total number of residential subscribers of Internet service providers as of such deadline are provided such software or systems by such providers; or

(3) 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, if the Office and the Commission determine as a result of the survey completed by the deadline in subsection (b)(2)(C) that less than 100 percent of the total number of residential subscribers of Internet service providers as of such deadline are provided such software or systems by such providers.

(e) INTERNET SERVICE PROVIDER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Internet service provider'' means a service provider as defined in section 512(k)(1)(A) of title 17, United States Code, which has more than 50,000 subscribers.

TITLE VII—UNIVERSAL SERVICE FOR SCHOOLS AND LIBRARIES

SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE. This title may be cited as the ''Neighborhood Children's Internet Protection Act''.

SEC. 702. NO UNIVERSAL SERVICE FOR SCHOOLS OR LIBRARIES THAT FAIL TO IMPLEMENT A FILTERING OR BLOCKING SYSTEM FOR COMPUTERS WITH INTERNET ACCESS OR ADOPT INTERNET USE POLICIES. (a) NO UNIVERSAL SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(l) IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNET FILTERING OR BLOCKING SYSTEM OR USE POLICIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No services may be provided under subsection (h)(1)(B) to any elementary or secondary school, or any library, unless it provides the certification required by paragraph (2) to the Commission or its designee.

''(2) CERTIFICATION.—A certification under this paragraph with respect to a school or library is a certification by the school, school board, or other authority with responsibility for administration of the school, or the library, or any other entity representing the school or library in applying for universal service assistance, that the school or library—

''(A) has—

''(i) selected a system for its computers with Internet access that are dedicated to student use in order to filter or block Internet access to matter considered to be inappropriate for minors; and

''(ii) installed on such computers, or upon obtaining such computers will install on such computers, a system to filter or block Internet access to such matter; or

''(B)(i) has adopted and implemented an Internet use policy that addresses—

''(I) access by minors to inappropriate matter on the Internet and World Wide Web;

''(II) the safety and security of minors when using electronic mail, chat rooms, and other forms of direct electronic communications;

''(III) unauthorized access, including so-called 'hacking', and other unlawful activities by minors online;

''(IV) unauthorized disclosure, use, and dissemination of personal identification information regarding minors; and

''(V) whether the school or library, as the case may be, is employing hardware, software, or other technological means to limit, monitor, or otherwise control or guide Internet access by minors; and

''(ii) provided reasonable public notice and held at least one public hearing or meeting which addressed the proposed Internet use policy.

''(3) LOCAL DETERMINATION OF CONTENT.—For purposes of a certification under paragraph (2), the determination regarding what matter is inappropriate for minors shall be made by the school board, library, or other authority responsible for making the determination. No agency or instrumentality of the United States Government may—

''(A) establish criteria for making such determination;

''(B) review the determination made by the certifying school, school board, library, or other authority; or

''(C) consider the criteria employed by the certifying school, school board, library, or other authority in the administration of subsection (h)(1)(B).

''(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall apply with respect to schools and libraries seeking universal service assistance under subsection (h)(1)(B) on or after July 1, 2001.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (h)(1)(B) of that section is amended by striking ''All telecommunications'' and inserting ''Except as provided by subsection (l), all telecommunications''.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration shall initiate a notice and comment proceeding for purposes of—

(1) evaluating whether or not currently available commercial Internet blocking, filtering, and monitoring software adequately addresses the needs of educational institutions;

(2) making recommendations on how to foster the development of products which meet such needs; and

(3) evaluating the development and effectiveness of local Internet use policies that are currently in operation after community input.

SEC. 703. IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS. Not later than 100 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall adopt rules implementing this title and the amendments made by this title.

TITLE VIII—SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE OFF-BUDGET LOCKBOX ACT OF 2000

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE. This title may be cited as the ''Social Security and Medicare Off-Budget Lockbox Act of 2000''.

SEC. 802. STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY POINTS OF ORDER. (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 643) is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''(g) STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget (or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon) or any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would violate or amend section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.''.

(b) SUPER MAJORITY REQUIREMENT.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Section 904(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''312(g),'' after ''310(d)(2),''.

(2) WAIVER.—Section 904(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''312(g),'' after ''310(d)(2),''.

(c) ENFORCEMENT IN EACH FISCAL YEAR.—The Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended in—

(1) section 301(a)(7) (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(7)), by striking ''for the fiscal year'' through the period and inserting ''for each fiscal year covered by the resolution''; and

(2) section 311(a)(3) (2 U.S.C. 642(a)(3)), by striking beginning with ''for the first fiscal year'' through the period and insert the following: ''for any of the fiscal years covered by the concurrent resolution.''.

Sec. 803. MEDICARE TRUST FUND OFF-BUDGET. (a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) GENERAL EXCLUSION FROM ALL BUDGETS.—Title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''EXCLUSION OF MEDICARE TRUST FUND FROM ALL BUDGETS

''SEC. 316. (a) EXCLUSION OF MEDICARE TRUST FUND FROM ALL BUDGETS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund shall not be counted as new budget authority, outlays, receipts, or deficit or surplus for purposes of—

''(1) the budget of the United States Government as submitted by the President;

''(2) the congressional budget; or

''(3) the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

''(b) STRENGTHENING MEDICARE POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget (or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon) or any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would violate or amend this section.''.

(2) SUPER MAJORITY REQUIREMENT.—

(A) POINT OF ORDER.—Section 904(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''316,'' after ''313,''.

(B) WAIVER.—Section 904(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''316,'' after ''313,''.

(b) EXCLUSION OF MEDICARE TRUST FUND FROM CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET.—Section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The concurrent resolution shall not include the outlays and revenue totals of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund in the surplus or deficit totals required by this subsection or in any other surplus or deficit totals required by this title.''

(c) BUDGET TOTALS.—Section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

''(8) For purposes of Senate enforcement under this title, revenues and outlays of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for each fiscal year covered by the budget resolution.''.

(d) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS.—Section 301(i) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(i)) is amended by—

(1) striking ''SOCIAL SECURITY POINT OF ORDER.—It shall'' and inserting ''SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE POINTS OF ORDER.—

''(1) SOCIAL SECURITY.—It shall''; and

(2) inserting at the end the following:

''(2) MEDICARE.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget (or amendment, motion, or conference report on the resolution) that would decrease the excess of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund revenues over Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund outlays in any of the fiscal years covered by the concurrent resolution. This paragraph shall not apply to amounts to be expended from the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for purposes relating to programs within part A of Medicare as provided in law on the date of enactment of this paragraph.''.

(e) MEDICARE FIREWALL.—Section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642(a)) is amended by adding after paragraph (3), the following:

''(4) ENFORCEMENT OF MEDICARE LEVELS IN THE SENATE.—After a concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause a decrease in surpluses or an increase in deficits of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund in any year relative to the levels set forth in the applicable resolution. This paragraph shall not apply to amounts to be expended from the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for purposes relating to programs within part A of Medicare as provided in law on the date of enactment of this paragraph.''.

(f) BASELINE TO EXCLUDE HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND.—Section 257(b)(3) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by striking ''shall be included in all'' and inserting ''shall not be included in any''.

(g) MEDICARE TRUST FUND EXEMPT FROM SEQUESTERS.—Section 255(g)(1)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Medicare as funded through the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.''.

(h) BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND.—Section 710(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 911(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' the second place it appears and inserting a comma; and

(2) by inserting after ''Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund'' the following: '', Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund''.

SEC. 804. PREVENTING ON-BUDGET DEFICITS. (a) POINTS OF ORDER TO PREVENT ON-BUDGET DEFICITS.—Section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 643) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) POINTS OF ORDER TO PREVENT ON-BUDGET DEFICITS.—

''(1) CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, or conference report thereon or amendment thereto, that would cause or increase an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.

''(2) SUBSEQUENT LEGISLATION.—Except as provided by paragraph (3), it shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report if—

''(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution as reported;

''(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

''(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report, would cause or increase an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.''.

(b) SUPER MAJORITY REQUIREMENT.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Section 904(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''312(h),'' after ''312(g),''.

(2) WAIVER.—Section 904(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''312(h),'' after ''312(g),''.

SEC. 805. SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SAFE DEPOSIT BOX ACT OF 2000. (a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 2000''.

(b) PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SURPLUSES.—

(1) MEDICARE SURPLUSES OFF-BUDGET.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the net surplus of any trust fund for part A of Medicare shall not be counted as a net surplus for purposes of—

(A) the budget of the United States Government as submitted by the President;

(B) the congressional budget; or

(C) the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(2) POINTS OF ORDER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SURPLUSES.—Section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) POINTS OF ORDER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SURPLUSES.—

''(1) CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, or conference report thereon or amendment thereto, that would set forth an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.

''(2) SUBSEQUENT LEGISLATION.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report if—

''(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution as reported;

''(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

''(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report, would cause or increase an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.

''(3) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'on-budget deficit', when applied to a fiscal year, means the deficit in the budget as set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301(a)(3) for that fiscal year.''.

(3) SUPER MAJORITY REQUIREMENT.—

(A) POINT OF ORDER.—Section 904(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''312(g),'' after ''310(d)(2),''.

(B) WAIVER.—Section 904(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''312(g),'' after ''310(d)(2),''.

(c) PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SURPLUSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 11 of subtitle II of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding before section 1101 the following:

''§1100. Protection of social security and medicare surpluses

''The budget of the United States Government submitted by the President under this chapter shall not recommend an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year covered by that budget.''.

(2) CHAPTER ANALYSIS.—The chapter analysis for chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the item for section 1101 the following:

''1100. Protection of social security and medicare surpluses.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect upon the date of its enactment and the amendments made by this section shall apply to fiscal year 2001 and subsequent fiscal years.

TITLE IX—GENETIC INFORMATION AND SERVICES

SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE. This title may be cited as the ''Genetic Information Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance Act of 2000''.

SEC. 902. AMENDMENTS TO EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974. (a) PROHIBITION OF HEALTH DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF GENETIC INFORMATION OR GENETIC SERVICES.—

(1) NO ENROLLMENT RESTRICTION FOR GENETIC SERVICES.—Section 702(a)(1)(F) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1182(a)(1)(F)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: ''(including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services)''.

(2) NO DISCRIMINATION IN GROUP PREMIUMS BASED ON PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Subpart B of part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 714. PROHIBITING PREMIUM DISCRIMINATION AGAINST GROUPS ON THE BASIS OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.

''A group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering group health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall not adjust premium or contribution amounts for a group on the basis of predictive genetic information concerning any individual (including a dependent) or family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 702(b) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1182(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) REFERENCE TO RELATED PROVISION.—For a provision prohibiting the adjustment of premium or contribution amounts for a group under a group health plan on the basis of predictive genetic information (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services), see section 714.''.

(B) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 713 the following new item:

''Sec. 714. Prohibiting premium discrimination against groups on the basis of predictive genetic information.''.

(b) LIMITATION ON COLLECTION OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Section 702 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1182) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) COLLECTION OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) LIMITATION ON REQUESTING OR REQUIRING PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall not request or require predictive genetic information concerning any individual (including a dependent) or family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(2) INFORMATION NEEDED FOR DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT, OR PAYMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, that provides health care items and services to an individual or dependent may request (but may not require) that such individual or dependent disclose, or authorize the collection or disclosure of, predictive genetic information for purposes of diagnosis, treatment, or payment relating to the provision of health care items and services to such individual or dependent.

''(B) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES AND DESCRIPTION OF SAFEGUARDS.—As a part of a request under subparagraph (A), the group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall provide to the individual or dependent a description of the procedures in place to safeguard the confidentiality, as described in subsection (d), of such predictive genetic information.

''(d) CONFIDENTIALITY WITH RESPECT TO PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES.—

''(A) PREPARATION OF WRITTEN NOTICE.—A group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall post or provide, in writing and in a clear and conspicuous manner, notice of the plan or issuer's confidentiality practices, that shall include—

''(i) a description of an individual's rights with respect to predictive genetic information;

''(ii) the procedures established by the plan or issuer for the exercise of the individual's rights; and

''(iii) the right to obtain a copy of the notice of the confidentiality practices required under this subsection.

''(B) MODEL NOTICE.—The Secretary, in consultation with the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and after notice and opportunity for public comment, shall develop and disseminate model notices of confidentiality practices. Use of the model notice shall serve as a defense against claims of receiving inappropriate notice.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF SAFEGUARDS.—A group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall establish and maintain appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to protect the confidentiality, security, accuracy, and integrity of predictive genetic information created, received, obtained, maintained, used, transmitted, or disposed of by such plan or issuer.''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 733(d) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1191b(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) FAMILY MEMBER.—The term 'family member' means with respect to an individual—

''(A) the spouse of the individual;

''(B) a dependent child of the individual, including a child who is born to or placed for adoption with the individual; and

''(C) all other individuals related by blood to the individual or the spouse or child described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(6) GENETIC INFORMATION.—The term 'genetic information' means information about genes, gene products, or inherited characteristics that may derive from an individual or a family member (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(7) GENETIC SERVICES.—The term 'genetic services' means health services provided to obtain, assess, or interpret genetic information for diagnostic and therapeutic purposes, and for genetic education and counseling.

''(8) PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'predictive genetic information' means, in the absence of symptoms, clinical signs, or a diagnosis of the condition related to such information—

''(i) information about an individual's genetic tests;

''(ii) information about genetic tests of family members of the individual; or

''(iii) information about the occurrence of a disease or disorder in family members.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term 'predictive genetic information' shall not include—

''(i) information about the sex or age of the individual;

''(ii) information derived from physical tests, such as the chemical, blood, or urine analyses of the individual including cholesterol tests; and

''(iii) information about physical exams of the individual.

''(9) GENETIC TEST.—The term 'genetic test' means the analysis of human DNA, RNA, chromosomes, proteins, and certain metabolites, including analysis of genotypes, mutations, phenotypes, or karyotypes, for the purpose of predicting risk of disease in asymptomatic or undiagnosed individuals. Such term does not include physical tests, such as the chemical, blood, or urine analyses of the individual including cholesterol tests, and physical exams of the individual, in order to detect symptoms, clinical signs, or a diagnosis of disease.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in this section, this section and the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to group health plans for plan years beginning 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 903. AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT. (a) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE GROUP MARKET.—

(1) PROHIBITION OF HEALTH DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF GENETIC INFORMATION IN THE GROUP MARKET.—

(A) NO ENROLLMENT RESTRICTION FOR GENETIC SERVICES.—Section 2702(a)(1)(F) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–1(a)(1)(F)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: ''(including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services)''.

(B) NO DISCRIMINATION IN PREMIUMS BASED ON PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Subpart 2 of part A of title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–4 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 2707. PROHIBITING PREMIUM DISCRIMINATION AGAINST GROUPS ON THE BASIS OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION IN THE GROUP MARKET.

''A group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering group health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan shall not adjust premium or contribution amounts for a group on the basis of predictive genetic information concerning any individual (including a dependent) or family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).''.

(C) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2702(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–1(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) REFERENCE TO RELATED PROVISION.—For a provision prohibiting the adjustment of premium or contribution amounts for a group under a group health plan on the basis of predictive genetic information (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services), see section 2707.''.

(D) LIMITATION ON COLLECTION AND DISCLOSURE OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Section 2702 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) COLLECTION OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) LIMITATION ON REQUESTING OR REQUIRING PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall not request or require predictive genetic information concerning any individual (including a dependent) or a family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(2) INFORMATION NEEDED FOR DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT, OR PAYMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, that provides health care items and services to an individual or dependent may request (but may not require) that such individual or dependent disclose, or authorize the collection or disclosure of, predictive genetic information for purposes of diagnosis, treatment, or payment relating to the provision of health care items and services to such individual or dependent.

''(B) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES AND DESCRIPTION OF SAFEGUARDS.—As a part of a request under subparagraph (A), the group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall provide to the individual or dependent a description of the procedures in place to safeguard the confidentiality, as described in subsection (d), of such predictive genetic information.

''(d) CONFIDENTIALITY WITH RESPECT TO PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES.—

''(A) PREPARATION OF WRITTEN NOTICE.—A group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall post or provide, in writing and in a clear and conspicuous manner, notice of the plan or issuer's confidentiality practices, that shall include—

''(i) a description of an individual's rights with respect to predictive genetic information;

''(ii) the procedures established by the plan or issuer for the exercise of the individual's rights; and

''(iii) the right to obtain a copy of the notice of the confidentiality practices required under this subsection.

''(B) MODEL NOTICE.—The Secretary, in consultation with the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and after notice and opportunity for public comment, shall develop and disseminate model notices of confidentiality practices. Use of the model notice shall serve as a defense against claims of receiving inappropriate notice.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF SAFEGUARDS.—A group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall establish and maintain appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to protect the confidentiality, security, accuracy, and integrity of predictive genetic information created, received, obtained, maintained, used, transmitted, or disposed of by such plan or issuer.''.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2791(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–91(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(15) FAMILY MEMBER.—The term 'family member' means, with respect to an individual—

''(A) the spouse of the individual;

''(B) a dependent child of the individual, including a child who is born to or placed for adoption with the individual; and

''(C) all other individuals related by blood to the individual or the spouse or child described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(16) GENETIC INFORMATION.—The term 'genetic information' means information about genes, gene products, or inherited characteristics that may derive from an individual or a family member (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(17) GENETIC SERVICES.—The term 'genetic services' means health services provided to obtain, assess, or interpret genetic information for diagnostic and therapeutic purposes, and for genetic education and counseling.

''(18) PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'predictive genetic information' means, in the absence of symptoms, clinical signs, or a diagnosis of the condition related to such information—

''(i) information about an individual's genetic tests;

''(ii) information about genetic tests of family members of the individual; or

''(iii) information about the occurrence of a disease or disorder in family members.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term 'predictive genetic information' shall not include—

''(i) information about the sex or age of the individual;

''(ii) information derived from physical tests, such as the chemical, blood, or urine analyses of the individual including cholesterol tests; and

''(iii) information about physical exams of the individual.

''(19) GENETIC TEST.—The term 'genetic test' means the analysis of human DNA, RNA, chromosomes, proteins, and certain metabolites, including analysis of genotypes, mutations, phenotypes, or karyotypes, for the purpose of predicting risk of disease in asymptomatic or undiagnosed individuals. Such term does not include physical tests, such as the chemical, blood, or urine analyses of the individual including cholesterol tests, and physical exams of the individual, in order to detect symptoms, clinical signs, or a diagnosis of disease.''.

(e) AMENDMENTS TO PHSA RELATING TO THE INDIVIDUAL MARKET.—The first subpart 3 of part B of title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–51 et seq.) (relating to other requirements) (42 U.S.C. 300gg–51 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 2753. PROHIBITION OF HEALTH DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.

''(a) PROHIBITION ON PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION AS A CONDITION OF ELIGIBILITY.—A health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in the individual market may not use predictive genetic information as a condition of eligibility of an individual to enroll in individual health insurance coverage (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(b) PROHIBITION ON PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION IN SETTING PREMIUM RATES.—A health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in the individual market shall not adjust premium rates for individuals on the basis of predictive genetic information concerning such an individual (including a dependent) or a family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(c) COLLECTION OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) LIMITATION ON REQUESTING OR REQUIRING PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in the individual market shall not request or require predictive genetic information concerning any individual (including a dependent) or a family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(2) INFORMATION NEEDED FOR DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT, OR PAYMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in the individual market that provides health care items and services to an individual or dependent may request (but may not require) that such individual or dependent disclose, or authorize the collection or disclosure of, predictive genetic information for purposes of diagnosis, treatment, or payment relating to the provision of health care items and services to such individual or dependent.

''(B) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES AND DESCRIPTION OF SAFEGUARDS.—As a part of a request under subparagraph (A), the health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in the individual market shall provide to the individual or dependent a description of the procedures in place to safeguard the confidentiality, as described in subsection (d), of such predictive genetic information.

''(d) CONFIDENTIALITY WITH RESPECT TO PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES.—

''(A) PREPARATION OF WRITTEN NOTICE.—A health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in the individual market shall post or provide, in writing and in a clear and conspicuous manner, notice of the issuer's confidentiality practices, that shall include—

''(i) a description of an individual's rights with respect to predictive genetic information;

''(ii) the procedures established by the issuer for the exercise of the individual's rights; and

''(iii) the right to obtain a copy of the notice of the confidentiality practices required under this subsection.

''(B) MODEL NOTICE.—The Secretary, in consultation with the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and after notice and opportunity for public comment, shall develop and disseminate model notices of confidentiality practices. Use of the model notice shall serve as a defense against claims of receiving inappropriate notice.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF SAFEGUARDS.—A health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in the individual market shall establish and maintain appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to protect the confidentiality, security, accuracy, and integrity of predictive genetic information created, received, obtained, maintained, used, transmitted, or disposed of by such issuer.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to—

(1) group health plans, and health insurance coverage offered in connection with group health plans, for plan years beginning after 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) health insurance coverage offered, sold, issued, renewed, in effect, or operated in the individual market after 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 904. AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986. (a) PROHIBITION OF HEALTH DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF GENETIC INFORMATION OR GENETIC SERVICES.—

(1) NO ENROLLMENT RESTRICTION FOR GENETIC SERVICES.—Section 9802(a)(1)(F) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting before the period the following: ''(including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services)''.

(2) NO DISCRIMINATION IN GROUP PREMIUMS BASED ON PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter B of chapter 100 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 9813. PROHIBITING PREMIUM DISCRIMINATION AGAINST GROUPS ON THE BASIS OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.

''A group health plan shall not adjust premium or contribution amounts for a group on the basis of predictive genetic information concerning any individual (including a dependent) or a family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9802(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) REFERENCE TO RELATED PROVISION.—For a provision prohibiting the adjustment of premium or contribution amounts for a group under a group health plan on the basis of predictive genetic information (including information about a request for or the receipt of genetic services), see section 9813.''.

(C) AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 100 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Sec. 9813. Prohibiting premium discrimination against groups on the basis of predictive genetic information.''.

(b) LIMITATION ON COLLECTION OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Section 9802 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) COLLECTION OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) LIMITATION ON REQUESTING OR REQUIRING PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a group health plan shall not request or require predictive genetic information concerning any individual (including a dependent) or a family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(2) INFORMATION NEEDED FOR DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT, OR PAYMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a group health plan that provides health care items and services to an individual or dependent may request (but may not require) that such individual or dependent disclose, or authorize the collection or disclosure of, predictive genetic information for purposes of diagnosis, treatment, or payment relating to the provision of health care items and services to such individual or dependent.

''(B) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES; DESCRIPTION OF SAFEGUARDS.—As a part of a request under subparagraph (A), the group health plan shall provide to the individual or dependent a description of the procedures in place to safeguard the confidentiality, as described in subsection (e), of such predictive genetic information.

''(e) CONFIDENTIALITY WITH RESPECT TO PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES.—

''(A) PREPARATION OF WRITTEN NOTICE.—A group health plan shall post or provide, in writing and in a clear and conspicuous manner, notice of the plan's confidentiality practices, that shall include—

''(i) a description of an individual's rights with respect to predictive genetic information;

''(ii) the procedures established by the plan for the exercise of the individual's rights; and

''(iii) the right to obtain a copy of the notice of the confidentiality practices required under this subsection.

''(B) MODEL NOTICE.—The Secretary, in consultation with the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and after notice and opportunity for public comment, shall develop and disseminate model notices of confidentiality practices. Use of the model notice shall serve as a defense against claims of receiving inappropriate notice.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF SAFEGUARDS.—A group health plan shall establish and maintain appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to protect the confidentiality, security, accuracy, and integrity of predictive genetic information created, received, obtained, maintained, used, transmitted, or disposed of by such plan.''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 9832(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) FAMILY MEMBER.—The term 'family member' means, with respect to an individual—

''(A) the spouse of the individual;

''(B) a dependent child of the individual, including a child who is born to or placed for adoption with the individual; and

''(C) all other individuals related by blood to the individual or the spouse or child described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(7) GENETIC INFORMATION.—The term 'genetic information' means information about genes, gene products, or inherited characteristics that may derive from an individual or a family member (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(8) GENETIC SERVICES.—The term 'genetic services' means health services provided to obtain, assess, or interpret genetic information for diagnostic and therapeutic purposes, and for genetic education and counseling.

''(9) PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'predictive genetic information' means, in the absence of symptoms, clinical signs, or a diagnosis of the condition related to such information—

''(i) information about an individual's genetic tests;

''(ii) information about genetic tests of family members of the individual; or

''(iii) information about the occurrence of a disease or disorder in family members.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term 'predictive genetic information' shall not include—

''(i) information about the sex or age of the individual;

''(ii) information derived from physical tests, such as the chemical, blood, or urine analyses of the individual including cholesterol tests; and

''(iii) information about physical exams of the individual.

''(10) GENETIC TEST.—The term 'genetic test' means the analysis of human DNA, RNA, chromosomes, proteins, and certain metabolites, including analysis of genotypes, mutations, phenotypes, or karyotypes, for the purpose of predicting risk of disease in asymptomatic or undiagnosed individuals. Such term does not include physical tests, such as the chemical, blood, or urine analyses of the individual including cholesterol tests, and physical exams of the individual, in order to detect symptoms, clinical signs, or a diagnosis of disease.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in this section, this section and the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to group health plans for plan years beginning after 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

DIVISION B—HEALTH CARE ACCESS AND PROTECTIONS FOR CONSUMERS

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Patients' Bill of Rights Plus Act''.

TITLE XXI—TAX-RELATED HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Health Care and Long-Term Care

SEC. 2101. DEDUCTION FOR HEALTH AND LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE COSTS OF INDIVIDUALS NOT PARTICIPATING IN EMPLOYER-SUBSIDIZED HEALTH PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating section 222 as section 223 and by inserting after section 221 the following new section:

''SEC. 222. HEALTH AND LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE COSTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction an amount equal to the applicable percentage of the amount paid during the taxable year for insurance which constitutes medical care for the taxpayer and the taxpayer's spouse and dependents.

''(b) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), the applicable percentage shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

''For taxable years beginning in calendar year—	**The applicable percentage is—**
2002 and 2003	25
2004	35
2005	65
2006 and thereafter	100.

''(2) LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE FOR INDIVIDUALS 60 YEARS OR OLDER.—In the case of amounts paid for a qualified long-term care insurance contract for an individual who has attained age 60 before the close of the taxable year, the applicable percentage is 100.

''(c) LIMITATION BASED ON OTHER COVERAGE.—

''(1) COVERAGE UNDER CERTAIN SUBSIDIZED EMPLOYER PLANS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any calendar month for which the taxpayer participates in any health plan maintained by any employer of the taxpayer or of the spouse of the taxpayer if 50 percent or more of the cost of coverage under such plan (determined under section 4980B and without regard to payments made with respect to any coverage described in subsection (e)) is paid or incurred by the employer.

''(B) EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS TO CAFETERIA PLANS, FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENTS, AND MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.—Employer contributions to a cafeteria plan, a flexible spending or similar arrangement, or a medical savings account which are excluded from gross income under section 106 shall be treated for purposes of subparagraph (A) as paid by the employer.

''(C) AGGREGATION OF PLANS OF EMPLOYER.—A health plan which is not otherwise described in subparagraph (A) shall be treated as described in such subparagraph if such plan would be so described if all health plans of persons treated as a single employer under subsection (b), (c), (m), or (o) of section 414 were treated as one health plan.

''(D) SEPARATE APPLICATION TO HEALTH INSURANCE AND LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE.—Subparagraphs (A) and (C) shall be applied separately with respect to—

''(i) plans which include primarily coverage for qualified long-term care services or are qualified long-term care insurance contracts, and

''(ii) plans which do not include such coverage and are not such contracts.

''(2) COVERAGE UNDER CERTAIN FEDERAL PROGRAMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid for any coverage for an individual for any calendar month if, as of the first day of such month, the individual is covered under any medical care program described in—

''(i) title XVIII, XIX, or XXI of the Social Security Act,

''(ii) chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code,

''(iii) chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code,

''(iv) chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, or

''(v) the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(i) QUALIFIED LONG-TERM CARE.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to amounts paid for coverage under a qualified long-term care insurance contract.

''(ii) CONTINUATION COVERAGE OF FEHBP.—Subparagraph (A)(iv) shall not apply to coverage which is comparable to continuation coverage under section 4980B.

''(d) LONG-TERM CARE DEDUCTION LIMITED TO QUALIFIED LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE CONTRACTS.—In the case of a qualified long-term care insurance contract, only eligible long-term care premiums (as defined in section 213(d)(10)) may be taken into account under subsection (a).

''(e) DEDUCTION NOT AVAILABLE FOR PAYMENT OF ANCILLARY COVERAGE PREMIUMS.—Any amount paid as a premium for insurance which provides for—

''(1) coverage for accidents, disability, dental care, vision care, or a specified illness, or

''(2) making payments of a fixed amount per day (or other period) by reason of being hospitalized,

shall not be taken into account under subsection (a).

''(f) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) COORDINATION WITH DEDUCTION FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS OF SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—The amount taken into account by the taxpayer in computing the deduction under section 162(l) shall not be taken into account under this section.

''(2) COORDINATION WITH MEDICAL EXPENSE DEDUCTION.—The amount taken into account by the taxpayer in computing the deduction under this section shall not be taken into account under section 213.

''(g) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be appropriate to

carry out this section, including regulations requiring employers to report to their employees and the Secretary such information as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.''.

(b) DEDUCTION ALLOWED WHETHER OR NOT TAXPAYER ITEMIZES OTHER DEDUCTIONS.—Subsection (a) of section 62 of such Code is amended by inserting after paragraph (17) the following new item:

''(18) HEALTH AND LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE COSTS.—The deduction allowed by section 222.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking the last item and inserting the following new items:

''Sec. 222. Health and long-term care insurance costs.

''Sec. 223. Cross reference.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

SEC. 2102. DEDUCTION FOR 100 PERCENT OF HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS OF SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 162(l) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(1) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of an individual who is an employee within the meaning of section 401(c)(1), there shall be allowed as a deduction under this section an amount equal to 100 percent of the amount paid during the taxable year for insurance which constitutes medical care for the taxpayer and the taxpayer's spouse and dependents.''.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF LIMITATIONS ON OTHER COVERAGE.—The first sentence of section 162(l)(2)(B) of such Code is amended to read as follows: ''Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any calendar month for which the taxpayer participates in any subsidized health plan maintained by any employer (other than an employer described in section 401(c)(4)) of the taxpayer or the spouse of the taxpayer.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

SEC. 2103. LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE PERMITTED TO BE OFFERED UNDER CAFETERIA PLANS AND FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENTS.

(a) CAFETERIA PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining qualified benefits) is amended by inserting before the period at the end ''; except that such term shall include the payment of premiums for any qualified long-term care insurance contract (as defined in section 7702B) to the extent the amount of such payment does not exceed the eligible long-term care premiums (as defined in section 213(d)(10)) for such contract''.

(b) FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENTS.—Section 106 of such Code (relating to contributions by employer to accident and health plans) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

SEC. 2104. ADDITIONAL PERSONAL EXEMPTION FOR TAXPAYER CARING FOR ELDERLY FAMILY MEMBER IN TAXPAYER'S HOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 151 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions) is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e) ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN ELDERLY FAMILY MEMBERS RESIDING WITH TAXPAYER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An exemption of the exemption amount for each qualified family member of the taxpayer.

''(2) QUALIFIED FAMILY MEMBER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualified family member' means, with respect to any taxable year, any individual—

''(A) who is an ancestor of the taxpayer or of the taxpayer's spouse or who is the spouse of any such ancestor,

''(B) who is a member for the entire taxable year of a household maintained by the taxpayer, and

''(C) who has been certified, before the due date for filing the return of tax for the taxable year (without extensions), by a physician (as defined in section 1861(r)(1) of the Social Security Act) as being an individual with long-term care needs described in paragraph (3) for a period—

''(i) which is at least 180 consecutive days, and

''(ii) a portion of which occurs within the taxable year.

Such term shall not include any individual otherwise meeting the requirements of the preceding sentence unless within the 39½ month period ending on such due date (or such other period as the Secretary prescribes) a physician (as so defined) has certified that such individual meets such requirements.

''(3) INDIVIDUALS WITH LONG-TERM CARE NEEDS.—An individual is described in this paragraph if the individual—

''(A) is unable to perform (without substantial assistance from another individual) at least two activities of daily living (as defined in section 7702B(c)(2)(B)) due to a loss of functional capacity, or

''(B) requires substantial supervision to protect such individual from threats to health and safety due to severe cognitive impairment and is unable to perform, without reminding or cuing assistance, at least one activity of daily living (as so defined) or to the extent provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary (in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services), is unable to engage in age appropriate activities.

''(4) SPECIAL RULES.—Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 21(e) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

SEC. 2105. STUDY OF LONG-TERM CARE NEEDS IN THE 21ST CENTURY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') shall on or after October 1, 2001, provide, in accordance with this section, for a study in order to determine—

(1) future demand for long-term health care services (including institutional and home and community-based services) in the United States in order to meet the needs in the 21st century; and

(2) long-term options to finance the provision of such services.

(b) DETAILS.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An identification of the relevant demographic characteristics affecting demand for long-term health care services, at least through the year 2030.

(2) The viability and capacity of community-based and other long-term health care services under different federal programs, including through the medicare and medicaid programs, grants to States, housing services, and changes in tax policy.

(3) How to improve the quality of long-term health care services.

(4) The integration of long-term health care services for individuals between different classes of health care providers (such as hospitals, nursing facilities, and home care agencies) and different Federal programs (such as the medicare and medicaid programs).

(5) The possibility of expanding private sector initiatives, including long-term care insurance, to meet the need to finance such services.

(6) An examination of the effect of enactment of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 on the provision and financing of long-term health care services, including on portability and affordability of private long-term care insurance, the impact of insurance options on low-income older Americans, and the options for eligibility to improve access to such insurance.

(7) The financial impact of the provision of long-term health care services on caregivers and other family members.

(c) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—October 1, 2002, the Secretary shall provide for a report on the study under this section.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include findings and recommendations regarding each of the following:

(A) The most effective and efficient manner that the Federal Government may use its resources to educate the public on planning for needs for long-term health care services.

(B) The public, private, and joint public-private strategies for meeting identified needs for long-term health care services.

(C) The role of States and local communities in the financing of long-term health care services.

(3) INCLUSION OF COST ESTIMATES.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include cost estimates of the various options for which recommendations are made.

(d) CONDUCT OF STUDY.—

(1) USE OF INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall seek to enter into an appropriate arrangement with the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences to conduct the study under this section. If such an arrangement cannot be made, the Secretary may provide for the conduct of the study by any other qualified non-governmental entity.

(2) CONSULTATION.—The study should be conducted under this section in consultation with experts from a wide-range of groups from the public and private sectors.

Subtitle B—Medical Savings Accounts

SEC. 2111. EXPANSION OF AVAILABILITY OF MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

(a) REPEAL OF LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER OF MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsections (i) and (j) of section 220 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are hereby repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Paragraph (1) of section 220(c) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (D).

(B) Section 138 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (f).

(b) AVAILABILITY NOT LIMITED TO ACCOUNTS FOR EMPLOYEES OF SMALL EMPLOYERS AND SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 220(c)(1)(A) of such Code (relating to eligible individual) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'eligible individual' means, with respect to any month, any individual if—

''(i) such individual is covered under a high deductible health plan as of the 1st day of such month, and

''(ii) such individual is not, while covered under a high deductible health plan, covered under any health plan—

''(I) which is not a high deductible health plan, and

''(II) which provides coverage for any benefit which is covered under the high deductible health plan.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 220(c)(1) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (C).

(B) Section 220(c) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (4) (defining small employer) and by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4).

(C) Section 220(b) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (4) (relating to deduction limited by compensation) and by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively.

(c) INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF DEDUCTION ALLOWED FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 220(b) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(2) MONTHLY LIMITATION.—The monthly limitation for any month is the amount equal to 1/12 of the annual deductible (as of the first day of such month) of the individual's coverage under the high deductible health plan.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Clause (ii) of section 220(d)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''75 percent of''.

(d) BOTH EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES MAY CONTRIBUTE TO MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.—Paragraph (4) of section 220(b) of such Code (as redesignated by subsection (b)(2)(C)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) COORDINATION WITH EXCLUSION FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS.—The limitation which would (but for this paragraph) apply under this subsection to the taxpayer for any taxable year shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount which would (but for section 106(b)) be includible in the taxpayer's gross income for such taxable year.''.

(e) REDUCTION OF PERMITTED DEDUCTIBLES UNDER HIGH DEDUCTIBLE HEALTH PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 220(c)(2) of such Code (defining high deductible health plan) is amended—

(A) by striking ''$1,500'' in clause (i) and inserting ''$1,000'';

(B) by striking ''$3,000'' in clause (ii) and inserting ''$2,000''; and

(C) by striking the matter preceding subclause (I) in clause (iii) and inserting ''pursuant to which the annual out-of-pocket expenses (including deductibles and co-payments) are required to be paid under the plan (other than for premiums) for covered benefits and may not exceed—''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (g) of section 220 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(g) COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2002, each dollar amount in subsection (c)(2) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which such taxable year begins by substituting 'calendar year 2001' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In the case of the $1,000 amount in subsection (c)(2)(A)(i) and the $2,000 amount in subsection (c)(2)(A)(ii), paragraph (1)(B) shall be applied by substituting 'calendar year 2002' for 'calendar year 2001'.

''(3) ROUNDING.—If any increase under paragraph (1) or (2) is not a multiple of $50, such increase shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $50.''.

(f) LIMITATION ON ADDITIONAL TAX ON DISTRIBUTIONS NOT USED FOR QUALIFIED MEDICAL EXPENSES.—Section 220(f)(4) of such Code (relating to additional tax on distributions not used for qualified medical expenses) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) EXCEPTION IN CASE OF SUFFICIENT ACCOUNT BALANCE.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any payment or distribution in any taxable year, but only to the extent such payment or distribution does not reduce the fair market value of the assets of the medical savings account to an amount less than the annual deductible for the high deductible health plan of the account holder (determined as of the earlier of January 1 of the calendar year in which the taxable year begins or January 1 of the last calendar year in which the account holder is covered under a high deductible health plan).''.

(g) TREATMENT OF NETWORK-BASED MANAGED CARE PLANS.—Section 220(c)(2)(B) of such Code (relating to special rules for high deductible health plans) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) TREATMENT OF NETWORK-BASED MANAGED CARE PLANS.—A plan which provides health care services through a network of contracted or affiliated health care providers, if the benefits provided when services are obtained through network providers meet the requirements of subparagraph (A), shall not fail to be treated as a high deductible health plan by reason of providing benefits for services rendered by providers who are not members of the network, so long as the annual deductible and annual limit on out-of-pocket expenses applicable to services received from non-network providers are not lower than those applicable to services received from the network providers.''.

(h) MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS MAY BE OFFERED UNDER CAFETERIA PLANS.—Subsection (f) of section 125 of such Code is amended by striking ''106(b),''.

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

(2) LIMITATION ON ADDITIONAL TAX ON DISTRIBUTIONS NOT USED FOR QUALIFIED MEDICAL EXPENSES.—The amendment made by subsection (f) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2005.

SEC. 2112. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS AND HIGH DEDUCTIBLE HEALTH PLANS UNDER FEHBP.

(a) MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.—

(1) CONTRIBUTIONS.—Title 5, United States Code, is amended by redesignating section 8906a as section 8906c and by inserting after section 8906 the following:

''§ 8906a. Government contributions to medical savings accounts

''(a) An employee or annuitant enrolled in a high deductible health plan is entitled, in addition to the Government contribution under section 8906(b) toward the subscription charge for such plan, to have a Government contribution made, in accordance with succeeding provisions of this section, to a medical savings account of such employee or annuitant.

''(b)(1) The biweekly Government contribution under this section shall, in the case of any such employee or annuitant, be equal to the amount (if any) by which—

''(A) the biweekly equivalent of the maximum Government contribution for the contract year involved (as defined by paragraph (2)), exceeds

''(B) the amount of the biweekly Government contribution payable on such employee's or annuitant's behalf under section 8906(b) for the period involved.

''(2) For purposes of this section, the term 'maximum Government contribution' means, with respect to a contract year, the maximum Government contribution that could be made for health benefits for an employee or annuitant for such contract year, as determined under section 8906(b) (disregarding paragraph (2) thereof).

''(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no contribution under this section shall be payable to any medical savings account of an employee or annuitant for any period—

''(A) if, as of the first day of the month before the month in which such period commences, such employee or annuitant (or the spouse of such employee or annuitant, if coverage is for self and family) is entitled to benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act;

''(B) to the extent that such contribution, when added to previous contributions made under this section for that same year with respect to such employee or annuitant, would cause the total to exceed—

''(i) the limitation under paragraph (1) of section 220(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (determined without regard to paragraph (3) thereof) which is applicable to such employee or annuitant for the calendar year in which such period commences; or

''(ii) such lower amount as the employee or annuitant may specify in accordance with regulations of the Office, including an election not to receive contributions under this section for a year or the remainder of a year; or

''(C) for which any information (or documentation) under subsection (d) that is needed in order to make such contribution has not been timely submitted.

''(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no contribution under this section shall be payable to any medical savings account of an employee for any period in a contract year unless that employee was enrolled in a health benefits plan under this chapter as an employee for not less than—

''(A) the 1 year of service immediately before the start of such contract year, or

''(B) the full period or periods of service between the last day of the first period, as prescribed by regulations of the Office of Personnel Management, in which he is eligible to enroll in the plan and the day before the start of such contract year,

whichever is shorter.

''(5) The Office shall provide for the conversion of biweekly rates of contributions specified by paragraph (1) to rates for employees and annuitants whose pay or annuity is provided on other than a biweekly basis, and for this purpose may provide for the adjustment of the converted rate to the nearest cent.

''(c) A Government contribution under this section—

''(1) shall be made at the same time that, and the same frequency with which, Government contributions under section 8906(b) are made for the benefit of the employee or annuitant involved; and

''(2) shall be payable from the same appropriation, fund, account, or other source as would any Government contributions under section 8906(b) with respect to the employee or annuitant involved.

''(d) The Office shall by regulation prescribe the time, form, and manner in which an employee or annuitant shall submit any information (and supporting documentation) necessary to identify any medical savings account to which contributions under this section are requested to be made.

''(e) Nothing in this section shall be considered to entitle an employee or annuitant to any Government contribution under this section with respect to any period for which such employee or annuitant is ineligible for a Government contribution under section 8906(b).

''§ 8906b. Individual contributions to medical savings accounts

''(a) Upon the written request of an employee or annuitant enrolled in a high deductible health plan, there shall be withheld from the pay or annuity of such employee or annuitant and contributed to the medical savings account identified by such employee or annuitant in accordance with applicable regulations under subsection (c) such amount as the employee or annuitant may specify.

''(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), no withholding under this section may be made from the pay or annuity of an employee or annuitant for any period—

''(1) if, or to the extent that, a Government contribution for such period under section 8906a would not be allowable by reason of subparagraph (A) or (B)(i) of subsection (b)(3) thereof;

''(2) for which any information (or documentation) that is needed in order to make such contribution has not been timely submitted; or

''(3) if the employee or annuitant submits a request for termination of withholdings, beginning on or after the effective date of the request and before the end of the year.

''(c) The Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out this section, including provisions relating to the time, form, and manner in which any request for withholdings under this section may be made, changed, or terminated.''.

(2) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or in any amendment made by this section shall be considered—

(A) to permit or require that any contributions to a medical savings account (whether by the Government or through withholdings from pay or annuity) be paid into the Employees Health Benefits Fund; or

(B) to affect any authority under section 1005(f) of title 39, United States Code, to vary, add to, or substitute for any provision of chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this section.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 8906a and inserting the following:

''8906a. Government contributions to medical savings accounts.
''8906b. Individual contributions to medical savings accounts.
''8906c. Temporary employees.''.

(B) Section 8913(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''8906a(a)'' and inserting ''8906c(a)''.

(b) INFORMATIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—Section 8907 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) In addition to any information otherwise required under this section, the Office shall make available to all employees and annuitants eligible to enroll in a high deductible health plan, information relating to—

''(1) the conditions under which Government contributions under section 8906a shall be made to a medical savings account;

''(2) the amount of any Government contributions under section 8906a to which an employee or annuitant may be entitled (or how such amount may be ascertained);

''(3) the conditions under which contributions to a medical savings account may be made under section 8906b through withholdings from pay or annuity; and

''(4) any other matter the Office considers appropriate in connection with medical savings accounts.''.

(c) HIGH DEDUCTIBLE HEALTH PLAN AND MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNT DEFINED.—Section 8901 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (10) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (11) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(12) the term 'high deductible health plan' means a plan described by section 8903(5) or section 8903a(d); and

''(13) the term 'medical savings account' has the meaning given such term by section 220(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.''.

(d) AUTHORITY TO CONTRACT FOR HIGH DEDUCTIBLE HEALTH PLANS, ETC.—

(1) CONTRACTS FOR HIGH DEDUCTIBLE HEALTH PLANS.—Section 8902 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(p)(1) The Office shall contract under this chapter for a high deductible health plan with any qualified carrier that offers such a plan and, as of the date of enactment of this subsection, offers a health benefits plan under this chapter.

''(2) The Office may contract under this chapter for a high deductible health plan with any qualified carrier that offers such a plan, but does not, as of the date of enactment of this subsection, offer a health benefits plan under this chapter.''.

(2) COMPUTATION OF GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO PLANS UNDER CHAPTER 89 NOT AFFECTED BY HIGH DEDUCTIBLE HEALTH PLANS.—Paragraph (2) of section 8906(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''(2)'' and inserting ''(2)(A)'', and adding at the end the following:

''(B) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the subscription charges for, and the number of enrollees enrolled in, high deductible health plans shall be disregarded for purposes of determining any weighted average under paragraph (1).''.

(e) DESCRIPTION OF HIGH DEDUCTIBLE HEALTH PLANS AND BENEFITS TO BE PROVIDED THEREUNDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8903 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) HIGH DEDUCTIBLE HEALTH PLANS.—(A) One or more plans described by paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4), which—

''(i) are high deductible health plans (as defined by section 220(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986); and

''(ii) provide benefits of the types referred to by section 8904(a)(5).

''(B) Nothing in this section shall be considered—

''(i) to prevent a carrier from simultaneously offering a plan described by subparagraph (A) and a plan described by paragraph (1) or (2); or

''(ii) to require that a high deductible health plan offer two levels of benefits.''.

(2) TYPES OF BENEFITS.—Section 8904(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) HIGH DEDUCTIBLE HEALTH PLANS.—Benefits of the types named under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection or both.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 8903a of title 5, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) The plans under this section may include one or more plans, otherwise allowable under this section, that satisfy the requirements of clauses (i) and (ii) of section 8903(5)(A).''.

(B) Section 8909(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''8903a(d)'' and inserting ''8903a(e)''.

(4) REFERENCES.—Section 8903 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after paragraph (5) (as added by paragraph (1) of this subsection) as a flush left sentence, the following:

''The Office shall prescribe regulations in accordance with which the requirements of section 8902(c), 8902(n), 8909(e), and any other provision of this chapter that applies with respect to a plan described by paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this section shall apply with respect to the corresponding plan under paragraph (5) of this section. Similar regulations shall be prescribed with respect to any plan under section 8903a(d).''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to contract years beginning on or after October 1, 2001. The Office of Personnel Management shall take appropriate measures to ensure that coverage under a high deductible health plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code (as amended by this section) shall be available as of the beginning of the first contract year described in the preceding sentence.

SEC. 2113. RULE WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, health insurance issuers may offer, and eligible individuals may purchase, high deductible health plans described in section 220(c)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. Effective for the 5-year period beginning on October 1, 2001, such health plans shall not be required to provide payment for any health care items or services that are exempt from the plan's deductible.

(b) EXISTING STATE LAWS.—A State law relating to payment for health care items and services in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is preempted under paragraph (1), shall not apply to high deductible health plans after the expiration of the 5-year period described in such paragraph unless the State reenacts such law after such period.

Subtitle C—Other Health-Related Provisions

SEC. 2121. EXPANDED HUMAN CLINICAL TRIALS QUALIFYING FOR ORPHAN DRUG CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subclause (I) of section 45C(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(I) after the date that the application is filed for designation under such section 526, and''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Clause (i) of section 45C(b)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by inserting ''which is'' before ''being'' and by inserting before the comma at the end ''and which is designated under section 526 of such Act''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 2001.

SEC. 2122. CARRYOVER OF UNUSED BENEFITS FROM CAFETERIA PLANS, FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENTS, AND HEALTH FLEXIBLE SPENDING ACCOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 125 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to cafeteria plans) is amended by redesignating subsections (h) and (i) as subsections (i) and (j) and by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

''(h) ALLOWANCE OF CARRYOVERS OF UNUSED BENEFITS TO LATER TAXABLE YEARS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this title—

''(A) notwithstanding subsection (d)(2), a plan or other arrangement shall not fail to be treated as a cafeteria plan or flexible spending or similar arrangement, and

''(B) no amount shall be required to be included in gross income by reason of this section or any other provision of this chapter,

solely because under such plan or other arrangement any nontaxable benefit which is unused as of the close of a taxable year may be carried forward to 1 or more succeeding taxable years.

''(2) LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to amounts carried from a plan to the extent such amounts exceed $500 (applied on an annual basis). For purposes of this paragraph, all plans and arrangements maintained by an employer or any related person shall be treated as 1 plan.

''(3) ALLOWANCE OF ROLLOVER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any unused benefit described in paragraph (1) which consists of amounts in a health flexible spending account or dependent care flexible spending account, the plan or arrangement shall provide that a participant may elect, in lieu of such carryover, to have such amounts distributed to the participant.

''(B) AMOUNTS NOT INCLUDED IN INCOME.—Any distribution under subparagraph (A) shall not be included in gross income to the extent that such amount is transferred in a trustee-to-trustee transfer, or is contributed within 60 days of the date of the distribution, to—

''(i) a qualified cash or deferred arrangement described in section 401(k),

''(ii) a plan under which amounts are contributed by an individual's employer for an annuity contract described in section 403(b),

''(iii) an eligible deferred compensation plan described in section 457, or

''(iv) a medical savings account (within the meaning of section 220).

Any amount rolled over under this subparagraph shall be treated as a rollover contribution

for the taxable year from which the unused amount would otherwise be carried.

''(C) TREATMENT OF ROLLOVER.—Any amount rolled over under subparagraph (B) shall be treated as an eligible rollover under section 220, 401(k), 403(b), or 457, whichever is applicable, and shall be taken into account in applying any limitation (or participation requirement) on employer or employee contributions under such section or any other provision of this chapter for the taxable year of the rollover.

''(4) COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2002, the $500 amount under paragraph (2) shall be adjusted at the same time and in the same manner as under section 415(d)(2), except that the base period taken into account shall be the calendar quarter beginning October 1, 2001, and any increase which is not a multiple of $50 shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $50.

''(5) APPLICABILITY.—This subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

SEC. 2123. REDUCTION IN TAX ON VACCINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 4131(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to amount of tax) is amended by striking ''75 cents'' and inserting ''50 cents''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 2002.

Subtitle D—Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 2131. NO IMPACT ON SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this division (or an amendment made by this division) shall be construed to alter or amend the Social Security Act (or any regulation promulgated under that Act).

(b) TRANSFERS.—

(1) ESTIMATE OF SECRETARY.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall annually estimate the impact that the enactment of this division has on the income and balances of the trust funds established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401).

(2) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—If, under paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Treasury estimates that the enactment of this division has a negative impact on the income and balances of the trust funds established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401), the Secretary shall transfer, not less frequently than quarterly, from the general revenues of the Federal Government an amount sufficient so as to ensure that the income and balances of such trust funds are not reduced as a result of the enactment of such division.

SEC. 2132. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended by striking ''2003'' and inserting ''2010''.

SEC. 2133. ESTABLISHMENT OF MEDICARE ADMINISTRATIVE FEE FOR SUBMISSION OF PAPER CLAIMS.

(a) IMPOSITION OF FEE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish (in the form of a separate fee or reduction of payment otherwise made under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.)) an administrative fee of $1 for the submission of a claim in a paper or non-electronic form for items or services for which payment is sought under such title.

(b) EXCEPTION AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall waive the imposition of the fee under subsection (a)—

(1) in cases in which there is no method available for the submission of claims other than in a paper or non-electronic form; and

(2) for rural providers and small providers that the Secretary determines, under procedures established by the Secretary, are unable to purchase the necessary hardware in order to submit claims electronically.

(c) TREATMENT OF FEES FOR PURPOSES OF COST REPORTS.—An entity may not include a fee assessed pursuant to this section as an allowable item on a cost report under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) or title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section apply to claims submitted on or after January 1, 2002.

SEC. 2134. ESTABLISHMENT OF MEDICARE ADMINISTRATIVE FEE FOR SUBMISSION OF DUPLICATE AND UNPROCESSABLE CLAIMS.

(a) IMPOSITION OF FEE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall establish (in the form of a separate fee or reduction of payment otherwise made under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.)) an administrative fee of $2 for the submission of a claim described in subsection (b).

(b) CLAIMS SUBJECT TO FEE.—A claim described in this subsection is a claim that—

(1) is submitted by an individual or entity for items or services for which payment is sought under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; and

(2) either—

(A) duplicates, in whole or in part, another claim submitted by the same individual or entity; or

(B) is a claim that cannot be processed and must, in accordance with the Secretary of Health and Human Service's instructions, be returned by the fiscal intermediary or carrier to the individual or entity for completion.

(c) TREATMENT OF FEES FOR PURPOSES OF COST REPORTS.—An entity may not include a fee assessed pursuant to this section as an allowable item on a cost report under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) or title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section apply to claims submitted on or after January 1, 2002.

TITLE XXII—PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

Subtitle A—Right to Advice and Care

SEC. 2201. PATIENT RIGHT TO MEDICAL ADVICE AND CARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1181 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subpart C as subpart D; and

(2) by inserting after subpart B the following:

''Subpart C—Patient Right to Medical Advice and Care

''SEC. 721. ACCESS TO EMERGENCY MEDICAL CARE.

''(a) COVERAGE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES.—If a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) provides coverage for any benefits consisting of emergency medical care, except for items or services specifically excluded from coverage, the plan shall, without regard to prior authorization or provider participation—

''(1) provide coverage for emergency medical screening examinations to the extent that a prudent layperson, who possesses an average knowledge of health and medicine, would determine such examinations to be necessary; and

''(2) provide coverage for additional emergency medical care to stabilize an emergency medical condition following an emergency medical screening examination (if determined necessary), pursuant to the definition of stabilize under section 1867(e)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395dd(e)(3)).

''(b) COVERAGE OF EMERGENCY AMBULANCE SERVICES.—If a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) provides coverage for any benefits consisting of emergency ambulance services, except for items or services specifically excluded from coverage, the plan shall, without regard to prior authorization or provider participation, provide coverage for emergency ambulance services to the extent that a prudent layperson, who possesses an average knowledge of health and medicine, would determine such emergency ambulance services to be necessary.

''(c) CARE AFTER STABILIZATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of medically necessary and appropriate items or services related to the emergency medical condition that may be provided to a participant or beneficiary by a nonparticipating provider after the participant or beneficiary is stabilized, the nonparticipating provider shall contact the plan as soon as practicable, but not later than 2 hours after stabilization occurs, with respect to whether—

''(A) the provision of items or services is approved;

''(B) the participant or beneficiary will be transferred; or

''(C) other arrangements will be made concerning the care and treatment of the participant or beneficiary.

''(2) FAILURE TO RESPOND AND MAKE ARRANGEMENTS.—If a group health plan fails to respond and make arrangements within 2 hours of being contacted in accordance with paragraph (1), then the plan shall be responsible for the cost of any additional items or services provided by the nonparticipating provider if—

''(A) coverage for items or services of the type furnished by the nonparticipating provider is available under the plan;

''(B) the items or services are medically necessary and appropriate and related to the emergency medical condition involved; and

''(C) the timely provision of the items or services is medically necessary and appropriate.

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to apply to a group health plan that does not require prior authorization for items or services provided to a participant or beneficiary after the participant or beneficiary is stabilized.

''(d) REIMBURSEMENT TO A NON-PARTICIPATING PROVIDER.—The responsibility of a group health plan to provide reimbursement to a nonparticipating provider under this section shall cease accruing upon the earlier of—

''(1) the transfer or discharge of the participant or beneficiary; or

''(2) the completion of other arrangements made by the plan and the nonparticipating provider.

''(e) RESPONSIBILITY OF PARTICIPANT.—With respect to items or services provided by a nonparticipating provider under this section, the participant or beneficiary shall not be responsible for amounts that exceed the amounts (including co-insurance, co-payments, deductibles or any other form of cost-sharing) that would be incurred if the care was provided by a participating health care provider with prior authorization.

''(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a group health plan from negotiating reimbursement rates with a nonparticipating provider for items or services provided under this section.

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) EMERGENCY AMBULANCE SERVICES.—The term 'emergency ambulance services' means, with respect to a participant or beneficiary under a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan), ambulance services furnished to transport an individual who has an emergency medical condition to a treating facility for receipt of emergency medical care if—

''(A) the emergency services are covered under the group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) involved; and

''(B) a prudent layperson who possesses an average knowledge of health and medicine could reasonably expect the absence of such transport to result in placing the health of the participant

or beneficiary (or, with respect to a pregnant woman, the health of the woman or her unborn child) in serious jeopardy, serious impairment to bodily functions, or serious dysfunction of any bodily organ or part.

''(2) EMERGENCY MEDICAL CARE.—The term 'emergency medical care' means, with respect to a participant or beneficiary under a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan), covered inpatient and outpatient items or services that—

''(A) are furnished by any provider, including a nonparticipating provider, that is qualified to furnish such items or services; and

''(B) are needed to evaluate or stabilize (as such term is defined in section 1867(e)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395dd(e)(3)) an emergency medical condition.

''(3) EMERGENCY MEDICAL CONDITION.—The term 'emergency medical condition' means a medical condition manifesting itself by acute symptoms of sufficient severity (including severe pain) such that a prudent layperson, who possesses an average knowledge of health and medicine, could reasonably expect the absence of immediate medical attention to result in placing the health of the participant or beneficiary (or, with respect to a pregnant woman, the health of the woman or her unborn child) in serious jeopardy, serious impairment to bodily functions, or serious dysfunction of any bodily organ or part.

''SEC. 722. OFFERING OF CHOICE OF COVERAGE OPTIONS.

''(a) REQUIREMENT.—If a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) provides coverage for benefits only through a defined set of participating health care professionals, the plan shall offer the participant the option to purchase point-of-service coverage (as defined in subsection (b)) for all such benefits for which coverage is otherwise so limited. Such option shall be made available to the participant at the time of enrollment under the plan and at such other times as the plan offers the participant a choice of coverage options.

''(b) POINT-OF-SERVICE COVERAGE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'point-of-service coverage' means, with respect to benefits covered under a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan), coverage of such benefits when provided by a nonparticipating health care professional.

''(c) SMALL EMPLOYER EXEMPTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to any group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) of a small employer.

''(2) SMALL EMPLOYER.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'small employer' means, in connection with a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) with respect to a calendar year and a plan year, an employer who employed an average of at least 2 but not more than 50 employees on business days during the preceding calendar year and who employs at least 2 employees on the first day of the plan year. For purposes of this paragraph, the provisions of subparagraph (C) of section 712(c)(1) shall apply in determining employer size.

''(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

''(1) as requiring coverage for benefits for a particular type of health care professional;

''(2) as requiring an employer to pay any costs as a result of this section or to make equal contributions with respect to different health coverage options;

''(3) as preventing a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) from imposing higher premiums or cost-sharing on a participant for the exercise of a point-of-service coverage option; or

''(4) to require that a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) include coverage of health care professionals that the plan excludes because of fraud, quality of care, or other similar reasons with respect to such professionals.

''SEC. 723. PATIENT ACCESS TO OBSTETRIC AND GYNECOLOGICAL CARE.

''(a) GENERAL RIGHTS.—

''(1) DIRECT ACCESS.—A group health plan described in subsection (b) may not require authorization or referral by the primary care provider described in subsection (b)(2) in the case of a female participant or beneficiary who seeks coverage for obstetrical or gynecological care provided by a participating physician who specializes in obstetrics or gynecology.

''(2) OBSTETRICAL AND GYNECOLOGICAL CARE.—A group health plan described in subsection (b) shall treat the provision of obstetrical and gynecological care, and the ordering of related obstetrical and gynecological items and services, pursuant to the direct access described under paragraph (1), by a participating health care professional who specializes in obstetrics or gynecology as the authorization of the primary care provider.

''(b) APPLICATION OF SECTION.—A group health plan described in this subsection is a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan), that—

''(1) provides coverage for obstetric or gynecologic care; and

''(2) requires the designation by a participant or beneficiary of a participating primary care provider other than a physician who specializes in obstetrics or gynecology.

''(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

''(1) to require that a group health plan approve or provide coverage for—

''(A) any items or services that are not covered under the terms and conditions of the group health plan;

''(B) any items or services that are not medically necessary and appropriate; or

''(C) any items or services that are provided, ordered, or otherwise authorized under subsection (a)(2) by a physician unless such items or services are related to obstetric or gynecologic care;

''(2) to preclude a group health plan from requiring that the physician described in subsection (a) notify the designated primary care professional or case manager of treatment decisions in accordance with a process implemented by the plan, except that the group health plan shall not impose such a notification requirement on the participant or beneficiary involved in the treatment decision;

''(3) to preclude a group health plan from requiring authorization, including prior authorization, for certain items and services from the physician described in subsection (a) who specializes in obstetrics and gynecology if the designated primary care provider of the participant or beneficiary would otherwise be required to obtain authorization for such items or services;

''(4) to require that the participant or beneficiary described in subsection (a)(1) obtain authorization or a referral from a primary care provider in order to obtain obstetrical or gynecological care from a health care professional other than a physician if the provision of obstetrical or gynecological care by such professional is permitted by the group health plan and consistent with State licensure, credentialing, and scope of practice laws and regulations; or

''(5) to preclude the participant or beneficiary described in subsection (a)(1) from designating a health care professional other than a physician as a primary care provider if such designation is permitted by the group health plan and the treatment by such professional is consistent with State licensure, credentialing, and scope of practice laws and regulations.

''SEC. 724. ACCESS TO PEDIATRIC CARE.

''(a) PEDIATRIC CARE.—If a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) requires or provides for a participant or beneficiary to designate a participating primary care provider for a child of such participant or beneficiary, the plan shall permit the participant or beneficiary to designate a physician who specializes in pediatrics as the child's primary care provider if such provider participates in the network of the plan.

''(b) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—With respect to the child of a participant or beneficiary, nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to—

''(1) require that the participant or beneficiary obtain prior authorization or a referral from a primary care provider in order to obtain pediatric care from a health care professional other than a physician if the provision of pediatric care by such professional is permitted by the plan and consistent with State licensure, credentialing, and scope of practice laws and regulations; or

''(2) preclude the participant or beneficiary from designating a health care professional other than a physician as a primary care provider for the child if such designation is permitted by the plan and the treatment by such professional is consistent with State licensure, credentialing, and scope of practice laws.

''SEC. 725. TIMELY ACCESS TO SPECIALISTS.

''(a) TIMELY ACCESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) shall ensure that participants and beneficiaries receive timely coverage for access to specialists who are appropriate to the medical condition of the participant or beneficiary, when such specialty care is a covered benefit under the plan.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed—

''(A) to require the coverage under a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) of benefits or services;

''(B) to prohibit a plan from including providers in the network only to the extent necessary to meet the needs of the plan's participants and beneficiaries;

''(C) to prohibit a plan from establishing measures designed to maintain quality and control costs consistent with the responsibilities of the plan; or

''(D) to override any State licensure or scope-of-practice law.

''(3) ACCESS TO CERTAIN PROVIDERS.—

''(A) PARTICIPATING PROVIDERS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) from requiring that a participant or beneficiary obtain specialty care from a participating specialist.

''(B) NONPARTICIPATING PROVIDERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to specialty care under this section, if a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) determines that a participating specialist is not available to provide such care to the participant or beneficiary, the plan shall provide for coverage of such care by a nonparticipating specialist.

''(ii) TREATMENT OF NONPARTICIPATING PROVIDERS.—If a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) refers a participant or beneficiary to a nonparticipating specialist pursuant to clause (i), such specialty care shall be provided at no additional cost to the participant or beneficiary beyond what the participant or beneficiary would otherwise pay for such specialty care if provided by a participating specialist.

''(b) REFERRALS.—

''(1) AUTHORIZATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) from requiring an authorization in order to obtain coverage for specialty services so long as such authorization is for an appropriate duration or number of referrals.

''(2) REFERRALS FOR ONGOING SPECIAL CONDITIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) shall permit a participant or beneficiary who has an ongoing special condition (as defined in subparagraph (B)) to receive a referral to a specialist for the treatment of such condition and

such specialist may authorize such referrals, procedures, tests, and other medical services with respect to such condition, or coordinate the care for such condition, subject to the terms of a treatment plan referred to in subsection (c) with respect to the condition.

''(B) ONGOING SPECIAL CONDITION DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'ongoing special condition' means a condition or disease that—

''(i) is life-threatening, degenerative, or disabling; and

''(ii) requires specialized medical care over a prolonged period of time.

''(c) TREATMENT PLANS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) from requiring that specialty care be provided pursuant to a treatment plan so long as the treatment plan is—

''(A) developed by the specialist, in consultation with the case manager or primary care provider, and the participant or beneficiary;

''(B) approved by the plan in a timely manner if the plan requires such approval; and

''(C) in accordance with the applicable quality assurance and utilization review standards of the plan.

''(2) NOTIFICATION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed as prohibiting a plan from requiring the specialist to provide the plan with regular updates on the specialty care provided, as well as all other necessary medical information.

''(d) SPECIALIST DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'specialist' means, with respect to the medical condition of the participant or beneficiary, a health care professional, facility, or center (such as a center of excellence) that has adequate expertise (including age-appropriate expertise) through appropriate training and experience.

''(e) RIGHT TO EXTERNAL REVIEW.—Pursuant to the requirements of section 503B, a participant or beneficiary shall have the right to an independent external review if the denial of an item or service or condition that is required to be covered under this section is eligible for such review.

''SEC. 726. CONTINUITY OF CARE.

''(a) TERMINATION OF PROVIDER.—If a contract between a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) and a treating health care provider is terminated (as defined in paragraph (e)(4)), or benefits or coverage provided by a health care provider are terminated because of a change in the terms of provider participation in such plan, and an individual who is a participant or beneficiary in the plan is undergoing an active course of treatment for a serious and complex condition, institutional care, pregnancy, or terminal illness from the provider at the time the plan receives or provides notice of such termination, the plan shall—

''(1) notify the individual, or arrange to have the individual notified pursuant to subsection (d)(2), on a timely basis of such termination;

''(2) provide the individual with an opportunity to notify the plan of the individual's need for transitional care; and

''(3) subject to subsection (c), permit the individual to elect to continue to be covered with respect to the active course of treatment with the provider's consent during a transitional period (as provided for under subsection (b)).

''(b) TRANSITIONAL PERIOD.—

''(1) SERIOUS AND COMPLEX CONDITIONS.—The transitional period under this section with respect to a serious and complex condition shall extend for up to 90 days from the date of the notice described in subsection (a)(1) of the provider's termination.

''(2) INSTITUTIONAL OR INPATIENT CARE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The transitional period under this section for institutional or non-elective inpatient care from a provider shall extend until the earlier of—

''(i) the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the notice described in subsection (a)(1) of the provider's termination is provided; or

''(ii) the date of discharge of the individual from such care or the termination of the period of institutionalization.

''(B) SCHEDULED CARE.—The 90 day limitation described in subparagraph (A)(i) shall include post-surgical follow-up care relating to non-elective surgery that has been scheduled before the date of the notice of the termination of the provider under subsection (a)(1).

''(3) PREGNANCY.—If—

''(A) a participant or beneficiary has entered the second trimester of pregnancy at the time of a provider's termination of participation; and

''(B) the provider was treating the pregnancy before the date of the termination;

the transitional period under this subsection with respect to provider's treatment of the pregnancy shall extend through the provision of post-partum care directly related to the delivery.

''(4) TERMINAL ILLNESS.—If—

''(A) a participant or beneficiary was determined to be terminally ill (as determined under section 1861(dd)(3)(A) of the Social Security Act) at the time of a provider's termination of participation; and

''(B) the provider was treating the terminal illness before the date of termination;

the transitional period under this subsection shall extend for the remainder of the individual's life for care that is directly related to the treatment of the terminal illness.

''(c) PERMISSIBLE TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—A group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) may condition coverage of continued treatment by a provider under this section upon the provider agreeing to the following terms and conditions:

''(1) The treating health care provider agrees to accept reimbursement from the plan and individual involved (with respect to cost-sharing) at the rates applicable prior to the start of the transitional period as payment in full (or at the rates applicable under the replacement plan after the date of the termination of the contract with the group health plan) and not to impose cost-sharing with respect to the individual in an amount that would exceed the cost-sharing that could have been imposed if the contract referred to in this section had not been terminated.

''(2) The treating health care provider agrees to adhere to the quality assurance standards of the plan responsible for payment under paragraph (1) and to provide to such plan necessary medical information related to the care provided.

''(3) The treating health care provider agrees otherwise to adhere to such plan's policies and procedures, including procedures regarding referrals and obtaining prior authorization and providing services pursuant to a treatment plan (if any) approved by the plan.

''(d) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

''(1) to require the coverage of benefits which would not have been covered if the provider involved remained a participating provider; or

''(2) with respect to the termination of a contract under subsection (a) to prevent a group health plan from requiring that the health care provider—

''(A) notify participants or beneficiaries of their rights under this section; or

''(B) provide the plan with the name of each participant or beneficiary who the provider believes is eligible for transitional care under this section.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) CONTRACT.—The term 'contract between a plan and a treating health care provider' shall include a contract between such a plan and an organized network of providers.

''(2) HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.—The term 'health care provider' or 'provider' means—

''(A) any individual who is engaged in the delivery of health care services in a State and who is required by State law or regulation to be licensed or certified by the State to engage in the delivery of such services in the State; and

''(B) any entity that is engaged in the delivery of health care services in a State and that, if it is required by State law or regulation to be licensed or certified by the State to engage in the delivery of such services in the State, is so licensed.

''(3) SERIOUS AND COMPLEX CONDITION.—The term 'serious and complex condition' means, with respect to a participant or beneficiary under the plan, a condition that is medically determinable and—

''(A) in the case of an acute illness, is a condition serious enough to require specialized medical treatment to avoid the reasonable possibility of death or permanent harm; or

''(B) in the case of a chronic illness or condition, is an illness or condition that—

''(i) is complex and difficult to manage;

''(ii) is disabling or life-threatening; and

''(iii) requires—

''(I) frequent monitoring over a prolonged period of time and requires substantial on-going specialized medical care; or

''(II) frequent ongoing specialized medical care across a variety of domains of care.

''(4) TERMINATED.—The term 'terminated' includes, with respect to a contract (as defined in paragraph (1)), the expiration or nonrenewal of the contract by the group health plan, but does not include a termination of the contract by the plan for failure to meet applicable quality standards or for fraud.

''(f) RIGHT TO EXTERNAL REVIEW.—Pursuant to the requirements of section 503B, a participant or beneficiary shall have the right to an independent external review if the denial of an item or service or condition that is required to be covered under this section is eligible for such review.

''SEC. 727. PROTECTION OF PATIENT-PROVIDER COMMUNICATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan and in relation to a participant or beneficiary) shall not prohibit or otherwise restrict a health care professional from advising such a participant or beneficiary who is a patient of the professional about the health status of the participant or beneficiary or medical care or treatment for the condition or disease of the participant or beneficiary, regardless of whether coverage for such care or treatment are provided under the contract, if the professional is acting within the lawful scope of practice.

''(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) to provide specific benefits under the terms of such plan.

''SEC. 728. PATIENT'S RIGHT TO PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) provides coverage for benefits with respect to prescription drugs, and limits such coverage to drugs included in a formulary, the plan shall—

''(1) ensure the participation of physicians and pharmacists in developing and reviewing such formulary; and

''(2) in accordance with the applicable quality assurance and utilization review standards of the plan, provide for exceptions from the formulary limitation when a non-formulary alternative is medically necessary and appropriate.

''(b) RIGHT TO EXTERNAL REVIEW.—Pursuant to the requirements of section 503B, a participant or beneficiary shall have the right to an independent external review if the denial of an item or service or condition that is required to be covered under this section is eligible for such review.

"SEC. 729. SELF-PAYMENT FOR BEHAVIORAL HEALTH CARE SERVICES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) may not—

''(1) prohibit or otherwise discourage a participant or beneficiary from self-paying for behavioral health care services once the plan has denied coverage for such services; or

''(2) terminate a health care provider because such provider permits participants or beneficiaries to self-pay for behavioral health care services—

''(A) that are not otherwise covered under the plan; or

''(B) for which the group health plan provides limited coverage, to the extent that the group health plan denies coverage of the services.

''(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a)(2)(B) shall be construed as prohibiting a group health plan from terminating a contract with a health care provider for failure to meet applicable quality standards or for fraud.

"SEC. 730. COVERAGE FOR INDIVIDUALS PARTICIPATING IN APPROVED CANCER CLINICAL TRIALS.

''(a) COVERAGE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) provides coverage to a qualified individual (as defined in subsection (b)), the plan—

''(A) may not deny the individual participation in the clinical trial referred to in subsection (b)(2);

''(B) subject to subsections (b), (c), and (d) may not deny (or limit or impose additional conditions on) the coverage of routine patient costs for items and services furnished in connection with participation in the trial; and

''(C) may not discriminate against the individual on the basis of the participant's or beneficiaries participation in such trial.

''(2) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN COSTS.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), routine patient costs do not include the cost of the tests or measurements conducted primarily for the purpose of the clinical trial involved.

''(3) USE OF IN-NETWORK PROVIDERS.—If one or more participating providers is participating in a clinical trial, nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed as preventing a plan from requiring that a qualified individual participate in the trial through such a participating provider if the provider will accept the individual as a participant in the trial.

''(b) QUALIFIED INDIVIDUAL DEFINED.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'qualified individual' means an individual who is a participant or beneficiary in a group health plan and who meets the following conditions:

''(1)(A) The individual has been diagnosed with cancer for which no standard treatment is effective.

''(B) The individual is eligible to participate in an approved clinical trial according to the trial protocol with respect to treatment of such illness.

''(C) The individual's participation in the trial offers meaningful potential for significant clinical benefit for the individual.

''(2) Either—

''(A) the referring physician is a participating health care professional and has concluded that the individual's participation in such trial would be appropriate based upon the individual meeting the conditions described in paragraph (1); or

''(B) the participant or beneficiary provides medical and scientific information establishing that the individual's participation in such trial would be appropriate based upon the individual meeting the conditions described in paragraph (1).

''(c) PAYMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Under this section a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) shall provide for payment for routine patient costs described in subsection (a)(2) but is not required to pay for costs of items and services that are reasonably expected to be paid for by the sponsors of an approved clinical trial.

''(2) STANDARDS FOR DETERMINING ROUTINE PATIENT COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH CLINICAL TRIAL PARTICIPATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, in accordance with this paragraph, establish standards relating to the coverage of routine patient costs for individuals participating in clinical trials that group health plans must meet under this section.

''(B) FACTORS.—In establishing routine patient cost standards under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consult with interested parties and take into account —

''(i) quality of patient care;

''(ii) routine patient care costs versus costs associated with the conduct of clinical trials, including unanticipated patient care costs as a result of participation in clinical trials; and

''(iii) previous and on-going studies relating to patient care costs associated with participation in clinical trials.

''(C) APPOINTMENT AND MEETINGS OF NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING COMMITTEE.—

''(i) PUBLICATION OF NOTICE.—Not later than November 15, 2000, the Secretary shall publish notice of the establishment of a negotiated rulemaking committee, as provided for under section 564(a) of title 5, United States Code, to develop the standards described in subparagraph (A), which shall include—

''(I) the proposed scope of the committee;

''(II) the interests that may be impacted by the standards;

''(iii) a list of the proposed membership of the committee;

''(iv) the proposed meeting schedule of the committee;

''(v) a solicitation for public comment on the committee; and

''(vi) the procedures under which an individual may apply for membership on the committee.

''(ii) COMMENT PERIOD.—Notwithstanding section 564(c) of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary shall provide for a period, beginning on the date on which the notice is published under clause (i) and ending on November 30, 2000, for the submission of public comments on the committee under this subparagraph.

''(iii) APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE.—Not later than December 30, 2000, the Secretary shall appoint the members of the negotiated rulemaking committee under this subparagraph.

''(iv) FACILITATOR.—Not later than January 10, 2001, the negotiated rulemaking committee shall nominate a facilitator under section 566(c) of title 5, United States Code, to carry out the activities described in subsection (d) of such section.

''(v) MEETINGS.—During the period beginning on the date on which the facilitator is nominated under clause (iv) and ending on March 30, 2001, the negotiated rulemaking committee shall meet to develop the standards described in subparagraph (A).

''(D) PRELIMINARY COMMITTEE REPORT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The negotiated rulemaking committee appointed under subparagraph (C) shall report to the Secretary, by not later than March 30, 2001, regarding the committee's progress on achieving a consensus with regard to the rulemaking proceedings and whether such consensus is likely to occur before the target date described in subsection (F).

''(ii) TERMINATION OF PROCESS AND PUBLICATION OF RULE BY SECRETARY.—If the committee reports under clause (i) that the committee has failed to make significant progress towards such consensus or is unlikely to reach such consensus by the target date described in subsection (F), the Secretary shall terminate such process and provide for the publication in the Federal Register, by not later than June 30, 2001, of a rule under this paragraph through such other methods as the Secretary may provide.

''(E) FINAL COMMITTEE REPORT AND PUBLICATION OR RULE BY SECRETARY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If the rulemaking committee is not terminated under subparagraph (D)(ii), the committee shall submit to the Secretary, by not later than May 30, 2001, a report containing a proposed rule.

''(ii) PUBLICATION OF RULE.—If the Secretary receives a report under clause (i), the Secretary shall provide for the publication in the Federal Register, by not later than June 30, 2001, of the proposed rule.

''(F) TARGET DATE FOR PUBLICATION OF RULE.—As part of the notice under subparagraph (C)(i), and for purposes of this paragraph, the 'target date for publication' (referred to in section 564(a)(5) of title 5, United States Code) shall be June 30, 2001.

''(G) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this paragraph shall apply to group health plans (other than a fully insured group health plan) for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2002.

''(3) PAYMENT RATE.—In the case of covered items and services provided by—

''(A) a participating provider, the payment rate shall be at the agreed upon rate, or

''(B) a nonparticipating provider, the payment rate shall be at the rate the plan would normally pay for comparable services under subparagraph (A).

''(d) APPROVED CLINICAL TRIAL DEFINED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term 'approved clinical trial' means a cancer clinical research study or cancer clinical investigation approved or funded (which may include funding through in-kind contributions) by one or more of the following:

''(A) The National Institutes of Health.

''(B) A cooperative group or center of the National Institutes of Health.

''(C) The Food and Drug Administration.

''(D) Either of the following if the conditions described in paragraph (2) are met:

''(i) The Department of Veterans Affairs.

''(ii) The Department of Defense.

''(2) CONDITIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS.—The conditions described in this paragraph, for a study or investigation conducted by a Department, are that the study or investigation has been reviewed and approved through a system of peer review that the Secretary determines—

''(A) to be comparable to the system of peer review of studies and investigations used by the National Institutes of Health, and

''(B) assures unbiased review of the highest scientific standards by qualified individuals who have no interest in the outcome of the review.

''(e) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit a plan's coverage with respect to clinical trials.

''(f) PLAN SATISFACTION OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS; RESPONSIBILITIES OF FIDUCIARIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, insofar as a group health plan provides benefits in the form of health insurance coverage through a health insurance issuer, the plan shall be treated as meeting the requirements of this section with respect to such benefits and not be considered as failing to meet such requirements because of a failure of the issuer to meet such requirements so long as the plan sponsor or its representatives did not cause such failure by the issuer.

''(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect or modify the responsibilities of the fiduciaries of a group health plan under part 4 of subtitle B.

''(g) STUDY AND REPORT.—

''(1) STUDY.—The Secretary shall study the impact on group health plans for covering routine patient care costs for individuals who are entitled to benefits under this section and who are enrolled in an approved cancer clinical trial program.

''(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than January 1, 2005, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that contains an assessment of—

''(A) any incremental cost to group health plans resulting from the provisions of this section;

''(B) a projection of expenditures to such plans resulting from this section; and

''(C) any impact on premiums resulting from this section.

''(h) RIGHT TO EXTERNAL REVIEW.—Pursuant to the requirements of section 503B, a participant or beneficiary shall have the right to an independent external review if the denial of an item or service or condition that is required to be covered under this section is eligible for such review.

''SEC. 730A. PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PROVIDERS BASED ON LICENSURE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) shall not discriminate with respect to participation or indemnification as to any provider who is acting within the scope of the provider's license or certification under applicable State law, solely on the basis of such license or certification.

''(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (a) shall not be construed—

''(1) as requiring the coverage under a group health plan of a particular benefit or service or to prohibit a plan from including providers only to the extent necessary to meet the needs of the plan's participants or beneficiaries or from establishing any measure designed to maintain quality and control costs consistent with the responsibilities of the plan;

''(2) to override any State licensure or scope-of-practice law; or

''(3) as requiring a plan that offers network coverage to include for participation every willing provider who meets the terms and conditions of the plan.

''SEC. 730B. GENERALLY APPLICABLE PROVISION.

''In the case of a group health plan that provides benefits under 2 or more coverage options, the requirements of this subpart shall apply separately with respect to each coverage option.''.

(b) RULE WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, health insurance issuers may offer, and eligible individuals may purchase, high deductible health plans described in section 220(c)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. Effective for the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, such health plans shall not be required to provide payment for any health care items or services that are exempt from the plan's deductible.

(2) EXISTING STATE LAWS.—A State law relating to payment for health care items and services in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is preempted under paragraph (1), shall not apply to high deductible health plans after the expiration of the 5-year period described in such paragraph unless the State reenacts such law after such period.

(c) DEFINITION.—Section 733(a) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 1191(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) FULLY INSURED GROUP HEALTH PLAN.—The term 'fully insured group health plan' means a group health plan where benefits under the plan are provided pursuant to the terms of an arrangement between a group health plan and a health insurance issuer and are guaranteed by the health insurance issuer under a contract or policy of insurance.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 is amended—

(1) in the item relating to subpart C of part 7 of subtitle B of title I, by striking ''Subpart C'' and inserting ''Subpart D''; and

(2) by adding at the end of the items relating to subpart B of part 7 of subtitle B of title I, the following:

''SUBPART C—PATIENT RIGHT TO MEDICAL ADVICE AND CARE

''Sec. 721. Access to emergency medical care.

''Sec. 722. Offering of choice of coverage options.

''Sec. 723. Patient access to obstetric and gynecological care.

''Sec. 724. Access to pediatric care.

''Sec. 725. Timely access to specialists.

''Sec. 726. Continuity of care.

''Sec. 727. Protection of patient-provider communications.

''Sec. 728. Patient's right to prescription drugs.

''Sec. 729. Self-payment for behavioral health care services.

''Sec. 730. Coverage for individuals participating in approved cancer clinical trials.

''Sec. 730A. Prohibition of discrimination against providers based on licensure.

''Sec. 730B. Generally applicable provision.''.

SEC. 2202. CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.

Subchapter B of chapter 100 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in the table of sections, by inserting after the item relating to section 9812 the following new item:

''Sec. 9813. Standard relating to patient's bill of rights.'';

and

(2) by inserting after section 9812 the following:

''SEC. 9813. STANDARD RELATING TO PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS.

''A group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) shall comply with the requirements of subpart C of part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as added by section 2201 of the Patients' Bill of Rights Plus Act, and such requirements shall be deemed to be incorporated into this section.''.

SEC. 2203. EFFECTIVE DATE AND RELATED RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this subtitle shall apply with respect to plan years beginning on or after January 1 of the second calendar year following the date of the enactment of this Act. The Secretary shall issue all regulations necessary to carry out the amendments made by this section before the effective date thereof.

(b) LIMITATION ON ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.—No enforcement action shall be taken, pursuant to the amendments made by this subtitle, against a group health plan with respect to a violation of a requirement imposed by such amendments before the date of issuance of regulations issued in connection with such requirement, if the plan has sought to comply in good faith with such requirement.

Subtitle B—Right to Information About Plans and Providers

SEC. 2211. INFORMATION ABOUT PLANS.

(a) EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—Subpart B of part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1185 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 714. HEALTH PLAN INFORMATION.

''(a) REQUIREMENT—

''(1) DISCLOSURE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan, and a health insurance issuer that provides coverage in connection with group health insurance coverage, shall provide for the disclosure of the information described in subsection (b) to participants and beneficiaries—

''(i) at the time of the initial enrollment of the participant or beneficiary under the plan or coverage;

''(ii) on an annual basis after enrollment—

''(I) in conjunction with the election period of the plan or coverage if the plan or coverage has such an election period; or

''(II) in the case of a plan or coverage that does not have an election period, in conjunction with the beginning of the plan or coverage year; and

''(iii) in the case of any material reduction to the benefits or information described in paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) of subsection (b), in the form of a summary notice provided not later than the date on which the reduction takes effect.

''(B) PARTICIPANTS AND BENEFICIARIES.—The disclosure required under subparagraph (A) shall be provided—

''(i) jointly to each participant and beneficiary who reside at the same address; or

''(ii) in the case of a beneficiary who does not reside at the same address as the participant, separately to the participant and such beneficiary.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent a group health plan sponsor and health insurance issuer from entering into an agreement under which either the plan sponsor or the issuer agrees to assume responsibility for compliance with the requirements of this section, in whole or in part, and the party delegating such responsibility is released from liability for compliance with the requirements that are assumed by the other party, to the extent the party delegating such responsibility did not cause such noncompliance.

''(3) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—Information shall be provided to participants and beneficiaries under this section at the last known address maintained by the plan or issuer with respect to such participants or beneficiaries, to the extent that such information is provided to participants or beneficiaries via the United States Postal Service or other private delivery service.

''(b) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—The informational materials to be distributed under this section shall include for each option available under the group health plan or health insurance coverage the following:

''(1) BENEFITS.—A description of the covered benefits, including—

''(A) any in- and out-of-network benefits;

''(B) specific preventative services covered under the plan or coverage if such services are covered;

''(C) any benefit limitations, including any annual or lifetime benefit limits and any monetary limits or limits on the number of visits, days, or services, and any specific coverage exclusions; and

''(D) any definition of medical necessity used in making coverage determinations by the plan, issuer, or claims administrator.

''(2) COST SHARING.—A description of any cost-sharing requirements, including—

''(A) any premiums, deductibles, coinsurance, copayment amounts, and liability for balance billing above any reasonable and customary charges, for which the participant or beneficiary will be responsible under each option available under the plan;

''(B) any maximum out-of-pocket expense for which the participant or beneficiary may be liable;

''(C) any cost-sharing requirements for out-of-network benefits or services received from nonparticipating providers; and

''(D) any additional cost-sharing or charges for benefits and services that are furnished without meeting applicable plan or coverage requirements, such as prior authorization or precertification.

''(3) SERVICE AREA.—A description of the plan or issuer's service area, including the provision of any out-of-area coverage.

''(4) PARTICIPATING PROVIDERS.—A directory of participating providers (to the extent a plan or issuer provides coverage through a network of providers) that includes, at a minimum, the name, address, and telephone number of each participating provider, and information about how to inquire whether a participating provider is currently accepting new patients.

''(5) CHOICE OF PRIMARY CARE PROVIDER.—A description of any requirements and procedures to be used by participants and beneficiaries in selecting, accessing, or changing their primary care provider, including providers both within and outside of the network (if the plan or issuer permits out-of-network services), and the right to select a pediatrician as a primary care provider under section 724 for a participant or beneficiary who is a child if such section applies.

''(6) PREAUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—A description of the requirements and procedures to be used to obtain preauthorization for health services, if such preauthorization is required.

''(7) EXPERIMENTAL AND INVESTIGATIONAL TREATMENTS.—A description of the process for determining whether a particular item, service, or treatment is considered experimental or investigational, and the circumstances under which such treatments are covered by the plan or issuer.

''(8) SPECIALTY CARE.—A description of the requirements and procedures to be used by participants and beneficiaries in accessing specialty care and obtaining referrals to participating and nonparticipating specialists, including the right to timely coverage for access to specialists care under section 725 if such section applies.

''(9) CLINICAL TRIALS.—A description the circumstances and conditions under which participation in clinical trials is covered under the terms and conditions of the plan or coverage, and the right to obtain coverage for approved cancer clinical trials under section 729 if such section applies.

''(10) PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—To the extent the plan or issuer provides coverage for prescription drugs, a statement of whether such coverage is limited to drugs included in a formulary, a description of any provisions and cost-sharing required for obtaining on- and off-formulary medications, and a description of the rights of participants and beneficiaries in obtaining access to access to prescription drugs under section 727 if such section applies.

''(11) EMERGENCY SERVICES.—A summary of the rules and procedures for accessing emergency services, including the right of a participant or beneficiary to obtain emergency services under the prudent layperson standard under section 721, if such section applies, and any educational information that the plan or issuer may provide regarding the appropriate use of emergency services.

''(12) CLAIMS AND APPEALS.—A description of the plan or issuer's rules and procedures pertaining to claims and appeals, a description of the rights of participants and beneficiaries under sections 503, 503A and 503B in obtaining covered benefits, filing a claim for benefits, and appealing coverage decisions internally and externally (including telephone numbers and mailing addresses of the appropriate authority), and a description of any additional legal rights and remedies available under section 502.

''(13) ADVANCE DIRECTIVES AND ORGAN DONATION.—A description of procedures for advance directives and organ donation decisions if the plan or issuer maintains such procedures.

''(14) INFORMATION ON PLANS AND ISSUERS.—The name, mailing address, and telephone number or numbers of the plan administrator and the issuer to be used by participants and beneficiaries seeking information about plan or coverage benefits and services, payment of a claim, or authorization for services and treatment. The name of the designated decision-maker (or decision-makers) appointed under section 502(n)(2) for purposes of making final determinations under section 503A and approving coverage pursuant to the written determination of an independent medical reviewer under section 503B. Notice of whether the benefits under the plan are provided under a contract or policy of insurance issued by an issuer, or whether benefits are provided directly by the plan sponsor who bears the insurance risk.

''(15) TRANSLATION SERVICES.—A summary description of any translation or interpretation services (including the availability of printed information in languages other than English, audio tapes, or information in Braille) that are available for non-English speakers and participants and beneficiaries with communication disabilities and a description of how to access these items or services.

''(16) ACCREDITATION INFORMATION.—Any information that is made public by accrediting organizations in the process of accreditation if the plan or issuer is accredited, or any additional quality indicators (such as the results of enrollee satisfaction surveys) that the plan or issuer makes public or makes available to participants and beneficiaries.

''(17) NOTICE OF REQUIREMENTS.—A description of any rights of participants and beneficiaries that are established by the Patients' Bill of Rights Plus Act (excluding those described in paragraphs (1) through (16)) if such sections apply. The description required under this paragraph may be combined with the notices required under sections 711(d), 713(b), or 606(a)(1), and with any other notice provision that the Secretary determines may be combined.

''(18) AVAILABILITY OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—A statement that the information described in subsection (c), and instructions on obtaining such information (including telephone numbers and, if available, Internet websites), shall be made available upon request.

''(c) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—The informational materials to be provided upon the request of a participant or beneficiary shall include for each option available under a group health plan or health insurance coverage the following:

''(1) STATUS OF PROVIDERS.—The State licensure status of the plan or issuer's participating health care professionals and participating health care facilities, and, if available, the education, training, specialty qualifications or certifications of such professionals.

''(2) COMPENSATION METHODS.—A summary description of the methods (such as capitation, fee-for-service, salary, bundled payments, per diem, or a combination thereof) used for compensating participating health care professionals (including primary care providers and specialists) and facilities in connection with the provision of health care under the plan or coverage. The requirement of this paragraph shall not be construed as requiring plans or issuers to provide information concerning proprietary payment methodology.

''(3) PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—Information about whether a specific prescription medication is included in the formulary of the plan or issuer, if the plan or issuer uses a defined formulary.

''(4) EXTERNAL APPEALS INFORMATION.—Aggregate information on the number and outcomes of external medical reviews, relative to the sample size (such as the number of covered lives) determined for the plan or issuer's book of business.

''(d) MANNER OF DISCLOSURE.—The information described in this section shall be disclosed in an accessible medium and format that is calculated to be understood by the average participant.

''(e) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a group health plan, or a health insurance issuer in connection with group health insurance coverage, from—

''(1) distributing any other additional information determined by the plan or issuer to be important or necessary in assisting participants and beneficiaries in the selection of a health plan; and

''(2) complying with the provisions of this section by providing information in brochures, through the Internet or other electronic media, or through other similar means, so long as participants and beneficiaries are provided with an opportunity to request that informational materials be provided in printed form.

''(f) CONFORMING REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations to coordinate the requirements on group health plans and health insurance issuers under this section with the requirements imposed under part 1, to reduce duplication with respect to any information that is required to be provided under any such requirements.

''(g) SECRETARIAL ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may assess a civil monetary penalty against the administrator of a plan or issuer in connection with the failure of the plan or issuer to comply with the requirements of this section.

''(2) AMOUNT OF PENALTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the penalty to be imposed under paragraph (1) shall not exceed $100 for each day for each participant and beneficiary with respect to which the failure to comply with the requirements of this section occurs.

''(B) INCREASE IN AMOUNT.—The amount referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be increased or decreased, for each calendar year that ends after December 31, 2000, by the same percentage as the percentage by which the medical care expenditure category of the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (United States city average), published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for September of the preceding calendar year has increased or decreased from the such Index for September of 2000.

''(3) FAILURE DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, a plan or issuer shall have failed to comply with the requirements of this section with respect to a participant or beneficiary if the plan or issuer failed or refused to comply with the requirements of this section within 30 days—

''(A) of the date described in subsection (a)(1)(A)(i);

''(B) of the date described in subsection (a)(1)(A)(ii); or

''(C) of the date on which additional information was requested under subsection (c).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 732(a) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1191a(a)) is amended by striking ''section 711'' and inserting ''sections 711 and 714''.

(2) The table of contents in section 1 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 713, the following:

''Sec 714. Health plan comparative information.''.

(3) Section 502(b)(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1132(b)(3)) is amended by striking ''733(a)(1))'' and inserting ''733(a)(1)), except with respect to the requirements of section 714''.

SEC. 2212. INFORMATION ABOUT PROVIDERS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall enter into a contract with the Institute of Medicine for the conduct of a study, and the submission to the Secretary of a report, that includes—

(1) an analysis of information concerning health care professionals that is currently available to patients, consumers, States, and professional societies, nationally and on a State-by-State basis, including patient preferences with respect to information about such professionals and their competencies;

(2) an evaluation of the legal and other barriers to the sharing of information concerning health care professionals; and

(3) recommendations for the disclosure of information on health care professionals, including the competencies and professional qualifications of such practitioners, to better facilitate patient choice, quality improvement, and market competition.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall forward to the appropriate committees of Congress a copy

of the report and study conducted under subsection (a).

Subtitle C—Right to Hold Health Plans Accountable

SEC. 2221. AMENDMENTS TO EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part 5 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after section 503 (29 U.S.C. 1133) the following:

"SEC. 503A. CLAIMS AND INTERNAL APPEALS PROCEDURES FOR GROUP HEALTH PLANS.

''(a) INITIAL CLAIM FOR BENEFITS UNDER GROUP HEALTH PLANS.—

''(1) PROCEDURES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall ensure that procedures are in place for—

''(i) making a determination on an initial claim for benefits by a participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) regarding payment or coverage for items or services under the terms and conditions of the plan or coverage involved, including any cost-sharing amount that the participant or beneficiary is required to pay with respect to such claim for benefits; and

''(ii) notifying a participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) and the treating health care professional involved regarding a determination on an initial claim for benefits made under the terms and conditions of the plan or coverage, including any cost-sharing amounts that the participant or beneficiary may be required to make with respect to such claim for benefits, and of the right of the participant or beneficiary to an internal appeal under subsection (b).

''(B) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—With respect to an initial claim for benefits, the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) and the treating health care professional (if any) shall provide the plan or issuer with access to information necessary to make a determination relating to the claim, not later than 5 business days after the date on which the claim is filed or to meet the applicable timelines under clauses (ii) and (iii) of paragraph (2)(A).

''(C) ORAL REQUESTS.—In the case of a claim for benefits involving an expedited or concurrent determination, a participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) may make an initial claim for benefits orally, but a group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, may require that the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) provide written confirmation of such request in a timely manner.

''(2) TIMELINE FOR MAKING DETERMINATIONS.—

''(A) PRIOR AUTHORIZATION DETERMINATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall maintain procedures to ensure that a prior authorization determination on a claim for benefits is made within 14 business days from the date on which the plan or issuer receives information that is reasonably necessary to enable the plan or issuer to make a determination on the request for prior authorization, but in no case shall such determination be made later than 28 business days after the receipt of the claim for benefits.

''(ii) EXPEDITED DETERMINATION.—Notwithstanding clause (i), a group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall maintain procedures for expediting a prior authorization determination on a claim for benefits described in such clause when a request for such an expedited determination is made by a participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) at any time during the process for making a determination and the treating health care professional substantiates, with the request, that a determination under the procedures described in clause (i) would seriously jeopardize the life or health of the participant or beneficiary. Such determination shall be made within 72 hours after a request is received by the plan or issuer under this clause.

''(iii) CONCURRENT DETERMINATIONS.—A group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall maintain procedures to ensure that a concurrent determination on a claim for benefits that results in a discontinuation of inpatient care is made within 24 hours after the receipt of the claim for benefits.

''(B) RETROSPECTIVE DETERMINATION.—A group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall maintain procedures to ensure that a retrospective determination on a claim for benefits is made within 30 business days of the date on which the plan or issuer receives information that is reasonably necessary to enable the plan or issuer to make a determination on the claim, but in no case shall such determination be made later than 60 business days after the receipt of the claim for benefits.

''(3) NOTICE OF A DENIAL OF A CLAIM FOR BENEFITS.—Written notice of a denial made under an initial claim for benefits shall be issued to the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) and the treating health care professional not later than 2 business days after the determination (or within the 72-hour or 24-hour period referred to in clauses (ii) and (iii) of paragraph (2)(A) if applicable).

''(4) REQUIREMENTS OF NOTICE OF DETERMINATIONS.—The written notice of a denial of a claim for benefits determination under paragraph (3) shall include—

''(A) the reasons for the determination (including a summary of the clinical or scientific-evidence based rationale used in making the determination and instruction on obtaining a more complete description written in a manner calculated to be understood by the average participant);

''(B) the procedures for obtaining additional information concerning the determination; and

''(C) notification of the right to appeal the determination and instructions on how to initiate an appeal in accordance with subsection (b).

''(b) INTERNAL APPEAL OF A DENIAL OF A CLAIM FOR BENEFITS.—

''(1) RIGHT TO INTERNAL APPEAL.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) may appeal any denial of a claim for benefits under subsection (a) under the procedures described in this subsection.

''(B) TIME FOR APPEAL.—A group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall ensure that a participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) has a period of not less than 60 days beginning on the date of a denial of a claim for benefits under subsection (a) in which to appeal such denial under this subsection.

''(C) FAILURE TO ACT.—The failure of a plan or issuer to issue a determination on a claim for benefits under subsection (a) within the applicable timeline established for such a determination under such subsection shall be treated as a denial of a claim for benefits for purposes of proceeding to internal review under this subsection.

''(D) PLAN WAIVER OF INTERNAL REVIEW.—A group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, may waive the internal review process under this subsection and permit a participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) to proceed directly to external review under section 503B.

''(2) TIMELINES FOR MAKING DETERMINATIONS.—

''(A) ORAL REQUESTS.—In the case of an appeal of a denial of a claim for benefits under this subsection that involves an expedited or concurrent determination, a participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) may request such appeal orally, but a group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, may require that the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) provide written confirmation of such request in a timely manner.

''(B) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—With respect to an appeal of a denial of a claim for benefits, the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) and the treating health care professional (if any) shall provide the plan or issuer with access to information necessary to make a determination relating to the appeal, not later than 5 business days after the date on which the request for the appeal is filed or to meet the applicable timelines under clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (C).

''(C) PRIOR AUTHORIZATION DETERMINATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall maintain procedures to ensure that a determination on an appeal of a denial of a claim for benefits under this subsection is made within 14 business days after the date on which the plan or issuer receives information that is reasonably necessary to enable the plan or issuer to make a determination on the appeal, but in no case shall such determination be made later than 28 business days after the receipt of the request for the appeal.

''(ii) EXPEDITED DETERMINATION.—Notwithstanding clause (i), a group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall maintain procedures for expediting a prior authorization determination on an appeal of a denial of a claim for benefits described in clause (i), when a request for such an expedited determination is made by a participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) at any time during the process for making a determination and the treating health care professional substantiates, with the request, that a determination under the procedures described in clause (i) would seriously jeopardize the life or health of the participant or beneficiary. Such determination shall be made not later than 72 hours after the request for such appeal is received by the plan or issuer under this clause.

''(iii) CONCURRENT DETERMINATIONS.—A group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall maintain procedures to ensure that a concurrent determination on an appeal of a denial of a claim for benefits that results in a discontinuation of inpatient care is made within 24 hours after the receipt of the request for appeal.

''(B) RETROSPECTIVE DETERMINATION.—A group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall maintain procedures to ensure that a retrospective determination on an appeal of a claim for benefits is made within 30 business days of the date on which the plan or issuer receives necessary information that is reasonably required by the plan or issuer to make a determination on the appeal, but in no case shall such determination be made later than 60 business days after the receipt of the request for the appeal.

''(3) CONDUCT OF REVIEW.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A review of a denial of a claim for benefits under this subsection shall be conducted by an individual with appropriate expertise who was not directly involved in the initial determination.

''(B) REVIEW OF MEDICAL DECISIONS BY PHYSICIANS.—A review of an appeal of a denial of a

claim for benefits that is based on a lack of medical necessity and appropriateness, or based on an experimental or investigational treatment, or requires an evaluation of medical facts, shall be made by a physician with appropriate expertise, including age-appropriate expertise, who was not involved in the initial determination.

''(4) NOTICE OF DETERMINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Written notice of a determination made under an internal appeal of a denial of a claim for benefits shall be issued to the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) and the treating health care professional not later than 2 business days after the completion of the review (or within the 72-hour or 24-hour period referred to in paragraph (2) if applicable).

''(B) FINAL DETERMINATION.—The decision by a plan or issuer under this subsection shall be treated as the final determination of the plan or issuer on a denial of a claim for benefits. The failure of a plan or issuer to issue a determination on an appeal of a denial of a claim for benefits under this subsection within the applicable timeline established for such a determination shall be treated as a final determination on an appeal of a denial of a claim for benefits for purposes of proceeding to external review under section 503B.

''(C) REQUIREMENTS OF NOTICE.—With respect to a determination made under this subsection, the notice described in subparagraph (A) shall include—

''(i) the reasons for the determination (including a summary of the clinical or scientific-evidence based rationale used in making the determination and instruction on obtaining a more complete description written in a manner calculated to be understood by the average participant);

''(ii) the procedures for obtaining additional information concerning the determination; and

''(iii) notification of the right to an independent external review under section 503B and instructions on how to initiate such a review.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—The definitions contained in section 503B(i) shall apply for purposes of this section.

''SEC. 503B. INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL APPEALS PROCEDURES FOR GROUP HEALTH PLANS.

''(a) RIGHT TO EXTERNAL APPEAL.—A group health plan, and a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall provide in accordance with this section participants and beneficiaries (or authorized representatives) with access to an independent external review for any denial of a claim for benefits.

''(b) INITIATION OF THE INDEPENDENT EXTERNAL REVIEW PROCESS.—

''(1) TIME TO FILE.—A request for an independent external review under this section shall be filed with the plan or issuer not later than 60 business days after the date on which the participant or beneficiary receives notice of the denial under section 503A(b)(4) or the date on which the internal review is waived by the plan or issuer under section 503A(b)(1)(D).

''(2) FILING OF REQUEST.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the succeeding provisions of this subsection, a group health plan, and a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, may—

''(i) except as provided in subparagraph (B)(i), require that a request for review be in writing;

''(ii) limit the filing of such a request to the participant or beneficiary involved (or an authorized representative);

''(iii) except if waived by the plan or issuer under section 503A(b)(1)(D), condition access to an independent external review under this section upon a final determination of a denial of a claim for benefits under the internal review procedure under section 503A;

''(iv) except as provided in subparagraph (B)(ii), require payment of a filing fee to the plan or issuer of a sum that does not exceed $50; and

''(v) require that a request for review include the consent of the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) for the release of medical information or records of the participant or beneficiary to the qualified external review entity for purposes of conducting external review activities.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS AND EXCEPTION RELATING TO GENERAL RULE.—

''(i) ORAL REQUESTS PERMITTED IN EXPEDITED OR CONCURRENT CASES.—In the case of an expedited or concurrent external review as provided for under subsection (e), the request may be made orally. In such case a written confirmation of such request shall be made in a timely manner. Such written confirmation shall be treated as a consent for purposes of subparagraph (A)(v).

''(ii) EXCEPTION TO FILING FEE REQUIREMENT.—

''(I) INDIGENCY.—Payment of a filing fee shall not be required under subparagraph (A)(iv) where there is a certification (in a form and manner specified in guidelines established by the Secretary) that the participant or beneficiary is indigent (as defined in such guidelines). In establishing guidelines under this subclause, the Secretary shall ensure that the guidelines relating to indigency are consistent with the poverty guidelines used by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under title XIX of the Social Security Act.

''(II) FEE NOT REQUIRED.—Payment of a filing fee shall not be required under subparagraph (A)(iv) if the plan or issuer waives the internal appeals process under section 503A(b)(1)(D).

''(III) REFUNDING OF FEE.—The filing fee paid under subparagraph (A)(iv) shall be refunded if the determination under the independent external review is to reverse the denial which is the subject of the review.

''(IV) INCREASE IN AMOUNT.—The amount referred to in subclause (I) shall be increased or decreased, for each calendar year that ends after December 31, 2001, by the same percentage as the percentage by which the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (United States city average), published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for September of the preceding calendar year has increased or decreased from the such Index for September of 2001.

''(c) REFERRAL TO QUALIFIED EXTERNAL REVIEW ENTITY UPON REQUEST.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon the filing of a request for independent external review with the group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering coverage in connection with a group health plan, the plan or issuer shall refer such request to a qualified external review entity selected in accordance with this section.

''(2) ACCESS TO PLAN OR ISSUER AND HEALTH PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION.—With respect to an independent external review conducted under this section, the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative), the plan or issuer, and the treating health care professional (if any) shall provide the external review entity with access to information that is necessary to conduct a review under this section, as determined by the entity, not later than 5 business days after the date on which a request is referred to the qualified external review entity under paragraph (1), or earlier as determined appropriate by the entity to meet the applicable timelines under clauses (ii) and (iii) of subsection (e)(1)(A).

''(3) SCREENING OF REQUESTS BY QUALIFIED EXTERNAL REVIEW ENTITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a request referred to a qualified external review entity under paragraph (1) relating to a denial of a claim for benefits, the entity shall refer such request for the conduct of an independent medical review unless the entity determines that—

''(i) any of the conditions described in subsection (b)(2)(A) have not been met;

''(ii) the thresholds described in subparagraph (B) have not been met;

''(iii) the denial of the claim for benefits does not involve a medically reviewable decision under subsection (d)(2);

''(iv) the denial of the claim for benefits relates to a decision regarding whether an individual is a participant or beneficiary who is enrolled under the terms of the plan or coverage (including the applicability of any waiting period under the plan or coverage); or

''(v) the denial of the claim for benefits is a decision as to the application of cost-sharing requirements or the application of a specific exclusion or express limitation on the amount, duration, or scope of coverage of items or services under the terms and conditions of the plan or coverage unless the decision is a denial described in subsection (d)(2)(C);

Upon making a determination that any of clauses (i) through (v) applies with respect to the request, the entity shall determine that the denial of a claim for benefits involved is not eligible for independent medical review under subsection (d), and shall provide notice in accordance with subparagraph (D).

''(B) THRESHOLDS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The thresholds described in this subparagraph are that—

''(I) the total amount payable under the plan or coverage for the item or service that was the subject of such denial exceeds a significant financial threshold (as determined under guidelines established by the Secretary); or

''(II) a physician has asserted in writing that there is a significant risk of placing the life, health, or development of the participant or beneficiary in jeopardy if the denial of the claim for benefits is sustained.

''(ii) THRESHOLDS NOT APPLIED.—The thresholds described in this subparagraph shall not apply if the plan or issuer involved waives the internal appeals process with respect to the denial of a claim for benefits involved under section 503A(b)(1)(D).

''(C) PROCESS FOR MAKING DETERMINATIONS.—

''(i) NO DEFERENCE TO PRIOR DETERMINATIONS.—In making determinations under subparagraph (A), there shall be no deference given to determinations made by the plan or issuer under section 503A or the recommendation of a treating health care professional (if any).

''(ii) USE OF APPROPRIATE PERSONNEL.—A qualified external review entity shall use appropriately qualified personnel to make determinations under this section.

''(D) NOTICES AND GENERAL TIMELINES FOR DETERMINATION.—

''(i) NOTICE IN CASE OF DENIAL OF REFERRAL.—If the entity under this paragraph does not make a referral to an independent medical reviewer, the entity shall provide notice to the plan or issuer, the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) filing the request, and the treating health care professional (if any) that the denial is not subject to independent medical review. Such notice—

''(I) shall be written (and, in addition, may be provided orally) in a manner calculated to be understood by an average participant;

''(II) shall include the reasons for the determination; and

''(III) include any relevant terms and conditions of the plan or coverage.

''(ii) GENERAL TIMELINE FOR DETERMINATIONS.—Upon receipt of information under paragraph (2), the qualified external review entity, and if required the independent medical reviewer, shall make a determination within the overall timeline that is applicable to the case under review as described in subsection (e), except that if the entity determines that a referral to an independent medical reviewer is not required, the entity shall provide notice of such determination to the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) within 2 business days of such determination.

''(d) INDEPENDENT MEDICAL REVIEW.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a qualified external review entity determines under subsection (c) that a denial of a claim for benefits is eligible for independent medical review, the entity shall refer the denial involved to an independent medical reviewer for the conduct of an independent medical review under this subsection.

''(2) MEDICALLY REVIEWABLE DECISIONS.—A denial described in this paragraph is one for which the item or service that is the subject of the denial would be a covered benefit under the terms and conditions of the plan or coverage but for one (or more) of the following determinations:

''(A) DENIALS BASED ON MEDICAL NECESSITY AND APPROPRIATENESS.—The basis of the determination is that the item or service is not medically necessary and appropriate.

''(B) DENIALS BASED ON EXPERIMENTAL OR INVESTIGATIONAL TREATMENT.—The basis of the determination is that the item or service is experimental or investigational.

''(C) DENIALS OTHERWISE BASED ON AN EVALUATION OF MEDICAL FACTS.—A determination that the item or service or condition is not covered but an evaluation of the medical facts by a health care professional in the specific case involved is necessary to determine whether the item or service or condition is required to be provided under the terms and conditions of the plan or coverage.

''(3) INDEPENDENT MEDICAL REVIEW DETERMINATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An independent medical reviewer under this section shall make a new independent determination with respect to—

''(i) whether the item or service or condition that is the subject of the denial is covered under the terms and conditions of the plan or coverage; and

''(ii) based upon an affirmative determination under clause (i), whether or not the denial of a claim for a benefit that is the subject of the review should be upheld or reversed.

''(B) STANDARD FOR DETERMINATION.—The independent medical reviewer's determination relating to the medical necessity and appropriateness, or the experimental or investigation nature, or the evaluation of the medical facts of the item, service, or condition shall be based on the medical condition of the participant or beneficiary (including the medical records of the participant or beneficiary) and the valid, relevant scientific evidence and clinical evidence, including peer-reviewed medical literature or findings and including expert consensus.

''(C) NO COVERAGE FOR EXCLUDED BENEFITS.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to permit an independent medical reviewer to require that a group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, provide coverage for items or services that are specifically excluded or expressly limited under the plan or coverage and that are not covered regardless of any determination relating to medical necessity and appropriateness, experimental or investigational nature of the treatment, or an evaluation of the medical facts in the case involved.

''(D) EVIDENCE AND INFORMATION TO BE USED IN MEDICAL REVIEWS.—In making a determination under this subsection, the independent medical reviewer shall also consider appropriate and available evidence and information, including the following:

''(i) The determination made by the plan or issuer with respect to the claim upon internal review and the evidence or guidelines used by the plan or issuer in reaching such determination.

''(ii) The recommendation of the treating health care professional and the evidence, guidelines, and rationale used by the treating health care professional in reaching such recommendation.

''(iii) Additional evidence or information obtained by the reviewer or submitted by the plan, issuer, participant or beneficiary (or an authorized representative), or treating health care professional.

''(iv) The plan or coverage document.

''(E) INDEPENDENT DETERMINATION.—In making the determination, the independent medical reviewer shall—

''(i) consider the claim under review without deference to the determinations made by the plan or issuer under section 503A or the recommendation of the treating health care professional (if any);

''(ii) consider, but not be bound by the definition used by the plan or issuer of 'medically necessary and appropriate', or 'experimental or investigational', or other equivalent terms that are used by the plan or issuer to describe medical necessity and appropriateness or experimental or investigational nature of the treatment; and

''(iii) notwithstanding clause (ii), adhere to the definition used by the plan or issuer of 'medically necessary and appropriate', or 'experimental or investigational' if such definition is the same as the definition of such term—

''(I) that has been adopted pursuant to a State statute or regulation; or

''(II) that is used for purposes of the program established under titles XVIII or XIX of the Social Security Act or under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

''(F) DETERMINATION OF INDEPENDENT MEDICAL REVIEWER.—An independent medical reviewer shall, in accordance with the deadlines described in subsection (e), prepare a written determination to uphold or reverse the denial under review. Such written determination shall include the specific reasons of the reviewer for such determination, including a summary of the clinical or scientific-evidence based rationale used in making the determination. The reviewer may provide the plan or issuer and the treating health care professional with additional recommendations in connection with such a determination, but any such recommendations shall not be treated as part of the determination.

''(e) TIMELINES AND NOTIFICATIONS.—

''(1) TIMELINES FOR INDEPENDENT MEDICAL REVIEW.—

''(A) PRIOR AUTHORIZATION DETERMINATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The independent medical reviewer (or reviewers) shall make a determination on a denial of a claim for benefits that is referred to the reviewer under subsection (c)(3) not later than 14 business days after the receipt of information under subsection (c)(2) if the review involves a prior authorization of items or services.

''(ii) EXPEDITED DETERMINATION.—Notwithstanding clause (i), the independent medical reviewer (or reviewers) shall make an expedited determination on a denial of a claim for benefits described in clause (i), when a request for such an expedited determination is made by a participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) at any time during the process for making a determination, and the treating health care professional substantiates, with the request, that a determination under the timeline described in clause (i) would seriously jeopardize the life or health of the participant or beneficiary. Such determination shall be made not later than 72 hours after the receipt of information under subsection (c)(2).

''(iii) CONCURRENT DETERMINATION.—Notwithstanding clause (i), a review described in such subclause shall be completed not later than 24 hours after the receipt of information under subsection (c)(2) if the review involves a discontinuation of inpatient care.

''(B) RETROSPECTIVE DETERMINATION.—The independent medical reviewer (or reviewers) shall complete a review in the case of a retrospective determination on an appeal of a denial of a claim for benefits that is referred to the reviewer under subsection (c)(3) not later than 30 business days after the receipt of information under subsection (c)(2).

''(2) NOTIFICATION OF DETERMINATION.—The external review entity shall ensure that the plan or issuer, the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) and the treating health care professional (if any) receives a copy of the written determination of the independent medical reviewer prepared under subsection (d)(3)(F). Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as preventing an entity or reviewer from providing an initial oral notice of the reviewer's determination.

''(3) FORM OF NOTICES.—Determinations and notices under this subsection shall be written in a manner calculated to be understood by an average participant.

''(4) TERMINATION OF EXTERNAL REVIEW PROCESS IF APPROVAL OF A CLAIM FOR BENEFITS DURING PROCESS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a plan or issuer—

''(i) reverses a determination on a denial of a claim for benefits that is the subject of an external review under this section and authorizes coverage for the claim or provides payment of the claim; and

''(ii) provides notice of such reversal to the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) and the treating health care professional (if any), and the external review entity responsible for such review,

the external review process shall be terminated with respect to such denial and any filing fee paid under subsection (b)(2)(A)(iv) shall be refunded.

''(B) TREATMENT OF TERMINATION.—An authorization of coverage under subparagraph (A) by the plan or issuer shall be treated as a written determination to reverse a denial under section (d)(3)(F) for purposes of liability under section 502(n)(1)(B).

''(f) COMPLIANCE.—

''(1) APPLICATION OF DETERMINATIONS.—

''(A) EXTERNAL REVIEW DETERMINATIONS BINDING ON PLAN.—The determinations of an external review entity and an independent medical reviewer under this section shall be binding upon the plan or issuer involved.

''(B) COMPLIANCE WITH DETERMINATION.—If the determination of an independent medical reviewer is to reverse the denial, the plan or issuer, upon the receipt of such determination, shall authorize coverage to comply with the medical reviewer's determination in accordance with the timeframe established by the medical reviewer.

''(2) FAILURE TO COMPLY.—If a plan or issuer fails to comply with the timeframe established under paragraph (1)(B)(i) with respect to a participant or beneficiary, where such failure to comply is caused by the plan or issuer, the participant or beneficiary may obtain the items or services involved (in a manner consistent with the determination of the independent external reviewer) from any provider regardless of whether such provider is a participating provider under the plan or coverage.

''(3) REIMBURSEMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Where a participant or beneficiary obtains items or services in accordance with paragraph (2), the plan or issuer involved shall provide for reimbursement of the costs of such items of services. Such reimbursement shall be made to the treating health care professional or to the participant or beneficiary (in the case of a participant or beneficiary who pays for the costs of such items or services).

''(B) AMOUNT.—The plan or issuer shall fully reimburse a professional, participant or beneficiary under subparagraph (A) for the total costs of the items or services provided (regardless of any plan limitations that may apply to the coverage of such items of services) so long as—

''(i) the items or services would have been covered under the terms of the plan or coverage if provided by the plan or issuer; and

''(ii) the items or services were provided in a manner consistent with the determination of the independent medical reviewer.

''(4) FAILURE TO REIMBURSE.—Where a plan or issuer fails to provide reimbursement to a professional, participant or beneficiary in accordance with this subsection, the professional, participant or beneficiary may commence a civil action (or utilize other remedies available under law) to recover only the amount of any such reimbursement that is unpaid and any necessary legal costs or expenses (including attorneys' fees) incurred in recovering such reimbursement.

''(g) QUALIFICATIONS OF INDEPENDENT MEDICAL REVIEWERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In referring a denial to 1 or more individuals to conduct independent medical review under subsection (c), the qualified external review entity shall ensure that—

''(A) each independent medical reviewer meets the qualifications described in paragraphs (2) and (3);

''(B) with respect to each review at least 1 such reviewer meets the requirements described in paragraphs (4) and (5); and

''(C) compensation provided by the entity to the reviewer is consistent with paragraph (6).

''(2) LICENSURE AND EXPERTISE.—Each independent medical reviewer shall be a physician or health care professional who—

''(A) is appropriately credentialed or licensed in 1 or more States to deliver health care services; and

''(B) typically treats the diagnosis or condition or provides the type or treatment under review.

''(3) INDEPENDENCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), each independent medical reviewer in a case shall—

''(i) not be a related party (as defined in paragraph (7));

''(ii) not have a material familial, financial, or professional relationship with such a party; and

''(iii) not otherwise have a conflict of interest with such a party (as determined under regulations).

''(B) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph (A) shall be construed to—

''(i) prohibit an individual, solely on the basis of affiliation with the plan or issuer, from serving as an independent medical reviewer if—

''(I) a non-affiliated individual is not reasonably available;

''(II) the affiliated individual is not involved in the provision of items or services in the case under review; and

''(III) the fact of such an affiliation is disclosed to the plan or issuer and the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) and neither party objects;

''(ii) prohibit an individual who has staff privileges at the institution where the treatment involved takes place from serving as an independent medical reviewer if the affiliation is disclosed to the plan or issuer and the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative), and neither party objects;

''(iii) permit an employee of a plan or issuer, or an individual who provides services exclusively or primarily to or on behalf of a plan or issuer, from serving as an independent medical reviewer; or

''(iv) prohibit receipt of compensation by an independent medical reviewer from an entity if the compensation is provided consistent with paragraph (6).

''(4) PRACTICING HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONAL IN SAME FIELD.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The requirement of this paragraph with respect to a reviewer in a case involving treatment, or the provision of items or services, by—

''(i) a physician, is that the reviewer be a practicing physician of the same or similar specialty, when reasonably available, as a physician who typically treats the diagnosis or condition or provides such treatment in the case under review; or

''(ii) a health care professional (other than a physician), is that the reviewer be a practicing physician or, if determined appropriate by the qualified external review entity, a health care professional (other than a physician), of the same or similar specialty as the health care professional who typically treats the diagnosis or condition or provides the treatment in the case under review.

''(B) PRACTICING DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'practicing' means, with respect to an individual who is a physician or other health care professional that the individual provides health care services to individual patients on average at least 1 day per week.

''(5) AGE-APPROPRIATE EXPERTISE.—The independent medical reviewer shall have expertise under paragraph (2) that is age-appropriate to the participant or beneficiary involved.

''(6) LIMITATIONS ON REVIEWER COMPENSATION.—Compensation provided by a qualified external review entity to an independent medical reviewer in connection with a review under this section shall—

''(A) not exceed a reasonable level; and

''(B) not be contingent on the decision rendered by the reviewer.

''(7) RELATED PARTY DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'related party' means, with respect to a denial of a claim under a plan or coverage relating to a participant or beneficiary, any of the following:

''(A) The plan, plan sponsor, or issuer involved, or any fiduciary, officer, director, or employee of such plan, plan sponsor, or issuer.

''(B) The participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative).

''(C) The health care professional that provides the items of services involved in the denial.

''(D) The institution at which the items or services (or treatment) involved in the denial are provided.

''(E) The manufacturer of any drug or other item that is included in the items or services involved in the denial.

''(F) Any other party determined under any regulations to have a substantial interest in the denial involved.

''(h) QUALIFIED EXTERNAL REVIEW ENTITIES.—

''(1) SELECTION OF QUALIFIED EXTERNAL REVIEW ENTITIES.—

''(A) LIMITATION ON PLAN OR ISSUER SELECTION.—The Secretary shall implement procedures with respect to the selection of qualified external review entities by a plan or issuer to assure that the selection process among qualified external review entities will not create any incentives for external review entities to make a decision in a biased manner.

''(B) STATE AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFIED EXTERNAL REVIEW ENTITIES FOR HEALTH INSURANCE ISSUERS.—With respect to health insurance issuers offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan in a State, the State may, pursuant to a State law that is enacted after the date of enactment of the Patients' Bill of Rights Plus Act, provide for the designation or selection of qualified external review entities in a manner determined by the State to assure an unbiased determination in conducting external review activities. In conducting reviews under this section, an entity designated or selected under this subparagraph shall comply with the provision of this section.

''(2) CONTRACT WITH QUALIFIED EXTERNAL REVIEW ENTITY.—Except as provided in paragraph (1)(B), the external review process of a plan or issuer under this section shall be conducted under a contract between the plan or issuer and 1 or more qualified external review entities (as defined in paragraph (4)(A)).

''(3) TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT.—The terms and conditions of a contract under paragraph (2) shall—

''(A) be consistent with the standards the Secretary shall establish to assure there is no real or apparent conflict of interest in the conduct of external review activities; and

''(B) provide that the costs of the external review process shall be borne by the plan or issuer.

Subparagraph (B) shall not be construed as applying to the imposition of a filing fee under subsection (b)(2)(A)(iv) or costs incurred by the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) or treating health care professional (if any) in support of the review, including the provision of additional evidence or information.

''(4) QUALIFICATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term 'qualified external review entity' means, in relation to a plan or issuer, an entity that is initially certified (and periodically recertified) under subparagraph (C) as meeting the following requirements:

''(i) The entity has (directly or through contracts or other arrangements) sufficient medical, legal, and other expertise and sufficient staffing to carry out duties of a qualified external review entity under this section on a timely basis, including making determinations under subsection (b)(2)(A) and providing for independent medical reviews under subsection (d).

''(ii) The entity is not a plan or issuer or an affiliate or a subsidiary of a plan or issuer, and is not an affiliate or subsidiary of a professional or trade association of plans or issuers or of health care providers.

''(iii) The entity has provided assurances that it will conduct external review activities consistent with the applicable requirements of this section and standards specified in subparagraph (C), including that it will not conduct any external review activities in a case unless the independence requirements of subparagraph (B) are met with respect to the case.

''(iv) The entity has provided assurances that it will provide information in a timely manner under subparagraph (D).

''(v) The entity meets such other requirements as the Secretary provides by regulation.

''(B) INDEPENDENCE REQUIREMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), an entity meets the independence requirements of this subparagraph with respect to any case if the entity—

''(I) is not a related party (as defined in subsection (g)(7));

''(II) does not have a material familial, financial, or professional relationship with such a party; and

''(III) does not otherwise have a conflict of interest with such a party (as determined under regulations).

''(ii) EXCEPTION FOR REASONABLE COMPENSATION.—Nothing in clause (i) shall be construed to prohibit receipt by a qualified external review entity of compensation from a plan or issuer for the conduct of external review activities under this section if the compensation is provided consistent with clause (iii).

''(iii) LIMITATIONS ON ENTITY COMPENSATION.—Compensation provided by a plan or issuer to a qualified external review entity in connection with reviews under this section shall—

''(I) not exceed a reasonable level; and

''(II) not be contingent on the decision rendered by the entity or by any independent medical reviewer.

''(C) CERTIFICATION AND RECERTIFICATION PROCESS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The initial certification and recertification of a qualified external review entity shall be made—

''(I) under a process that is recognized or approved by the Secretary; or

''(II) by a qualified private standard-setting organization that is approved by the Secretary under clause (iii).

''(ii) PROCESS.—The Secretary shall not recognize or approve a process under clause (i)(I) unless the process applies standards (as promulgated in regulations) that ensure that a qualified external review entity—

''(I) will carry out (and has carried out, in the case of recertification) the responsibilities of such an entity in accordance with this section, including meeting applicable deadlines;

''(II) will meet (and has met, in the case of recertification) appropriate indicators of fiscal integrity;

''(III) will maintain (and has maintained, in the case of recertification) appropriate confidentiality with respect to individually identifiable health information obtained in the course of conducting external review activities; and

''(IV) in the case recertification, shall review the matters described in clause (iv).

''(iii) APPROVAL OF QUALIFIED PRIVATE STANDARD-SETTING ORGANIZATIONS.—For purposes of clause (i)(II), the Secretary may approve a qualified private standard-setting organization if the Secretary finds that the organization only certifies (or recertifies) external review entities that meet at least the standards required for the certification (or recertification) of external review entities under clause (ii).

''(iv) CONSIDERATIONS IN RECERTIFICATIONS.—In conducting recertifications of a qualified external review entity under this paragraph, the Secretary or organization conducting the recertification shall review compliance of the entity with the requirements for conducting external review activities under this section, including the following:

''(I) Provision of information under subparagraph (D).

''(II) Adherence to applicable deadlines (both by the entity and by independent medical reviewers it refers cases to).

''(III) Compliance with limitations on compensation (with respect to both the entity and independent medical reviewers it refers cases to).

''(IV) Compliance with applicable independence requirements.

''(v) PERIOD OF CERTIFICATION OR RECERTIFICATION.—A certification or recertification provided under this paragraph shall extend for a period not to exceed 5 years.

''(vi) REVOCATION.—A certification or recertification under this paragraph may be revoked by the Secretary or by the organization providing such certification upon a showing of cause.

''(D) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A qualified external review entity shall provide to the Secretary, in such manner and at such times as the Secretary may require, such information (relating to the denials which have been referred to the entity for the conduct of external review under this section) as the Secretary determines appropriate to assure compliance with the independence and other requirements of this section to monitor and assess the quality of its external review activities and lack of bias in making determinations. Such information shall include information described in clause (ii) but shall not include individually identifiable medical information.

''(ii) INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED.—The information described in this subclause with respect to an entity is as follows:

''(I) The number and types of denials for which a request for review has been received by the entity.

''(II) The disposition by the entity of such denials, including the number referred to a independent medical reviewer and the reasons for such dispositions (including the application of exclusions), on a plan or issuer-specific basis and on a health care specialty-specific basis.

''(III) The length of time in making determinations with respect to such denials.

''(IV) Updated information on the information required to be submitted as a condition of certification with respect to the entity's performance of external review activities.

''(iii) INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO CERTIFYING ORGANIZATION.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a qualified external review entity which is certified (or recertified) under this subsection by a qualified private standard-setting organization, at the request of the organization, the entity shall provide the organization with the information provided to the Secretary under clause (i).

''(II) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed as preventing such an organization from requiring additional information as a condition of certification or recertification of an entity.

''(iv) USE OF INFORMATION.—Information provided under this subparagraph may be used by the Secretary and qualified private standard-setting organizations to conduct oversight of qualified external review entities, including recertification of such entities, and shall be made available to the public in an appropriate manner.

''(E) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—No qualified external review entity having a contract with a plan or issuer, and no person who is employed by any such entity or who furnishes professional services to such entity (including as an independent medical reviewer), shall be held by reason of the performance of any duty, function, or activity required or authorized pursuant to this section, to be civilly liable under any law of the United States or of any State (or political subdivision thereof) if there was no actual malice or gross misconduct in the performance of such duty, function, or activity.

''(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE.—The term 'authorized representative' means, with respect to a participant or beneficiary—

''(A) a person to whom a participant or beneficiary has given express written consent to represent the participant or beneficiary in any proceeding under this section;

''(B) a person authorized by law to provide substituted consent for the participant or beneficiary; or

''(C) a family member of the participant or beneficiary (or the estate of the participant or beneficiary) or the participant's or beneficiary's treating health care professional when the participant or beneficiary is unable to provide consent.

''(2) CLAIM FOR BENEFITS.—The term 'claim for benefits' means any request by a participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) for benefits (including requests that are subject to authorization of coverage or utilization review), for eligibility, or for payment in whole or in part, for an item or service under a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered by a health insurance issuer in connection with a group health plan.

''(3) GROUP HEALTH PLAN.—The term 'group health plan' shall have the meaning given such term in section 733(a). In applying this paragraph, excepted benefits described in section 733(c) shall not be treated as benefits consisting of medical care.

''(4) HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.—The term 'health insurance coverage' has the meaning given such term in section 733(b)(1). In applying this paragraph, excepted benefits described in section 733(c) shall not be treated as benefits consisting of medical care.

''(5) HEALTH INSURANCE ISSUER.—The term 'health insurance issuer' has the meaning given such term in section 733(b)(2).

''(6) PRIOR AUTHORIZATION DETERMINATION.—The term 'prior authorization determination' means a determination by the group health plan or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan prior to the provision of the items and services as a condition of coverage of the items and services under the terms and conditions of the plan or coverage.

''(7) TREATING HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONAL.—The term 'treating health care professional' with respect to a group health plan, health insurance issuer or provider sponsored organization means a physician (medical doctor or doctor of osteopathy) or other health care practitioner who is acting within the scope of his or her State licensure or certification for the delivery of health care services and who is primarily responsible for delivering those services to the participant or beneficiary.

''(8) UTILIZATION REVIEW.—The term 'utilization review' with respect to a group health plan or health insurance coverage means procedures used in the determination of coverage for a participant or beneficiary, such as procedures to evaluate the medical necessity, appropriateness, efficacy, quality, or efficiency of health care services, procedures or settings, and includes prospective review, concurrent review, second opinions, case management, discharge planning, or retrospective review.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 503 the following:

''Sec. 503A. Claims and internal appeals procedures for group health plans.

''Sec. 503B. Independent external appeals procedures for group health plans.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to plan years beginning on or after 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act. The Secretary shall issue all regulations necessary to carry out the amendments made by this section before the effective date thereof.

SEC. 2222. ENFORCEMENT.

Section 502(c) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1132(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) The Secretary may assess a civil penalty against any plan of up to $10,000 for the plan's failure or refusal to comply with any deadline applicable under section 503B or any determination under such section, except that in any case in which treatment was not commenced by the plan in accordance with the determination of an independent external reviewer, the Secretary shall assess a civil penalty of $10,000 against the plan and the plan shall pay such penalty to the participant or beneficiary involved.''.

Subtitle D—Remedies

SEC. 2231. AVAILABILITY OF COURT REMEDIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 502 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1132) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(n) CAUSE OF ACTION RELATING TO DENIAL OF A CLAIM FOR HEALTH BENEFITS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH EXTERNAL MEDICAL REVIEW.—In any case in which—

''(i) a designated decision-maker described in paragraph (2) fails to exercise ordinary care in

approving coverage pursuant to the written determination of an independent medical reviewer under section 503B(d)(3)(F) that reverses a denial of a claim for benefits; and

''(ii) the failure described in clause (i) is the proximate cause of substantial harm to, or the wrongful death of, the participant or beneficiary;

such designated decision-maker shall be liable to the participant or beneficiary (or the estate of such participant or beneficiary) for economic and noneconomic damages in connection with such failure and such injury or death (subject to paragraph (4)).

''(B) WRONGFUL DETERMINATION RESULTING IN DELAY IN PROVIDING BENEFITS.—In any case in which—

''(i) a designated decision-maker described in paragraph (2) acts in bad faith in making a final determination denying a claim for benefits under section 503A(b);

''(ii) the denial described in clause (i) is reversed by an independent medical reviewer under section 503B(d); and

''(iii) the delay attributable to the failure described in clause (i) is the proximate cause of substantial harm to, or the wrongful death of, the participant or beneficiary;

such designated decision-maker shall be liable to the participant or beneficiary (or the estate of such participant or beneficiary) for economic and noneconomic damages in connection with such failure and such injury or death (subject to paragraph (4)).

''(2) DESIGNATED DECISION-MAKERS FOR PURPOSES OF LIABILITY.—An employer or plan sponsor shall not be liable under any cause of action described in paragraph (1) if the employer or plan sponsor complies with the following provisions:

''(A) APPOINTMENT.—A group health plan may designate one or more persons to serve as the designated decision-maker for purposes of paragraph (1). Such designated decision-makers shall have the exclusive authority under the group health plan (or under the health insurance coverage in the case of a health insurance issuer offering coverage in connection with a group health plan) to make determinations described in section 503A with respect to claims for benefits and determination to approve coverage pursuant to written determination of independent medical reviewers under section 503B, except that the plan documents may expressly provide that the designated decision-maker is subject to the direction of a named fiduciary.

''(B) PROCEDURES.—A designated decision-maker shall—

''(i) be a person who is named in the plan or coverage documents, or who, pursuant to procedures specified in the plan or coverage documents, is identified as the designated decision-maker by—

''(I) a person who is an employer or employee organization with respect to the plan or issuer;

''(II) a person who is such an employer and such an employee organization acting jointly; or

''(III) a person who is a named fiduciary;

''(ii) agree to accept appointment as a designated decision-maker; and

''(iii) be identified in the plan or coverage documents as required under section 714(b)(14).

''(C) QUALIFICATIONS.—To be appointed as a designated decision-maker under this paragraph, a person shall be—

''(i) a plan sponsor;

''(ii) a group health plan;

''(iii) a health insurance issuer; or

''(iv) any other person who can provide adequate evidence, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary, of the ability of the person to—

''(I) carry out the responsibilities set forth in the plan or coverage documents;

''(II) carry out the applicable requirements of this subsection; and

''(III) meet other applicable requirements under this Act, including any financial obligation for liability under this subsection.

''(D) FLEXIBILITY IN ADMINISTRATION.—A group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering coverage in connection with a group health plan, may provide—

''(i) that any person or group of persons may serve in more than one capacity with respect to the plan or coverage (including service as a designated decision-maker, administrator, and named fiduciary); or

''(ii) that a designated decision-maker may employ one or more persons to provide advice with respect to any responsibility of such decision-maker under the plan or coverage.

''(E) FAILURE TO DESIGNATE.—In any case in which a designated decision-maker is not appointed under this paragraph, the group health plan (or health insurance issuer offering coverage in connection with the group health plan), the administrator, or the party or parties that bears the sole responsibility for making the final determination under section 503A(b) (with respect to an internal review), or for approving coverage pursuant to the written determination of an independent medical reviewer under section 503B, with respect to a denial of a claim for benefits shall be treated as the designated decision-maker for purposes of liability under this section.

''(3) REQUIREMENT OF EXHAUSTION OF INDEPENDENT MEDICAL REVIEW.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only if a final determination denying a claim for benefits under section 503A(b) has been referred for independent medical review under section 503B(d) and a written determination by an independent medical reviewer to reverse such final determination has been issued with respect to such review.

''(4) LIMITATIONS ON RECOVERY OF DAMAGES.—

''(A) MAXIMUM AWARD OF NONECONOMIC DAMAGES.—The aggregate amount of liability for noneconomic loss in an action under paragraph (1) may not exceed $350,000.

''(B) INCREASE IN AMOUNT.—The amount referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be increased or decreased, for each calendar year that ends after December 31, 2001, by the same percentage as the percentage by which the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (United States city average), published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for September of the preceding calendar year has increased or decreased from the such Index for September of 2001.

''(C) JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY.—In the case of any action commenced pursuant to paragraph (1), the defendant shall be liable only for the amount of noneconomic damages attributable to such defendant in direct proportion to such defendant's share of fault or responsibility for the injury suffered by the participant or beneficiary. In all such cases, the liability of a defendant for noneconomic damages shall be several and not joint.

''(D) TREATMENT OF COLLATERAL SOURCE PAYMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any action commenced pursuant to paragraph (1), the total amount of damages received by a participant or beneficiary under such action shall be reduced, in accordance with clause (ii), by any other payment that has been, or will be, made to such participant or beneficiary to compensate such participant or beneficiary for the injury that was the subject of such action.

''(ii) AMOUNT OF REDUCTION.—The amount by which an award of damages to a participant or beneficiary for an injury shall be reduced under clause (i) shall be—

''(I) the total amount of any payments (other than such award) that have been made or that will be made to such participant or beneficiary to pay costs of or compensate such participant or beneficiary for the injury that was the subject of the action; less

''(II) the amount paid by such participant or beneficiary (or by the spouse, parent, or legal guardian of such participant or beneficiary) to secure the payments described in subclause (I).

''(iii) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNTS FROM COLLATERAL SOURCES.—The reduction required under clause (ii) shall be determined by the court in a pretrial proceeding. At the subsequent trial no evidence shall be admitted as to the amount of any charge, payments, or damage for which a participant or beneficiary—

''(I) has received payment from a collateral source or the obligation for which has been assured by a third party; or

''(II) is, or with reasonable certainty, will be eligible to receive from a collateral source which will, with reasonable certainty, be assumed by a third party.

''(5) AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES.—In the case of any cause of action under paragraph (1), it shall be an affirmative defense that—

''(A) the group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, involved did not receive from the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) or the treating health care professional (if any), sufficient information regarding the medical condition of the participant or beneficiary that was necessary to make a final determination on a claim for benefits under section 503A(b);

''(B) the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative)—

''(i) was in possession of facts that were sufficient to enable the participant or beneficiary (or authorized representative) to know that an expedited review under section 503A or 503B would have prevented the harm that is the subject of the action; and

''(ii) failed to notify the plan or issuer of the need for such an expedited review; or

''(C) the cause of action is based solely on the failure of a qualified external review entity or an independent medical reviewer to meet the timelines applicable under section 503B.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the application of any other affirmative defense that may be applicable to the cause of action involved.

''(6) WAIVER OF INTERNAL REVIEW.—In the case of any cause of action under paragraph (1), the waiver or nonwaiver of internal review under section 503A(b)(1)(D) by the group health plan, or health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall not be used in determining liability.

''(7) LIMITATIONS ON ACTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply in connection with any action that is commenced more than 1 year after—

''(A) the date on which the last act occurred which constituted a part of the failure referred to in such paragraph; or

''(B) in the case of an omission, the last date on which the decision-maker could have cured the failure.

''(8) LIMITATION ON RELIEF WHERE DEFENDANT'S POSITION PREVIOUSLY SUPPORTED UPON EXTERNAL REVIEW.—In any case in which the court finds the defendant to be liable in an action under this subsection, to the extent that such liability is based on a finding by the court of a particular failure described in paragraph (1) and such finding is contrary to a previous determination by an independent medical reviewer under section 503B(d) with respect to such defendant, no relief shall be available under this subsection in addition to the relief otherwise available under subsection (a)(1)(B).

''(9) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as authorizing a cause of action under paragraph (1) for—

''(A) the failure of a group health plan or health insurance issuer to provide an item or service that is specifically excluded under the plan or coverage; or

''(B) any denial of a claim for benefits that was not eligible for independent medical review under section 503B(d).

''(10) FEDERAL JURISDICTION.—In the case of any action commenced pursuant to paragraph (1) the district courts of the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction.

''(11) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE.—The term 'authorized representative' has the meaning given such term in section 503B(i).

''(B) CLAIM FOR BENEFITS.—The term 'claim for benefits' shall have the meaning given such term in section 503B(i), except that such term shall only include claims for prior authorization determinations (as such term is defined in section 503B(i)).

''(C) GROUP HEALTH PLAN.—The term 'group health plan' shall have the meaning given such term in section 733(a).

''(D) HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.—The term 'health insurance coverage' has the meaning given such term in section 733(b)(1).

''(E) HEALTH INSURANCE ISSUER.—The term 'health insurance issuer' has the meaning given such term in section 733(b)(2) (including health maintenance organizations as defined in section 733(b)(3)).

''(F) ORDINARY CARE.—The term 'ordinary care' means the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances prevailing at the time the care is provided that a prudent individual acting in a like capacity and familiar with the care being provided would use in providing care of a similar character.

''(G) SUBSTANTIAL HARM.—The term 'substantial harm' means the loss of life, loss or significant impairment of limb or bodily function, significant disfigurement, or severe and chronic physical pain.

''(12) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this subsection shall apply to acts and omissions occurring on or after the date of enactment of this subsection.''.

(b) IMMUNITY FROM LIABILITY FOR PROVISION OF INSURANCE OPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 502 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1132), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(o) IMMUNITY FROM LIABILITY FOR PROVISION OF INSURANCE OPTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No liability shall arise under subsection (n) with respect to a participant or beneficiary against a group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan) if such plan offers the participant or beneficiary the coverage option described in paragraph (2).

''(2) COVERAGE OPTION.—The coverage option described in this paragraph is one under which the group health plan (other than a fully insured group health plan), at the time of enrollment or as provided for in paragraph (3), provides the participant or beneficiary with the option to—

''(A) enroll for coverage under a fully insured health plan; or

''(B) receive an individual benefit payment, in an amount equal to the amount that would be contributed on behalf of the participant or beneficiary by the plan sponsor for enrollment in the group health plan, for use by the participant or beneficiary in obtaining health insurance coverage in the individual market.

''(3) TIME OF OFFERING OF OPTION.—The coverage option described in paragraph (2) shall be offered to a participant or beneficiary—

''(A) during the first period in which the individual is eligible to enroll under the group health plan; or

''(B) during any special enrollment period provided by the group health plan after the date of enactment of the Patients' Bill of Rights Plus Act for purposes of offering such coverage option.''.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.—

(A) EXCLUSION FROM INCOME.—Section 106 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to contributions by employer to accident and health plans) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN COVERAGE OPTION UNDER SELF-INSURED PLANS.—No amount shall be included in the gross income of an individual by reason of—

''(1) the individual's right to elect a coverage option described in section 502(o)(2) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, or

''(2) the receipt by the individual of an individual benefit payment described in section 502(o)(2)(A) of such Act.''

(B) NONDISCRIMINATION RULES.—Section 105(h) of such Code (relating to self-insured medical expense reimbursement plans) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(11) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN COVERAGE OPTIONS.—If a self-insured medical reimbursement plan offers the coverage option described in section 502(o)(2) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, employees who elect such option shall be treated as eligible to benefit under the plan and the plan shall be treated as benefiting such employees.''

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 502(a)(1)(A) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1132(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting ''or (n)'' after ''subsection (c)''.

SEC. 2232. LIMITATION ON CERTAIN CLASS ACTION LITIGATION.

(a) ERISA.—Section 502 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1132), as amended by section 2231, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(p) LIMITATION ON CLASS ACTION LITIGATION.—A claim or cause of action under section 502(n) may not be maintained as a class action.''.

(b) RICO.—Section 1964(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after the subsection designation; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) No action may be brought under this subsection, or alleging any violation of section 1962, against any person where the action seeks relief for which a remedy may be provided under section 502 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to all civil actions that are filed on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PENDING CIVIL ACTIONS.—Notwithstanding section 502(p) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and section 1964(c)(2) of title 18, United States Code, such sections 502(p) and 1964(c)(2) shall apply to civil actions that are pending and have not been finally determined by judgment or settlement prior to the date of enactment of this Act if such actions are substantially similar in nature to the claims or causes of actions referred to in such sections 502(p) and 1964(c)(2).

SEC. 2233. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this subtitle, an amendment made by this subtitle, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this subtitle, the amendments made by this subtitle, and the application of the provisions of such to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE XXIII—WOMEN'S HEALTH AND CANCER RIGHTS

SEC. 2301. WOMEN'S HEALTH AND CANCER RIGHTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Women's Health and Cancer Rights Act of 2000''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the offering and operation of health plans affect commerce among the States;

(2) health care providers located in a State serve patients who reside in the State and patients who reside in other States; and

(3) in order to provide for uniform treatment of health care providers and patients among the States, it is necessary to cover health plans operating in 1 State as well as health plans operating among the several States.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart B of part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended by section 2211(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 715. REQUIRED COVERAGE FOR MINIMUM HOSPITAL STAY FOR MASTECTOMIES AND LYMPH NODE DISSECTIONS FOR THE TREATMENT OF BREAST CANCER AND COVERAGE FOR SECONDARY CONSULTATIONS.

''(a) INPATIENT CARE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan, and a health insurance issuer providing health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, that provides medical and surgical benefits shall ensure that inpatient coverage with respect to the treatment of breast cancer is provided for a period of time as is determined by the attending physician, in consultation with the patient, to be medically necessary and appropriate following—

''(A) a mastectomy;

''(B) a lumpectomy; or

''(C) a lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring the provision of inpatient coverage if the attending physician and patient determine that a shorter period of hospital stay is medically appropriate.

''(b) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN MODIFICATIONS.—In implementing the requirements of this section, a group health plan, and a health insurance issuer providing health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, may not modify the terms and conditions of coverage based on the determination by a participant or beneficiary to request less than the minimum coverage required under subsection (a).

''(c) NOTICE.—A group health plan, and a health insurance issuer providing health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan shall provide notice to each participant and beneficiary under such plan regarding the coverage required by this section in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary. Such notice shall be in writing and prominently positioned in any literature or correspondence made available or distributed by the plan or issuer and shall be transmitted—

''(1) in the next mailing made by the plan or issuer to the participant or beneficiary;

''(2) as part of any yearly informational packet sent to the participant or beneficiary; or

''(3) not later than January 1, 2001;

whichever is earlier.

''(d) SECONDARY CONSULTATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan, and a health insurance issuer providing health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, that provides coverage with respect to medical and surgical services provided in relation to the diagnosis and treatment of cancer shall ensure that full coverage is provided for secondary consultations by specialists in the appropriate medical fields (including pathology, radiology, and oncology) to confirm or refute such diagnosis. Such plan or issuer shall ensure that full coverage is provided for such secondary consultation whether such consultation is based on a positive or negative initial diagnosis. In any case in which the attending physician certifies in writing that services necessary for such a secondary consultation are not sufficiently available from specialists operating under the plan with respect to whose services coverage is otherwise provided under such plan or by such issuer, such plan or issuer shall ensure that coverage is provided with respect to the services necessary for the secondary consultation with any other specialist selected by the attending physician for such purpose at no additional cost to the individual beyond that which the individual would have paid if the specialist was participating in the network of the plan.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed as requiring the provision of secondary consultations where the patient determines not to seek such a consultation.

''(e) PROHIBITION ON PENALTIES OR INCENTIVES.—A group health plan, and a health insurance issuer providing health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, may not—

''(1) penalize or otherwise reduce or limit the reimbursement of a provider or specialist because the provider or specialist provided care to a participant or beneficiary in accordance with this section;

''(2) provide financial or other incentives to a physician or specialist to induce the physician or specialist to keep the length of inpatient stays of patients following a mastectomy, lumpectomy, or a lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer below certain limits or to limit referrals for secondary consultations; or

''(3) provide financial or other incentives to a physician or specialist to induce the physician or specialist to refrain from referring a participant or beneficiary for a secondary consultation that would otherwise be covered by the plan or coverage involved under subsection (d).''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 714 the following new item:

''Sec. 715. Required coverage for minimum hospital stay for mastectomies and lymph node dissections for the treatment of breast cancer and coverage for secondary consultations.''.

(d) AMENDMENTS TO PHSA RELATING TO THE GROUP MARKET.—Subpart 2 of part A of title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–4 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 2707. REQUIRED COVERAGE FOR MINIMUM HOSPITAL STAY FOR MASTECTOMIES AND LYMPH NODE DISSECTIONS FOR THE TREATMENT OF BREAST CANCER AND COVERAGE FOR SECONDARY CONSULTATIONS.

''(a) INPATIENT CARE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan, and a health insurance issuer providing health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, that provides medical and surgical benefits shall ensure that inpatient coverage with respect to the treatment of breast cancer is provided for a period of time as is determined by the attending physician, in consultation with the patient, to be medically necessary and appropriate following—

''(A) a mastectomy;

''(B) a lumpectomy; or

''(C) a lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring the provision of inpatient coverage if the attending physician and patient determine that a shorter period of hospital stay is medically appropriate.

''(b) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN MODIFICATIONS.—In implementing the requirements of this section, a group health plan, and a health insurance issuer providing health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, may not modify the terms and conditions of coverage based on the determination by a participant or beneficiary to request less than the minimum coverage required under subsection (a).

''(c) NOTICE.—A group health plan, and a health insurance issuer providing health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan shall provide notice to each participant and beneficiary under such plan regarding the coverage required by this section in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary. Such notice shall be in writing and prominently positioned in any literature or correspondence made available or distributed by the plan or issuer and shall be transmitted—

''(1) in the next mailing made by the plan or issuer to the participant or beneficiary;

''(2) as part of any yearly informational packet sent to the participant or beneficiary; or

''(3) not later than January 1, 2001;

whichever is earlier.

''(d) SECONDARY CONSULTATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan, and a health insurance issuer providing health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan that provides coverage with respect to medical and surgical services provided in relation to the diagnosis and treatment of cancer shall ensure that full coverage is provided for secondary consultations by specialists in the appropriate medical fields (including pathology, radiology, and oncology) to confirm or refute such diagnosis. Such plan or issuer shall ensure that full coverage is provided for such secondary consultation whether such consultation is based on a positive or negative initial diagnosis. In any case in which the attending physician certifies in writing that services necessary for such a secondary consultation are not sufficiently available from specialists operating under the plan with respect to whose services coverage is otherwise provided under such plan or by such issuer, such plan or issuer shall ensure that coverage is provided with respect to the services necessary for the secondary consultation with any other specialist selected by the attending physician for such purpose at no additional cost to the individual beyond that which the individual would have paid if the specialist was participating in the network of the plan.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed as requiring the provision of secondary consultations where the patient determines not to seek such a consultation.

''(e) PROHIBITION ON PENALTIES OR INCENTIVES.—A group health plan, and a health insurance issuer providing health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, may not—

''(1) penalize or otherwise reduce or limit the reimbursement of a provider or specialist because the provider or specialist provided care to a participant or beneficiary in accordance with this section;

''(2) provide financial or other incentives to a physician or specialist to induce the physician or specialist to keep the length of inpatient stays of patients following a mastectomy, lumpectomy, or a lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer below certain limits or to limit referrals for secondary consultations; or

''(3) provide financial or other incentives to a physician or specialist to induce the physician or specialist to refrain from referring a participant or beneficiary for a secondary consultation that would otherwise be covered by the plan or coverage involved under subsection (d).''.

(e) AMENDMENTS TO PHSA RELATING TO THE INDIVIDUAL MARKET.—The first subpart 3 of part B of title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–51 et seq.) (relating to other requirements) (42 U.S.C. 300gg–51 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating such subpart as subpart 2; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 2753. REQUIRED COVERAGE FOR MINIMUM HOSPITAL STAY FOR MASTECTOMIES AND LYMPH NODE DISSECTIONS FOR THE TREATMENT OF BREAST CANCER AND SECONDARY CONSULTATIONS.

''The provisions of section 2707 shall apply to health insurance coverage offered by a health insurance issuer in the individual market in the same manner as they apply to health insurance coverage offered by a health insurance issuer in connection with a group health plan in the small or large group market.''.

(f) AMENDMENTS TO THE IRC.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter B of chapter 100 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 2202, is further amended by inserting after section 9813 the following:

''SEC. 9814. REQUIRED COVERAGE FOR MINIMUM HOSPITAL STAY FOR MASTECTOMIES AND LYMPH NODE DISSECTIONS FOR THE TREATMENT OF BREAST CANCER AND COVERAGE FOR SECONDARY CONSULTATIONS.

''(a) INPATIENT CARE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan that provides medical and surgical benefits shall ensure that inpatient coverage with respect to the treatment of breast cancer is provided for a period of time as is determined by the attending physician, in consultation with the patient, to be medically necessary and appropriate following—

''(A) a mastectomy;

''(B) a lumpectomy; or

''(C) a lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring the provision of inpatient coverage if the attending physician and patient determine that a shorter period of hospital stay is medically appropriate.

''(b) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN MODIFICATIONS.—In implementing the requirements of this section, a group health plan may not modify the terms and conditions of coverage based on the determination by a participant or beneficiary to request less than the minimum coverage required under subsection (a).

''(c) NOTICE.—A group health plan shall provide notice to each participant and beneficiary under such plan regarding the coverage required by this section in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary. Such notice shall be in writing and prominently positioned in any literature or correspondence made available or distributed by the plan and shall be transmitted—

''(1) in the next mailing made by the plan to the participant or beneficiary;

''(2) as part of any yearly informational packet sent to the participant or beneficiary; or

''(3) not later than January 1, 2000;

whichever is earlier.

''(d) SECONDARY CONSULTATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A group health plan that provides coverage with respect to medical and surgical services provided in relation to the diagnosis and treatment of cancer shall ensure that full coverage is provided for secondary consultations by specialists in the appropriate medical fields (including pathology, radiology, and oncology) to confirm or refute such diagnosis. Such plan or issuer shall ensure that full coverage is provided for such secondary consultation whether such consultation is based on a positive or negative initial diagnosis. In any case in which the attending physician certifies in writing that services necessary for such a secondary consultation are not sufficiently available from specialists operating under the plan with respect to whose services coverage is otherwise provided under such plan or by such issuer, such plan or issuer shall ensure that coverage is provided with respect to the services necessary for the secondary consultation with any other specialist selected by the attending physician for such purpose at no additional cost to the individual beyond that which the individual would have paid if the specialist was participating in the network of the plan.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed as requiring the provision of secondary consultations where the patient determines not to seek such a consultation.

''(e) PROHIBITION ON PENALTIES.—A group health plan may not—

''(1) penalize or otherwise reduce or limit the reimbursement of a provider or specialist because the provider or specialist provided care to a participant or beneficiary in accordance with this section;

''(2) provide financial or other incentives to a physician or specialist to induce the physician or specialist to keep the length of inpatient stays of patients following a mastectomy, lumpectomy, or a lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer below certain limits or to limit referrals for secondary consultations; or

''(3) provide financial or other incentives to a physician or specialist to induce the physician or specialist to refrain from referring a participant or beneficiary for a secondary consultation that would otherwise be covered by the plan involved under subsection (d).''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for chapter 100 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 9813 the following new item:

''Sec. 9814. Required coverage for minimum hospital stay for mastectomies and lymph node dissections for the treatment of breast cancer and coverage for secondary consultations.''.

TITLE XXIV—GENETIC INFORMATION AND SERVICES

SEC. 2401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Genetic Information Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2402. AMENDMENTS TO EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.

(a) PROHIBITION OF HEALTH DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF GENETIC INFORMATION OR GENETIC SERVICES.—

(1) NO ENROLLMENT RESTRICTION FOR GENETIC SERVICES.—Section 702(a)(1)(F) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1182(a)(1)(F)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: ''(including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services)''.

(2) NO DISCRIMINATION IN GROUP PREMIUMS BASED ON PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Subpart B of part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended by section 2301(c), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 716. PROHIBITING PREMIUM DISCRIMINATION AGAINST GROUPS ON THE BASIS OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.

''A group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering group health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall not adjust premium or contribution amounts for a group on the basis of predictive genetic information concerning any individual (including a dependent) or family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 702(b) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1182(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) REFERENCE TO RELATED PROVISION.—For a provision prohibiting the adjustment of premium or contribution amounts for a group under a group health plan on the basis of predictive genetic information (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services), see section 716.''.

(B) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended by section 2301, is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 715 the following new item:

''Sec. 716. Prohibiting premium discrimination against groups on the basis of predictive genetic information.''.

(b) LIMITATION ON COLLECTION OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Section 702 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1182) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) COLLECTION OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) LIMITATION ON REQUESTING OR REQUIRING PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall not request or require predictive genetic information concerning any individual (including a dependent) or family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(2) INFORMATION NEEDED FOR DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT, OR PAYMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, that provides health care items and services to an individual or dependent may request (but may not require) that such individual or dependent disclose, or authorize the collection or disclosure of, predictive genetic information for purposes of diagnosis, treatment, or payment relating to the provision of health care items and services to such individual or dependent.

''(B) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES AND DESCRIPTION OF SAFEGUARDS.—As a part of a request under subparagraph (A), the group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall provide to the individual or dependent a description of the procedures in place to safeguard the confidentiality, as described in subsection (d), of such predictive genetic information.

''(d) CONFIDENTIALITY WITH RESPECT TO PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES.—

''(A) PREPARATION OF WRITTEN NOTICE.—A group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall post or provide, in writing and in a clear and conspicuous manner, notice of the plan or issuer's confidentiality practices, that shall include—

''(i) a description of an individual's rights with respect to predictive genetic information;

''(ii) the procedures established by the plan or issuer for the exercise of the individual's rights; and

''(iii) the right to obtain a copy of the notice of the confidentiality practices required under this subsection.

''(B) MODEL NOTICE.—The Secretary, in consultation with the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and after notice and opportunity for public comment, shall develop and disseminate model notices of confidentiality practices. Use of the model notice shall serve as a defense against claims of receiving inappropriate notice.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF SAFEGUARDS.—A group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall establish and maintain appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to protect the confidentiality, security, accuracy, and integrity of predictive genetic information created, received, obtained, maintained, used, transmitted, or disposed of by such plan or issuer.''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 733(d) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1191b(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) FAMILY MEMBER.—The term 'family member' means with respect to an individual—

''(A) the spouse of the individual;

''(B) a dependent child of the individual, including a child who is born to or placed for adoption with the individual; and

''(C) all other individuals related by blood to the individual or the spouse or child described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(6) GENETIC INFORMATION.—The term 'genetic information' means information about genes, gene products, or inherited characteristics that may derive from an individual or a family member (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(7) GENETIC SERVICES.—The term 'genetic services' means health services provided to obtain, assess, or interpret genetic information for diagnostic and therapeutic purposes, and for genetic education and counseling.

''(8) PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'predictive genetic information' means, in the absence of symptoms, clinical signs, or a diagnosis of the condition related to such information—

''(i) information about an individual's genetic tests;

''(ii) information about genetic tests of family members of the individual; or

''(iii) information about the occurrence of a disease or disorder in family members.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term 'predictive genetic information' shall not include—

''(i) information about the sex or age of the individual;

''(ii) information derived from physical tests, such as the chemical, blood, or urine analyses of the individual including cholesterol tests; and

''(iii) information about physical exams of the individual.

''(9) GENETIC TEST.—The term 'genetic test' means the analysis of human DNA, RNA, chromosomes, proteins, and certain metabolites, including analysis of genotypes, mutations, phenotypes, or karyotypes, for the purpose of predicting risk of disease in asymptomatic or undiagnosed individuals. Such term does not include physical tests, such as the chemical, blood, or urine analyses of the individual including cholesterol tests, and physical exams of the individual, in order to detect symptoms, clinical signs, or a diagnosis of disease.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in this section, this section and the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to group health plans for plan years beginning 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2403. AMENDMENTS TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE GROUP MARKET.—

(1) PROHIBITION OF HEALTH DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF GENETIC INFORMATION IN THE GROUP MARKET.—

(A) NO ENROLLMENT RESTRICTION FOR GENETIC SERVICES.—Section 2702(a)(1)(F) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–1(a)(1)(F)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: ''(including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services)''.

(B) NO DISCRIMINATION IN PREMIUMS BASED ON PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Subpart 2 of part A of title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–4 et seq.), as amended by section 2301(d), is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 2708. PROHIBITING PREMIUM DISCRIMINATION AGAINST GROUPS ON THE BASIS OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION IN THE GROUP MARKET.

''A group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering group health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan shall not adjust premium or contribution amounts for a group on the basis of predictive genetic information concerning any individual (including a dependent) or family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).''.

(C) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2702(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–1(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) REFERENCE TO RELATED PROVISION.—For a provision prohibiting the adjustment of premium or contribution amounts for a group under a group health plan on the basis of predictive genetic information (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services), see section 2708.''.

(D) LIMITATION ON COLLECTION AND DISCLOSURE OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Section 2702 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) COLLECTION OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) LIMITATION ON REQUESTING OR REQUIRING PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall not request or require predictive genetic information concerning any individual (including a dependent) or a family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(2) INFORMATION NEEDED FOR DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT, OR PAYMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, that provides health care items and services to an individual or dependent may request (but may not require) that such individual or dependent disclose, or authorize the collection or disclosure of, predictive genetic information for purposes of diagnosis, treatment, or payment relating to the provision of health care items and services to such individual or dependent.

''(B) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES AND DESCRIPTION OF SAFEGUARDS.—As a part of a request under subparagraph (A), the group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall provide to the individual or dependent a description of the procedures in place to safeguard the confidentiality, as described in subsection (d), of such predictive genetic information.

''(d) CONFIDENTIALITY WITH RESPECT TO PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES.—

''(A) PREPARATION OF WRITTEN NOTICE.—A group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall post or provide, in writing and in a clear and conspicuous manner, notice of the plan or issuer's confidentiality practices, that shall include—

''(i) a description of an individual's rights with respect to predictive genetic information;

''(ii) the procedures established by the plan or issuer for the exercise of the individual's rights; and

''(iii) the right to obtain a copy of the notice of the confidentiality practices required under this subsection.

''(B) MODEL NOTICE.—The Secretary, in consultation with the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and after notice and opportunity for public comment, shall develop and disseminate model notices of confidentiality practices. Use of the model notice shall serve as a defense against claims of receiving inappropriate notice.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF SAFEGUARDS.—A group health plan, or a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in connection with a group health plan, shall establish and maintain appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to protect the confidentiality, security, accuracy, and integrity of predictive genetic information created, received, obtained, maintained, used, transmitted, or disposed of by such plan or issuer.''.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2791(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–91(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(15) FAMILY MEMBER.—The term 'family member' means, with respect to an individual—

''(A) the spouse of the individual;

''(B) a dependent child of the individual, including a child who is born to or placed for adoption with the individual; and

''(C) all other individuals related by blood to the individual or the spouse or child described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(16) GENETIC INFORMATION.—The term 'genetic information' means information about genes, gene products, or inherited characteristics that may derive from an individual or a family member (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(17) GENETIC SERVICES.—The term 'genetic services' means health services provided to obtain, assess, or interpret genetic information for diagnostic and therapeutic purposes, and for genetic education and counseling.

''(18) PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'predictive genetic information' means, in the absence of symptoms, clinical signs, or a diagnosis of the condition related to such information—

''(i) information about an individual's genetic tests;

''(ii) information about genetic tests of family members of the individual; or

''(iii) information about the occurrence of a disease or disorder in family members.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term 'predictive genetic information' shall not include—

''(i) information about the sex or age of the individual;

''(ii) information derived from physical tests, such as the chemical, blood, or urine analyses of the individual including cholesterol tests; and

''(iii) information about physical exams of the individual.

''(19) GENETIC TEST.—The term 'genetic test' means the analysis of human DNA, RNA, chromosomes, proteins, and certain metabolites, including analysis of genotypes, mutations, phenotypes, or karyotypes, for the purpose of predicting risk of disease in asymptomatic or undiagnosed individuals. Such term does not include physical tests, such as the chemical, blood, or urine analyses of the individual including cholesterol tests, and physical exams of the individual, in order to detect symptoms, clinical signs, or a diagnosis of disease.''.

(e) AMENDMENTS TO PHSA RELATING TO THE INDIVIDUAL MARKET.—The first subpart 3 of part B of title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–51 et seq.) (relating to other requirements) (42 U.S.C. 300gg–51 et seq.), as amended by section 2301(e), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 2754. PROHIBITION OF HEALTH DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.

''(a) PROHIBITION ON PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION AS A CONDITION OF ELIGIBILITY.—A health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in the individual market may not use predictive genetic information as a condition of eligibility of an individual to enroll in individual health insurance coverage (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(b) PROHIBITION ON PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION IN SETTING PREMIUM RATES.—A health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in the individual market shall not adjust premium rates for individuals on the basis of predictive genetic information concerning such an individual (including a dependent) or a family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(c) COLLECTION OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) LIMITATION ON REQUESTING OR REQUIRING PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in the individual market shall not request or require predictive genetic information concerning any individual (including a dependent) or a family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(2) INFORMATION NEEDED FOR DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT, OR PAYMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in the individual market that provides health care items and services to an individual or dependent may request (but may not require) that such individual or dependent disclose, or authorize the collection or disclosure of, predictive genetic information for purposes of diagnosis, treatment, or payment relating to the provision of health care items and services to such individual or dependent.

''(B) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES AND DESCRIPTION OF SAFEGUARDS.—As a part of a request under subparagraph (A), the health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in the individual market shall provide to the individual or dependent a description of the procedures in place to safeguard the confidentiality, as described in subsection (d), of such predictive genetic information.

''(d) CONFIDENTIALITY WITH RESPECT TO PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES.—

''(A) PREPARATION OF WRITTEN NOTICE.—A health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in the individual market shall post or provide, in writing and in a clear and conspicuous manner, notice of the issuer's confidentiality practices, that shall include—

''(i) a description of an individual's rights with respect to predictive genetic information;

''(ii) the procedures established by the issuer for the exercise of the individual's rights; and

''(iii) the right to obtain a copy of the notice of the confidentiality practices required under this subsection.

''(B) MODEL NOTICE.—The Secretary, in consultation with the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and after notice and opportunity for public comment, shall develop and disseminate model notices of confidentiality practices. Use of the model notice shall serve as a defense against claims of receiving inappropriate notice.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF SAFEGUARDS.—A health insurance issuer offering health insurance coverage in the individual market shall establish and maintain appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to protect the confidentiality, security, accuracy, and integrity of predictive genetic information created, received, obtained, maintained, used, transmitted, or disposed of by such issuer.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to—

(1) group health plans, and health insurance coverage offered in connection with group health plans, for plan years beginning after 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) health insurance coverage offered, sold, issued, renewed, in effect, or operated in the individual market after 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2404. AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.

(a) PROHIBITION OF HEALTH DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF GENETIC INFORMATION OR GENETIC SERVICES.—

(1) NO ENROLLMENT RESTRICTION FOR GENETIC SERVICES.—Section 9802(a)(1)(F) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting before the period the following: ''(including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services)''.

(2) NO DISCRIMINATION IN GROUP PREMIUMS BASED ON PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter B of chapter 100 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 2301(f), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 9815. PROHIBITING PREMIUM DISCRIMINATION AGAINST GROUPS ON THE BASIS OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.

''A group health plan shall not adjust premium or contribution amounts for a group on the basis of predictive genetic information concerning any individual (including a dependent)

or a family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9802(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) REFERENCE TO RELATED PROVISION.—For a provision prohibiting the adjustment of premium or contribution amounts for a group under a group health plan on the basis of predictive genetic information (including information about a request for or the receipt of genetic services), see section 9815.''.

(C) AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 100 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 2301(f), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''Sec. 9815. Prohibiting premium discrimination against groups on the basis of predictive genetic information.''.

(b) LIMITATION ON COLLECTION OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Section 9802 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) COLLECTION OF PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) LIMITATION ON REQUESTING OR REQUIRING PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a group health plan shall not request or require predictive genetic information concerning any individual (including a dependent) or a family member of the individual (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(2) INFORMATION NEEDED FOR DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT, OR PAYMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a group health plan that provides health care items and services to an individual or dependent may request (but may not require) that such individual or dependent disclose, or authorize the collection or disclosure of, predictive genetic information for purposes of diagnosis, treatment, or payment relating to the provision of health care items and services to such individual or dependent.

''(B) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES; DESCRIPTION OF SAFEGUARDS.—As a part of a request under subparagraph (A), the group health plan shall provide to the individual or dependent a description of the procedures in place to safeguard the confidentiality, as described in subsection (e), of such predictive genetic information.

''(e) CONFIDENTIALITY WITH RESPECT TO PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(1) NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY PRACTICES.—

''(A) PREPARATION OF WRITTEN NOTICE.—A group health plan shall post or provide, in writing and in a clear and conspicuous manner, notice of the plan's confidentiality practices, that shall include—

''(i) a description of an individual's rights with respect to predictive genetic information;

''(ii) the procedures established by the plan for the exercise of the individual's rights; and

''(iii) the right to obtain a copy of the notice of the confidentiality practices required under this subsection.

''(B) MODEL NOTICE.—The Secretary, in consultation with the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics and the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and after notice and opportunity for public comment, shall develop and disseminate model notices of confidentiality practices. Use of the model notice shall serve as a defense against claims of receiving inappropriate notice.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF SAFEGUARDS.—A group health plan shall establish and maintain appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to protect the confidentiality, security, accuracy, and integrity of predictive genetic information created, received, obtained, maintained, used, transmitted, or disposed of by such plan.''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 9832(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) FAMILY MEMBER.—The term 'family member' means, with respect to an individual—

''(A) the spouse of the individual;

''(B) a dependent child of the individual, including a child who is born to or placed for adoption with the individual; and

''(C) all other individuals related by blood to the individual or the spouse or child described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(7) GENETIC INFORMATION.—The term 'genetic information' means information about genes, gene products, or inherited characteristics that may derive from an individual or a family member (including information about a request for or receipt of genetic services).

''(8) GENETIC SERVICES.—The term 'genetic services' means health services provided to obtain, assess, or interpret genetic information for diagnostic and therapeutic purposes, and for genetic education and counseling.

''(9) PREDICTIVE GENETIC INFORMATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'predictive genetic information' means, in the absence of symptoms, clinical signs, or a diagnosis of the condition related to such information—

''(i) information about an individual's genetic tests;

''(ii) information about genetic tests of family members of the individual; or

''(iii) information about the occurrence of a disease or disorder in family members.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term 'predictive genetic information' shall not include—

''(i) information about the sex or age of the individual;

''(ii) information derived from physical tests, such as the chemical, blood, or urine analyses of the individual including cholesterol tests; and

''(iii) information about physical exams of the individual.

''(10) GENETIC TEST.—The term 'genetic test' means the analysis of human DNA, RNA, chromosomes, proteins, and certain metabolites, including analysis of genotypes, mutations, phenotypes, or karyotypes, for the purpose of predicting risk of disease in asymptomatic or undiagnosed individuals. Such term does not include physical tests, such as the chemical, blood, or urine analyses of the individual including cholesterol tests, and physical exams of the individual, in order to detect symptoms, clinical signs, or a diagnosis of disease.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in this section, this section and the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to group health plans for plan years beginning after 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE XXV—PATIENT SAFETY AND ERRORS REDUCTION

SEC. 2501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Patient Safety and Errors Reduction Act''.

SEC. 2502. PURPOSES.

It is the purpose of this title to—

(1) promote the identification, evaluation, and reporting of medical errors;

(2) raise standards and expectations for improvements in patient safety;

(3) reduce deaths, serious injuries, and other medical errors through the implementation of safe practices at the delivery level;

(4) develop error reduction systems with legal protections to support the collection of information under such systems;

(5) extend existing confidentiality and peer review protections to the reports relating to medical errors that are reported under such systems that are developed for safety and quality improvement purposes; and

(6) provide for the establishment of systems of information collection, analysis, and dissemination to enhance the knowledge base concerning patient safety.

SEC. 2503. AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT.

Title IX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 299 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating part C as part D;

(2) by redesignating sections 921 through 928, as sections 931 through 938, respectively;

(3) in section 938(1) (as so redesignated), by striking ''921'' and inserting ''931''; and

(4) by inserting after part B the following:

''PART C—REDUCING ERRORS IN HEALTH CARE

''SEC. 921. DEFINITIONS.

''In this part:

''(1) ADVERSE EVENT.—The term 'adverse event' means, with respect to the patient of a provider of services, an untoward incident, therapeutic misadventure, or iatrogenic injury directly associated with the provision of health care items and services by a health care provider or provider of services.

''(2) CENTER.—The term 'Center' means the Center for Quality Improvement and Patient Safety established under section 922(b).

''(3) CLOSE CALL.—The term 'close call' means, with respect to the patient of a provider of services, any event or situation that—

''(A) but for chance or a timely intervention, could have resulted in an accident, injury, or illness; and

''(B) is directly associated with the provision of health care items and services by a provider of services.

''(4) EXPERT ORGANIZATION.—The term 'expert organization' means a third party acting on behalf of, or in conjunction with, a provider of services to collect information about, or evaluate, a medical event.

''(5) HEALTH CARE OVERSIGHT AGENCY.—The term 'health care oversight agency' means an agency, entity, or person, including the employees and agents thereof, that performs or oversees the performance of any activities necessary to ensure the safety of the health care system.

''(6) HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.—The term 'health care provider' means—

''(A) any provider of services (as defined in section 1861(u) of the Social Security Act); and

''(B) any person furnishing any medical or other health care services as defined in section 1861(s)(1) and (2) of such Act through, or under the authority of, a provider of services described in subparagraph (A).

''(7) PROVIDER OF SERVICES.—The term 'provider of services' means a hospital, skilled nursing facility, comprehensive outpatient rehabilitation facility, home health agency, renal dialysis facility, ambulatory surgical center, or hospice program, and any other entity specified in regulations promulgated by the Secretary after public notice and comment.

''(8) PUBLIC HEALTH AUTHORITY.—The term 'public health authority' means an agency or authority of the United States, a State, a territory, a political subdivision of a State or territory, and an Indian tribe that is responsible for public health matters as part of its official mandate.

''(9) MEDICAL EVENT.—The term 'medical event' means, with respect to the patient of a provider of services, any sentinel event, adverse event, or close call.

''(10) MEDICAL EVENT ANALYSIS ENTITY.—The term 'medical event analysis entity' means an entity certified under section 923(a).

''(11) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'root cause analysis' means a process for identifying the basic or contributing causal factors that underlie variation in performance associated with medical events that—

''(i) has the characteristics described in subparagraph (B);

''(ii) includes participation by the leadership of the provider of services and individuals most closely involved in the processes and systems under review;

''(iii) is internally consistent; and

''(iv) includes the consideration of relevant literature.

''(B) CHARACTERISTICS.—The characteristics described in this subparagraph include the following:

''(i) The analysis is interdisciplinary in nature and involves those individuals who are responsible for administering the reporting systems.

''(ii) The analysis focuses primarily on systems and processes rather than individual performance.

''(iii) The analysis involves a thorough review of all aspects of the process and all contributing factors involved.

''(iv) The analysis identifies changes that could be made in systems and processes, through either redesign or development of new processes or systems, that would improve performance and reduce the risk of medical events.

''(12) SENTINEL EVENT.—The term 'sentinel event' means, with respect to the patient of a provider of services, an unexpected occurrence that—

''(A) involves death or serious physical or psychological injury (including loss of a limb); and

''(B) is directly associated with the provision of health care items and services by a health care provider or provider of services.

''SEC. 922. RESEARCH TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY AND SAFETY OF PATIENT CARE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To improve the quality and safety of patient care, the Director shall—

''(1) conduct and support research, evaluations and training, support demonstration projects, provide technical assistance, and develop and support partnerships that will identify and determine the causes of medical errors and other threats to the quality and safety of patient care;

''(2) identify and evaluate interventions and strategies for preventing or reducing medical errors and threats to the quality and safety of patient care;

''(3) identify, in collaboration with experts from the public and private sector, reporting parameters to provide consistency throughout the errors reporting system;

''(4) identify approaches for the clinical management of complications from medical errors; and

''(5) establish mechanisms for the rapid dissemination of interventions and strategies identified under this section for which there is scientific evidence of effectiveness.

''(b) CENTER FOR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND PATIENT SAFETY.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director shall establish a center to be known as the Center for Quality Improvement and Patient Safety to assist the Director in carrying out the requirements of subsection (a).

''(2) MISSION.—The Center shall—

''(A) provide national leadership for research and other initiatives to improve the quality and safety of patient care;

''(B) build public-private sector partnerships to improve the quality and safety of patient care; and

''(C) serve as a national resource for research and learning from medical errors.

''(3) DUTIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out this section, the Director, acting through the Center, shall consult and build partnerships, as appropriate, with all segments of the health care industry, including health care practitioners and patients, those who manage health care facilities, systems and plans, peer review organizations, health care purchasers and policymakers, and other users of health care research.

''(B) REQUIRED DUTIES.—In addition to the broad responsibilities that the Director may assign to the Center for research and related activities that are designed to improve the quality of health care, the Director shall ensure that the Center—

''(i) builds scientific knowledge and understanding of the causes of medical errors in all health care settings and identifies or develops and validates effective interventions and strategies to reduce errors and improve the safety and quality of patient care;

''(ii) promotes public and private sector research on patient safety by—

''(I) developing a national patient safety research agenda;

''(II) identifying promising opportunities for preventing or reducing medical errors; and

''(III) tracking the progress made in addressing the highest priority research questions with respect to patient safety;

''(iii) facilitates the development of voluntary national patient safety goals by convening all segments of the health care industry and tracks the progress made in meeting those goals;

''(iv) analyzes national patient safety data for inclusion in the annual report on the quality of health care required under section 913(b)(2);

''(v) strengthens the ability of the United States to learn from medical errors by—

''(I) developing the necessary tools and advancing the scientific techniques for analysis of errors;

''(II) providing technical assistance as appropriate to reporting systems; and

''(III) entering into contracts to receive and analyze aggregate data from public and private sector reporting systems;

''(vi) supports dissemination and communication activities to improve patient safety, including the development of tools and methods for educating consumers about patient safety; and

''(vii) undertakes related activities that the Director determines are necessary to enable the Center to fulfill its mission.

''(C) LIMITATION.—Aggregate data gathered for the purposes described in this section shall not include specific patient, health care provider, or provider of service identifiers.

''(c) LEARNING FROM MEDICAL ERRORS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—To enhance the ability of the health care community in the United States to learn from medical events, the Director shall—

''(A) carry out activities to increase scientific knowledge and understanding regarding medical error reporting systems;

''(B) carry out activities to advance the scientific knowledge regarding the tools and techniques for analyzing medical events and determining their root causes;

''(C) carry out activities in partnership with experts in the field to increase the capacity of the health care community in the United States to analyze patient safety data;

''(D) develop a confidential national safety database of medical event reports;

''(E) conduct and support research, using the database developed under subparagraph (D), into the causes and potential interventions to decrease the incidence of medical errors and close calls; and

''(F) ensure that information contained in the national database developed under subparagraph (D) does not include specific patient, health care provider, or provider of service identifiers.

''(2) NATIONAL PATIENT SAFETY DATABASE.—The Director shall, in accordance with paragraph (1)(D), establish a confidential national safety database (to be known as the National Patient Safety Database) of reports of medical events that can be used only for research to improve the quality and safety of patient care. In developing and managing the National Patient Safety Database, the Director shall—

''(A) ensure that the database is only used for its intended purpose;

''(B) ensure that the database is only used by the Agency, medical event analysis entities, and other qualified entities or individuals as determined appropriate by the Director and in accordance with paragraph (3) or other criteria applied by the Director;

''(C) ensure that the database is as comprehensive as possible by aggregating data from Federal, State, and private sector patient safety reporting systems;

''(D) conduct and support research on the most common medical errors and close calls, their causes, and potential interventions to reduce medical errors and improve the quality and safety of patient care;

''(E) disseminate findings made by the Director, based on the data in the database, to clinicians, individuals who manage health care facilities, systems, and plans, patients, and other individuals who can act appropriately to improve patient safety; and

''(F) develop a rapid response capacity to provide alerts when specific health care practices pose an imminent threat to patients or health care practitioners, or other providers of health care items or services.

''(3) CONFIDENTIALITY AND PEER REVIEW PROTECTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law any information (including any data, reports, records, memoranda, analyses, statements, and other communications) developed by or on behalf of a health care provider or provider of services with respect to a medical event, that is contained in the National Patient Safety Database shall be confidential in accordance with section 925.

''(4) PATIENT SAFETY REPORTING SYSTEMS.—The Director shall identify public and private sector patient safety reporting systems and build scientific knowledge and understanding regarding the most effective—

''(A) components of patient safety reporting systems;

''(B) incentives intended to increase the rate of error reporting;

''(C) approaches for undertaking root cause analyses;

''(D) ways to provide feedback to those filing error reports;

''(E) techniques and tools for collecting, integrating, and analyzing patient safety data; and

''(F) ways to provide meaningful information to patients, consumers, and purchasers that will enhance their understanding of patient safety issues.

''(5) TRAINING.—The Director shall support training initiatives to build the capacity of the health care community in the United States to analyze patient safety data and to act on that data to improve patient safety.

''(d) EVALUATION.—The Director shall recommend strategies for measuring and evaluating the national progress made in implementing safe practices identified by the Center through the research and analysis required under subsection (b) and through the voluntary reporting system established under subsection (c).

''(e) IMPLEMENTATION.—In implementing strategies to carry out the functions described in subsections (b), (c), and (d), the Director may contract with public or private entities on a national or local level with appropriate expertise.

''SEC. 923. MEDICAL EVENT ANALYSIS ENTITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, based on information collected under section 922(c), shall provide for the certification of entities to collect and analyze information on medical errors, and to collaborate with health care providers or providers of services in collecting information about, or evaluating, certain medical events.

''(b) COMPATIBILITY OF COLLECTED DATA.—To ensure that data reported to the National Patient Safety Database under section 922(c)(2) concerning medical errors and close calls are comparable and useful on an analytic basis, the Director shall require that the entities described in subsection (c) follow the recommendations regarding a common set of core measures for reporting that are developed by the National Forum for Health Care Quality Measurement and Reporting, or other voluntary private standard-setting organization that is designated by the Director taking into account existing measurement systems and in collaboration with experts from the public and private sector.

''(c) DUTIES OF CERTIFIED ENTITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An entity that is certified under subsection (a) shall collect and analyze information, consistent with the requirement of subsection (b), provided to the entity under section 924(a)(4) to improve patient safety.

''(2) INFORMATION TO BE REPORTED TO THE ENTITY.—A medical event analysis entity shall, on a periodic basis and in a format that is specified by the Director, submit to the Director a report that contains—

''(A) a description of the medical events that were reported to the entity during the period covered under the report;

''(B) a description of any corrective action taken by providers of services with respect to such medical events or any other measures that are necessary to prevent similar events from occurring in the future; and

''(C) a description of the systemic changes that entities have identified, through an analysis of the medical events included in the report, as being needed to improve patient safety.

''(3) COLLABORATION.—A medical event analysis entity that is collaborating with a health care provider or provider of services to address close calls and adverse events may, at the request of the health care provider or provider of services—

''(A) provide expertise in the development of root cause analyses and corrective action plan relating to such close calls and adverse events; or

''(B) collaborate with such provider of services to identify on-going risk reduction activities that may enhance patient safety.

''(d) CONFIDENTIALITY AND PEER REVIEW PROTECTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any information (including any data, reports, records, memoranda, analyses, statements, and other communications) collected by a medical event analysis entity or developed by or on behalf of such an entity under this part shall be confidential in accordance with section 925.

''(e) TERMINATION AND RENEWAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The certification of an entity under this section shall terminate on the date that is 3 years after the date on which such certification was provided. Such certification may be renewed at the discretion of the Director.

''(2) NONCOMPLIANCE.—The Director may terminate the certification of a medical event analysis entity if the Director determines that such entity has failed to comply with this section.

''(f) IMPLEMENTATION.—In implementing strategies to carry out the functions described in subsection (c), the Director may contract with public or private entities on a national or local level with appropriate expertise.

''SEC. 924. PROVIDER OF SERVICES SYSTEMS FOR REPORTING MEDICAL EVENTS.

''(a) INTERNAL MEDICAL EVENT REPORTING SYSTEMS.—Each provider of services that elects to participate in a medical error reporting system under this part shall—

''(1) establish a system for—

''(A) identifying, collecting information about, and evaluating medical events that occur with respect to a patient in the care of the provider of services or a practitioner employed by the provider of services, that may include—

''(i) the provision of a medically coherent description of each event so identified;

''(ii) the provision of a clear and thorough accounting of the results of the investigation of such event under the system; and

''(iii) a description of all corrective measures taken in response to the event; and

''(B) determining appropriate follow-up actions to be taken with respect to such events;

''(2) establish policies and procedures with respect to when and to whom such events are to be reported;

''(3) take appropriate follow-up action with respect to such events; and

''(4) submit to the appropriate medical event analysis entity information that contains descriptions of the medical events identified under paragraph (1)(A).

''(b) PROMOTING IDENTIFICATION, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING OF CERTAIN MEDICAL EVENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law any information (including any data, reports, records, memoranda, analyses, statements, and other communications) developed by or on behalf of a provider of services with respect to a medical event pursuant to a system established under subsection (a) shall be privileged in accordance with section 925.

''(2) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as prohibiting—

''(A) disclosure of a patient's medical record to the patient;

''(B) a provider of services from complying with the requirements of a health care oversight agency or public health authority; or

''(C) such an agency or authority from disclosing information transferred by a provider of services to the public in a form that does not identify or permit the identification of the health care provider or provider of services or patient.

''SEC. 925. CONFIDENTIALITY.

''(a) CONFIDENTIALITY AND PEER REVIEW PROTECTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

''(1) any information (including any data, reports, records, memoranda, analyses, statements, and other communications) developed by or on behalf of a health care provider or provider of services with respect to a medical event, that is contained in the National Patient Safety Database, collected by a medical event analysis entity, or developed by or on behalf of such an entity, or collected by a health care provider or provider or services for use under systems that are developed for safety and quality improvement purposes under this part—

''(A) shall be privileged, strictly confidential, and may not be disclosed by any other person to which such information is transferred without the authorization of the health care provider or provider of services; and

''(B) shall—

''(i) be protected from disclosure by civil, criminal, or administrative subpoena;

''(ii) not be subject to discovery or otherwise discoverable in connection with a civil, criminal, or administrative proceeding;

''(iii) not be subject to disclosure pursuant to section 552 of title 5, United States Code (the Freedom of Information Act) and any other similar Federal or State statute or regulation; and

''(iv) not be admissible as evidence in any civil, criminal, or administrative proceeding;

without regard to whether such information is held by the provider or by another person to which such information was transferred;

''(2) the transfer of any such information by a provider of services to a health care oversight agency, an expert organization, a medical event analysis entity, or a public health authority, shall not be treated as a waiver of any privilege or protection established under paragraph (1) or established under State law.

''(b) PENALTY.—It shall be unlawful for any person to disclose any information described in subsection (a) other than for the purposes provided in such subsection. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code, and imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both.

''(c) APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.—The protections provided under subsection (a) and the penalty provided for under subsection (b) shall apply to any information (including any data, reports, memoranda, analyses, statements, and other communications) collected or developed pursuant to research, including demonstration projects, with respect to medical error reporting supported by the Director under this part.

''SEC. 926. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part, $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and such sums as may be necessary for subsequent fiscal years.''.

SEC. 2504. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 2503 shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act.

This Act may be cited as the ''Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001''.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 4577

AMENDMENT NO. 3714

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, during wrap-up of H.R. 4577, the Labor appropriations bill, amendment No. 3714, which had been agreed to, was inadvertently displaced. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be placed back in its original position in the bill.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3633

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to amendment No. 3633, previously agreed to, a correction be made with the following change:

On line 7, strike $1,065,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof $1,075,000,000.

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

DISABLED VETERANS' LIFE MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 516, S. 311.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 311) to authorize the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments, as follows:.

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

S. 311

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

TITLE I—THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS MEMORIAL

[SECTION 1.] *SECTION 101.* AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MEMORIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—**[**The Disabled**]** *Notwithstanding section 3(c) of Public Law 99–652, as amended (40 U.S.C. 1003(c)), the Disabled* Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation is authorized to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor disabled American veterans who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—The establishment of the memorial authorized by subsection (a)

shall be in accordance with the Act entitled ''An Act to provide standards for placement of commemorative works on certain Federal lands in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes'', approved November 14, 1986 (40 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

SEC. [2.] *102.* PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.

The Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the establishment of the memorial authorized by section 1(a). No Federal funds may be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the memorial.

SEC. [3.] *103.* DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.

If, upon payment of all expenses of the establishment of the memorial authorized by section 1(a) (including the maintenance and preservation amount provided for in section 8(b) of the Act referred to in section 1(b)), or upon expiration of the authority for the memorial under section 10(b) of such Act, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the memorial, the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit in the account provided for in section 8(b)(1) of such Act.

TITLE II—COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 201. REFERENCE TO COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.

(a) In this title the term ''Act'' means the Commemorative Works Act of 1986, as amended (Public Law 99–652; 40 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

SEC. 202. CLARIFICATIONS AND REVISIONS TO THE ACT.

(a) Section 1(b) of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1001(b)) is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting ''and its environs, and to encourage the location of commemorative works within the urban fabric of the District of Columbia;''.

(b) Section 2 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1002) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (c) by striking ''or a structure which is primarily used for other purposes'' and inserting ''that is not a commemorative work as defined by this Act'';

(2) In subsection (d) by striking ''person'' and inserting ''sponsor'';

(3) In subsection (e) by striking ''Areas I and II as depicted on the map numbered 869/86501, and dated May 1, 1986', and insert ''the Reserve, Area I, and Area II as depicted on the map numbered 869/86501A, and dated March 23, 2000'';

(4) By redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(5) By adding a new subsection (e) as follows:

''(e) the term ''Reserve'' means the great cross-axis of the Mall, which is a substantially completed work of civic art and which generally extends from the U.S. Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial, and from the White House to the Jefferson Memorial, as depicted on the map described in subsection (f);''.

(c) Section 3 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1003) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''work commemorating a lesser conflict'' and inserting ''work solely commemorating a limited military engagement'';

(B) by striking ''10'' and inserting ''25''; and

(C) by striking ''the event.'' and inserting ''such war or conflict.''.

(2) In subsection (c) by striking ''other than a military commemorative work as described in subsection (b) of this section''; and

(3) In subsection (d) by striking ''House Oversight'' and inserting ''Resources''.

(d) Section 4 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1004) is amended as follows:

(1) By amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) The National Capital Memorial Commission is hereby established and shall include the following members or their designees:

''(1) Director, National Park Service (who shall serve as Chairman);

''(2) Architect of the Capitol;

''(3) Chairman, American Battle Monuments Commission;

''(4) Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts;

''(5) Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission;

''(6) Mayor, District of Columbia;

''(7) Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration; and

''(8) Secretary, Department of Defense.''; and

(2) In subsection (b) by striking ''Administrator'' and inserting ''Administrator (as appropriate)''.

(e) Section 5 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1005) is amended—

(1) By striking ''Administrator'' and inserting ''Administrator (as appropriate)'' and

(2) By striking ''869/8501, and dated May 1, 1986.'' and inserting ''869/8501A, and dated March 23, 2000.''.

(f) Section 6 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1006) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) by striking ''3(b)'' and inserting ''3(d)'';

(2) By redesignating subsections (a) and (b) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively; and

(3) by adding a new subsection (a) as follows:

''(a) Sites for commemorative works shall not be authorized within the Reserve after January 1, 2000.''.

(g) Section 7 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1007) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking ''person'' and inserting ''sponsor'' each place it appears;

(2) In subsection (a) by striking ''designs'' and inserting ''design concepts'';

(3) In subsection (b) by striking ''and Administrator'' and inserting ''or Administrator (as appropriate)'';

(4) In subsection (b)(2) by striking ''open space and existing public use; and'' and inserting ''open space, existing public use, and cultural and natural resources;'';

(5) In subsection (b)(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(6) by adding the following new paragraphs:

''(4) No commemorative work primarily designed as a museum may be located on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary in Area I or in East Potomac Park as depicted on the map referenced in subsection 2(f);

''(5) The National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts may develop such criteria or guidelines specified to each site that are mutually agreed upon to ensure that the design of the commemorative work carries out the purposes of this Act; and''

''(6) Donor contributions to commemorative works shall not be acknowledged in any manner as part of the commemorative work or its site.''.

(h) Section 8 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1008) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)(3) and (a)(4) and in subsection (b) by striking ''person'' each place it appears and inserting ''sponsor'';

(2) In subsection (b)(1) and (b)(2) by striking ''persons'' each place it appears and inserting ''a sponsor'';

(3) By adding at the end of subsection (b)(1), ''All such proceeds shall be available, without further appropriation, for the non-recurring repair of the sponsor's commemorative work.'';

(4) In subsection (b)(2), by striking ''Congress authorizes and directs that,'' and inserting ''Congress authorizes and directs that, upon request,'';

(5) In subsection (b)(2) in the first sentence strike ''Administrator'', and inserting ''Administrator (as appropriate)''; and

(6) By amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) The sponsor shall be required to submit to the Secretary or the Administrator (as appropriate) an annual report of operations, including financial statements audited by an independent certified public accountant, paid for by the sponsor authorized to construct the commemorative work.''.

(i) Section 9 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1009) is hereby repealed.

(j) Section 10 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1010) is amended as follows:

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) Any legislative authority for a commemorative work shall expire at the end of the seven-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of such authority, or at the end of the seven-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of legislative authority to locate the commemorative work within Area I where such addition authority has been granted, unless:

''(1) the Secretary or the Administrator (as appropriate) has issued a construction permit for the commemorative work during that period; or

''(2) the Secretary or the Administrator, in consultation with the National Capital Memorial Commission, has made a determination that final design approvals have been obtained from the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts and that 75 percent of the amount estimated to be required to complete the memorial has been raised. If these two conditions have been met, the Secretary or the Administrator may extend the 7-year legislative authority for a period not to exceed three years from the date of expiration. Upon expiration of the legislative authority, any previous site and design approvals will also expire.''; and

(2) By adding a new subsection (f) as follows:

''(f) The National Capital Planning Commission, in coordination with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Memorial Commission, shall complete its master plan to guide the location and development of future memorials outside the Reserve for the next 50 years, including evaluation of and guidelines for potential sites.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3777

(Purpose: To clarify that the sites for memorials previously approved are not affected by the amendments to the Commemorative Works Act made in title II of the bill, and to make clarifying changes)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], for Mr. THOMAS, proposes an amendment numbered 3777.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, line 1, strike ''American''.

On page 2, line 10, strike ''American''.

On page 3, after line 16, insert the following new section and redesignate the following sections accordingly:

''SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

''This title may be cited as the ''Commemorative Works Clarification and Revision Act of 2000''.

On page 8, line 6, through page 9, line 6, strike subsection (h) in its entirety and insert the following:

''(h) Section 8 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1008) is amended as follows:

''(1) In subsection (a)(3) and (a)(4) and in subsection (b) by striking ''person'' each place it appears and inserting ''sponsor'';

''(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) In addition to the foregoing criteria, no construction permit shall be issued unless the sponsor authorized to construct the commemorative work has donated an amount equal to 10 percent of the total estimated cost of construction to offset the costs of perpetual maintenance and preservation of the commemorative work. All such proceeds

shall be available for the nonrecurring repair of the sponsor's commemorative work pursuant to the provisions of this subsection. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply in instances when the commemorative work is constructed by a Department or agency of the Federal Government and less than 50 percent of the funding for such work is provided by private sources.

''(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, money on deposit in the Treasury on the date of enactment of this subsection provided by a sponsor for maintenance pursuant to this subsection shall be credited to a separate account in the Treasury.

''(2) Money provided by a sponsor pursuant to the provisions of this subsection after the date of enactment of the Commemorative Works Clarification and Revision Act of 2000 shall be credited to a separate account with the National Park Foundation.

''(3) Upon request, the Secretary of the Treasury or the National Park Foundation shall make all or a portion of such moneys available to the Secretary or the Administrator (as appropriate) for the maintenance of a commemorative work. Under no circumstances may the Secretary or Administrator request funds from a separate account exceeding the total money in the account established under paragraph (1) or (2). The Secretary and the Administrator shall maintain an inventory of funds available for such purposes. Funds provided under this paragraph shall be available without further appropriation and shall remain available until expended.''; and

''(3) By amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) The sponsor shall be required to submit to the Secretary or the Administrator (as appropriate) an annual report of operations, including financial statements audited by an independent certified public accountant, paid for by the sponsor authorized to construct the commemorative work.''.

On page 10, after line 17, insert the following:

''SEC. 204. PREVIOUSLY APPROVED MEMORIALS.

''Nothing in this title shall apply to a memorial whose site was approved, in accordance with the Commemorative Works Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–652; 40 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), prior to the date of enactment of this title.''.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the committee amendments be agreed to, the bill be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill appear in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 3777) was agreed to.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 311), as amended, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 311

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

TITLE I—THE DISABLED VETERANS MEMORIAL

SECTION 101. AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MEMORIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3(c) of Public Law 99–652, as amended (40 U.S.C. 1003(c)), the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation is authorized to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor disabled veterans who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—The establishment of the memorial authorized by subsection (a) shall be in accordance with the Act entitled ''An Act to provide standards for placement of commemorative works on certain Federal lands in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes'', approved November 14, 1986 (40 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

SEC. 102. PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.

The Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the establishment of the memorial authorized by section 1(a). No Federal funds may be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the memorial.

SEC. 103. DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.

If, upon payment of all expenses of the establishment of the memorial authorized by section 1(a) (including the maintenance and preservation amount provided for in section 8(b) of the Act referred to in section 1(b)), or upon expiration of the authority for the memorial under section 10(b) of such Act, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the memorial, the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit in the account provided for in section 8(b)(1) of such Act.

TITLE II—COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE

This title may be cited as the ''Commemorative Works Clarification and Revision Act of 2000''.

SEC. 202. REFERENCE TO COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.

(a) In this title the term ''Act'' means the Commemorative Works Act of 1986, as amended (Public Law 99–652; 40 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

SEC. 203. CLARIFICATIONS AND REVISIONS TO THE ACT.

(a) Section 1(b) of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1001(b)) is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting ''and its environs, and to encourage the location of commemorative works within the urban fabric of the District of Columbia;''.

(b) Section 2 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1002) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (c) by striking ''or a structure which is primarily used for other purposes'' and inserting ''that is not a commemorative work as defined by this Act'';

(2) In subsection (d) by striking ''person'' and inserting ''sponsor'';

(3) In subsection (e) by striking ''Areas I and II as depicted on the map numbered 869/86501, and dated May 1, 1986', and insert ''the Reserve, Area I, and Area II as depicted on the map numbered 869/86501A, and dated March 23, 2000'';

(4) By redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(5) By adding a new subsection (e) as follows:

''(e) the term ''Reserve'' means the great cross-axis of the Mall, which is a substantially completed work of civic art and which generally extends from the U.S. Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial, and from the White House to the Jefferson Memorial, as depicted on the map described in subsection (f);''.

(c) Section 3 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1003) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''work commemorating a lesser conflict'' and inserting ''work solely commemorating a limited military engagement'';

(B) by striking ''10'' and inserting ''25''; and

(C) by striking ''the event.'' and inserting ''such war or conflict.''.

(2) In subsection (c) by striking ''other than a military commemorative work as described in subsection (b) of this section''; and

(3) In subsection (d) by striking ''House Oversight'' and inserting ''Resources''.

(d) Section 4 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1004) is amended as follows:

(1) By amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) The National Capital Memorial Commission is hereby established and shall include the following members or their designees:

''(1) Director, National Park Service (who shall serve as Chairman);

''(2) Architect of the Capitol;

''(3) Chairman, American Battle Monuments Commission;

''(4) Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts;

''(5) Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission;

''(6) Mayor, District of Columbia;

''(7) Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration; and

''(8) Secretary, Department of Defense.''; and

(2) In subsection (b) by striking ''Administrator'' and inserting ''Administrator (as appropriate)''.

(e) Section 5 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1005) is amended—

(1) By striking ''Administrator'' and inserting ''Administrator (as appropriate)'' and

(2) By striking ''869/8501, and dated May 1, 1986.'' and inserting ''869/8501A, and dated March 23, 2000.''.

(f) Section 6 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1006) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) by striking ''3(b)'' and inserting ''3(d)'';

(2) By redesignating subsections (a) and (b) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively; and

(3) by adding a new subsection (a) as follows:

''(a) Sites for commemorative works shall not be authorized within the Reserve after January 1, 2000.''.

(g) Section 7 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1007) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking ''person'' and inserting ''sponsor'' each place it appears;

(2) In subsection (a) by striking ''designs'' and inserting ''design concepts'';

(3) In subsection (b) by striking ''and Administrator'' and inserting ''or Administrator (as appropriate)'';

(4) In subsection (b)(2) by striking ''open space and existing public use; and'' and inserting ''open space, existing public use, and cultural and natural resources;'';

(5) In subsection (b)(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(6) by adding the following new paragraphs:

''(4) No commemorative work primarily designed as a museum may be located on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary in Area I or in East Potomac Park as depicted on the map referenced in subsection 2(f);

''(5) The National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts may develop such criteria or guidelines specified to each site that are mutually agreed upon to ensure that the design of the commemorative work carries out the purposes of this Act; and''

''(6) Donor contributions to commemorative works shall not be acknowledged in any manner as part of the commemorative work or its site.''.

(h) Section 8 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1008) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsections (a)(3) and (a)(4) and in subsection (b) by striking ''person'' each place it appears and inserting ''sponsor''.

(2) By amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) In addition to the foregoing criteria, no construction permit shall be issued unless the sponsor authorized to construct the commemorative work has donated an amount equal to 10 percent of the total estimated cost of construction to offset the costs of perpetual maintenance and preservation of the commemorative work. All such proceeds shall be available for the nonrecurring repair of the sponsor's commemorative work pursuant to the provisions of this subsection. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply in instances when the commemorative work is constructed by a department or agency of the Federal Government and less than 50 percent of the funding for such work is provided by private sources:

''(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, money on deposit in the Treasury on the date of enactment of this subsection provided by a sponsor for maintenance pursuant to this subsection shall be credited to a separate account in the Treasury.

''(2) Money provided by a sponsor pursuant to the provisions of this subsection after the date of enactment of the Commemorative Works Clarification and Revision Act of 2000 shall be credited to a separate account with the National Park Foundation.

''(3) Upon request, the Secretary of the Treasury or the National Park Foundation shall make all or a portion of such moneys available to the Secretary or the Administrator (as appropriate) for the maintenance of a commemorative work. Under no circumstances may the Secretary or Administrator request funds from a separate account exceeding the total money in the account established under paragraph (1) or (2). The Secretary and the Administrator shall maintain an inventory of funds available for such purposes. Funds provided under this paragraph shall be available without further appropriation and shall remain available until expended.''.

(3) By amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) The sponsor shall be required to submit to the Secretary or the Administrator (as appropriate) an annual report of operations, including financial statements audited by an independent certified public accountant, paid for by the sponsor authorized to construct the commemorative work.''.

(i) Section 9 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1009) is hereby repealed.

(j) Section 10 of the Act (40 U.S.C. 1010) is amended as follows:

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) Any legislative authority for a commemorative work shall expire at the end of the seven-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of such authority, or at the end of the seven-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of legislative authority to locate the commemorative work within Area I where such addition authority has been granted, unless:

''(1) the Secretary or the Administrator (as appropriate) has issued a construction permit for the commemorative work during that period; or

''(2) the Secretary or the Administrator, in consultation with the National Capital Memorial Commission, has made a determination that final design approvals have been obtained from the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts and that 75 percent of the amount estimated to be required to complete the memorial has been raised. If these two conditions have been met, the Secretary or the Administrator may extend the 7-year legislative authority for a period not to exceed three years from the date of expiration. Upon expiration of the legislative authority, any previous site and design approvals will also expire.''; and

(2) By adding a new subsection (f) as follows:

''(f) The National Capital Planning Commission, in coordination with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Memorial Commission, shall complete its master plan to guide the location and development of future memorials outside the Reserve for the next 50 years, including evaluation of and guidelines for potential sites.''.

SEC. 204. PREVIOUSLY APPROVED MEMORIALS.

Nothing in this title shall apply to a memorial whose site was approved, in accordance with the Commemorative Works Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–652; 40 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), prior to the date of enactment of this title.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am proud and pleased that today the Senate has voted to authorize a memorial in our Nation's Capital to honor disabled American veterans.

I must say that it is humbling for me to be a co-sponsor of this bill alongside some of the very people we are honoring—my fellow Senators MAX CLELAND, DANIEL INOUYE and BOB KERREY. I know there are thousands of others across our country—some of whom I know personally—and they deserve much more than a monument. They all have had their lives disrupted, sometimes painfully, as a result of their willingness to fight for America and all that it stands for.

But we cannot undo the damage to limb and spirit that has already been inflicted. So we now authorize a permanent monument that will call attention to the special esteem we hold for our disabled veterans—living and dead. It is my sincere hope that we can create a singular commemorative site that will encourage all Americans to come, pause, and reflect on the meaning of sacrifice, patriotism, and the place of disabled citizens in our society.

Mr. President, wish the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation all the best in the hard work to come, and I look forward to the day when the people of America can admire the memorial and reflect on the significant sacrifices it represents.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 11, 2000

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 11. I further ask consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business until 10:15 a.m., with the time equally divided between Senators ROTH and MOYNIHAN.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:15 a.m. tomorrow. Following morning business, a cloture vote will occur on the motion to proceed to H.R. 8, the Death Tax Elimination Act.

If cloture is invoked, the Senate will continue postcloture debate on the motion to proceed. In addition, it is expected that the Senate will resume consideration of the Interior appropriations bill in an effort to make further progress on that bill. As previously announced, it will be the leadership's intention to debate amendments to the DOD authorization bill during evening sessions this week. Any votes ordered on DOD amendments will be postponed to occur the following morning. The Senate is also expected to return to the reconciliation bill late this week. Senators can expect votes each day this week, with late nights and the possibility of a late session on Friday or a session on Saturday in order to complete the reconciliation bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:48 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, July 11, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 10, 2000:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

LESLIE BETH KRAMERICH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR, VICE RICHARD M. MCGAHEY, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. THOMAS R. CASE, 0000

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. SCOTT A. FRY, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOHN W. ALEXANDER, JR, 0000
MARIO M. AMEZCUA, 0000
LINDSEY E. ARNOLD, 0000
DIXEY R. BEHNKEN, 0000
SCOTT R. BORDERUD, 0000
DAVID R. BROCK, 0000
LAWRENCE J. CONWAY III, 0000
JOHN J. COOK III, 0000
DAVID L. DARBYSHIRE, 0000

IVERY L. DELACRUZ, 0000
CALVIN L. EASTHAM, JR, 0000
CHESTER C. EGERT, 0000
ERIC J. ERKKINEN, 0000
JOSEPH A. HARTRANFT, 0000
ROBERT D. HESTER, JR, 0000
DAVID P. HILLIS, 0000
JOSEPH J. KRAINTZ, JR, 0000
CHESTER H. LANIOUS, 0000
DANIEL L. MOLL, 0000
DENNIS R. NEWTON, 0000
JOHN E. POWERS, 0000
THOMAS E. PRESTON, 0000
MICHAEL C. PUNKE, 0000
BENJAMIN D. RICHARDSON, 0000
BYRON J. SIMMONS, 0000
RONALD L. SMITH, 0000
VIRGIL P. TRAVIS, JR, 0000
DONALD L. WILSON, 0000

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 10, 2000:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

MADELYN R. CREEDON, OF INDIANA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR DEFENSE PROGRAMS, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. RANDALL

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I inform the House of the death of a former member of this body, The Honorable William J. ''Bill'' Randall of Independence, Missouri.

Bill Randall was born July 16, 1909, in Independence, Missouri, a son of William R. Randall and Lillie B. Randall. He graduated from William Chrisman High School in 1927; Junior College of Kansas City in 1929; and University of Missouri in 1931. He received a LLB from Kansas City School of Law in 1936 and LLM from the same school in 1938. He married Margaret Layden in 1939, and she preceded him in death in 1986. Mr. Randall was a practicing attorney in the Independence area until 1943 when he served in southwest Pacific during World War II from March 1943 until December 1945. In 1947, he was elected Judge of Jackson County Court and served six consecutive terms until March 1959, at which time he was elected U.S. Representative of Missouri's Fourth Congressional District.

While in Congress from 1959 until his retirement in 1977, Representative Randall was appointed as the first chairman of the newly created 38-member Committee on Aging, and rose to become the fifth ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee. At his retirement, Representative Randall chaired two subcommittees on the Armed Services Committee, one subcommittee on the Government Operations Committee, and one subcommittee on the Committee on Aging. After retiring from Congress, Representative Randall remained in Washington, D.C. until 1981, during which time he lobbied for the U.S. Railway Association and represented other Missouri interests. In 1981, Representative Randall returned to Independence and resumed his practice with concentration in probate and estate law.

Representative Randall was also an involved member of his community. He was a member of the First United Methodist Church, a member of the Masonic Fraternal organizations and a member of Royal Order of Jesters. He was a member of Phi Kappa Psi social fraternity (University of Missouri) and was past Commander of Post #1000 Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Speaker, Representative Randall was a fine statesman for the people of the Fourth District of Missouri, with a distinguished record of public service. I know the Members of the House will join me in extending heartfelt condolences to his family: his daughter, Mary Pat Wilson, two grandsons, Patrick and Randall Wilson and a great-granddaughter, Adeline Wilson.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1304, QUALITY HEALTH-CARE COALITION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2000

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, in order to bring this bill up on the floor today, the rule had to waive all points of order that could be raised against it.

Yesterday, we were on this same floor debating the creation of a Medicare Prescription drug benefit for seniors. Two-thirds of our seniors have no drug coverage whatsoever or have inadequate coverage—a Medicare drug benefit is a vital issue to them.

Yet, the Republican leadership refused to grant us a waiver so that the Democratic bill—which created a real, defined Medicare drug benefit that would be dependable and available to all seniors across the country—could be equally debated with the Republican counterpart.

Instead of allowing a real debate, they passed their sham bill that turns drug coverage for seniors over to the private insurance industry—the very same industry that refused to cover seniors in the past. It is a false promise to America's seniors.

Here we are less than 24 hours later and we are waiving all points of order against a bill that won't do anything to help the millions of people who are lacking health insurance or prescription drug coverage. Not at all. This bill will help one profession with a very high income—doctors.

Clearly, if you aren't among their monied friends, you don't get on to the floor of the House these days.

If enacted, this bill would cost the Federal government some $1.7 billion over five years in new outlays, and lose $2.5 billion in federal revenues over that same period. At the same time, it would cost consumers some $2.4 billion in increased insurance premiums because the effect of the anti-trust exemption is predicted to increase doctors' fees by some 15%.

While I am sympathetic to providers' frustration with managed care's ever-growing control over our health care system, granting anti-trust exemption to health care providers is not the solution needed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and if the rule passes to vote against H.R. 1304.

TRIBUTE IN APPRECIATION OF GEORGE ROWELL

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, today I speak in appreciation for the many years of dedicated service that George Rowell has given to his country and to his community.

Born October 5, 1926, George Rowell has led a heroic and inspirational life. A World War II Navy veteran, he continued his service to his country as a United States letter carrier, and for the past 42 years, George has been a member of American Legion Post 18, in my hometown of Bay City, MI. But he has always been more than just a member of Post 18. He has been Post Commander. He has been on the Legion Baseball and Poppy Drive Committees. He has taught flag folding classes in local public schools and he has been the Color Guard Commander for all Color Guards in Bay County. And for all of this and more, George was named Bay County Veteran of the Year.

Throughout American history, there are stories of great heroism, tremendous sacrifice and epic courage, but none is greater than the men and women who defended our Nation in World War II. America is safe and free because this generation of men and women willingly endured the hardships and sacrifices required to preserve our liberty. They answered the call and were there to fight for the Nation, so that all of us could enjoy the freedoms we hold so dearly. America is truly the land of the free and home of the brave because of men like George Rowell who were willing to risk their life at the altar of freedom.

It was General George Patton who said ''Wars may be fought with weapons, but they are won by soldiers. It is the spirit of the soldier who follows and of the soldier who leads that gains the victory.'' Mr. Speaker, George Rowell has always been a ''soldier who leads,'' and I ask all of my colleagues to join me in honoring him for his unending dedication to his family, his community, and his country. I could go on and on about George Rowell's patriotism, but I wanted to recognize him for all that he has done, and wish him well in the days ahead, days that will be filled with all the good fruits of a selfless life. I know that he will spend even more time with his wife of nearly 40 years, Mildred, and his three sons, David, George III, and Kenneth. George Rowell has lived a truly incredible life, and he serves as a role model and an inspiration to everyone who has ever met him.

HONORING LOUIE D. CARLEO

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a personal privilege to honor Louie D. Carleo, an outstanding member of the Pueblo business community.

Louie was recipient of the Greater Pueblo Chamber of Commerce Charles W. Crews Business Leader of the Year award. Louie was recognized for his tireless efforts to redevelop the Downtown Pueblo area, making it a

beautiful vibrant metropolis. Louie's achievements in the business world are equally notable. He is a past chairman of the chamber of commerce, an active member of the Pueblo Economic Development Corporation, and the proprietor of Commercial Builders, Sound Venture Realty and LDC Properties. This award publicly notes Louie's commitment to Pueblo as well as his deep commitment to the State of Colorado, its people and its future.

Louie is not only an outstanding member of the Pueblo business community, he has been an active leader in the American Red Cross, YMCA, Junior Achievement, and Posada. In addition, Louie was also the recipient of the Sam Walton Outstanding business leader of the year award for Pueblo, Colorado.

The people of Colorado have every right to be proud of Mr. Carleo. On behalf of the people of Colorado, I thank you, Louie, for your service.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, Speaker, I rise today to express concerns that this body has seen too much legislation presented by the House Committee on Appropriations that does not take into consideration what the real needs of our country nor its citizens. The Legislative Branch Appropriations bill along with other bills that are intended to fund domestic appropriation's have more often than not provided a sever lack of funding of several important areas of legitimate domestic legislative needs.

First and foremost the passage of the Legislative Branch Appropriations should not result in the avoidance of a court judgment against the Library of Congress. Therefore, I join my Colleague Congressman Wynn speaking out on any attempt to pass section 208 of the bill, as it was originally introduced to this body, contains language that would negate a court ordered decree issued by the United States Court for the District of Columbia. This would in affect rubber stamp the discriminatory practices of the Library of Congress by allowing the transfer of 84 temporary employees to permanent status without being required to undergo the federal government's competitive employee selection process.

This bill will fund Legislative Branch activity for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001. Unfortunately as we consider this appropriations for next year it is not clear whether the appropriation needs for the Capitol Hill Police have been adequately met for this fiscal year, which is scheduled to end on September 30, 2000. My assessment of this situation is based on the Capitol Police Board's request that the House and Senate Legislative Branch Subcommittees approve transfer of a little over $16 million into their allotment for the remainder of this fiscal year. The Police Board makes this urgent request in order to address the revenue shortage of the Capitol Police for this fiscal year.

I would like to inform those colleagues of mine who are not aware of the fact that last month, May 2000, the Government Accounting Office (GAO) released a report on the finances of the Capitol Police. This report was produced in response to a letter, requesting a financial audit of the United States (USCP), sent to them by the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations of the House Committee on Appropriations. This GAO report is titled ''United States Capitol Police, 1999 Financial Audit Highlights the Need to address Internal Control Weaknesses.'' The report found that the United States Capitol Police administration lacked internal financial control and was not effective in ensuring the following: that assets are safeguarded against loss or misappropriation. The report also stated that department transactions are executed in accordance with management's authority and with laws and regulations. Finally, the report clarified that there are no material misstatements in the financial reports.

What is more disturbing to me is that the report stated that on three occasions, involving its salaries appropriations, the USCP violated the Anti-Deficiency Act. The Anti-Deficiency Act prohibits an officer or employee of the United States from, among other things, making an expenditure from an appropriation that exceeds the amount available in the appropriation.

The report also acknowledges that the USCP is in the process of making improvements in response to earlier recommendation, substantial work remains.

For this reason, I ask my fellow members of the House of Representatives, who is policing the budget for the United States Capitol Police?

I strongly believe that this body must act to ensure that the rank and file of the Capitol Hill Police are adequately compensated for the vital work they do. The protection of this body and the thousands of visitors we receive each year is the sole responsibility of the United States Capitol Police. They have been asked by the American people to protect our nation's capitol, which includes every member of this body, from violent assault by those who would seek to do this democratic system harm. For this reason, I would like to ask that the appropriated authorization and appropriations committees provide a more comprehensive plan to compensate the men and women of the United State Capitol Police. After extensive research I would like to offer that at this time these officers are not being adequately compensated based on the fact that they are required to purchase uniform items and provide for their care from their own personal resources.

I was shocked to learn that our nation's capitol police are required to purchase uniform items and provide for their care at their own personal expense. These uniforms are not being worn by our Hill police officers for any other purpose than as a direct requirement of their jobs. Therefore any expense associated with the officer's uniforms should be treated as if they were the department's operational expense.

As written the Legislative Branch Appropriations legislation before us today will only pay for the cleaning of the officer's pants—not their shirts, which are the most visible feature of their uniforms. Those who administer the budget for the Capitol Hill For this reason, I beseech this body to allow for the budgeting for the cleaning expenses for the shirts of our capitol hill police uniforms. If these officers did launder and iron their own shirts, as the under funding of their annual uniform cleaning expense by this body suggests that they should do, then the crisp professional look that we have all come to see in our Hill Police Force would be difficult to maintain. However, because these law enforcement officers are professionals in every sense, they use their own income to ensure that their uniforms are adequately dry cleaned.

This body's actions in not passing legislation with sufficient appropriations nor legislative directives for the proper expensing of items of the Capitol Police budget rest with the lack of guidance of the United States Capitol Police in this area by this body.

The signs of under funding of our capitol hill police extends to their having to provide their own personal protection from work related injury to their feet, legs, and lower back. For this reason, many Capitol Hill Police spend up to $150 dollars for a pair of Red Wing foot ware. This foot ware provides the best protection to the front line Capitol Police officers who are required to work for hours on the unforgiving marble floors or concrete of the Capitol grounds. In addition to the expense of the shoes, the ware on the instep of the shoes requires a $15 to $20 replacement for each shoe every six months. I will not ask that each of you respond to a question regarding how many pairs of shoes have been worn through the soles while you have been working on Capitol Hill.

I do not want to make light of the hardship these men and women face in serving to protect the democratic heart of this nation. I do not need to remind each of you that in 1998, Officer Jacob J. Chestnut, and Detective John M. Gibson offered the ultimate—their lives—in their commitment to provide public service to our nation as Hill law enforcement officers.

At that time this body responded by making special appropriations for the administration of the police function on the Hill by providing an additional $1 million a week in funds in order to fill the obvious need for increased security.

It is also disturbing that the two-year salary cycle of the Capital Hill Police is not taken into consideration during the appropriations process. It is a documented fact that after each presidential and or congressional election the overtime costs of the Capitol Police budget, during that December following the November election, increases substantially in anticipation of the swearing in festivities, which will take place during the month of January. It is my hope that this body will allow for the Capitol Hill appropriations for those years, of which the year 2000 is one of them, to flex in order to insure that adequate overtime compensation is ready and available to the Capitol Hill Police Department.

We all know that these individuals are more than just police, they secure the well of this House so the legislative and deliberative affairs of the people of the United States may be conducted in an environment free from threats of violence. In providing this vital protection, they also act as hosts to the thousands of visitors who come to the Hill each year to see the democratic process up close.

This is a role that our Hill police officers fill very well. They act as greeters and provide tour references for persons who are unfamiliar with our Capitol grounds. For this reason, I would offer that, it would be very proper to consider action that would provide authorization and funding for the development of a professional roster of Hill greeters who are on the grounds to fill this void in customer service to our guest and constituents.

In closing, I would like to make it clear by noting in the record that I was not approached by any Capitol Hill Police officers to speak on this subject—on the contrary I have waited for an opportunity to discuss this matter for some time. I do so now—because I have eyes that can see and a thinking mind and I know that what we have done to these—our own public servants is not right.

I was on the Hill after the 1996 elections and know that the Capitol Police force were required to work thousands of hours in overtime, but these officers were not compensated for their labor until well into the next year. I was also here in 1998, when Officer Jacob J. Chestnut, and Detective John M. Gibson were killed, and several others including civilians, were wounded.

For this reason, and this reason only, I ask that my colleagues consider my words as they deliberate and vote on this important appropriation.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE WALTER JOHNSON

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to a dedicated teacher, community visionary, and loving family man who passed away unexpectedly last week.

Walter Johnson was a man who loved life and all the important things in it—his family, his friends, his church, his students, his African American heritage. He loved the difference that he was making in our community through his work as an educator with the Milwaukee Public Schools, through his commitment to expanding low income housing for seniors and the disabled, and through his long time involvement with the Milwaukee branch of the NAACP.

Behind his dignified, gentle manner was a fierce determination to gain opportunity for all members of our community. He taught his students to do well by doing good. He was a leader at Calvary Baptist Church were he set an example for others in our city; that there is need and a way for people of faith to actively address poverty and prejudice. He served with the Milwaukee NAACP in many capacities, guiding the organization in its work to attain an integrated, diverse society—open to all Americans.

Shortly before he died, Martin Luther King, Jr. asked God to grant us all a chance to be participants in the newness and magnificent development of America. Walter Johnson heard the call and is now reaping his reward. I offer my condolences to his beloved wife, Minerva, and to his children, Christopher and Hilary. He will be missed.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. MARIANNE NESTOR

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to Mrs. Marianne Nestor, Vice-President of Fund Development and Volunteer Services of St. Joseph Mercy-Oakland Hospital. Mrs. Nestor resigned her post on June 30, 2000, after serving her community for over 20 years. It is a rare occurence that any person serves an institution so well for so long. Mrs. Nestor has been an asset to the hospital and community and will be sorely missed.

Marianne Nestor's distinguished career with St. Joseph Mercy-Oakland Hospital began in 1978 when she began serving as Vice-Chairwoman Board of Directors. Shortly after, she became Director of Volunteer Services, and later Director of Fund Development. In 1984 she was named the Director of the consolidated Fund Development, Volunteer Services, and Gift Shop department. At this post, Mrs. Nestor served of St. Joseph Mercy-Oakland Hospital for 15 years with the utmost concern for the hospital's patients and guests. In 1998, she became Vice-President of Fund Development and Volunteer Services. As a member of the President's senior management team, she has advised the hospital on overall operation of the hospital.

Despite the rigorous time constraints due to her hard work at the hospital, Mrs. Nestor found the time to additionally contribute to the community by volunteering for countless activities. Mrs. Nestor has been a volunteer Board Member, and later, President of the Rotary Club of Pontiac; a founding member of the Mental Illness Research Association; and a board member of the Russ Thomas Scholarship Foundation to name a few.

The residents of Oakland County have been fortunate to have Mrs. Nestor serve the community with the diligence and commitment rarely found today. She and her outstanding team of hospital volunteers have made of St. Joseph Mercy-Oakland Hospital one of the finest hospitals for health care in the country. She has been a great friend of mine and I wish her all the best.

TRIBUTE TO MR. AND MRS. RICHARD E. BURKE OF HUNTSVILLE, AL

HON. ROBERT E. (BUD) CRAMER, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on July 15th, a wonderful couple, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Burke will celebrate their 50th, wedding anniversary. In 1950, Mrs. Frances McAllister Burke and Mr. Richard E. Burke exchanged wedding vows to spend a lifetime together.

Now 50 years later, they shine as pillars of matrimony. The Burkes are a loving man and woman who have come together to share their lives, raise a family and prove that family values and selfless commitment still have a place in this world whose fleeting values can be confusing and inpermanent.

Their son Waymon, daughter-in-law Jan and grandson Jason look up to this remarkable couple as role models on how to live and love successfully.

This tribute is a fitting honor for the Burkes who have shown us that commitments can be honored through five decades of the trials and tribulations of life. The Burkes have spent a good portion of their lives working hard with their landscaping company and with GTE. Now they are enjoying their well-deserved retirement together in the Big Cove community where they have lived since their marriage.

I commend Mr. and Mrs. Burke on their happy and strong marriage and I join their family and friends in wishing them a joyous and special celebration at the Bevill Center on July 15th.

REMEMBERING MR. CHET SHIELDS

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that we take a moment to celebrate and remember the life of a great man, Chet Shields. In doing so, I would also like to remember this individual who has exemplified the notion of public service and civic duty.

Mr. Shields passed away after battling with Parkinson's disease. Mr. Shields was devoted to the environment and to his family. He had a prestigious career spanning three decades working for the Forest Service. Mr. Shields was born in Olathe, Colorado in 1928 and was part of the first graduating class at Smiley Junior High. Mr. Shields was active in many areas. He spent two years at Fort Lewis College before and after serving his country in World War II. Mr. Shields was always interested in forestry and acted on that interest by earning a bachelor's and master's degree in forestry from Colorado A & M. He also received a master's degree in public administration from Harvard in 1957.

Mr. Shields was married in 1948 to his lovely wife Ruth, who has also shared his love for the environment. During his prestigious career with the forest service, he and his wife were stationed in Taos, Penasco and Mountainair, New Mexico, Happy Jack, Arizona, and Durango, Colorado. He served as deputy chief in the Forest Service's Washington D.C. office for 13 years, later he and his wife later retired to Durango Colorado in 1978. Although technically retired, he and his wife never lost their work ethic, as they both volunteered on the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service's archeology site surveys.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to remember Mr. Shields and his efforts to make his community a better place to live. His dedication and know-how have distinguished him greatly. The citizens of Colorado owe Chet a debt of gratitude and we will all miss him dearly.

COMPUTER MILESTONE

HON. ELLEN O. TAUSCHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the occasion of a significant scientific achievement. Today, scientists at Livermore National Laboratory have started assembling the world's most powerful computer. This computer, known as ASCI White, delivered to Livermore on 28 tractor-trailer trucks, is capable of 12 trillion calculations per second. Mr. Speaker, that is more than three times faster than the most powerful computer in existence today.

One specific achievement of this endeavor is the collaboration it embodies. ASCI White is the product of work by IBM and our national labs, and the computer will now aid the Department of Energy in the work of simulating nuclear explosions without conducting live tests. Surely, this super computer is a model for the marvelous work that results from strong private-public partnerships.

Mr. Speaker. I submit the following article from the San Francisco Chronicle to be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And on behalf of this body, I would like to extend our congratulations to IBM, Livermore Lab, and all of the other agencies and individuals who contributed to this superb accomplishment.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, June 29, 2000]

IBM ASSEMBLING EXPLOSIVE NEW SUPERCOMPUTER PROCESSORS TO MIMIC NUCLEAR DETONATIONS AT LIVERMORE LAB

(Carrie Kirby)

Technicians at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory have begun assembling the world's most powerful supercomputer, the first sections of which were delivered by International Business Machines Corp. Monday.

The 8,100-processor computer, ASCI White, will be used to simulate nuclear explosions to maintain the nation's weapons stockpile. Exploding real nuclear bombs for testing purposes has been forbidden since the 1996 signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The testing is required to ensure that the nation's aging stockpile of nuclear weapons still functions properly and is safely stored.

The processors in the $110 million computer are no different than those found in high-end workstations used for engineering or design. But by putting 8,000 of them together in a box the size of two basketball courts, IBM has created a machine capable of 12.3 trillion operations per second—what scientists call a 12.3 teraflop computer.

Armed with a calculator, it would take a human being 10 million years to complete the number of calculations ASCI White can do in one second. That's three or four times better than the previous titlist for world's most powerful supercomputer, ASCI Blue Pacific, a 3.8 teraflop machine also located at Lawrence Livermore. ASCI White is 1,000 times more powerful than Deep Blue, the IBM supercomputer that beat world chess champion Garry Kasparov in 1997, and 30,000 times more powerful than the average personal computer. Its memory could comfortably house the Library of Congress—twice.

ASCI White is named for the Energy Department's Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative.

Tractor trailers brought about a quarter of the massive computer to Lawrence Livermore Monday, and the rest will arrive during the summer. When it is complete, a team of several hundred scientists at Lawrence Livermore will use the computer to conduct the most realistic mock nuclear explosions ever.

Limited memory and computer power meant that previous simulations used a simplified, two-dimensional model to approximate a three-dimensional explosion.

''A one-dimensional problem assumes that the surface of the Earth is uniform—all earth or all water,'' said David Nowak, the physicist who will lead the ASCI White program at Lawrence Livermore. Two-dimensional models would assume that the Earth is smooth, without mountains, valleys or complicated factors such as air currents. ''ASCI White allows us to go to three dimensions.''

Nowak has been anticipating getting his hands on the computer for two years, while 1,000 engineers at IBM's Poughkeepsie, N.Y., laboratory designed and built it. Yet he knows that despite its mind-boggling abilities, ASCI White is not powerful enough to simulate the blasts as realistically as scientists want.

''To actually do the problem, we need 100 teraflops,'' Nowak said. ''We think we can get that by 2004 or 2005.''

The ASCI program calls for two more supercomputers to be built. The first, with 30 teraflops, will go to Los Alamos, N.M., in about two years. The second, with 100 teraflops, is scheduled to be assigned to Livermore, said lab spokesman David Schwoegler.

TRIBUTE TO DAN RATTINER

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to congratulate Dan Rattiner, my neighbor and constituent from Long Island, on the 40th anniversary of Dan's Papers.

Dan Rattiner's story is that of many seeking the American dream. As a college student during the summer of 1960, Mr. Rattiner started a small, free, eight-page publication in Montauk, New York. Over time, as Eastern Long Island has grown, this one-man operation has grown into a 50-page publication employing over 40 people. Articles range from serious issue-based essays to coverage of summer in the Hamptons.

Mr. Rattiner's work ethic, dedication, and success represent the very best of Long Island, New York and our Nation. His commitment to journalistic excellence, all the while providing important information to the people of Southampton and Easthampton, is worthy of commendation and praise.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Rattiner, for 40 years of bringing news with a local flavor to the people of Eastern Long Island. On behalf of the people of Long Island, I would like to thank Mr. Rattiner and the entire staff of Dan's Papers and I wish them the best of luck in the future.

MEDICARE RX 2000 ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. MAXINE WATERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2000

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4680, the Medicare Prescription 2000 Act. H.R. 4680 is a poor excuse for a prescription drug bill for our Nation's senior citizens.

This Republican bill would force seniors who want prescription drug coverage to get it from private insurance companies. However, the bill provides no guarantee that individual seniors will have access to private insurance plans that cover prescription drug. Furthermore, even when coverage is offered, the premiums, deductibles and co-payments will vary widely, depending upon what plans are available in the area. Millions of seniors will not be able to afford to participate in these private insurance plans.

The Republican bill would provide payments for prescription drugs to private health insurance companies—not patients themselves or their health care providers. Many private insurance companies have unfairly restricted health care for their patients in the past. Now is not the time to give these insurance companies additional government benefits.

H.R. 4770, the alternative prescription drug bill proposed by the Democrats, would provide a guaranteed prescription drug benefit under Medicare to all seniors who want one. This bill would ensure that all seniors who choose to participate would pay the same low premiums and receive the same benefits, regardless of where they live. Moreover, low-income seniors who cannot afford to pay the premiums would not be denied prescription drug coverage under the Democratic alternative.

It is time that Congress make prescription medicines available to all seniors who need them. I urge my colleagues to oppose this Republican giveaway to private insurance companies and support the Democratic alternative.

HONORING MR. TOM MESSENGER

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to honor a man that has devoted his career to protecting the health of people in the great State of Colorado, Tom Messenger. After 30 years of service to the citizens of Colorado, Tom is set to retire this week, bringing to a close what has been a truly distinguished career.

As his family, friends and colleagues celebrate Tom's retirement, I would like to pay tribute to his substantial efforts to improve the quality of life for all Coloradans. His career is eminently deserving of both the praise and thanks of this body.

Tom began his tenure as an environmental health advocate in 1970. He first started as a sanitarian for the Tri-County District Health Department and, after earning a masters degree, started a career at the Colorado Health Department. Early in his career, Tom demonstrated both the integrity and the skill needed to conduct a responsible, responsive and

successful food safety program. His ambition and ability gave rise to his rapid ascension through the ranks of the Department. In 1980, Tom became the Department of Consumer Protection Assistant Director, holding that position until 1988. After a brief stint as the Department's budget director, Tom later returned to the Consumer Protection Division, serving as its appointed Director until today.

Tom has spent twenty seven years with the Department and his efforts to protect Colorado's health have been considerable. He has been the catalyst in bringing state, local and federal governments together toward mutually agreeable health policies. Throughout his career, Tom has been highly effective in bringing these often divergent entities together to address emerging health issues. In recent times, Tom has made a parade of bold breakthroughs in the Department, including providing the leadership at the state level to help ensure the successful introduction of a state retail food law, and coordinating a proactive action plan with the state dairy industry to address issues of antibiotic residues. Although these accomplishments only scratch the surface of what Tom has achieved, they both are indicative of the type of success that he has repeatedly encountered in his time working for the State of Colorado.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to pay tribute to Mr. Messenger and his efforts to make his community, state and nation a better and healthier place to live. His dedication and know-how have distinguished him greatly. The citizens of Colorado owe Tom a debt of gratitude and I wish him well during his retirement.

Your family, friends and colleagues are proud of you, Tom, and we all are thankful for your dedicated service over the past three decades.

INTRODUCTION OF SAINT CROIX ISLAND HERITAGE ACT

HON. JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation to help Calais, Maine, commemorate the 400th anniversary of an internationally historic event. In 1604, a group of adventurers led by a French nobleman established a settlement on Saint Croix Island in the Saint Croix River that forms part of the border between Maine and New Brunswick. By accounts it was one of the earliest settlements in North America.

The residents of the region, with the Saint Croix Economic Alliance and the Sunrise County Economic Council and with the cooperation of state and federal agencies have worked for several years to develop a regional heritage center to mark the event with a celebration in 2004 with the United States, Canada and France. The island itself is the only international historic site in the National Park System. The heritage center in Calais will preserve and chronicle the region's cultural, natural, and historical heritage.

The work began with an evaluation of the market potential for the heritage center and preparation of a preliminary exhibit and operating plans. The loose-knit coalition secured planning funds and seed money from local businesses, the city of Calais, and the U.S. Forest Service. A full-time project coordinator is in place to oversee the development of the project.

It is time for the National Park Service to step forward. The Saint Croix Island Heritage Act would grant the Park Service the authority to provide assistance. The bill directs the Park Service to facilitate the development of the heritage center in time for the 400th anniversary of the island's settlement by French explorers. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with other federal agencies as well as with nonprofit organizations, and state and local governments. It also authorizes $2.5 million for this endeavor.

QUALITY HEALTH CARE COALITION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. MATT SALMON

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1304) to ensure and foster continued patient safety and quality of care by making the antitrust laws apply to negotiations between groups of health care professionals and health plans and health insurance issuers in the same manner as such laws apply to collective bargaining by labor organizations under the National Labor Relations Act:

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to comment on H.R. 1304, the Quality Health Care Coalition Act—Representative CAMPBELL's bill which the House passed on June 29. While I had some reservations about this bill, I supported the legislation because I believe that it ultimately will level the playing field for health care providers when they negotiate patient-care agreements with managed care companies. I believe that we should do all we can to restore the relationship between patient and physician. Too often, managed care companies negotiate with providers on a ''take it or leave it'' basis. And because many independent physicians have little leverage over third party payers, they must take what is offered for their services or lose patients. We improve the quality of patient care when we give physicians a greater role in determining care.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the bill would give physicians and other health care providers the same collective bargaining options (under the Clayton and Sherman Acts) accorded to labor organizations under the National Labor Relations Act. Smartly, the negotiating authority granted by H.R. 1304 sunsets in three years. At that point, the General Accounting Office will study the impact of the legislation and make recommendations on how to improve it.

Opponents of the bill argue that it will allow physicians to form monopolies. Nothing in this legislation preempts the FTC or anti-trust department at DOJ from overseeing the business practices of groups formed by doctors. And the bill specifically states that physicians must negotiate in ''good faith'' with managed care companies. I encourage the FTC and the DOJ to continue to pay close attention to any activity that would adversely affect patients. Ironically, it is the HMOs which seem to exhibit monopolistic behavior. Over the last decade, third party payers have increasingly exercised their market power over both patients and doctors.

As I mentioned before, I have some reservations about the bill. For example, I am concerned that the legislation might create agreements where HMOs will pass any increase in health care costs to patients. I am also concerned that any shift in cost to patients will increase the number of uninsured. But, that argument is used every time Congress tries to reform the current health care system and it is the reason we cannot break the stranglehold that HMOs have on our health care decisions. At some point, we must return the health care market back to patients and doctors. I believe that this bill is a small step toward restoring the patient-physician relationship.

NONLETHAL WILDLIFE SERVICES BILL

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, as I have traveled the roads in my district talking and spending time with my constituents—small ranchers, sheep growers, farmers, conservationists, environmentalists and others—I have learned to understand and appreciate their different concerns over the issue of predators. This has been an important listening and learning experience for me. What I learned from all of this was the need for a balanced approach. On one hand environmentalists insist that out on the range, where no one can see, many predators are killed unnecessarily. The traditional small ranchers, sheep growers and farmers on the other hand, point out the need to find solutions for protecting the domestic resources that provide them with a living. Conservationists are concerned about predator impacts on both game animals and protected species.

My legislation is an effort to bring common sense thinking to these sensitive issues. In the rural Hispanic and Native American communities of my district, I have seen the need for finding ways to control predators that will allow them to preserve a way of life that is more than four centuries old while not putting the surrounding ecosystem under unnecessary stress. My legislation would provide grants through the Wildlife Services Agency, to assist with implementing nonlethal predator control in areas like my district. Funds would also be made available for providing training and technical assistance to traditional small ranchers, sheep growers and farmers regarding the use of nonlethal predator control in their operations. Emphasis would be placed on methods such as using burros, llamas, night penning and guard dogs for predator control.

Matching the funding to the small subsistence operators is important if the assistance is to get to those who need it to protect their livelihood. I am also recommending that the Secretary of Agriculture add to our knowledge base concerning these methods by conducting

research directly or through grants to determine the extent of damage to livestock operations, throughout the western states, where different methods of predator control are used. Only then can we intelligently learn to find the balance that successfully protects traditional ways of living and our need for vital, thriving ecosystems.

REMEMBERING DR. GEORGE ''HOWARD'' HARDY III

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor and profound sadness that I now rise to pay tribute to the life of Aspen, Colorado's great civic patriarch, Dr. George ''Howard'' Hardy III. After living a remarkably accomplished life, sadly, Dr. Hardy passed away while mountain biking in the four corners area. But even as we mourn his passing, everyone who knew Howard should take comfort in the truly incredible life he led.

Since the 1970's, few can claim a place in the Aspen community as lofty as Howard. His accomplishments and contributions, Mr. Speaker, were many. Howard was a well liked Dentist in the Aspen community. George Kauffman, a close friend of Howard's, said that: ''Howard was a fixture in the community, and a core member of what makes Aspen special.''

Howard, an Ohio native, received his undergraduate and doctoral degree from Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio. After completion of his education, Howard used his acquired skills to serve his country in the Army as a captain and a Doctor. Following his service, Howard established a private practice in Aspen, Colorado. Patients still remember Howard's office as a heartwarming place, recalling Howard's wonderful sense of humor and his love of practical jokes.

One of Howard's colleagues, Dr. David Swersky, remembered the office as ''joke central, people came into the office just to tell us some jokes, because they knew Howard was always game.'' Howard's compassion was easy to distinguish before a procedure. David said that ''Howard would always start a procedure with a joke. He was very caring about his patients.'' He was not only a Doctor, but a friend to his patients. His relationships with his colleagues were also special, David said that ''We had a very special relationship, I'm not only losing a partner. I'm losing a brother.''

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I say thank you and good-bye to this great American who will long serve as an inspiration to us all. We will all miss him greatly.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY STABILITY ACT OF 2000

HON. PAUL RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the International Monetary Stability Act of 2000. This bill would give countries who have been seriously considering using the U.S. dollar as their national currency the incentive to do so. When a foreign country grants the U.S. dollar legal tender in place of its own currency, that country dollarizes. This bill would serve to encourage such dollarization.

Dollarization is an extremely important issue for developing countries seeking monetary stability and economic growth in the Western Hemisphere. Of course, dollarization is no panacea. However, sound money combined with a sound fiscal policy—or I would even posit as a precursor to a sound fiscal policy—and property rights, and a viable rule of law, helps to ensure that dollarization can boost development in growing economies.

Today, countries can dollarize without consulting the Federal Reserve or the U.S. Treasury. There is no need for the Fed to be the world's lender of last resort by opening up its discount window to dollarized countries. Like Panama, countries can maintain liquidity through the private banking system.

The Fed will never be responsible for supervising foreign banks. Not only would sovereign governments disapprove of the United States regulating their private banking system, I would imagine that the Fed has no desire to grant foreign banks the same privileges that U.S. banks receive without making foreign banks pay for such protection.

The Fed already takes the international circumstances into account when formulating policy. If you remember back to the end of 1998, the Fed lowered interest rates three times to stem contagion, not because of any domestic considerations. Regardless, with a consistent law outlining dollarization agreements with the United States, countries understand from the beginning that the Fed will not act as their central bank.

There are significant benefits to the United States should more countries choose to dollarize. There would be a decrease in cases of dumping since foreign countries would lose the ability to devalue against the dollar to gain trade advantage, and U.S. businesses would find it easier to invest in these countries since currency risk and inflation risk are greatly diminished.

Likewise, dollarization lowers monetary instability within dollarized countries and increases the living standards of their citizens. During Senate hearings on dollarization, Judy Shelton, of Empower America, eloquently described the entrepreneurial spirit within Mexico but contrasted this optimism with a scenario of high interest rates and scarce bank loans for businesses. Indeed, sporadic devaluations and politically derived inflation negate expectations that a domestic currency can be a meaningful store of future value.

Inflation is directly linked to interest rates. Inflation expectations act as an interest rate premium. When inflation is expected to go up, interest rates are high. As we have seen lately in the United States in our own debate over rising interest rates, low rates reduce the cost of borrowing and increase prosperity, while higher rates raise the cost of capital and slow economic growth. For most Latin American countries, dollarization should lower their interest rates to within 4 percent of U.S. rates, depending on political and fiscal factors.

Further, because dollarization eliminates the ability of foreign central banks to manipulate money supply, which I would argue is a benefit of dollarization and not a cost as some analysts do, inflation is tied to U.S. inflation.

My bill, the International Monetary Stability Act of 2000, would give countries who have been seriously considering using the U.S. dollar as their national currency the incentive to do so. A couple of changes have been made since I first introduced the original bill last fall in order to take into account concerns raised by the Treasury Department during Senate hearings. One important change includes the ability of the Treasury to consider money laundering as a factor for deciding whether to certify a country for seigniorage sharing.

In general, enacting this legislation would set up a structure in which the U.S. Treasury would have the discretion to promote official dollarization in emerging market countries by offering to rebate 85% of the resulting increase in U.S. seigniorage earnings. Part of the remaining 15% would be distributed to countries like Panama that have already dollarized, but the majority of the 15% would be deposited at the Treasury Department as government revenue. Additionally, this bill would make it explicitly clear that the United States has no obligation to serve as a lender of last resort to dollarized countries, consider their economic conditions in setting monetary policy or supervise their banks.

I would like to conclude by repeating an old quote from Treasury Secretary Larry Summers. Back in 1992, when he was at the World Bank, Secretary Summers said ''finding ways of bribing people to dollarize, or at least give back the extra seigniorage that is earned when dollarization takes place, ought to be an international priority. For the world as a whole, the advantages of dollarization seem clear to me.''

Congressional leadership in exchange rate policies such as dollarization protects our own economy. Every foreign devaluation affects our economy through international trade and through the equity markets. American companies need reliable currencies to make investment decisions abroad; and American workers need to know countries cannot competitively devalue in an effort to lower foreign worker wages. The ramifications of an Asian-style economic collapse in Latin America, our own back yard, call for legislation that will help these countries embrace consistent economic growth.

I strongly believe that strengthening global economies, especially those in the Western Hemisphere, by encouraging dollarization is in America's best interest.

PROMOTING HEALTHY EYES AND HEALTHY LIVES: THE CONGRESSIONAL GLAUCOMA CAUCUS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as one of the founders of the Congressional Glaucoma Caucus, I want to praise the work of a far-seeing business firm, the Pharmacia Corporation which encouraged and supported the formation of the Friends of the Congressional Glaucoma Caucus Foundation. The Congressional Glaucoma Caucus is a bipartisan group that grew out of discussions with several of my

House colleagues. We recognized that there was a need to provide our constituents with free screenings for glaucoma, a devastating disease that robs a person of his or her sight. There is no cure for glaucoma—but it can be prevented if caught early enough. Unfortunately, many of our fellow Americans who are at highest risk for glaucoma are also unable to easily avail themselves of the latest in medical testing. We formed the Congressional Glaucoma Caucus to bring important information and preventive screenings to constituents in our own districts. The idea has gained great momentum. There are now 40 members of the Congressional Glaucoma Caucus and we have already held screenings in Florida, Illinois, New York, Tennessee, and Washington, DC. Hundreds of Americans have been referred for follow-up care of possible glaucoma or other acuity problems; hundreds of others have gone home from our screenings reassured that their eyes are healthy. In this effort we have had much help. The Friends of the Congressional Glaucoma Caucus Foundation was founded to bring together physicians, blindness prevention groups; industry spokespeople and others interested in this cause. The Foundation has done yeoman work in setting up the screenings and ensuring that they run smoothly and for that the members of the Caucus are profoundly grateful. A great deal of thanks is owed to the ophthalmologists and their staffs who have volunteered to conduct the actual screenings. And we owe the Pharmacia Corporation a debt of gratitude for its generous educational grant to the Friends of the Congressional Glaucoma Caucus Foundation. Their support has been vital, and has meant that not one penny of anyone's tax dollars have been spent on this noble effort. This is truly a wonderful thing, and I commend everyone involved.

QUALITY HEALTH-CARE COALITION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1304) to ensure and foster continued patient safety and quality of care by making the antitrust laws apply to negotiations between groups of health care professionals and health plans and health insurance issuers in the same manner as such laws apply to collective bargaining by labor organizations under the National Labor Relations Act:

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, the fact that we are considering this legislation on the House floor today is a testament to the Republican leadership's lack of desire to deal with the real problems consumers are facing from managed care.

We passed a bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights last October, the conference was appointed nearly four months ago—but we have made precious little progress on that important legislation that is already so long overdue.

That is what we should be debating on the House floor today. We should be debating extending patient protections to consumers to ensure that health plans cover emergency room care, that women have an unfettered right to ob/gyn care, that health plans are required to provide their members with access to specialists, that patients be guaranteed access to an independent external appeals, and that patients could hold health plans liable if their actions caused harm or death.

Instead, we are faced with a bill that does absolutely nothing to protect consumers in managed care—but does wonders to protect doctors' incomes.

I guess we shouldn't be surprised. This Republican Congress has shown us time and time again that they are far more interested in helping their monied friends and supporters than the general public.

On its face, this legislation raises numerous concerns. A simple look at the exceptions in the bill makes it clear that anti-trust exemptions fraught with potential problems.

It Exempts Federal Health Programs. In order to get the bill out of the Judiciary Committee the bill's supporters had to accept an amendment to exclude Medicare, Medicaid, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan, the State Children's Health Insurance Program, Veterans Health services, Indian Health Services and all other federal health programs from the law.

The reason for this amendment was that Congressional Budget Office analysis showed that the bill would impact federal spending for these programs by increasing expenditures by some $11.3 billion over 10 years.

Managed care plays a major role in most of these programs today. By allowing doctors to collectively bargain with managed care plans, CBO estimates that rates will increase by 15 percent. If the law applied to federal health programs it would obviously impact federal health spending. The supporters of the bill don't want to acknowledge the real costs associated with passage of this bill so they exempt federal programs from it.

Even with federal health programs exempted, CBO found that passage of the bill would decrease federal tax revenues by some $3.6 billion over ten years. Those federal losses come about because employers would claim larger deductions for the increased expense of providing health benefits (because of the increased bargaining power of doctors). This would also result in employees receiving a greater share of compensation in tax-sheltered benefits.

The law sunsets after three years. In another attempt to gain support, the bill has a provision that would automatically sunset the law after three years. This sunset provision is a direct acknowledgement of the concern that granting anti-trust exemptions is a dramatic move. The fact is that we don't know exactly how much strength doctors would exert through this new found ability to collectively bargain. It may be that they would exercise restraint and put the quality of care of their patients first. Then again, they might exercise united power by refusing to contract with health plans that won't meet their demands—whatever those demands might be.

Should the latter occur, the impact on patient care could be devastating. Therefore, the authors are acknowledging that an escape hatch might be necessary. I'd rather not open such a risky door in the first place.

After all of these strong statements, I must also acknowledge that I understand and empathize with the frustration of America's physicians and other health care providers. The growth of managed care has significantly altered their professions in ways in which we could not have imagined even 10 years ago. And, much of this change has not been good for patients or health care providers. Congress can and should take action to address those concerns, but this bill isn't the solution.

Instead, I urge Congress to move forward with passage of the Patients' Bill of Rights which would limit health plans' abilities to use financial incentives, eliminate gag clauses, and finally extend liability already faced by doctors and hospitals to the health plans that are making many of today's medical decisions.

Many of my colleagues may not know that I was voted the most fiscally conservative Democrat this year by the National Taxpayer's Union. In the spirit of maintaining my standing of strong fiscal responsibility—and on the many additional grounds I've mentioned—I strongly oppose H.R. 1304 and urge my colleagues to join with me in opposition to this so-called managed care ''solution'' that is fraught with such serious flaws.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE CITY OF CLINTON ON RECEIVING THE ALL-AMERICAN CITY AWARD

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to congratulate the community of Clinton, Missouri, which recently received the designation of All-American City from the National Civic League.

The All-American City Award recognizes towns that work together to address critical community issues. The sponsors of this award commended Clinton for exhibiting outstanding citizen involvement, high government performance, local philanthropic resources, and intercommunity cooperation.

With a population of 9,300, Clinton was the smallest of the 10 cities selected for this award, although towns of all sizes participated on an equal level. A group of 75 residents of Clinton—including many student ambassadors—traveled to Louisville, Kentucky, in early June to present a summary of three of their community betterment programs to a panel of judges selected by the sponsor of the award.

Several projects which the sponsors noted as especially worthwhile included the START (Students Together Achieving Responsible Tasks) program. This local youth community service organization connects students with charitable volunteer opportunities. In addition, Clinton has made progress in attacking its biggest killer, cardiovascular disease, by creating a CHART wellness center staffed by local hospital employees. Through community educational measures and blood pressure and cholesterol screenings, this group helps increase awareness and prevention of heart disease. Also, the town participates in the Main Street USA program in an effort to revitalize its downtown and Historic Square Districts.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my congratulations to the residents of the city of Clinton. It is with great pride that I honor them for being designated an All-American City.

IN MEMORY OF IRENE WOODFIN

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I now rise to honor the life and memory of an outstanding person, my friend Irene Woodfin. Sadly, Irene passed away July 8, 2000 in her own home. As family and friends mourn her passing, I would like to pay tribute to this beloved wife to her husband, mother to her children, and friend to all. She will be missed by many. Even so, her life was a remarkable one that is most deserving of both the recognition and praise of this body.

Much of Irene's life was spent educating and helping others. Irene graduated from Greeley Colorado State Teacher's College (UNC) in 1927. After her distinguished teaching career, Irene retired from teaching in 1971. Irene was also very involved in community organizations and events throughout her life. Some of the groups she belonged to included being a member of Delta Kappa Gamma (Xi Chapter), American Association of University Women (AAUW), and always an active participant in her local church choir. Irene's love of making music and crafts brought her great distinction and were rightly a source of pride.

While her involvement in education and community are to be remembered, Irene's lasting legacy rests in her family. Irene is survived by her husband of 69 years, Dick Woodfin. Irene was the mother to three, grandmother to eight, great-grandmother to 17, and great-great-grandmother to 4. She also had 11 step-grand-children. In her children, grandchildren, and their offspring, Irene's love and generosity will endure.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, Irene was a person who lived an accomplished life. Although friends and family are profoundly saddened by her passing, each can take solace in the wonderful life that she led. I know I speak for everyone who knew Irene well when I say she will be greatly missed.

RECOGNITION OF THE PEOPLE OF THE INDIAN STATE OF PUNJAB

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary people of the Indian state of Punjab.

Punjab is an agricultural state, home of the Green Revolution and famous for the diligence of its people. Though Punjab comprises only 1.5 percent of India's territory, farmers from the state have provided 65 percent of India's wheat and 45 percent of its rice for the past 25 years. Punjab is a naturally breathtaking place, but I was most inspired by the limitless potential of its people. They are hardworking men and women, striving to better the lives of their families and neighbors, and sharing a deep devotion to God.

While in the city of Amritsar I visited the Golden Temple, the spiritual capital of Punjab and the destination of all Sikh pilgrims. It was truly an honor to witness the Sikh faith in practice within the walls of their holiest of temples. After experiencing the Punjabi people's intense spirituality firsthand, I now understand why Punjab today enjoys peace and stability.

Mr. Parkash S. Badal, Chief Minister of Punjab, was kind enough to meet with me during my stay in Punjab. We met not in the capital city, but in the small village of Sahouli, where the Chief Minister demonstrated his sincere concern for the villagers and farmers of Punjab. He is a man of great commitment to the state of Punjab and its people, and he has worked relentlessly to improve the lives of all Punjabis. The Chief Minister expressed to me the Punjabi people's profound desire to build a strong and lasting relationship with the United States, and he has asked for the help of this House of Representatives in doing so.

I encourage my colleagues and all Americans to welcome the Punjabi people with open arms. President Clinton recently traveled to India, and in doing so he displayed great foresight and wisdom. I believe it is our obligation to follow the President's lead and work to establish strong ties between our two nations' governments, businesses and citizens. I am confident Chief Minister Badal will continue to guide Punjab towards progress and prosperity, and I am hopeful my colleagues here today will join with me in my efforts to broaden and extend our personal and economic collaboration with the people of Punjab indefinitely.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently voted yes on Roll Call No. 369 and was unable to correct my vote in time prior to announcement of the result. My intention was to vote no.

TRIBUTE TO TURNER N. ROBERTSON

HON. EVA M. CLAYTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 2, 2000, a long-time official of the House will be laid to rest in Scotland Neck, North Carolina. At age 91, Turner N. Robertson has been called to rest and to reside in a place of total peace.

Mr. Robertson came to Congress in 1939, with then Representative John Kerr. He served in various positions until 1947, when he was appointed by Speaker Sam Rayburn as Chief of Page. He served in that position until his retirement in 1972, and moved to Coral Springs, Florida. Yet, even in retirement, he was consulted by Speakers John McCormick and Carl Albert. He received the Employee of the Year Award for the House of Representatives in 1971. A plaque to this effect hangs in the U.S. Capitol, across from the Speaker's office

Turner was a gentle man, a true and honest American, a devoted husband and loving father. All who knew him were touched by his humility, strength of character and faith in God. He was well respected on Capitol Hill, and his friends spanned the spectrum from the Congresspersons he served to the Pages he supervised.

Born in Macon, North Carolina, on April 22, 1909, his early life involved great personal sacrifice. Yet, he was guided by faith. He is survived by his wife of 60 years, Ernestine, his daughter Barbara, his brother Bernard and sister Mrytice. His earthly family incluced many relatives, friends and church families in Washington, DC, Virginia, North Carolina and Florida. Turner N. Robertson was an ordinary man who was special and a special man who was ordinary.

God's finger has gently touched him and he now sleeps. I am confident that he has left a lastng impression on those who came to know him, and the principles that guided him will now serve as guideposts for those he leaves behind. He shall surely be missed. I feel certain, however, that he would want all of us to rejoice in his life and the time he spent on this earth.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN LINDER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like it to be noted in the RECORD that on June 23, 2000, I intended to vote nay on Roll Call No. 372, final passage of H.R. 1304, the Quality Health Care Coalition Act.

IN HONOR OF THE LATE BENNIE HOLMES, JR.

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and sadness that I honor the life of Bennie Holmes Jr., who passed away recently at too young an age. Mr. Holmes' leadership in the civil rights movement and as an anti-poverty activist earned him the respect of our entire San Francisco community; his caring heart and kind ways earned him our affection. Bennie's presence in the community can never be replaced, but the work of his life will live on after him.

Bennie was born and reared in McComb, Mississippi, and it was there that he learned the values of hard work, community, and his deeply rooted sense of justice. In the late 1950's, he moved to California, and in 1961 he graduated from Monrovia High School in Los Angeles County. He later moved to San Francisco and continued his education at San Francisco State University, where he earned a degree in Political Science.

Mr. Holmes worked much of his life for racial equality. He helped to found the N.A.A.C.P. Junior Chapter at Pasadena College in 1961. In 1964 he organized a group from San Francisco which joined the 1964 march for civil rights that went from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama. He fought continually for the cause of civil rights with the Congress

On Racial Equality, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and with such individuals as Martin Luther King, Jr. and James Farmer.

Dedicated to fighting poverty and improving the lives of low-income residents, Bennie worked most of his professional life with the Economic Opportunity Council of San Francisco. For the past thirty-three years, Bennie was employed by this nonprofit group in several different capacities. He organized and raised money for numerous anti-poverty programs in San Francisco and worked to clothe, feed, and find employment for the neediest among us. Known and trusted by everyone, Bennie was regarded as the ''eyes and ears'' of the community because he was always looking out for those in need.

Mr. Holmes also organized workshops at which tenants learned their rights when dealing with landlords, worked with youth groups, and traveled extensively in Africa, Europe, and the United States.

Well-regarded for his tireless community service, Bennie was also admired for his delicious barbecue ribs. At social and political events, he could always be found behind the grill, serving the community in yet another way.

Bennie Holmes left us much too soon. He worked his entire life for civil rights, equal opportunity, and economic and social justice. He treated everyone with respect, and he was respected for doing so. His passing is a loss to all of our San Francisco community.

My thoughts and prayers are with his mother, Leola Wells Holmes, his children, and his entire family.

HONORING STEVEN R. MAVIGLIO FOR HIS DEDICATED SERVICE TO THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to express my appreciation to, and tremendous respect for, a dedicated public servant that is leaving my staff today, my administrative assistant, Steven R. Maviglio. Steve is leaving Capitol Hill after many years of dedicated service to the U.S. House of Representatives and to the nation.

Steve has been a key policy, political and management advisor to me since my election to Congress nearly two years ago. More than that, he has been a trusted friend. Prior to heading up my office, Steve served as a top aide to California Representative Vic Fazio, as Director of the House Democratic Caucus, and in high-level positions in the Department of Justice and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. Having been an elected official himself, Steve's guidance and counsel have been of tremendous value to me, as a new representative. When it comes to politics, Steve is a seasoned pro, and this institution will miss him. Anyone who has worked with Steve knows that his experience, his passion, and his humor are assets that will be sorely missed.

As my colleagues know, serving in the House of Representatives is a great honor and an even greater responsibility. Among the real benefits of being here is having the opportunity to work with some of the finest and most decent men and women anywhere in our nation. Steve is one of those talented people who have made my time here memorable and successful.

When the public looks at Congress, it is often easy to miss the dedicated staff that work here, helping Member's to do the people's business. Congressional staffers like Steve are the members of the congressional family who rarely get the attention they deserve. They share our hopes, our dreams, our commitment, our purpose, and our idealism. They are the ones who are in the office when we arrive in the morning and are still there when we leave at night. For my entire first term, Steve's commitment and hard work helped set me on the right course. He helped to oversee and implement all of the pieces that make up a successful Representative's office.

Being the top aide to a Member of Congress isn't an easy job. It's a position that is made up of many roles. Steve has been my adviser, gatekeeper, eyes, ears, and voice. Top aides like Steve act as all of these things and more. They are diplomats and negotiators, fighters and sometimes even scapegoats. When Members look good it is often because of the hard work of people like Steve. When something goes wrong they often shoulder the blame. While staffers are often overlooked, overworked, and under appreciated, I wanted to take this time to let Steve know that he is not. I am grateful for all that he has done for me, for the people of New Jersey and for this great institution.

The Democratic Members of this body and the people of central New Jersey have gained much from Steve Maviglio's years of hard work, his dedication, his friendship and his wise and reasoned counsel. Steve leaves my office today to begin work as the Press Secretary for Gov. Gray Davis of California; he will be missed here by me and his many friends.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me in extending to Steve our appreciation for a job well done and our best wishes for the challenges that lie ahead.

COMMENDING THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE DEPARTMENT LEGAL DEPARTMENT

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to your attention the commendable actions of the International Finance Corporation (IFC) Legal Department, the private sector arm of the World Bank.

Since 1994, the IFC Legal Department has been involved in a joint effort with Gospel Rescue Ministries (GRM), a homeless shelter and drug rehabilitation/educational training center for men on the edge of DC's Chinatown neighborhood. This partnership has helped rebuild the lives of numerous formerly homeless individuals.

IFC offers men from Gospel Rescue Ministries the opportunity to work and receive training in the Legal Departments Records Room. The program allows these men to gain experience in records management while the IFC gains reliable help. Already, 14 men have taken part in the program and several of them have gone on to continue their studies, move to promising jobs with other firms, or take positions with other IFC Departments, while all have laid foundations for more stable lives.

The idea of IFC's involvement came about at a Legal Department retreat, where staff members said they wished they could see development impact locally or at least find ways of reaching out to the community. IFC Deputy General Counsel Jennifer Sullivan knew GRM and knew that it needed jobs for the graduates of its computer training program. Aware of openings in her department paying between $8 and $10 an hour, she proposed a partnership. As Ms. Sullivan has told me, it was definitely a win-win situation. These young men are gaining experience and training and IFC gets reliable, low-cost help.

Office manager Viki Betancourt and Records Room manager Michael Cortese closely track the program with GRM. Both were devastated when their first hire reverted to drug use and had to leave both the shelter and his job at IFC. But their eyes shine when they talk about the other men they have hired since.

One participant, who has earned his high school equivalency degree, is attending Strayer College and plans to become a minister. Others have landed jobs in other IFC departments. All feel a great responsibility to reach out to others in the shelter and show them that success is attainable. All have worked very hard and done well, according to Mr. Cortese. Other staff in the Records Room have come to appreciate the enthusiasm and dedication of these individuals.

Dr. Edward Eyring, director of GRM, says that most men who walk into the shelter cannot even conceive of being successful. Dr. Eyring is a friend of mine and an orthopedic surgeon who moved to Washington from Knoxville, Tennessee with his wife Mary Jane to run the privately supported program.

It is very appropriate that there is a sign over the front door of the program's facilities that reads, ''If you haven't got a friend in the world, you can find one here. Come in.'' GRM says it has a 70 percent success rate in helping its men stay free of drugs and alcohol for at least 15 months but really offers more than just drug rehabilitation, aiming to give men support and training so that they can begin life anew. Nothing helps more than a job.

The IFC Legal Department staff is committed to finding ways to reach out to the community. This commitment has gone beyond words to provide employment opportunities that have transformed lives and renewed hope for a brighter future. The IFC deserves our congratulations and thanks for their successful involvement in the fight to combat homelessness in our nation's capital.

SECURING JUSTICE FOR THE IRANIAN JEWS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 2000

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deepest concerns for the ten Iranian Jews who were convicted last week of

seditious crimes and sentenced to extraordinarily long sentences. By now it is well documented that the condemning trial was saturated with false evidence and forced confessions, and was never intended to expose the meaning of true justice. These individuals were small tradesmen, leading a life in the ways consistent with their religion, and it is that for which they are being punished. Religious persecution can never be allowed, but when such injustices are showcased before the international community, it is our responsibility to take a stand and say that this will not be tolerated.

We have seen legal and human rights organizations worldwide affirming that this trial was in fact a sham, and that it is beyond the realm of possibility to believe that such individuals could ever have been capable of committing the crimes for which they are accused.

By staging such a mockery of justice it is apparent that Iran has no comprehension of human or civil rights, and therefore convicted no other than themselves in proving that they remain unfit to enter any exercise of the civilized world.

In a recent meeting between President Clinton and the American relatives of the convicted Iranian Jews, a promise was made to use all possible U.S. government resources to secure the freedom of these individuals. This is a promise in which I would urge President Clinton to keep as I hope my colleagues here in the House would as well.

We must remember that as we speak that there are thousands of Jews remaining in Iran, who can be subjected to identical suppression at any time. We must take a stand here and now and say behavior such as this will not be tolerated both now and in the future.

Today, in New York the Jewish Community Relations Council and the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations organized a solidarity gathering in an effort to show the world community that we will continue to fight for the rights of these individuals until justice is truly served. I would like to commend these organizations for their efforts and would like to offer and assistance possible to the rectification of this atrocity.

CHURCH PLAN PARITY AND ENTANGLEMENT PREVENTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN R. THUNE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 2000

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for S. 1309. This bill clarifies that church sponsored employer benefit plans are not subject to state insurance laws.

Because church plans are exempt from the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, they do not benefit from the explicit preemption of state insurance regulation that secular self-insured health plans enjoy. Many service providers have been reluctant to do business with church benefit programs for fear that they themselves may violate state insurance rules barring contracts with unlicensed entities. In addition, state regulators occasionally raise questions about the legal status of these benefit programs. These complications have caused churches to contract with numerous service providers in order to comply with recent federal mandates on church plans.

S. 1309 remedies this problem by clarifying that church plans are not insurance companies for state law purposes. Congress has already addressed a similar problem for church sponsored employee benefit plans under federal securities laws, extending the exemptions enjoyed by secular plans and preempting state securities regulation of church plans.

Just this year, my own state of South Dakota enacted an exemption for church plans from its insurance laws—making my State the fourth state to so act. I commend the Director of Insurance, Darla Lyon, the State Legislature and the Governor for working hard to protect the health care benefits of church workers and to assist them in accessing discounted providers. South Dakota has now joined Texas, Florida and Minnesota in clarifying that church benefit plans are not insurance companies. It makes little sense to suggest that church benefit programs spend their resources to enact 46 more state exemptions. The pending bill will provide these programs the legal certainty they need in every state.

More than one million clergy, lay workers, and their families are presently being denied access to discounted service providers because of the ambiguous position of church plans under state law. S. 1309 corrects this problem.

I urge adoption of the pending bill.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 11, 2000 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 12

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of Francisco J. Sanchez, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation; Frank Henry Cruz, of California, Ernest J. Wilson III, of Maryland, Katherine Milner Anderson, of Virginia, and Kenneth Y. Tomlinson, of Virginia, all to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.
SR–253

Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program.
SH–216

10 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine the National Science Foundation.
SD–430

Judiciary
Technology, Terrorism, and Government Information Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine identity theft and how to protect and restore your good name.
SD–226

Budget
To hold hearings on certain provisions of S. 2274, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide families and disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the medicaid program for such children.
SD–608

10:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the United Nations policy in Africa.
SD–419

2 p.m.
Foreign Relations
International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the role of biotechnology in combating poverty and hunger in developing countries.
SD–419

Judiciary
To hold hearings on the nomination of Glenn A. Fine, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Department of Justice; the nomination of Dennis M. Cavanaugh, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey; the nomination of James S. Moody, Jr., of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida vice a new position created by Public Law 106–113, approved November 29, 1999; the nomination of Gregory A. Presnell, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida vice a new position created by Public Law 106–113, approved November 29, 1999; and the nomination of John E. Steele, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida vice a new position created by Public Law 106–113, approved November 29, 1999.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement implementing the October 1999 announcement by the Presidnet to review approximately 40 million acres of national forest for increased protection.
SD–366

Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on risk management and tort liability relating to Indian matters.
SR–485

JULY 13

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business; to be followed by oversight hearings to examine American gasoline supply problems.
SD–366

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to markup pending calendar business.
SR–253

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Employment, Safety and Training Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine ergonomics and health care.
SD–430

10 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Business meeting to markup S. 2107, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to reduce securities fees in excess of those required to fund the operations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to adjust compensation provisions for employees of the Commission; S. 2266, to provide for the minting of commemorative coins to support the 2002 Salt Lake Olympic Winter Games and the programs of the United States Olympic Committee; S. 2453, to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Pope John Paul II in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions to humanity; S. 2459, 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. 2101, to promote international monetary stability and to share seigniorage with officially dollarized countries; and a committee print of a substitute amendment ot H.R. 3046, to preserve limited Federal agency reporting requirements on banking and housing matters to facilitate congressional oversight and public accountability.
SD–538

1 p.m.
Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the United States trade policy agenda at the G 8 Summit.
SD–215

2 p.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
Business meeting to markup H.R. 4733, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001.
SD–124

Governmental Affairs
International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the annual report of the Postmaster General.
SD–342

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2294, to establish the Rosie the Riveter-World War II Home Front National Historical Park in the State of California; S. 2331, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to recalculate the franchise fee owed by Fort Sumter Tours, Inc., a concessioner providing services to Fort Sumter National Monument, South Carolina; and S. 2598, to authorize appropriations for the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.
SD–366

Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters.
SH–219

JULY 18

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–366

JULY 19

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–366

10 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on certain legislative proposals and issues relevant to the operations of Inspectors General, including S. 870, to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) to increase the efficiency and accountability of Offices of Inspecter General within Federal departments, and an Administrative proposal to grant statutory law enforcement authority to 23 Inspectors General.
SD–342

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the status of the Biological Opinions of the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the operations of the Federal hydropower system of the Columbia River.
SD–366

Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the National Indian Gaming Commission.
SR–485

JULY 20

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the United States General Accounting Office's investigation of the Cerro Grande Fire in the State of New Mexico, and from Federal agencies on the Cerro Grande Fire and their fire policies in general.
SD–366
Small Business
To hold hearings to examine the General Accounting Office's performance and accountability review.
SR–428A

10 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2688, to amend the Native American Languages Act to provide for the support of Native American Language Survival Schools.
SR–485
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the conduct of monetary policy by the Federal Reserve.
SH–216

JULY 25

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the National Missile Defense Program.
SH–216

JULY 26

9 a.m.
Small Business
Business meeting to markup S. 1594, to amend the Small Business Act and Small Business Investment Act of 1958.
SR–428A

10 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1801, to provide for the identification, collection, and review for declassification of records and materials that are of extraordinary public interest to the people of the United States.
SD–342

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on potential timber sale contract liability incurred by the government as a result of timber sale contract cancellations.
SD–366

Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2526, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to revise and extend such Act.
SR–485

JULY 27

10 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.
SR–485

SEPTEMBER 26

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the Legislative recommendation of the American Legion.
345 Cannon Building

CANCELLATIONS

JULY 12

10 a.m.
Finance
To hold hearings on disclosure of political activity of tax code section 527 and other organizations.
SD–215

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6301–S6401

Measures Introduced: Four bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2840–2843, and S. Res. 334. **Pages S6347–48**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Reported on Wednesday, July 5, during the adjournment:

H.R. 3916, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 106–328)

S. 2839, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide marriage tax relief by adjusting the standard deduction, 15-percent and 28-percent rate brackets, and earned income credit. (S. Rept. No. 106–329)

Reported today:

S. 1438, to establish the National Law Enforcement Museum on Federal land in the District of Columbia, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 106–330)

S. 1670, to revise the boundary of Fort Matanzas National Monument. (S. Rept. No. 106–331)

S. 2020, to adjust the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, Mississippi. (S. Rept. No. 106–332)

S. 2511, to establish the Kenai Mountains-Turnagain Arm National Heritage Area in the State of Alaska, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 106–333)

H.R. 2879, to provide for the placement at the Lincoln Memorial of a plaque commemorating the speech of Martin Luther King, Jr., known as the ''I Have A Dream'' speech, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 106–334)

Page S6347

Measures Passed:

Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation: Senate passed S. 311, to authorize the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs, after agreeing to committee amendments, and the following amendment proposed thereto:

Pages S6397–S6400

Warner (for Thomas) Amendment No. 3777, to clarify that the sites for memorials previously approved are not affected by the amendments to the Commemorative Works Act made in title II of the bill, and to make clarifying changes. **Pages S6398–99**

Interior Appropriations: Senate began consideration of H.R. 4578, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S6302–24, S6328**

Pending:

Wellstone Amendment No. 3772, to increase funding for emergency expenses resulting from wind storms. **Page S6323**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 54 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. 172), Madelyn R. Creedon, of Indiana, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administration. **Pages S6329, S6334–38, S6401**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Leslie Beth Kramerich, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

A routine list in the Army. **Pages S6400–01**

Messages From the House: **Pages S6346–47**

Communications: **Page S6347**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Page S6348**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6348–50**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S6350–52**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S6352**

Additional Statements: **Pages S6345–46**

Text of S. 2071 and H.R. 4577, as Previously Passed: Pages S6352–97

Enrolled Bills Signed: Pages S6346–47

Privileges of the Floor: Page S6352

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—172) Pages S6337–38

Adjournment: Senate convened at 1:01 p.m., and adjourned at 6:48 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Tuesday, July 11, 2000. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6400.)

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 10 public bills, H.R. 4810–4819; and 1 resolution, H. Con. Res. 369, were introduced. Page H5736

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows.

H.R. 1787, to reauthorize the participation of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Deschutes Resources Conservancy (H. Rept. 106–712);

H.R. 4286, to provide for the establishment of the Cahaba River National Wildlife Refuge in Bibb County, Alabama, amended (H. Rept. 106–713);

H.R. 4132, to reauthorize grants for water resources research and technology institutes established under the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (H. Rept. 106–714);

H.R. 4442, 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 (H. Rept. 106–715);

H. Res. 415, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National Ocean Day to recognize the significant role the ocean plays in the lives of the Nation's people and the important role the Nation's people must play in the continued life of the ocean, amended (H. Rept. 106–716);

S. 986, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Griffith Project to the Southern Nevada Water Authority (H. Rept. 106–717);

H.R. 4108, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to make grants to improve security at schools, including the placement and use of metal detectors, amended (H. Rept. 106–718);

H.R. 4391, to amend title 4 of the United States Code to establish nexus requirements for State and local taxation of mobile telecommunication services, amended (H. Rept. 106–719); and

H.R. 4811, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001 (H. Rept. 106–720). Pages H5735–36

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Biggert to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H5659

Recess: The House recessed at 12:38 p.m. and reconvened at 2:00 p.m. Page H5660

Recess: The House recessed at 3:16 p.m. and reconvened at 4:01 p.m. Pages H5682–83

Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment on June 30, 2000 of Ms. Lura Lynn Ryan of Kankakee, Illinois to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission. Page H5660

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Read a letter from Chairman Shuster wherein he transmitted copies of resolutions approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on June 21—referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Page H5660

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Importance of United States History Education: S. Con. Res. 129, expressing the sense of Congress regarding the importance and value of education in United States history; Pages H5661–70

Deschutes Resources Conservancy Reauthorization: H.R. 1787, to reauthorize the participation of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Deschutes Resources Conservancy; Pages H5670–71

Water Resources Research and Technology Institutes Grants: H.R. 4132, to reauthorize grants for water resources research and technology institutes established under the Water Resources Research Act of 1984; Pages H5671–72

Cahaba River Wildlife Refuge in Bibb County, Alabama: H.R. 4286, amended, to provide for the establishment of the Cahaba River National Wildlife Refuge in Bibb County, Alabama; and **Pages H5672–73**

Conveyance of the Griffith Project to the Southern Nevada Water Authority. S. 986, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Griffith Project to the Southern Nevada Water Authority clearing the measure for the President. **Pages H5678–79**

Improvement of Social and Political Conditions in Vietnam: H. Con. Res. 322, amended, expressing the sense of the Congress regarding Vietnamese Americans and others who seek to improve social and political conditions in Vietnam. Agreed to amend the title. **Pages H5679–82**

Suspensions Proceedings Postponed: The House completed debate on the following motions to suspend the rules and postponed further proceedings on the measures:

National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Act: H.R. 4442, amended, 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 **Pages H5673–76**

National Ocean Day: H. Res. 415, amended, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National Ocean Day to recognize the significant role the ocean plays in the lives of the Nation's people and the important role the Nation's people must play in the continued life of the ocean. **Pages H5676–78**

Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and Related Agencies Appropriations: The House considered amendments to H.R. 4461, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001. The House previously considered the bill on June 29. **Pages H5683–H5718, H5719–23**

Agreed To:

Brown of Ohio amendment No. 38 printed in the Congressional Record that makes available $3 million to the FDA Center for Veterinary Research for research on antibiotic resistance; **Pages H5684–85**

Knollenberg amendment No. 58 printed in the Congressional Record that clarifies that any limitations related to implementation of the Kyoto Protocol shall not apply to activities otherwise authorized by law; **Pages H5687–88**

Boyd amendment No. 56 printed in the Congressional Record that makes the Town of Thompson instead of the town of Harris eligible for the specified loans and grants; **Pages H5688–89**

Boyd amendment that prohibits the use of any funding to recover payments erroneously made to oyster fishermen in the State of Connecticut; **Pages H5692–93**

Crowley amendment No. 36 printed in the Congressional Record that prohibits the FDA from taking actions that restrict the purchase of prescription drugs in Canada and Mexico by United States Citizens (agreed to by a recorded vote of 363 ayes to 12 noes, Roll No. 375); **Pages H5696–H5700, H5720–21**

Coburn amendment that prohibits the FDA from taking any action to interfere with the import of drugs that have been approved for use within the United States and were manufactured in an FDA-approved facility in the United States, Canada, or Mexico (agreed to by a recorded vote of 370 ayes to 12 noes, Roll No. 377); **Pages H5705–09, H5721–22**

Kaptur amendment that urges the Secretary of Agriculture to use ethanol, biodiesel, and other alternative fuels to the maximum extent practicable in meeting the fuel needs of the Department of Agriculture; **Page H5709**

Rejected:

Coburn amendment No. 6 printed in the Congressional Record that sought to prohibit the use of any funding for drugs solely intended for the chemical inducement of abortion (rejected by a recorded vote of 182 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 373); **Pages H5693–94, H5719**

Royce amendment No. 47 printed in the Congressional Record that sought to reduce by one percent each amount that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law (a recorded vote of 53 ayes to 316 noes, Roll No. 374); **Pages H5694–96, H5719–20**

Royce amendment No. 51 printed in the Congressional Record that sought to prohibit any funding to award any new allocations under the market access program or pay salaries of personnel to award such allocations (rejected by a recorded vote of 77 ayes to 301 noes, Roll No. 376; and **Pages H5701–04, H5721**

Sanford amendment No. 33 printed in the Congressional Record that sought to prohibit any funding by the Department of Agriculture to carry out a pilot program under child nutrition programs to study the effects of providing free breakfasts to students without regard to family income (rejected by a recorded vote of 59 ayes to 323 noes, Roll No. 378); **Pages H5712–14, H5722–23**

Points of order sustained against:

Section 741 that sought to make funds available for the market access program assistance; **Page H5689**

Section 752 that sought to limit the use of funding for section 508(k) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act; **Page H5690**

Title VIII that sought to establish the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement act that, among other provisions, removed agricultural and medical sanctions against Cuba; **Pages H5691–92**

Royce amendment No. 52 printed in the Congressional Record that sought to strike a section in the bill previously stricken; **Page H5701**

Rangel amendment that sought to stop the implementation of provisions in foreign assistance and other statutes that prohibit the export of products to Cuba; **Pages H5710–11**

Withdrawn:

Gilman amendment No. 70 printed in the Congressional Record was offered and withdrawn that sought to make available $15 million from the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide compensation to producers of onions, including those in Orange County, New York, who have suffered quality losses due to severe weather conditions; and **Pages H5709–10**

DeFazio amendment No. 26 was offered and withdrawn that sought to reduce Wildlife Services Program funding for livestock protection by $7 million and prohibit any funding to destruct wild predatory mammals for the purpose of protecting livestock. **Page H5714**

Offered:

DeFazio amendment No. 39 printed in the Congressional Record was offered that seeks to reduce Wildlife Services Program funding for livestock protection by $7 million and prohibit any funding to conduct campaigns to destruct wild animals for the purpose of protecting stock; **Pages H5714–18**

The House agreed to H. Res. 538, the rule that is providing for consideration of the bill on June 28.

Further Consideration of Agriculture Appropriations: Agreed that during further consideration of H.R. 4611 that no further amendment shall be in order except (1) pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate; (2) and the following amendments printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 9, 29, 32, 37, 48, 61, and 68, and each debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled. **Page H5718**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate appear on page H5659.

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on page H5738.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Six recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H5719, H5720, H5720–21, H5721, H5721–22, and H5722–23. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No Committee Meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D705)*

S. 761, to regulate interstate commerce by electronic means by permitting and encouraging the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces. Signed June 30, 2000. (P.L. 106–229)

H.R. 4762, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require 527 organizations to disclose their political activities. Signed July 1, 2000. (P.L. 106–230)

H.R. 642, to redesignate the Federal building located at 701 South Santa Fe Avenue in Compton, California, and known as the Compton Main Post Office, as the ''Mervyn Malcolm Dymally Post Office Building''. Signed July 6, 2000. (P.L. 106–231)

H.R. 643, to redesignate the Federal building located at 10301 South Compton Avenue, in Los Angeles, California, and known as the Watts Finance Office, as the ''Augustus F. Hawkins Post Office Building''. Signed July 6, 2000. (P.L. 106–232)

H.R. 1666, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 200 East Pinckney Street in Madison, Florida, as the ''Captain Colin P. Kelly, Jr. Post Office''. Signed July 6, 2000. (P.L. 106–233)

H.R. 2307, to designate the building of the United States Postal Service located at 5 Cedar Street in Hopkinton, Massachusetts, as the ''Thomas J. Brown Post Office Building''. Signed July 6, 2000. (P.L. 106–234)

H.R. 2357, to designate the United States Post Office located at 3675 Warrensville Center Road in Shaker Heights, Ohio, as the ''Louise Stokes Post Office''. Signed July 6, 2000. (P.L. 106–235)

H.R. 2460, to designate the United States Post Office located at 125 Border Avenue West in Wiggins, Mississippi, as the ''Jay Hanna 'Dizzy' Dean Post Office''. Signed July 6, 2000. (P.L. 106–236)

H.R. 2591, to designate the United States Post Office located at 713 Elm Street in Wakefield, Kansas, as the ''William H. Avery Post Office''. Signed July 6, 2000. (P.L. 106–237)

H.R. 2952, to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Orchard Park Drive in Greenville, South Carolina, as the

"Keith D. Oglesby Station". Signed July 6, 2000. (P.L. 106–238)

H.R. 3018, to designate certain facilities of the United States Postal Service in South Carolina. Signed July 6, 2000. (P.L. 106–239)

H.R. 3699, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, as the "Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building". Signed July 6, 2000. (P.L. 106–240)

H.R. 3701, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, as the "Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building". Signed July 6, 2000. (P.L. 106–241)

H.R. 4241, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1818 Milton Avenue in Janesville, Wisconsin, as the "Les Aspin Post Office Building". Signed July 6, 2000. (P.L. 106–242)

NEW PRIVATE LAWS

H.R. 3903, to deem the vessel M/V MIST COVE to be less than 100 gross tons, as measured under chapter 145 of title 46, United States Code. Signed July 6, 2000. (P.L. 106–5)

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of July 10 through July 15, 2000

Senate Chamber

On *Tuesday*, Senate will vote on the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 8, Death Tax Elimination Act. Also, Senate expects to continue consideration of H.R. 4578, Interior Appropriations.

During the remainder of the week, Senate expects to resume consideration of S. 2549, Defense Authorization, the Reconciliation bill, and any other cleared legislative and executive business, including appropriation bills, when available.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Special Committee on Aging: July 11, to hold hearings to examine living trust scams, 9:30 a.m., SD–628.

Committee on Appropriations: July 13, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, business meeting to mark up H.R. 4733, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, 2 p.m., SD–124.

Committee on Armed Services: July 12, to hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: July 11, Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation, to hold hearings to examine the Federal Transit Administration's approval of extension of the Amtrak Commuter Rail contract, 2 p.m., SD–538.

July 13, Full Committee, business meeting to mark up S. 2107, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to reduce securities fees in excess of those required to fund the operations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, to adjust compensation provisions for employees of the Commission; S. 2266, to provide for the minting of commemorative coins to support the 2002 Salt Lake Olympic Winter Games and the programs of the United States Olympic Committee; S. 2453, to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Pope John Paul II in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions to humanity; S. 2459, 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. 2101, to promote international monetary stability and to share seigniorage with officially dollarized countries; and a committee print of a substitute amendment to H.R. 3046, to preserve limited Federal agency reporting requirements on banking and housing matters to facilitate congressional oversight and public accountability, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget: July 12, to hold hearings on certain provisions of S. 2274, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide families and disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the medicaid program for such children, 10 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: July 12, to hold hearings on the nomination of Francisco J. Sanchez, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation; Frank Henry Cruz, of California, Ernest J. Wilson III, of Maryland, Katherine Milner Anderson, of Virginia, and Kenneth Y. Tomlinson, of Virginia, all to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

July 13, Full Committee, business meeting to mark up pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: July 11, Subcommittee on Water and Power, to hold hearings on S. 2195, to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Truckee watershed reclamation project for the reclamation and reuse of water; S. 2350, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to certain water rights to Duchesne City, Utah; and S. 2672, to provide for the conveyance of various reclamation projects to local water authorities, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

July 12, Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management, to hold oversight hearings on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement implementing the October 1999 announcement by the President to review approximately 40 million acres of national forest for increased protection, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

July 13, Full Committee, business meeting to consider pending calendar business; to be followed by oversight

hearings to examine American gasoline supply problems, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

July 13, Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, to hold hearings on S. 2294, to establish the Rosie the Riveter-World War II Home Front National Historical Park in the State of California; S. 2331, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to recalculate the franchise fee owed by Fort Sumter Tours, Inc., a concessioner providing services to Fort Sumter National Monument, South Carolina; and S. 2598, to authorize appropriations for the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: July 13, Subcommittee on International Trade, to hold hearings to examine the United States trade policy agenda at the G 8 Summit, 1 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: July 12, to hold hearings to examine the United Nations policy in Africa, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

July 12, Subcommittee on International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion, to hold hearings on the role of biotechnology in combating poverty and hunger in developing countries, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs: July 13, Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, to hold hearings to examine the annual report of the Postmaster General, 2 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: July 12, to hold hearings to examine the National Science Foundation, 10 a.m., SD–430.

July 13, Subcommittee on Employment, Safety and Training, to hold hearings to examine ergonomics and health care, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Indian Affairs: July 12, to hold oversight hearings on risk management and tort liability relating to Indian matters, 2:30 p.m., SR–485.

Select Committee on Intelligence: July 13, to hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

Committee on the Judiciary: July 11, to hold hearings to examine the future of digital music, focusing on whether there is an upside to downloading, 10 a.m., SH–216.

July 12, Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism, and Government Information, to hold hearings to examine identity theft and how to protect and restore your good name, 10 a.m., SD–226.

July 12, Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nomination of Glenn A. Fine, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Department of Justice; the nomination of Dennis M. Cavanaugh, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey; the nomination of James S. Moody, Jr., of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida vice a new position created by Public Law 106–113, approved November 29, 1999; the nomination of Gregory A. Presnell, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida vice a new position created by Public Law 106–113, approved November 29, 1999; and the nomination of John E. Steele, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida vice a new position created by Public Law 106–113, approved November 29, 1999, 2 p.m., SD–226.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, July 12, hearing to review federal farm policy, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

July 13. Subcommittee on Livestock and Horticulture, hearing to review the agricultural consequences of banning methyl bromide, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, July 12, Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, on Fiscal Year 2001 District of Columbia Budget, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, July 11, Special Oversight Panel on Department of Energy Reorganization, hearing on implementation issues related to the establishment of the National Nuclear Security Administration, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

July 13, Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism, hearing on terrorism and threats to U.S. interests in the Middle East, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

July 13, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on Department of Defense management of the Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, July 12, Health Task Force, hearing on Blowing Smoke on the Invisible Man, Measuring Fraud, Payment Errors in Medicare and Medicaid, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

July 12, Natural Resources and the Environment Task Force, hearing on Department of Energy Management Practices, 2 p.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Commerce, July 11, Subcommittee on Health and Environment, hearing on H.R. 4807, Ryan White CARE Act Amendments of 2000, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

July 11, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on ''DOE's Fixed-Price Cleanup Contracts: Why are costs Still Out of Control?'' 9:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

July 12, Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials, hearing on H.R. 4541, Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, July 11, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources, hearing on the Effectiveness of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, 9 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

July 11, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, hearing on H.R. 4401, Health Care Infrastructure Investment Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

July 12, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, hearing on the following bills: the Federal Property Asset Management Reform Act; and H.R. 3285, Federal Asset Management Improvement Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

July 12, Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans' Affairs and International Relations, hearing on Hepatitis C: Access, Testing and Treatment in the VA Health Care System, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

July 13, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, hearing on H.R. 4012,

Construction Quality Assurance Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, July 12, hearing on Global Terrorism: South Asia-The New Locus, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, July 11, to continue markup of H.R. 1349, Federal Prisoner Health Care Copayment Act of 1999; and to mark up the following bills: H.R. 4194, Small Business Merger Fee Reduction Act of 2000; H.R. 2059 to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the retroactive eligibility dates 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; H.R. 2987, Methamphetamine Anti-Proliferation Act of 1999; and H.R. 2558, Prison Industries Reform Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

July 12, Subcommittee on Crime, oversight hearing on the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

July 13, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, to mark up H.R. 534, Fairness and Voluntary Arbitration Act, 10 a.m., B–352 Rayburn.

July 13, Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, oversight hearing on Gene Patents and Other Genomic Inventions, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

July 13, Subcommittee on Crime, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 4423, Probation Officers' Protection Act of 2000; and H.R. 3484, Child Sex Crimes Wiretapping Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

July 13, Subcommittee on Crime, oversight hearing on the U.S. Marshals Service, 1 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, July 11, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing to examine laws, policies, practices, and operations of the Department of the Interior and Department of Energy related to payments to their employees (including federal public land oil royalty and valuation policy advisors) from outside sources, (including the Project on Government Oversight); and to examine (a) the source of funds for such payments (b) the relationship between those managing and overseeing the organization that made the payments and the individuals who received the payments, (c) the effect of the payments on programs, policies, and positions of such departments, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

July 12, full Committee, to mark up a motion to sustain rulings by Chairman Don Young on objections to the production of records subject to subpoenas issued by Chairman Don Young under the authority of a resolution adopted by the Committee on Resources on June 9, 1999, which objections were raised by Robert A. Berman, Henry M. Banta, Danielle Brian Stockton, Keith Rutter, and the Project on Government Oversight; followed by an oversight hearing on Office of Insular Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth,

July 13, Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, oversight hearing on Implementation of the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

July 13, Subcommittee on National Parks, and Public Lands, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2752, Lincoln County Land Act of 1999; H.R. 4312, Upper Housatonic National Heritage Area Study Act of 2000; H.R. 4613, National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act of 2000; and H.R. 4721, to provide for all right, title, and interest in and to certain property in Washington County, Utah, to be vested in the United States, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

July 13, Subcommittee on Water and Power, oversight hearing on the Bureau of Reclamation's Title XVI program, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, July 11, to consider the following: a measure making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001; and the Marriage Penalty Tax Elimination Reconciliation Act, 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, July 13, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on Strengthening Science at the U.S. Environmental Agency-National Research Council Findings, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, July 11, Subcommittee on Rural Enterprises, Business Opportunities and Special Small Business Problems, hearing on the Effects of the Roadless Policy on Rural Small Business and Rural Communities, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

July 13, Subcommittee on Tax, Finance, and Exports, hearing on the impact of banning snowmobiles inside National Parks on small business, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, July 12 and 13, Subcommittee on Benefits, hearings on the following bills: H.R. 4765, 21st Century Veterans Employment and Training Act; and H.R. 3256, Veterans' Right to Know Act, 10 a.m., on July 12 and 9 a.m., on July 13, 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, July 13, to mark up the Comprehensive Retirement Security and Pension Reform Act, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

July 13, Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing on Challenges Facing Social Security Disability Programs in the 21st Century, 10 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

July 14, Subcommittee on Trade, to mark up the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Résumé of Congressional Activity

FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 24 through June 30, 2000

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	78	72	..
Time in session	579 hrs., 54′	594 hrs., 39′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	6,299	5,658	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	1,184	..
Public bills enacted into law	20	39	59
Private bills enacted into law	1	..	1
Bills in conference	7	13	..
Measures passed, total	208	303	511
Senate bills	50	23	..
House bills	50	140	..
Senate joint resolutions	7	4	..
House joint resolutions	2	3	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	22	8	..
House concurrent resolutions	20	38	..
Simple resolutions	54	87	..
Measures reported, total	176	207	383
Senate bills	101	5	..
House bills	43	127	..
Senate joint resolutions	1	..	..
House joint resolutions	1	1	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	11	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	3	7	..
Simple resolutions	16	67	..
Special reports	6	9	..
Conference reports	2	7	..
Measures pending on calendar	237	76	..
Measures introduced, total	997	1,582	2,579
Bills	842	1,292	..
Joint resolutions	11	18	..
Concurrent resolutions	52	129	..
Simple resolutions	92	143	..
Quorum calls	6	3	..
Yea-and-nay votes	171	179	..
Recorded votes	..	190	..
Bills vetoed	1	..	..
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

* These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 98 reports have been filed in the Senate, a total of 223 reports have been filed in the House.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 24 through June 30, 2000

Civilian nominations, totaling 333 (including 142 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed as follows:

Confirmed	116
Unconfirmed	209
Withdrawn	8

Other Civilian nominations totaling 1,499 (including 778 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed as follows:

Confirmed	1,498
Unconfirmed	1

Air Force nominations, totaling 4,977, (including 15 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed as follows:

Confirmed	4,971
Unconfirmed	3
Returned to White House	3

Army nominations, totaling 2,580, (including 204 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed as follows:

Confirmed	2,053
Unconfirmed	525
Returned to White House	2

Navy nominations, totaling 2,435, (including 20 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed as follows:

Confirmed	1,682
Unconfirmed	751
Returned to White House	2

Marine Corps nominations, totaling 1,794, (including 1 nomination carried over from the First Session), disposed as follows:

Confirmed	1,772
Unconfirmed	22

Summary

Total nominations received	1,150
Total confirmed	12,468
Total unconfirmed	12,092
Total unconfirmed	1,511
Total withdrawn	8
Total returned to White House	7

Next Meeting of the **Senate**

9:30 a.m., Tuesday, July 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 10:15 a.m.), Senate will vote on the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 8, Death Tax Elimination Act. Also, Senate expects to continue consideration of H.R. 4578, Interior Appropriations, and S. 2549, Defense Authorization.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

9 a.m., Tuesday, July 11

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of Suspensions (9 bills):

1. S. 1892, Acquisition of Valles Caldera, New Mexico;

2 H.R. 4579, Utah West Desert Land Exchange Act;

3. H.R. 4063, Rosie the Riveter World War II Home Front National Historical Park;

4. H. Con. Res. 253, objecting to any effort to expel the Holy See from its United Nations Permanent Observer Status;

5. H.R. 4528, International Academic Opportunity Act;

6. H. Con. Res. 348, condemning the use of children as soldiers;

7. H.R. 894, Aimee's Law;

8. H.R. 4681, granting permanent resident status to certain Syrian nationals;

9. H.R. 4391, Mobile Telecommunications Sourcing Act;

Complete Consideration of H.R. 4461, Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and Related Agencies Appropriations;

Consideration of Additional Suspensions:

1. H.R. 4658, designation of J.L. Dawkins Post Office in Fayetteville, N.C.;

2. H.R. 4169, designation of Barbara F. Vucanovich Post Office in Reno, NV;

3. H.R. 3909, designation of Henry W. McGee Post Office in Chicago, IL; and

4. H.R. 4487, designation of Samuel H. Lacy, Sr. Post Office in Baltimore, MD.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

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.