



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE **105th** CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 5, 1998

No. 54

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 5, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable Jo ANN EMERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 21, 1997, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SNOWBARGER) for 5 minutes.

CAMPAIN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. SNOWBARGER. Madam Speaker, during the last year, many Members of Congress, independent organizations, and other political groups have been in touch with Congress to urge immediate action on reform of our Nation's campaign finance system. Because the Nation's attention has been piqued by ambitious claims that we are going to clean up politics, we face the very real danger of passing a bill, calling it reform, and, as a result, destroying any remaining credibility enjoyed by the Congress of the United States.

During the upcoming debate on campaign finance reform, we will undoubtedly see a great number of different competing plans for reform. Many will be dramatic changes, and some will be modest in scope. If this fair and open debate is to mean anything, we should at least agree on a set of principles with which to judge the various entries.

To my colleagues listening back in their offices, if your plan is to sit on the sidelines during the debate and try to judge this combination dance contest and beauty pageant, I would like to offer you a kind of score card for this event.

Madam Speaker, remember the dance contest and beauty pageants have standards that aid the judges in determining what an ideal candidate should look like. These principles should provide an excellent guide for scoring in the various proposals. The three cardinal principles that should be our guide are transparency, real accountability, and trusting the American people.

First is transparency. Any real reform should make our campaign system easier to understand for the average person. It is hard for voters to know what is going on, to get outraged, or to judge our conduct if we are always playing hide the ball.

Consider the recent Washington Post story about the Democratic National Committee's swapping hard dollars for soft money with their State affiliates. It is difficult for average citizens to be involved in the critique of that system if stunts like this are permitted.

Secondly, we should punish the offenders. The citizens are tired of all this talk about reform. They tar all of us with the same broad brush of accusations, and we need to get serious about granting enforcement authority to the FEC, Federal Election Commission, and the Justice Department.

If all we do is add five more new rules to the 10 that are already not enforced,

what have we gained? We will only have succeeded in proving what the public already suspects; namely, that we were never really serious about reform.

The only way for Congress to earn back the trust and the respect of the people is to impose real punishment for breaking the rules.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, we should trust the good judgment of the American people. If we have learned nothing else about political reform since the first go-around in 1974, it is that we should not make Federal bureaucrats the sole watchdog of our electoral system.

Our axiom should be absolutely open campaigns. New technology allows immediate disclosure. So why set arbitrary limits on donations? The public, if informed in a timely manner, will hold elected officials accountable.

The present limits force candidates to spend all their time chasing dollars and far less time serving constituents. We should trust the people. The electorate may decide that \$1 from tobacco companies and the Ku Klux Klan is unacceptable, while, at the same time, judging \$50,000 from the candidate's parents is perfectly appropriate.

Madam Speaker, I have never taken money from tobacco companies and never would, but my constituents may not believe that because our system hides the donations in this maze of regulations. Why should we continue to tell the people what to do when we so often get it wrong.

It is for this reason I have introduced H.R. 3315, the Fair Elections and Political Accountability Act of 1998. This bill would honor all of the above principles and make progress towards destroying the confidence of the American people.

I will not claim that my bill is the perfect answer to everyone's gripe about our political system. Many of you will find things about it that you

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

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



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H2747

do not like. However, this bill represents a comprehensive and meaningful change away from the arcane and mystifying system that we have today. It holds politicians accountable, it eliminates soft money, and it empowers all American voters with the knowledge to discern for themselves who Members of Congress actually represent.

I am confident that the American people will reward candidates that play by the rules. If they do not play by the rules, Madam Speaker, my bill does what no one else has proposed, it sends the crooked politicians to jail.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL COLLINS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity today to honor a truly wonderful person with whom I was proud to join in a number of important battles, Mike Collins. Michael Collins died in February at the age of 55.

He was the General Secretary-Treasurer of the Pipefitters Union, and he was, indeed, a fighter for working men and women. He fought so strongly because he believed that the labor movement was the most effective way to help working families earn a better life.

At the 35th UA General Convention, Mike reflected on his first elected position in much the same way many of us in Congress have done. Let me quote from his remarks. He said, "My anxiety level was so high, my hands were shaking, and my heart was pounding. I was only 31 years old then, and I was awed by the thought that I had been elected to lead the fine men and women of my local union, and I prayed to God that I would be up to the task."

"The people wanted to know what kind of man they had elected, whether I would have the right stuff or whether I would fumble the ball. I learned a very important lesson that night. I learned that the hard job is not just getting elected, it is what comes later, when the tough decisions have to be made and the inevitable disappointments have to be endured."

It is this sense of dedication and determination and humility that made Mike so special. He never lost his perspective of the broader goals, to help working men and women have a decent quality of life.

Over the next 25 years that followed Mike's first election, not only did he not fumble, he picked up the ball, and he seemingly never stopped running.

After leading Local 5 for a number of years, he was appointed by the international to serve as Legislative Director in the legislative department. That is when I first met him.

We fought many a battle together in these Halls, in this building, and across

the streets in the offices where we worked, battles for a decent wage for people, battles for decent health care, battles to make sure that people had pensions, that those pensions were not taken from them, battles for worker safety.

It was not that long ago, Mike remembered this well, that we lost 35,000 people a year to industrial accidents in this country, 35,000 a year; 500,000 maimed. He cared deeply about workers and about their safety and their families.

He eventually rose to the rank of General Secretary-Treasurer where his leadership positioned the UA to continue to grow in the next century.

Mike's public life was devoted to the labor movement, yet the same characteristics that made him successful, his leadership, his loyalty, his moral strength, and his force of character made him truly special to his family and friends.

His twin brother Terry paid Mike the ultimate testimonial at his funeral service when he stated, and I quote, "Kathleen, Brian, Mickey, Kevin, Maggie, and Karen, my heart aches. Kathleen, you were the center point of support on which Mike's life turned. As I mourn him, I celebrate the 34 years of his marriage. He truly had a special partner. He loved you dearly."

"To his children, I'm not sure what to say because I cannot think of anything you do not already know. He was a giant of a man whose imprint has been passed and will be passed on for generations to come. You, along with your mom, were his most precious treasures."

I certainly do not think it could have been said better. I know that Mike cared deeply about his family and his faith, and he had true passion for helping people. He fought many battles. We fought many battles together.

I was honored and proud to join such a tireless fighter who never gave up. Yet, Mike was one of those rare individuals who could fight with dogged tenacity while still being able to laugh and smile, and laugh at himself and not take himself too seriously.

He was such a pleasure to have on your team. He could always make you feel good just by being around him. He truly enjoyed life. Those of us who shared his friendship and his ideals will truly miss him.

To his family, many of whom are here with us today, thank you for all the support you gave Mike throughout the years. Few had his resolve and strength to fight for the working men and women of this country and with the tenacity that Mike Collins brought to that task.

Those who knew him know that his strength came from his family, and for that, we all owe a great deal of thanks to each and every one of you.

So, Mike, if you are listening up there, and I am sure you are, rest assured that you have many loyal fans and people who love you and who will

continue to do the good work that you performed in this body and throughout the Halls of this Congress. Your values are the values that we will continue to sustain and maintain and fight for as long as we are in public service. To your family, we wish you all the best. You gave us a real champion in Mike Collins.

YEAR 2000 CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, this afternoon, the Subcommittee on the Census of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight will be meeting for the second time and addressing the issue of a potential failed census in year 2000.

Many people believe that the census in the year 2000 is moving towards failure. This comes from reports from the General Accounting Office, who has said actually in every report, including the most recent one in March, that the risk of a failure has increased.

The Inspector General has talked about the potential of a failed census. This is because this Clinton administration has proposed the largest statistical experiment in history to take place in year 2000.

This is a very dangerous situation, because the census, which is required by our Constitution and by law to be done every 10 years, is the basis, is fundamental to our democratic process of elected government here in the United States.

All Members of Congress, most elected officials in America are elected based upon census information. If we have a census that the people do not trust, we are threatening the entire elective process in America.

So it is absolutely essential that we save the census, that we have a successful census, that we have the most accurate census possible. That is what we need to strive for and work together, Democrats and Republicans.

The hearing today will be focused on what happened in 1990 so we can learn from the experience of 1990 and not repeat the mistakes, but also do what needs to be done to improve the census. There were some problems in the 1990 census. But in 1990, we counted 98.4 percent of the American people; 98.4 percent of the people were counted. That was not a bad census actually. That is a pretty good census, the second most accurate census in history, and some people think it was the most accurate census in history. So it was successful in counting 98.4 percent of the people.

But the way the census took place in 1990 was, after you did the full census, the full enumeration, and counted that 98.4 percent, then a sample was conducted of about 150,000 households. The thought was let us take that sample and adjust the full enumeration.

What happened in 1990 was the failure was on the sample. Sampling was the failure in 1990. That is the concern that we have today because now the Clinton administration only wants to rely on sampling. It was a failure in 1990, and they are going to totally rely on it in year 2000.

What happened in 1990 when they used sampling, Secretary Mosbacher had the choice of, at that time, whether to use sampling and adjust the census. What the recommendation of the Census Bureau was back in 1981 was to adjust the census, take away a congressional seat from Wisconsin, take away a congressional seat from Pennsylvania, give them away based on adjustment, based on statistics.

I mean, how do you explain that to the States that they are saying we counted these people, but the statisticians in Washington think they are not right. Thank goodness Secretary Mosbacher rejected that recommendation, because we found out in 1992 there was a major computer glitch. It was a computer error, and it would have been done by error and by mistake.

What would people in Wisconsin and Pennsylvania say knowing they would have lost a congressional seat because of mistakes by the Census Bureau? So sampling was a failure because what they did with the sampling is they delete people from the census.

There are census tracts and areas all over the country where the Census Bureau would come in because of the computer analysis and said, on average, we do not think all those people are there, so we are going to delete people, not because they double-counted, not because of mistakes, just because of averages and statistics, and we could allow that.

Another thing we found out in analyzing the 1990 census, and the Census Bureau says this, that the numbers are not accurate below 100,000. So the accuracy becomes less accurate when we get to districts of under 100,000.

□ 1245

When we work with the census, we deal with census tracks and census blocks, and those are the building stones, the cornerstones to building a Congressional District, a State Senate district, a State House district, a county commission district, a city council. And the accuracy is less by adjustment than having the full enumeration. So the Census Bureau admits that that is a problem. And now the Clinton administration wants to rely on this potentially inaccurate information.

In fact, the Census Bureau, when they reviewed the 1990 census, decided not to adjust even for the intercentennial census, which is when they adjust between 1990 and 2000, because it was not accurate enough to use, and they did not even use that 150,000 use of sampling.

So what does the Clinton administration propose in the year 2000? They have proposed first, instead of using a

full enumeration and counting everybody like they did in 1990, they say oh, no, we are only going to count 90 percent of the people; ninety percent of the people in 60,000 separate samples, because there will be one for each census track.

So we start off without the full data, and then they will do a sample of 750,000 households, five times larger than they used in the sampling experiment back in 1990. But they will do it in half the time, with a less experienced work force.

So they are going to sample five times as many people in half the time, with a less experienced work force, and use that to adjust the sample today data they started with at 90 percent.

So we are moving towards a very complex system that will lead to failure, and it threatens our entire Democratic elections process in this country.

PUERTO RICO IS FISCALLY CONSERVATIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Madam Speaker, when the United States was founded, many States severed the previously existing relationship between property ownership and voting rights by granting universal suffrage to white men. Since then, of course, the right to vote has become truly universal, extended to all men and women without regard to race, ethnic origin, or economic considerations.

The point I wish to make today, however, is that early on in the Nation's history, it was established that the right to vote, that is, the right to participate in this democracy, exists independent of an individual's economic well-being. Unfortunately, it is a concept that the opponents of self-determination for the 3,800,000 American citizens in Puerto Rico just do not seem to get. They would deny the U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico the opportunity to vote on status just because they allege that poverty on the island would affect the Nation's pocketbook.

Opponents of Puerto Rican self-determination incorrectly state that a vote for self-determination is a vote for Puerto Rican statehood. And contrary to reality, they also allege the Island's poor will cost the U.S. Treasury many millions of dollars more a year if Puerto Rico becomes a State. Quite the contrary is true.

Puerto Rico is now a welfare Commonwealth. We receive Federal grants but do not pay Federal income taxes. If Puerto Rico were a State today, our tax contribution to the U.S. Treasury would net a positive cash flow of \$1.5 billion over and above the additional Federal expenditures in grants and direct payments, which Puerto Rico

would receive as a State in addition to what it is now receiving.

In their rush to paint the worst case scenario, opponents of Puerto Rican self-determination overlook the stable investment environment which statehood would bring about, overlook the growth potential of Puerto Rico's many assets and the fiscally conservative underpinnings of the Puerto Rican economy.

It is a fact that the present territorial relationship between Puerto Rico and the rest of the Nation has its economic downside. Tax credit to U.S. corporations designed to stimulate economic development on the Island have actually drained the territory of investment capital. A study by Hex, Incorporated, an international economic policy and development consulting firm based in Cambridge, Massachusetts, reveals that despite an investment of \$12.3 billion in Puerto Rico between 1981 and 1994, the Island suffered a net loss of \$2.2 billion in investment capital. The repatriation of profits by the U.S. companies which benefit from tax credits accounts for the most of the loss.

Alexander Odishelidze, president of Employee Benefits Associates, Incorporated, which is a consulting firm, is correct when he says, "You cannot build a solid economy when the capital created by the productivity of the workers is shipped out as soon as it is created." Statehood would confer the sense of stability that encourages economic investment. Hex, Inc. projects that statehood would accelerate fiscal and economic growth in Puerto Rico by an annual 2.2 to 3.5 percent.

Chilean economist Fernando Lefort, in a working paper for the International Tax Program at Harvard Law School, calculated if Puerto Rico had become a State in 1955, the average Puerto Rican would have been earning \$6,000 a year more by 1994.

The fact is that Puerto Rico has the assets for growth. It boasts a manufacturing base which employs 15.6 percent of the Island's work force; highly educated skilled workers, many of whom are bilingual and experienced users of high-tech equipment in the pharmaceutical, plastics and electronics industry, as well as the scenic beauty and historic landmarks that so much appeal to tourists.

What is more, the value-added per dollar of production wages paid in Puerto Rico is double the national average. These assets alone led one analyst interviewed by the Wall Street Journal to conclude that as a State, Puerto Rico's underlying growth potential would be the strongest in the country, the Nevada of 10 years from now.

In addition, Puerto Rico practices sound fiscal policy. Since adoption of its Constitution in 1952, Puerto Rico has required the government to approve the balanced budget annually. Four years ago tax reform provided \$400 million in tax relief to Island residents while generating a government

surplus. Puerto Rico has also initiated a privatization strategy, which is expected to save the government \$1 billion over a period of 10 years.

It is grossly unjust and undemocratic to bind the people of Puerto Rico to a colonial economy and then deny them the right to self-determination, giving as a reason the fact that the Island territory has not thrived fiscally as well as the equal partners, the 50 States. Let us not revive the practice of democracy for the rich and by the rich, but rather let us extend the right of self-determination to the American citizens of Puerto Rico, no matter the size of their bank accounts.

We discarded the poll tax as unfair and undemocratic. It should not be revived to deprive 4 million U.S. citizens of the right to self-determination.

THE WEED AND SEED PROGRAM WORKS

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, Members often take to the floor to talk about our government, how it is working or not working. In fact, I have done that myself occasionally.

Today, my colleagues, I will talk about a government program that does work. My colleagues will hear about how a little funding in the hands of a caring and committed group of individuals can make a huge difference in the lives of hundreds of young people. I want to share with my colleagues today a story about the Weed and Seed Program that has helped transform the Howard Middle School in my hometown of Ocala, Florida.

In 1993, I contacted the Attorney General, Janet Reno, in support of bringing the Weed and Seed Program to Florida. Since then, communities near and about my district, including Gainesville, Jacksonville, and Ocala have received funding through this program.

The Weed and Seed Program coordinates the use of law enforcement and criminal prosecution to weed out criminal offenders in the targeted neighborhoods and "seeds" the community with housing, employment and various social programs. I have long supported the goals of the Weed and Seed Program because, Madam Speaker, it is community based and not an entangling government bureaucracy.

The Howard Middle School in my home town of Ocala, Florida, has nurtured this seed into a wonderful product. The school has developed creative after-school activities that keep the students positively engaged. This is important because, as we all know, Madam Speaker, nearly 5 million school-aged children spend time without adult supervision during a typical week. Research indicates that during these unsupervised hours, children are

more likely to engage in at-risk behavior, such as crime and drug use. In fact, the FBI reports that most juvenile crime takes place between the hours of 3 p.m. and 8 p.m.

Unfortunately, 70 percent of all public schools do not offer after-school programs. Howard Middle School is one of the valuable exceptions. Last week I visited this school to witness firsthand the community services it has developed. I was greeted by the principal, Scott Hackmyer; Joan Spainhower, public relations officer; Dan Greer, safe and drug free school specialist; and Ms. Myers, the comprehensive health coordinator.

I was escorted to a small conference room where the principal gave an overview of the program. During this briefing a student, Sharika Palmer, an 8th grader in the Hair and Nails Program, instructed me on how a manicure program is implemented. Miss Sharon Samuels is one of the teacher assistants hired using Weed and Seed money, and she created the Hair and Nails Program. Coach Ron Nealis is another caring individual who was hired using these funds.

The principal has staffed the school with dedicated individuals who give unselfishly with their time and talents, including Barbara Flemming, who coaches "The Steppers," dancers; and Ms. Weaver and Ms. Faso, who coach the cheerleaders. Together they have created an after-school support group, rich with instruction in many studies and activities, and providing supervision during those critical hours when most parents are at work.

There are sports, cheerleading, dancing groups, chess clubs, and the Hair and Nail group. Unique to this program is a "neighborhood mentor," a program designed solely for those children who ride the bus to school and, consequently, must leave school at the normal time. Instead of depriving them of these special programs, arrangements were made with two neighborhood churches to allow a teacher to accompany these children and use the building for these programs. The principal has received a commitment from six churches to participate next year, meaning that after-school mentoring will reach into virtually every student's neighborhood.

The coach told us an example of a young person, a young man, who was getting D's and F's in school until he got into the coach's fitness and basketball program. Now, I am happy to say this student is an honor roll student. This last semester there are 436 students on the honor roll, and that is nearly double the numbers before this after-school program was instituted.

Not only have the students become better students, but vandalism and police calls in the area have greatly diminished. The principal is to be commended and his caring faculty and staff have indeed put the Weed and Seed money to exceptional use. I congratulate him, the staff, the faculty, and

most importantly, the students of Howard Middle School in Ocala, Florida for a job well done. Keep up the outstanding work.

LEADERSHIP OF USPS FUMBLING ONE OPPORTUNITY AFTER ANOTHER

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I came to Congress as somebody predisposed to support our Postal Service. I believe we have some of the finest men and women in the world delivering the mail, playing an important part in communities in many small and important ways. But the leadership and management of the Postal Service is fumbling one opportunity after another.

One example is their years of insensitivity to relocation issues. Because of the tremendous concern expressed by people in communities across the country, I have introduced legislation to prevent the Postal Service managers from unilaterally abandoning historical buildings and moving to strip malls at the edge of town; that they must obey local land use planning and building codes and give local citizens as much say in how the post office relates to their community as which Elvis stamp we are going to have.

If I ever needed additional evidence that the management of the Postal Service is out of touch with America, the evidence was delivered to my office last week. The Postal Service notified me that it is going to get tough with the Portland Marathon, the largest volunteer marathon in America, which raised over \$600,000 last year to benefit the Special Olympics, schools, service groups, the Leukemia Society, and many other charities.

By letter, the Postal Service said that it has decided, despite a perfect record on the part of the Portland Marathon, no prior violations or complaints, despite an illegal search of the Marathon files by its postal inspectors; despite the preapproval of all the Marathon's mailings by representatives of the Postal Service, that the Portland Marathon, this group of dedicated volunteers, must pay a \$5,000 fine or face Federal trial.

What terrible scheme inspired the Postal Service to clamp down on the Marathon? What scheme so horrible that the Postal Service will pursue a case while paying many times the cost it will ever recover from the Marathon if it wins? What terrible scheme requires the Postal Service to bring down its full force on this dedicated volunteer organization without so much as a warning, with no exceptions or adjustments?

The Portland Marathon offered T-shirts and other memorabilia to some

runners without indicating an identification statement in some of its mailings.

□ 1300

Somehow the U.S. Postal Service seems to have adopted the attitude that in its new status as a quasipublic agency, it is free to be dumb, rigid, and engage in behavior which wastes the resources of a dedicated group of volunteers.

In the words of the fabled gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), "Beam me up, Madam Speaker."

GUAM'S ACTIVITIES COMMEMORATING 100 YEARS UNDER AMERICAN RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, this week May 1 commemorates the strike of Admiral Dewey in the harbor of the Philippines in connection with the Spanish-American War.

One of the great misunderstood events of American history has been the Spanish-American War, in which most people assumed that most of the activity occurred in the Caribbean, when in fact immediately after the declaration of war, the first strike took place in the Philippines; and the repercussions of the Spanish-American War were actually felt more in the Pacific part of the world than in the Caribbean.

In commemoration of the 1898 Spanish-American War and Guam's role in that, I would like to inform my colleagues about the various activities my office will be hosting in conjunction with various organizations on Guam and in the continental United States. From exhibits to conferences to commemoration ceremonies, the centennial anniversary of the Spanish-American War promises to be an exciting and educational year not only for Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, but also for those who wish to learn about America's political, economic, and social campaigns in the Caribbean and Pacific areas at the turn of the century and their repercussions today.

I would like to invite my colleagues to view our upcoming exhibit at the Cannon Rotunda commencing May 18 and ending May 30. In conjunction with the Guam Museum, the Nieves Flores Public Library, the Guam Council on the Arts and Humanities, the Government of Guam, the University of Guam and dedicated individuals, my office will sponsor this event for the main purpose of educating congressional members and staff, as well as Capitol Hill visitors, on the importance of Guam's struggle, which continues today, to attain full membership into the American family.

Each of the 8 panels will illustrate the courageous story of the Chamorros, the indigenous people of Guam, from Guam's pre-European contact days to Spanish rule to the historical and strategic role Guam plays today in the United States and the Asian theatre.

On Guam, from June 18 to 20, my office and the University of Guam will be cosponsoring an academic conference tracing Guam's journey from Spanish to American governance. Participants from the United States, Guam, and Spain will present papers analyzing elements of the Spanish-American War and the eventual colonial steps taken by the United States to acquire its first possessions in the Pacific. This discussion promises to increase our awareness of just how important the Asian-Pacific region played then and, of course, its vital role today in international relations.

I am also involved in helping plan Guam's commemorative activities with the Smithsonian Institution later on this year.

I would also like to highlight Arizona State University's December conference entitled "1848/1898 at 1998: Transhistoric Thresholds." This week-long conference will involve academic presentations, film viewings, and forums designed to elicit debate and discussion about the effects of the Spanish-American War not only on Guam, Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Philippines, but on the overall American political agenda today.

I emphasize to my colleagues the valuable insight into Asian-Pacific-American affairs which can be obtained from the various events which I have outlined. Whether through print or visual mediums, these activities contain vital information which address issues currently being discussed in Congress today.

For example, the Guam Centennial Cannon Rotunda exhibit in May and the Guam conference in June will not only clarify the Spanish legacy and the American role in Guam today, they will also assist us in understanding Guam's political struggle for self-determination.

The centennial commemorations in 1998, whether they be sponsored by my office or other organizations, certainly deserve a great deal of attention from us. The American family in the Pacific reduced geographically in recent years. However, we must keep in mind that the American role in the Asian-Pacific region has not diminished. And Guam today place a very vital strategic role in the area, an important attribute not overlooked by American leaders at the turn of the century when they chose to acquire Guam.

Again, I invite my colleagues to take advantage of this historic year and participate in the various centennial events with me. Increasing our awareness of the Spanish-American War legacy will only improve our understanding of political, economic, and cultural relations today in the Pacific.

SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOL INITIATIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 3 minutes.

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, nothing is more heartbreaking than when a young person turns to drugs. Although the use of drugs by American youth began to level off in 1997, drug-use rates are almost twice as high as they were in 1992.

Research indicates that young people who avoid illegal drugs, alcohol, and tobacco before the age of 18 are likely to avoid chemical dependency problems during the remainder of their lives. This is why it is so important that we all pull together to discourage the distribution, sale, and use of illegal drugs by our Nation's youth.

The real desire is to stop juvenile drug use before it starts by teaching children about the dangers of drugs and demonstrating strong values and giving them opportunities. That is why I am such a strong believer and supporter in the Department of Education's safe and drug-free school initiative.

Through this program, funds are made available to individual school districts to meet their special needs in educating and protecting their students. These funds can pay for additional school security personnel and equipment or increased antidrug education. These funds can also be used to provide supervised after-school activities. The need for these programs is highlighted by the fact that half of all youth crimes are committed during the unsupervised hours between school and dinner time.

Positive parental involvement reduces the likelihood of drug use among children. Parents make the biggest difference in children's attitudes and values—bigger than schools, bigger than community groups, bigger than the government.

As we all know, most families need two incomes in today's economy. There is no substitute for a strong, involved family in a life of a child. But we can all work together to fill the gap for our working families as we work to protect our children from the dangers of illicit drugs. Our future depends on it.

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 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT) at 2 o'clock p.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Richard Lothian III, Community Baptist Church of Somerset, Somerset, New Jersey, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Heavenly Father, known by many names, we thank You for this day and for the lives that You have placed in our care. We come before You with full hearts, mindful that we carry the hope and trust of a Nation. We rejoice in the blessings of mind and spirit which You have freely given us. We understand that these gifts were given for a purpose, that we might know and do Your will on earth through love and service.

As we face the tasks before us, help us to feel Your presence in even the smallest of things, Your voice in every voice, Your hand in every act, Your love in every kindness.

Dear God, we ask that You will be with us in our deliberations and decisions this day. Help us to lead without manipulation, to listen without defensiveness, to challenge without anger, and to change without fear.

And may we serve with wisdom and strength those who trust and rest in our care, even as we trust and rest in Yours.

In Jesus name I pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BALLENGER 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.

REVEREND TERRY LOTHIAN III

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I am very privileged today in introducing Reverend Terry Lothian who offered the opening prayer of the House this afternoon. He is a graduate of the Eastern Baptist College and Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, was the chaplain at the Somerset County Jail for many years, and for more than 12 years has been Pastor of the Community Baptist Church of Somerset.

Many times here in Washington I welcomed constituent groups, from

school groups to families to senior citizens, and am very happy to be able to welcome Reverend Lothian and his wife Carolyn and others from Community Baptist Church here in Washington, D.C. He has played such a key role in so many peoples' lives, and I am very happy that he was able to be a part of the proceedings of our House this afternoon and certainly wish him well.

CHECK THIS OUT

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, foreign aid for Russia, billions for Japan and Germany, missiles for China, citizenship for illegal immigrants, free condoms for school kids, free needles for drug addicts. Now if that is not enough to roast the pork barrel, check this out:

Uncle Sam is now paying the taxes of foreign citizens who work for the International Monetary Fund. Let me say it again. Uncle Sam, with our tax dollars, is paying the taxes for foreign workers. To boot, to make it worse, the White House wants another \$18 billion for this slush fund of international welfare, and the experts agree.

Beam me up, my colleagues. I suggest that Congress hire a crew of protologists to go in and counsel these so-called experts.

I yield back what intelligent life there is left in D.C.

THE BLOATED FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY IS ALIVE AND WELL UNDER THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, it was just 2 short years ago that the Clinton administration proclaimed that the era of big government was over. My, oh my, how quickly things have changed, Mr. Speaker.

Now judging from his most recent budget proposal, the era of abusive bloated Federal bureaucracy is alive and well under the Clinton administration. What other possible explanation could there be for \$128 billion in new taxes in his 1999 budget proposal?

In all fairness to the President, however, he has the right, as he has in the past, to propose all of the tax increases that he desires. Certainly it is his prerogative as the top elected official of this country.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think most people will see through this big government, big tax increase proposal for exactly what it is: a thinly disguised effort by the administration to once again stick its greedy hands into the pockets of every working man and woman in America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of any money we all may have left.

THE CONTINUING CAMPAIGN TO DESTROY JUDGE KENNETH STARR

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, a White House official was quoted in the New York Times last month referring to our continuing campaign to destroy Ken Starr.

Now let us do it again. "Our continuing campaign to destroy Ken Starr."

I sincerely appreciate my fair-minded friends on the other side of the aisle if they would defend the White House, which openly acknowledges their strategy to destroy Judge Starr, the special counsel named by a 3-judge panel and the Attorney General to investigate allegations of serious wrongdoing by the President.

Am I to conclude that the Democrat party thinks it is okay to smear the independent counsel? Am I to conclude that the Democrat party does not care that the White House was in possession of 900 FBI files of Republicans, in gross violation of the law and the civil rights of American citizens? Am I to conclude that the Democrat party does not care if the integrity of our judicial system is violated and that obstruction of justice and lying under oath is okay if it is done by a Democrat? Am I to conclude that the President is in fact above the law because the Dow Jones is doing great?

LEWIS AND CLARK INTERPRETIVE CENTER HAS OPENED ITS DOORS IN GREAT FALLS, MONTANA

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, today is the day that dreams of hundreds of Montanans has come true. With their hard work and determination, the Lewis and Clark Interpretive Center in Great Falls has opened its doors to the public. It has taken more than a dozen years, but the work of dedicated community volunteers has paid off.

Mr. Speaker, these Montanans had a vision. They envisioned a place where all Americans could come to learn more about the heroic journey of Lewis and Clark. The reality today is 5,500 square feet of exhibits which tell the story of an exciting adventure from 1804 to 1806 of the journey which opened up the American West.

I want to extend my personal congratulations to the community of Great Falls and a special salute to the 125 volunteers who have signed up to help with the day-to-day work of greeting tourists and providing interpretive talks to visitors, and I want to invite everyone in the Chamber and all those looking in across the Nation to come to Montana and visit us this summer. It is a place where dreams still can come true.

THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY
MAKES NO SENSE

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

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, a lot of Americans look at our government and conclude that many of the things it does simply make no sense. The marriage tax penalty certainly falls into that category.

The Federal Government has actually set up the system that taxes people more to marry than for couples who live together.

When people shake their heads about the latest crazy scheme to come out of Washington, this is exactly the kind of thing they have in mind. There is no telling what social engineers were thinking when they created this marriage tax, but Americans with common sense think it is time to change, it is time to get rid of the idea of taxing people more to marry than those who live together.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to support H.R. 3734, the Weller-McIntosh bill to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, because it just makes sense.

SUPPORT H.R. 3734 AND ELIMINATE THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party, I think, has shown that they stand for tax relief and tax cuts. We stand for across-the-board tax relief for middle-class Americans. We would like to see the capital gains tax eliminated completely. We would like to see the IRA accounts expanded. We stand for eliminating estate taxes. We want a fair tax system that allows us to fund government at a reasonable level and yet allow Americans to keep more of what they earn.

Now we cannot do all of that at once, but what we can do right now is eliminate the marriage tax penalty from the Tax Code. H.R. 3734 will eliminate the marriage tax penalty and would be an excellent first step in achieving our goals.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a Member of the Committee on Science:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 30, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, The U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: After much thought and consideration, I am tendering my resignation from the Science Committee on which it has been a privilege to serve. As I complete my duties this year, I am nec-

essarily turning my attention to numerous projects that must be completed before the end of my term.

Sincerely,

PAUL MCRAE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

SALUTING THE DISTINGUISHED CAREER OF BOB LENT OF THE UNITED AUTO WORKERS

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Bob Lent of the United Auto Workers, who is retiring after a long and distinguished career serving his country, his union, and his community. I mention these together because they cannot be separated. Bob's personal investment in time and his sweat and loyalty and pride to build a stronger union, to build a stronger community, to build a stronger Nation, reflects the democratic values that I think we all share.

Many people know Bob as the president of UAW Region 1, which includes about 100,000 working men and women in southeastern Michigan and Ontario, but that is only the latest form of his service. As a young man he served as an army paratrooper; later, while working full time, raising a family, and doing union work, Bob volunteered on local political campaigns. He joined the NAACP and became a board member for area charities. His generosity and leadership have made a big difference in our community.

Underlying all of these commitments was Bob's belief in his capacity to contribute to the greater good. It is no understatement to say that for almost half a century Bob has helped to put the small "d" into American democracy.

So, Mr. Speaker, today I salute Bob and thank his wife, Earline, for years of friendship, leadership and community service. Congratulations, Bob.

ELIMINATE THE MARRIAGE PENALTY IN OUR TAX CODE

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the marriage penalty elimination bill, H.R. 3734, the Weller-McIntosh bill that will eliminate the marriage penalty in our Tax Code. There are so many reasons why we should eliminate this unfair and immoral tax provision. But I wanted to share with my colleagues an e-mail that I received the other day from a young man who said: Before we set a wedding date, I calculated the tax implications. Since we each earn in the low \$30,000, the Federal marriage penalty was over \$3,000. What a wonderful wedding gift from the IRS.

Or another e-mail from Wayne in Dayton, Ohio, who says that penalizing for marriage flies in the face of common sense. It is a classic example of government policy not supporting that which it wishes to promote.

These e-mails have been coming by the thousands into our office, and I ask any of those out there who are watching to communicate with me their family situation about the problems with this marriage penalty tax. We are making great progress in Washington, but we need support from the American people to eliminate this tax in our budget in the House, and next fall in our tax bill. It will save Americans \$1,400 on their tax bill per family.

□ 1415

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 5 p.m. today.

MADRID PROTOCOL
IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 567) to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, in order to carry out provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 567

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Madrid Protocol Implementation Act".

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

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

"TITLE XII—THE MADRID PROTOCOL

"SEC. 60. DEFINITIONS.

"For purposes of this title:

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

"(2) BASIC APPLICATION.—The term 'basic application' means the application for the

registration of a mark that has been filed with an Office of a Contracting Party and that constitutes the basis for an application for the international registration of that mark.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“SEC. 62. CERTIFICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(1) directly with the International Bureau, or

“(2) with the Patent and Trademark Office for transmittal to the International Bureau,

if the request is in such form, and contains such transmittal fee, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“(a) EXAMINATION AND OPPOSITION.—(1) A request for extension of protection described in section 66(a) shall be examined as an application for registration on the Principal Register under this Act, and if on such examination it appears that the applicant is entitled to extension of protection under this

title, the Commissioner shall cause the mark to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“SEC. 69. EFFECT OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

“(a) ISSUANCE OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.—Unless a request for extension of pro-

tection is refused under section 68, the Commissioner shall issue a certificate of extension of protection pursuant to the request and shall cause notice of such certificate of extension of protection to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“SEC. 71. AFFIDAVITS AND FEES.

“(a) REQUIRED AFFIDAVITS AND FEES.—An extension of protection for which a certificate of extension of protection has been issued under section 69 shall remain in force for the term of the international registration upon which it is based, except that the extension of protection of any mark shall be canceled by the Commissioner—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“SEC. 73. INCONTESTABILITY.

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

“SEC. 74. RIGHTS OF EXTENSION OF PROTECTION.

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

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

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

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

“SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

H.R. 567, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 567, the Madrid Protocol Implementation Act, and urge the House to adopt the measure.

House Resolution 567 is the implementing legislation for the protocol related to the Madrid Agreement of the Registration of Marks, commonly known as the "Madrid Protocol." The bill is identical to legislation introduced in the preceding two Congresses and will send a signal to the international business community, United States businesses, and trademark owners that the 105th Congress is determined to help our Nation, and particularly our small businesses, become part of an inexpensive, efficient system that allows the international registration of marks.

As a practical matter, Mr. Speaker, ratification of the protocol and enactment of H.R. 567 will enable the American trademark owners to pay a nominal fee to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, which will then register the marks in the individual countries that comprise the European Union, or EU. Currently, American trademark owners must hire attorneys or agents in each individual country to acquire protection. This process, as my colleagues can conclude, is both laborious and expensive and discourages small businesses in particular and individuals from registering their marks in Europe.

The Madrid Protocol took effect in April of 1996 and currently binds 16 countries to its terms, but not the United States. Our participation in the protocol is critical not just for the world community, but for those American individuals and small businesses who otherwise lack the resources to acquire worldwide, country-by-country protection for their trademarks.

Mr. Speaker, opposition to the protocol and the substantive provisions of H.R. 567 is nonexistent, as best I can determine. However, a sticking point to ratification does exist. The State Department has been trying for some time to reconcile differences between the administration and the EU regarding the voting rights of the "intergovernmental" members of the protocol in the assembly established by the agreement. Under the protocol, the EU receives a separate vote in addition to the votes of its member States. The Secretary of State has been working tirelessly to reconcile differences with the EU regarding the voting rights issue and the result has been positive.

Mr. Speaker, I remain confident that the problem will be resolved in the not-too-distant future. Passage of this legislation is intended to encourage a positive outcome in the negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 567 is an important and noncontroversial bill that will greatly benefit those American businesses and other individuals who need to register their trademarks overseas in a quick and cost-effective manner. I implore my colleagues to pass the bill today.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleague has explained this matter very adequately, and I urge Members to vote for it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. In closing let me say this, and I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts will agree with me: I want to reiterate the fact that the Secretary of State and Under Secretary Stu Eizenstat have done yeoman's work in trying to get this difference of opinion resolved, and I feel fairly good about its coming to fruition before too long.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I agree that Mr. Eizenstat has done yeoman's work and that the Secretary of State has done whatever the semantic equivalent of yeoman's work is.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 567.

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.

REGARDING AMERICAN VICTIMS OF TERRORISM

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 220) regarding American victims of terrorism, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 220

Whereas the traditional policy of the United States, reiterated by this Administration, has been to vigorously pursue and apprehend terrorists who have killed American citizens in other countries;

Whereas numerous American citizens have been killed by Palestinian terrorists, most of them in Israel or the Israeli administered territories, including 9 since the signing of the Oslo Accords in 1993, namely Nachshon Wachsman (New York), Alisa Flatow (New Jersey), Sara Duker (New Jersey), Matthew Eisenfeld (Connecticut), Joan Davenny (Connecticut), David Boim (New York), Yaron Ungar (New York), Leah Stern (New Jersey), and Yael Botwin (California);

Whereas at least 20 of the terrorists suspected in the killings of American citizens in Israel or the Israeli administered territories during 1993-1997 have been identified by Israel as Mohammed Dief, Nabil Sharhi, Nafez Sabih, Imjad Hinawi, Abd al-Majid Dudin, Adel Awadallah, Ibrahim Ghneimat, and Mahmoud Abu Hanudeh, Abd al-Rahman Ghanemat, Jamal al-Hur, Raid Abu Hamdayah, Mohammad Abu Wardah, Hassan Salamah, Abd Rabu Shaykh 'Id, Hamdallah Tzramah, Abd Al-Nasser Atallah Issa, Hataham Ibrahim Ismail, Jihad Mohammad Shaker Yamur, and Mohammad Abbasm;

Whereas, according to the Israeli Government, 10 of those 20 terrorist suspects are currently believed to be free men;

Whereas the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987 permits the prosecution, in the United States, of individuals who murder American citizens abroad; and

Whereas the United States has previously acted to bring to justice those responsible for the deaths of American citizens and has established a precedence of United States intervention by demanding that Libyan leader Moammar Qadafi transfer to the United States the Libyan terrorists suspected of bombing Pan Am flight 103: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) the United States should demand the prosecution of all suspected perpetrators of these attacks against United States citizens;

(2) the United States should seek the cooperation of the Palestinian Authority and all other appropriate authorities in the prosecution of these cases; and

(3) the suspects should be tried in the United States unless it is determined that such action is contrary to effective prosecution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution now being considered.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Fox), for sponsoring H. Con. Res. 220, which expresses the sense of the Congress regarding the murder of U.S. citizens by Palestinian terrorists.

As Secretary of State Albright meets with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and PLO Chairman Yassir Arafat, it is critical that security concerns be the basis for any movement in the negotiations. In that vein, H. Con. Res. 220 recognizes that the traditional policy of our Nation is to vigorously

□ 1430

pursue and apprehend any terrorists who have killed American citizens in other countries.

Regrettably, even as more Israelis have been killed since the beginning of the Oslo process than at any other time during the Intifada, at least nine American citizens have been killed by Palestinian terrorists since the handshake on the White House lawn in September 1993. They are: Nachshon Wachsman, David Boim, and Yaron Ungar of New York; Alisa Flatow, Sara Duker and Leah Stern of New Jersey; Matthew Eisenfeld and Joan Davenny of Connecticut, and Yael Botwin of California.

At least 20 of the terrorists suspected in these killings have been identified by the Government of Israel, although at least 10 are believed to be free, despite repeated Israeli transfer requests to the Palestinian Authority.

Mr. Speaker, this clearly undermines the process envisaged by the Oslo Accords. Because these families deserve justice, and since the Antiterrorism Act permits the prosecution in our Nation of individuals who murder American citizens abroad, this resolution expresses the sense of Congress that our Nation should demand the prosecution of all suspected perpetrators of these attacks; that we should seek the cooperation of the Palestinian Authority, and all other appropriate authorities in the prosecution of these cases; and unless effective prosecution elsewhere expresses the sense of Congress, that the suspects should be tried in the United States.

Recently, a task force comprised of individuals from the Justice Department and the FBI were in Israel in the Palestinian areas to investigate the death of these American citizens. Cooperation from the Palestinian Authority is critical as investigative authorities attempt to discover and develop evidence for prosecution.

I therefore want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX), for his leadership on this issue and for his persistence in seeking justice for these American families. I urge my colleagues to support this measure unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX), the original sponsor of this measure, and that he may control the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of the resolution. I would be glad to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania speak first, if he would like to do so.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we would be glad to hear from the ranking member of the committee whose support we accept and for whom our admiration is endless.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I support H. Con. Res. 220 and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX) for introducing it and working very hard to get it approved.

I also appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the committee, for accommodating several of our suggestions in committee, I think largely to make the resolution more accurate.

These changes included several changes recommended by the administration. They will help ensure that the resolution reflects the current set of facts as best they can be determined.

I certainly agree with the heart of this resolution; namely, that suspects in terrorist attacks against innocent civilians should be brought to justice. Where those attacks involve U.S. citizens, the United States should try to prosecute them in the United States if that serves the interests of justice.

As the headlines in the newspaper suggest almost daily, nothing is easy in the Middle East, and everything becomes very complicated. Several of the cases addressed in this resolution are complicated. The facts are murky. It is unclear in some instances which suspects are in the custody of the Palestinian Authority, which suspects are in Israeli custody, which suspects are still at large in territories controlled by the Palestinian Authority, or controlled jointly by Israel and the Palestinian Authority. It is sometimes difficult to know which suspects Israel has requested the Palestinian Authority to transfer to Israeli jurisdiction, or what Israeli prosecution plans are with regard to various cases.

The Department of State, I am told, cannot vouch for some of the specific information in the resolution. The administration may have a similar list of names to those included in the resolution, but many of these cases are still actively under investigation, and the finalist of suspects may look different. We simply do not know. At this point in time, the Department of State has not indicated that they have all of the names.

In addition, the United States may not have been given all of the evidence against the individuals listed in the resolution that the Israeli Government has or other appropriate authorities have. It is clear that the United States cannot proceed with prosecution until it has all of the relevant evidence.

Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of this resolution, let me urge parties with such evidence to cooperate fully with the United States in sharing information in order to bring the suspects to justice. The United States is currently reviewing a number of the cases mentioned in the resolution. A team from the Departments of Justice and State recently returned from a visit to Israel, and this team is now reviewing evidence in several of these cases with much of that evidence being classified.

The United States is and should be doing everything it appropriately can to pursue information and justice in these terrorism cases. In some cases, that may mean that it is best for Israel to try and to sentence the suspects.

For example, in one case described by the administration, over a dozen Israelis and one U.S.-Israeli dual national were victims of the attack. Clearly, Israeli authorities would be in a better position than the United States to impose the appropriately severe penalties in such a case. Our goal of swift and appropriate justice might be best served then with a prosecution in Israel.

It may not always be in the best interest of justice for the United States to insist on prosecution. I am pleased to see that the resolution makes this distinction. There is no question, though, that suspects in these terrorist incidents, as well as all other incidents leading to the loss of life, should be tried and should be sentenced if convicted.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FOX) and the other sponsors of the resolution for bringing it forward. I urge the adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution has moved quickly from its inception in the Committee on International Relations to the floor today under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), our colleague and friend, a testament to the strength and determination of the American people and their representatives to right the wrongs against our countrymen and women.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON), the ranking member, for his assistance in this regard.

H. Con. Res. 220 is a resolution that addresses some specific concerns that I and many of my colleagues have about current U.S. policy regarding terrorism involving American victims, specifically regarding American citizens who have been killed in recent months and years in terrorist attacks in Israel.

Since the beginning of the Oslo Accords in 1993, at least nine American citizens in Israel, and now I understand 11, have been killed by Palestinian terrorists. These are not random or unknown people. These people are our children and citizens.

They include Nachshon Wachsman, Alisa Flatow, Sara Duker, Matthew Eisenfeld, Joan Davenny, David Boim, Yaron Ungar, Leah Stern, and Yael Botwin. Recently, unfortunately, we have had to add two additional names to that list: Ira Weinstein and Dove Dribben.

To add insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, the United States Government in conjunction with the government of Israel

knows the location of 10 of the 20 terrorists suspected in the murders of these United States citizens. The Palestinian Authority has not honored Israel's formal requests for the transfer of many of these suspects. Their lack of compliance tremendously undermines the process envisaged by the Oslo Accords. Annex 4, Article 2, paragraph 7(f)(1). The United States must now invoke the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987, which permits the transfer of individuals accused of murdering Americans abroad.

The time has come for the United States to stand up and fight for the families of victims killed overseas. No longer can we simply assume that American citizens abroad are safe. When unfortunately they are endangered or in this case killed, this Nation must utilize its laws properly to ensure that justice is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their attention and look forward to their support on the resolution.

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, today America has the opportunity to deliver a powerful and poignant message to terrorists: If you murder innocent Americans and tear innocent families apart, the United States of America will demand justice.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate this bill on the Floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, Israeli and PLO leaders are in Great Britain being pressured to come together for a lasting peace.

But since the PLO signed the Oslo Accords, ten Americans have been killed by Arab terrorists—one of them was a constituent of mine. Her name is Sara Duker. And the Palestinian leadership headed by Yassir Arafat has done nothing to bring her terrorist murderers to justice.

When my good friend JOHN FOX and I announced that we were going to fight for her killer's transfer to the United States, Sara's mother Arline came down to Washington to join us for the announcement. All Arline wants to see is justice. Her daughter was taken away from her. She should expect no less from us.

Since giving his word at Oslo, Yassir Arafat has made a total mockery of his written commitment to transfer to Israel for prosecution any terrorist who has killed innocent people. In fact, not one of the accused terrorists that Israeli authorities have identified and requested has been turned over to Israel for justice.

Justice cannot wait any longer. We must seek the terrorists' transfer to the United States before the trail of evidence dries up. To do any less would represent a serious failure of the United States government to safeguard the sanctity of our citizenry.

We cannot let the murder of American citizens anywhere in the world go unanswered. We must have our message heard loud and clear: Terrorists will never win.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, this important resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States should demand that Palestinian Authority (PA) Chairman Yasser Arafat transfer the United States for prosecution the terrorists who have murdered

American citizens. The refusal by the PA to assist America in the fight against terrorism, calls into question its commitment to peace.

At least 10 U.S. citizens have been killed in Israel by Palestinian terrorists since the Oslo Accords were signed in 1993. About 20 Palestinians have been implicated in the attacks. Not a single terrorist implicated in the attacks has been transferred to Israel to stand trial as the Oslo Accords require. And in spite of sufficient evidence to do so, the U.S. Department of Justice has not indicted any of the terrorist involved in the spilling of American blood. The majority of the terrorists are believed to be living freely in territories controlled by Chairman Arafat. In a twist of irony, one terrorist, according to reports, is employed as a jailer at a Palestinian detention facility.

The Resolution continues the bi-partisan congressional effort to secure justice for the murdered Americans. I would briefly note some of the other attempts to prod the Administration to do its job and pressure Chairman Arafat to transfer the Palestinian murderers.

On January 20, I drafted a letter with Representative JIM SAXTON, signed by 29 other Members of the House and four Senators, which called on Secretary of State Albright to direct U.S. efforts to obtain the transfer of those who have murdered American citizens.

The State Department's response of February 25 was woefully inadequate. The State Department responded that it would be permissible for the PA to prosecute the murderers of Americans. For the State Department to refer these cases back to the PA is a sad joke. The PA criminal justice system is a circuit of kangaroo courts. Everybody knows it's a revolving door of justice. The Secretary of State has in the past admitted as much. Representative SAXTON and I followed-up the State Department's non-response with a March 25 letter to Secretary Albright. In the letter, we demanded action, noting that: "That failure of the United States to do everything in its power to prosecute Palestinian killers of Americans puts other Americans at risk, and is contrary to longstanding U.S. policy to pursue territories most aggressively. The time has come for results." We also questioned why the U.S. continues to provide aid for the Palestinian Authority, and is not willing to impose economic sanctions against the PA, as it does in the case of Libya for its refusal to transfer the terrorists suspected of bombing Pan Am flight 103.

The State Department's letter was useful, however, in pointing out the role the U.S. Department of Justice and the FBI play in capturing terrorists. U.S. law makes it a capital offense to kill a national of the United States anywhere in the world. On April 28, Representative JIM SAXTON and I sent a letter to Attorney General Janet Reno that has been signed by a group of over 60 Members of the House, including Speaker NEWT GINGRICH (Senator ALFONSE D'AMATO also signed the letter), which states that: "The DOJ should pursue these killers of American citizens abroad with the same vigor it has pursued the murderers of Americans killed in terrorism attacks here in the U.S. Americans traveling or living abroad have often been desirable targets for terrorist attacks. If we are to deter such attacks in the future, it is essential that our law enforcement agencies pursue these cases aggressively and to the fullest extent of the law. It is our view that the DOJ must in-

vestigate, indict and prosecute these individuals without further delay."

I will conclude my remarks with an excerpt from a letter that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu sent to me in February on the importance of punishing terrorists. "That murderers are allowed to go free and live without fear of prosecution in areas ruled by the Palestinian Authority is particularly worrisome. This is not just a travesty of justice but a very strong message to potential terrorists."

The blood of the victims cries from the dust for justice. Killers of Americans must be brought to justice. I commend Representative FOX for his sponsorship of the Resolution, and Chairman GILMAN's leadership in speedily bringing it to the floor.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The question on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 220, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule 1, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SENSE OF THE HOUSE THAT THE UNITED STATES MUST REMAIN COMMITTED TO COMBATING ILLEGAL DRUGS

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 267) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the citizens of the United States must remain committed to combat the distribution, sale, and use of illegal drugs by the Nation's youth.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 267

Whereas recently released statistics demonstrate that America is not winning the battle to keep young Americans drug-free;

Whereas the results of these studies show that 29 percent of high school students state that a student in their school died from a drug-related or an alcohol-related incident in the last year;

Whereas 76 percent of high school students and 46 percent of middle school students claim drugs are kept, used, or sold on their school grounds;

Whereas studies show that 61 percent of high school students claim they can buy drugs within 1 day and 35 percent claim they can buy drugs within 1 hour or less;

Whereas it is reported that the use of heroin is increasing and that 90 percent of new heroin users are under 26 years old;

Whereas the use of drugs at a young age dramatically increases the risk of failure to complete high school, increases the likelihood of committing crimes, and reduces future prospects in education, athletics, and careers;

Whereas it is known that safe, drug-free, and orderly classrooms are key to an effective learning environment;

Whereas parental involvement is critical to helping young Americans resist the temptations of drugs and to establishing a healthy learning environment;

Whereas violent crime rates across the United States have declined due to strong parental involvement and cooperation among local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies;

Whereas the same unified effort and commitment are needed to fight drugs in our schools, playgrounds, and communities; and

Whereas Congress has the unique ability to provide leadership on this issue by raising awareness of the dangers of drugs in schools in every community across this great Nation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) all schools should be drug-free;
 (2) the distribution, sale, and use of illegal drugs in the Nation's schools is unacceptable;

(3) all Federal, State, and local drug fighting agencies should work together with schools and parents to ensure that a renewed effort is made to fight the distribution, sale, and use of illegal drugs in our schools and to America's youth;

(4) all governmental leaders, educators, and parents share a role in raising the awareness of this issue and offering constructive alternatives to illegal drug use; and

(5) Congress and the President should work to end the distribution, sale, and use of illegal drugs in the Nation's schools and, work with local communities, schools, and parents to implement meaningful policies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire, is either gentleman opposed to the legislation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) opposed to the legislation?

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the legislation.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 7 minutes of my 20 minutes be controlled by the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ).

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be involved with this very important sense of the House resolution. Although this resolution is non-binding in nature, it is important. It sends a wakeup call to Americans.

By way of background, this resolution was introduced by the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS), my friend and colleague, last fall. I commend his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor today.

H. Res. 267 enjoys the bipartisan support of 181 cosponsors, including most of the Republican members of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, which reported out the resolution, as amended by the committee substitute, by voice vote on March 11.

Additionally, this bill has been endorsed by a variety of interest groups: The Partnership for a Drug Free America; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Youth to Youth; American Society of Addiction Medicine; National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence; D.A.R.E. America; and the Elks Drug Awareness Program.

Mr. Speaker, this simple resolution addresses a complex problem that plagues modern America: Illicit drug usage and trade. House Resolution 267 is clear and concise. It expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the citizens of the United States must remain committed to combat the distribution, sale and use of illegal drugs by the Nation's youth. If we fail to convey this vital message, our children's minds and bodies will continue to be poisoned by drugs.

Let me just say up front where I stand on the crisis of illicit drug use in America. I have addressed this body last week to explain my anti-drug amendment to the Higher Education bill and amendment to the underlying language offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON). In doing so, I challenged Congress to get serious about the epidemic of illicit drugs in this country.

As I emphasized last week on this floor, we have a major drug crisis in this country and the question is are we serious about it or not? It is too easy for us to criticize Mexico and Colombia for their apparent endless supply of poisonous drugs to this country. We must continue to find effective and creative ways to fight the demand problem within our own borders.

House Resolution 267 is a first step in sending a clear and concise message that we are serious about this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD some details of this crisis in particular, and not go into detail at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be involved with this very important sense of the House resolution. Although this resolution is non-binding in nature, it is important—it sends a wake up call to Americans.

By way of background, this resolution was introduced by my friend and colleague MIKE PAPPAS last fall. I commend his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor today.

H. Res. 267 enjoys the bipartisan support of 181 cosponsors, including most of the Republican members of the Education and the Workforce Committee, which reported out the resolution, as amended by the Committee substitute, by voice vote on March 11th.

Additionally, this bill has been endorsed by a variety of interest groups: the Partnership for

a Drug Free America, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Youth to Youth, American Society of Addiction Medicine, National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence, D.A.R.E. America, and Elks Drug Awareness Program.

Mr. Speaker, This simple resolution addresses a complex problem that plagues modern America—illicit drug usage and trade. H. Res. 267 is clear and concise—it expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the citizens of the United States must remain committed to combat the distribution, sale, and use of illegal drugs by the Nation's youth.

If we fail to convey this vital message, our children's minds and bodies will continue to be poisoned by drugs.

Let me just say up front where I stand on the crisis of illicit drug use in America. I addressed this body last week to explain my anti-drug amendment to the Higher Ed bill. In doing so, I challenged Congress to get serious about the epidemic of illicit drugs in this country.

As I emphasized last week on this floor, we have a major drug crisis in this country, and the question is—are we serious about it or not?

It is too easy for us to criticize Mexico and Columbia for their apparent endless supply of poisonous drugs to this country. We must continue to find creative and effective ways to combat the demand problem within our own borders. H. Res. 267 is a first step in sending a clear and concise message that we are serious about this crisis.

The evidence of the drug crisis is in, and it is quite compelling. Consider these telling statistics:

DRUG AVAILABILITY & USE IS ON THE RISE

A majority of all high school seniors would say "yes," they've used an illegal drug in their short lifetime. In 1992, 40.7% had ever used an illicit drug; by 1997, the number jumped to 54.3%. (Source: December 1997, "Monitoring the Future Study" a.k.a. the "National High School Survey," University of Michigan's Survey Research Center)

Marijuana use is up. In 1992, one-out-of-three high school seniors (32.6%) had tried the drug—a mere six years later in 1997, nearly half of all high school seniors (49.6%) had experimented with pot. (Source: same as above)

The number of 4th-6th graders (9-to-12 year olds) experimenting with marijuana increased 71% from 334,000 in 1993 to 571,000 in 1997. (Source: April 13, 1998, "Partnership Attitude Study," Partnership for a Drug-Free America)

"Children's exposure to marijuana doubled from 1993 to 1997." In 1993, 7% of kids said that they had close friends who "use marijuana sometimes" to 14% in 1997. (Source: same as above)

72% of people in the U.S. and 65% of people in Latin America favor U.S.-imposed sanctions on countries that don't do enough to combat drug production or trafficking. (Source: same as above)

34% see drug interdiction as a top priority foreign policy issue—more than illegal immigration (22%), the threat of terrorism (22%), and free trade (17%). (Source: February 26, 1998, "America Assesses Drug Policy," Family Research Council)

Mr. Speaker, that's what we're up against. As the evidence suggests, we can no longer allow the use and trade of illicit drugs to continue unchecked.

It's time we send an unequivocal message to America that the House unequivocally opposes illicit drugs. If you are a drug user or

pusher—beware. We are watching and we will find innovative ways to combat what you are doing.

By the time the average teenager reaches age 18, 68% can buy marijuana within a day—nearly half within an hour. In fact, 42% find marijuana easier to buy than either beer or cigarettes. (Source: September 1997, "Back to School 1997," Center for Addiction & Substance Abuse)

By the time the average child reaches age 13, ONE-in-FOUR have attended a party in the last six months where marijuana was available. (Source: same as above)

Fewer than one-in-three teenagers under 18 say they attend a drug-free school. (Source: same as above)

A third of teenagers (33%) were offered drugs at school in 1997—a significant increase of 44% from 1993 (23%). For children 9-to-12 years old (4th-6th graders), almost three out of ten (28%) were offered drugs in 1997—a 47% increase since 1993 (19%). (Source: April 13, 1998, "Partnership Attitude Study," Partnership for a Drug-Free America)

THE UNTOLD COSTS

Drug abuse killed 14,218 Americans in 1995 at the cost of more than \$67 billion. (November 10, 1997, "What America's Users Spend on Illegal Drugs: 1988-1995," Office of National Drug Control Policy)

If this casualty rate should continue, 114,000 Americans—many of them youth—will die from drug abuse and overdoses on President Clinton's watch. These numbers do not take into account deaths from drug-related crime and violence, which the Drug Enforcement Agency estimates would easily top 20,000 Americans per year.

By the time a child reaches age 13, ONE-in-TEN will say they know a schoolmate who has died because of drugs or alcohol. (Source: September 1997, "Back to School 1997," Center for Addiction & Substance Abuse)

American taxpayers footed a \$150 billion bill for drug-related criminal and medical costs in 1997 alone. (November 10, 1997, "What America's Users Spend on Illegal Drugs: 1988-1995," Office of National Drug Control Policy)

That's more than what we spent in 1997's federal budget for programs to fund education, transportation improvements, agriculture, energy, space, and all foreign aid combined.

Illegal drug users in the United States spent more than \$57 billion on their street poisons in 1995 alone. American consumers could have more wisely used that money to purchase a four-year college education for one million kids; or 22 billion gallons of milk to feed babies; or, one year's worth of child care for 14 million children. (November 10, 1997, "What America's Users Spend on Illegal Drugs: 1988-1995," Office of National Drug Control Policy)

THE CRIMINAL ELEMENT

70% of all hard drugs and illegal narcotics found in the United States originally crossed the U.S./Mexican border. (CRS)

More than 1.5 million people were arrested from drug offenses in 1996 alone. That's more than the number of residents living in Montana and North Dakota COMBINED. (November 10, 1997, "What America's Users Spend on Illegal Drugs: 1988-1995," Office of National Drug Control Policy)

Between 70%-90% of all persons incarcerated in state prisons are there for drug offenses. (November 10, 1997, "What America's Users Spend on Illegal Drugs: 1988-1995," Office of National Drug Control Policy)

Street cops, our foot soldiers in the War on Drugs, say that reducing drug abuse would

have the greatest single impact on reducing violent crime. (Source: Fall 1997, "Drug Facts for the Record," House Government Reform & Oversight Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs & Criminal Justice briefing paper citing a 1995 study conducted by the University of Maryland)

PERCEPTIONS & REALITIES ABOUT DRUGS

Nearly 9 in 10 people (85%) believe solving our drug crisis is more urgent than less urgent. (Source: February 26, 1998, "America Assesses Drug Policy," Family Research Council)

82% oppose drug legalization. (Source: same as above)

Teenagers say drugs (35%) are their most important problem, far ahead of social pressures (19%), crime (12%), sexual issues (8%), academic pressures (8%), or family problems (3%). (Source: September 1997, "Back to School 1997," Center for Addiction & Substance Abuse)

45% of parents believe their son or daughter may have friends who smoke pot. Yet 71% of teens say they have friends who use the drug. (Source: April 13, 1998, "Partnership Attitude Study," Partnership for a Drug-Free America)

Just 21% of parents acknowledged the possibility that their teen might have tried marijuana, significantly lower than the 44% of teens who say they've done so. (Source: same as above)

Some 54% of parents say they talked with their teenagers about drugs at least four times in the last year, yet less than a quarter (24%) of those teens recalled those discussions. (Source: same as above)

Less than one-third of teens (28%) named parents as a source of drug information, while another third (31%) said that in the past year their parents had never talked to them about drugs. (Source: same as above)

A plurality of those surveyed in the U.S. (39%) say the primary objective of U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America should be to decrease drug trafficking. (Source: April 16, 1998, "A Meeting of Minds, From Peoria to Patagonia," The Wall Street Journal)

Mr. Speaker, these facts that we have been hearing about on this floor for the past week are what we are up against. As the evidence suggests, we can no longer allow the use and trade of illicit drugs to continue unchecked.

It is time we send an unequivocal message to America that the House opposes illicit drugs. Drug users and pushers, beware. We are watching and we will find innovative ways to combat what users and pushers are doing in every category of legislation that we are facing.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a simple, yet important first step putting the United States Congress on record.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, not so much in any objection to what the goals are. The goals are very laudable. The first time I read this resolution, I was in agreement with everything until the very end. Then I had some disagreements with it.

I have taken this time so I would have adequate time to explain my position and why I oppose this bill. Obviously, this country is facing a serious problem with drugs. As a physician, I

can attest to it. We have major problems in this country, something should be done. But I thought it was necessary to take some time to point out that what we have done for 20 to 25 years has not been all that good. And I see this resolution as an endorsement of the status quo, not an introduction of one single new idea about how to approach this problem. And it is for this reason that I have taken this time to try to get people to think about maybe an alternative some day that we might look at, because so far the spending of the money and the abuse of our civil liberties that has occurred with the war on drugs has not accomplished a whole lot.

I object strongly to the Federal approach to law enforcement. That is one of the major issues I have contention with. When we think about when we tried to make a better world in 1919, and we thought we should prohibit certain substances being used in this country, in those days we had enough respect for the Constitution that we actually believed then that we should amend the Constitution, and we did and we had an experiment and after 14 years of a failed program, we repealed that amendment on alcohol.

In 1937, it was decided that possibly we should restrict marijuana, even for medical use, and even then it was not assumed that this was a Federal prerogative. It was not banned, it was not outlawed. It was still assumed that it was the responsibility of the States to deal with problems of drugs and marijuana and law enforcement.

In 1937, and I am sure some of my conservative colleagues might be interested in this because it was the great FDR who decided to impose a great tax on marijuana, putting \$100 tax on a pound of marijuana, essentially making it illegal. And even today those States who would like to legalize marijuana even for the sick and dying AIDS patients and the cancer patients are not even permitted to. It is because we have carelessly assumed that all regulation and all controls and all policing activities should be done here in Washington.

I am here just to suggest quite possibly our attack on drugs has not been correct, that we have possibly made some mistakes. Maybe we spent some money that we have not gotten our dollars' worth. Maybe we are going in the wrong direction.

It is estimated that we have spent over \$200 billion in the last 25 years fighting drugs. And yet it is the same old thing again. Play on the emotions of the people, condemn drug usage, which I do. As I said as a physician, I know they are horrible. But as a politician and somebody in the legislature, we should think about the efficiency and the effectiveness of our laws.

The evidence quite frankly is not there to show that we are doing a very good job. And even though I commend the individuals who are promoting this legislation, the motivations are there,

the desires are there, but I think, in my view, that it is the same old program of the Federal war on drugs that has a lot of shortcomings.

The first "whereas" of this resolution, I strongly agree with. It says, "Whereas recently revealed statistics demonstrate America is not winning the battle to keep young Americans drug-free." This is my point. This is conceded by everyone. We are not winning this fight, so why pursue the same policies over and over again, and especially since there are some shortcomings with the policy. Not only have they not been effective, there are some serious shortcomings, shortcomings on civil liberty and property rights and other things.

□ 1445

We ought to put the war on drugs in a proper perspective. Yes, it is easy to talk about a heroin addict and a crime committed and people narrowing in on one instance, but we ought to look at this in a proper manner.

There is talk that there are 20,000 deaths with illegal drugs. But that, in the best of my estimates, includes all the violent drugs which, to me, are a consequence of the war on drugs.

I have statistics that say there is about 6,000 people who die from overdosing and taking illegal drugs. A horrible figure. It is horrible. Nobody should be using these drugs. But let us put this in a different perspective.

We lose 37,000 people on highways every year, government-managed highways. And 36,000 people die each year from guns. But we do not take the guns away from the innocent people because there are gun accidents and gun deaths. It is 36,000 in comparison to 6,000.

There is one other figure that is astounding that was in the media, recorded in the media here the last couple of days. The medical profession has a responsibility here. It is estimated that we are losing 106,000 people a year. These are reports from 1994; 106,000 a year from drug reactions, legal prescription drugs coming from doctors.

If we want to go after a problem, let us go after the highways, let us go after the guns, let us go after the drug reaction. What about alcohol? There are 200,000 deaths, approximately, from alcohol. But do we come here and propose that we go back to prohibition? No. We do not. It is a serious problem. It is really the big problem.

Cigarette killing may be up to 400,000 a year. But if we make the suggestion that we want to go after them, then we have a President that says, yes, we will go after the kids that are taking a puff on the cigarette and apply the same rules.

There are 10 million new cases of sexually transmitted diseases diagnosed each year. It is probably higher because most of those cases do not get reported. So that is a serious problem. I mean, look for serious problems.

To dwell on the drug war and casually and carelessly violate civil lib-

erties, as we so often do, and have confiscation and seizure of property that we just blow it off because we are fighting the drug war, I think we are going in the wrong direction. We need some new ideas and new proposals on this drug war. I hope today to have time to make some of these suggestions on what we might do about the drug war.

Former HEW Secretary Joseph Califano said, not too long ago, he was comparing the drug war to the problem of alcohol, he said: The drug war is a grain of sand compared to alcohol.

If we look at the college issue, the overwhelming drug that is a problem on college campuses is alcohol. Yet, 99 percent of our concerns and our expression of horror is directed toward a narrower group of people; that is, on the illegal drugs.

Why might it be that we dwell on the illegal drugs? Alcohol of course is legal, but why would it be that maybe this Congress might not be as aggressive against the abuses of alcohol and the deaths? If we have compassion, should we show less compassion to the 200,000 people dying of alcohol deaths or the 400,000 dying from cigarette deaths? But we do.

It just happens that those who produce alcohol happen to come to Washington quite frequently. They make donations to candidates. They have a lobby. They do have a presence here in Washington. Not only those who make the alcohol, but what about the hotels or the restaurants?

I mean, if we even thought about doing anything or saying anything about alcohol, of course we would hear from the hotels and the restaurants, and maybe rightfully so, if we argue that people have a right to have a glass of wine with their dinner in their hotel or restaurant. But the point I am trying to make is that we dwell on certain things out of proportion to its danger.

Also, one reason why we might not talk about the tremendous abuse with alcohol is the fact that, quite possibly, a few Members of Congress actually participate in using such a thing. There are now probably 13 million people in this United States suffering from abuse or alcoholism, a serious, serious number.

Now, there is a lot more that has to be said, especially if we can someday open up the debate and go in a new direction, have some new ideas dealing with the drug program. But I want to pause here for a minute, and I want to emphasize just one thing; that is, that, constitutionally, it was never intended that the Federal Government fight the war on drug. And they never did until recent years. For 25 years now, we have done it. We have spent \$200 billion.

It is failing, and we are not willing to stand up and say, hey, maybe we are doing something wrong. Maybe we ought to have another idea. Maybe we ought to have a new approach.

I think when we talk about not only looking at this outer perspective of other problems that we have in the

country, but also the serious consequences of the drug laws which we all should be concerned about because it involves property rights and civil liberty rights, maybe we can get around to the point of saying maybe could there be a new approach.

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the other side and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS) for bringing this resolution, of which I am a cosponsor, to the floor today.

I just want to take a second today to say that all of the "whereases" deal with much of the problem that the previous speaker outlined. But in the end, the resolve is a resolve that he talks about, because Congress, in a unique way, can bring leadership and emphasis to the people in the communities to take an extra effort to combat this horrible disease that exists in our communities today: drugs.

Obviously the extent of drug distribution, sale, or use by our Nation's youth today is extremely troubling. A joint effort by Republicans, Democrats, the President, and the American people really, I believe, is needed to fight this pressing issue.

Too many of our Nation's youth have come to the perils of drugs. And I would not compare alcohol, which is a legal distribution, to drugs, as an illegal distribution, as being necessarily the same thing. They are horses of a different color.

I want to commend the other side, and Representative PAPPAS, for bringing this resolution, of which I am a cosponsor, to the floor today. Obviously, the extent of drug distribution, sale, or use by our Nation's youth is extremely troubling and a joint effort by Congress, the President and the American people is needed to combat this pressing problem.

Too many of our Nation's youth succumb to the perils of drugs and this resolution sends a strong message that we must continue to commit ourselves to ending the tragedy caused by illegal drug abuse.

For those who have followed the legislative history of this resolution, you are aware that I offered an amendment during committee consideration of this measure to include language regarding the need to improve the infrastructure of school buildings and their grounds as a component of our efforts to fight drug abuse.

Anyone who has visited the schools in our Nation's worst drug plagued communities realize the impact that deteriorating buildings, lack of proper lighting and unmaintained grounds have on the likelihood of illegal drug sales and use. A well maintained, or newly constructed school is an important tool in the battles waged by local law enforcement and educators against youth drug abuse. In addition, the discussion of school infrastructure is a key component in our efforts both as a Congress, and a nation, to combat drug abuse by our Nation's youth. Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle did not support this amendment.

In closing, I do want to point out to all Members that this resolution is just that—a resolution. We as a Congress should be committing ourselves to providing the assistance and directive to providing the assistance and direction to solve the problems of illegal drug use. I will vote to support this resolution and I urge others to do so as well, but I would hope that this Congress, and the Republican leadership would begin to address the needs of our Nation rather than grandstanding for the purposes of election year politics. Mr. Speaker, very simply, this Congress needs to act upon solutions rather than resolutions.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS) for bringing forth this resolution. I strongly support it. It sends a clear, unambiguous message about Congress' commitment to removing drugs from our schools. Never before has this message been more urgently needed. And that includes alcohol.

I believe drugs are the single greatest threat facing our children. Drug usage with the very young is exploding. More kids are trying and using drugs than ever before, and they are starting earlier and earlier. Our schools, which used to be a safe haven, are now becoming a hostile territory because drugs are available there.

I have a granddaughter in fourth grade and granddaughter in eighth grade. It is not a matter of are they going to be exposed to drugs; it is how often and by whom. Because they are there, they have already been exposed.

Students in sixth and seventh grade are deciding to smoke pot before they drink beer. How did we get here? I believe throughout the 1990s, many leaders and role models in the position to set a good example have sent mixed signals about whether drug use is wrong.

Prominent national leaders have trivialized their own drug use as if it matters whether or not one inhales. Hollywood celebrities have glorified drugs, using them in the popular culture. And movies have been sending the wrong message to our young people. The behavior of many professional athletes has suggested that it is okay as long as they can get away with it.

This is why this resolution, and the larger Republican agenda to make America drug free, is so important. With it, we draw a line in the sand.

A couple quick statistics. The proportion of 12-year-olds who reported having a peer on hard drugs increased 12 percent just last year alone. National and State and local leaders must send a strong, clear message to our youth by an example.

Hollywood needs to divert from its glorification of drugs to be against drugs. Professional sport teams need to put a line in the sand that says we are going to make it clear that drug users are not welcome on our teams. It is

time that American celebrities set the example, and that includes all leaders, local, State, and national.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I said, in most of our history, the control of drug abuse has never been a Federal issue. This is only very recent. This does not diminish one's concern. It is respecting the Constitution. It is also emphasizing the fact that the more we have centralized our control and the more that we have tried to enforce the thing at the national level, the worse the problem has gotten.

I have many conservatives say we have an educational problem, and all they want to do is throw more money at it. I cannot see how this is different. Yes, we have a major problem. But it gets worse, and all we do is throw more money at it with exactly the same programs.

My goal today is just to suggest, just to bring it to the Congress' attention, that possibly we are not doing the right things. If we would ever come to admitting that, then maybe we will not have to suffer the abuse of how the war on drugs goes awry.

For instance, we have had this war on drugs, and there is no evidence even that we have been able to keep drugs out of our prisons. So maybe there is something we are doing wrong. Maybe we are treating a symptom rather than the cause of the problem. Maybe the cause is not legislatively correctable. That is a possibility. Obviously there is a problem there, but we need to think about it. We need to take a consideration, and not ever to write off those of us who might say we do not endorse the current approach as being one that might not be concerned about the issue.

Obviously I am concerned. I have five children, and I have 13 grandchildren. I am a physician. I have a great deal of concern. But I have also been involved and I have seen people who have suffered, and, therefore, I have probably a slightly different approach to the problem.

But I do think that we ought to look for a minute at the harm done with the war on drugs. So often there are victims from the war on drugs that go unnoticed. How often have we seen on television, how often have we read in our newspaper of a drug bust with hooded FBI agents and hooded DEA agents barging into the wrong apartment and really tearing the place up, confiscating property of people who have never committed a crime?

Why are we at the point now that we permit the war on drugs to be fought without due process of law? All they have to be is a suspect. All we have to do is have cash these days, and the government will come and take it from us. Then we have to prove our innocence. That is not the Constitution. We have gone a long way from the due process.

Our job here is to protect the civil liberties of individuals. Yes, we ought

to try to influence behavior. Yes, we ought to make laws against illegal behavior; national, when necessary, but local when the Constitution dictates it. At the rate we are going, we are making very, very little progress.

I have a suspicion that there are motivations behind the invasion of privacy. Because government so often likes to know what people are doing, especially in the financial area, this has been a tremendous excuse to accuse anybody who spends anything in cash of being a drug dealer, because they want to know where the cash is. This is part of the IRS collection agency, because they are worried about collecting enough revenues.

Yet we carelessly say, well, a little violation of civil liberties is okay, because we are doing so much good for the country and we are collecting revenues for the government. But we cannot casually dismiss these important issues, especially, if anything I suggest, that this war on drugs is, or the problem of drugs in perspective is not nearly what some people claim it to be, and that many people are dying from other problems rather than these.

I would like to suggest in closing some of the things that we can consider. First, let us consider the Constitution, for instance. We have no authority to create a Federal police force. That is not in the Constitution. So we ought to consider that. It is a State problem. It is a State law enforcement problem. Most of our history, it was dealt that way.

I think education is very important; people who know what is going on. We should, if anything, be emphasizing the educational process. Possibly my medical background influences me into what I am going to say next; and that is, could we conceive of looking at some of this problem of addiction as a disease rather than a criminal act? We do this with alcohol. Maybe that would help the problem.

□ 1500

Is it conceivable that we are looking at a symptom that the drug problem, the drug craze, is a reflection of moral values in the society?

We cannot get rid of teenage illegitimacy by writing a national law against teenage pregnancy. We are not likely, we have not been able to get rid of drug usage, teenage drug usage, by writing national laws and coming down with the armed might of the Federal Government. So I do not think the current process is going to work.

Kids go on drugs because they are seeking happiness, they are alone, they are in broken families. This is a problem that will not be solved by more laws and a greater war on drugs. We have 80,000 Federal policemen now carrying drugs. Character is what is needed. Laws do not create character. This does not dismiss us from expressing concern about this problem, but let us not make the problem worse.

In 1974, Switzerland passed a law that said that the doctor could prescribe

medication for addicts. I, as a physician, if an addict comes into my office and I agree to give him drugs which would support his habit, because I figure for him to go out on the street and shoot somebody for it is a little worse than me trying to talk him into a program by giving him drugs for a while, I am a criminal. I am a criminal today if I decide that somebody should use or could use marijuana if they are dying with cancer or AIDS and they are dying of malnutrition because they cannot eat. There should be a little bit of compassion in this movement.

Again, we cannot distract from the serious problem of the drug war, but I do beg and plead for my colleagues to just look at the truth. Let us read the news carefully, let us look at the Constitution, like we do when it is convenient, and let us consider another option. It cannot be any worse than what we are doing.

We have too many people on drugs, and this resolution makes my point. The war on drugs has failed. Let us do something different. Let us not pursue this any longer.

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

There is no doubt that we should do everything we can to discourage the sale and use of drugs by our Nation's youth, but we do the youth of our Nation a disservice by suggesting that they alone are responsible for the Nation's drug problem. And we do them an even greater disservice by coming to the floor with an empty political gesture that plays to the worst stereotype of young people, while at the same time the Republican leadership of this Congress refuses to lift a finger on behalf of this Nation's youth.

Today, the Congress will make this simplistic statement about a very complex problem. It will scapegoat our Nation's young people for the problem for which, in reality, we all should be taking responsibility for. It is not a question of America's public commitment to the war against drugs, to the commitment of the parents of our young children to the war against drugs; it is the problem of a very tired, outdated and ineffective war on drugs.

Let me also point out what this resolution and this Congress will fail to do. It will fail to reward the vast majority of youth who stay out of trouble, in many cases overcoming great obstacles, such as poverty or difficult family circumstances; it will fail to promise America's youth improved conditions in their schools, conditions which adults would never tolerate in their own workplaces; it will fail to tell America's youth that we want them to

share in the benefits of a boom economy and unprecedented prosperity by expanding their educational and economic opportunities; it will fail to promise them the protection of being victims of violence or abuse, either at the hands of their peers, in their own families or someone much older than themselves; it will fail to provide for after-school programs to make productive use of the time that young people have in the late afternoons.

The number one complaint among young people is there is nothing to do, and yet we see music programs, arts programs, and educational programs all scaled back. No alternatives. No alternatives to people just hanging out.

This Congress will fail to announce a commitment of stopping tobacco companies from targeting our young people by aggressively marketing their product that will ultimately kill more than every illegal drug combined. Instead, the most affluent generation of elders in this Nation's history will scold its youth and tell them they are bad and shirk its responsibility for making things better.

It is easy to bash teens. And while we should not minimize the very real problem of drug use by America's young people, let us make sure the record is straight about the entire drug problem. Teenagers account for less than 1 percent of illegal drug deaths. The adult drug death rate is nearly 10 times higher than that of adolescents.

While the use of illegal drugs by young people actually decreased between 1979 and 1994, for adults over the age of 35 it increased by 28 percent. The top three causes of death among youth are automobile accidents, homicides, and suicides. The drug that is the factor in most of those car crashes is alcohol, but it is not addressed by this resolution.

In fact, just a few short weeks ago we saw the leadership cave to the alcohol lobby. We were not allowed to have an amendment voted on by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) to toughen laws against drunk driving.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this measure, as I expect all Members will, because I agree with most of what it says. But the things it does not say and the things it fails to do to provide hope and opportunity for this Nation's young people say more about where we are as a Nation and falling short on our responsibilities to our Nation's youth.

Finally, I would like to say that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) has raised a whole series of questions this Congress is afraid to debate. My colleagues should ask their constituents, the next time they are in a town hall meeting, if they believe the war on drugs is working. Tell them we have spent \$200 billion.

It may be the least effective program we have on the Nation's books. There is no other market in the world where we would spend \$200 billion interfering with the market and the price of drugs on the street would never change over

a two decade period of time. That is the testimony. The market every day turns in a report on the war on drugs, and the market says the cost of doing business has not gone up one scintilla.

We ought to start thinking about new tools and a new approach and we ought to stop pretending like this is only a problem for young people in this country.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), who has been a leader in the antidrug effort.

I would like to note also, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate the support of the gentleman from California, the previous speaker, for this measure.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, which simply expresses the sense of Congress that we as Americans remain committed to the war on drugs.

Now, I want to commend my friend from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS), who has done an excellent job in leading this fight, and also my friend from Texas who has spoken against this resolution, and I want to address a couple of concerns that he has raised.

He says this resolution is an endorsement of the status quo. It is just the contrary. It is saying that the status quo is unacceptable. The present situation, where we have teenage drug use soaring, is not acceptable. We have to get off the dime. We, as a country, have to do something to remain committed.

The gentleman from California that just spoke, he started pointing fingers and being critical of this. Well, the status quo is whenever we take \$1 billion away from our efforts for interdiction; whenever Federal drug prosecutions fall 12 percent since 1992; whenever the DEA agents are cut.

How can we fight a war on drugs when we are cutting those types of resources? That is the status quo. We need leadership and we need to go in a different direction. This resolution says we welcome new ideas. We want a different approach. We want to do more, and we, as a Nation, must be committed, and that is the direction that we need to go.

The argument is we do not want to Federalize all law enforcement and make this a Federal issue. Certainly we need to fight this community to community. I have been in Gentry, a town of a thousand in Arkansas; I am going to Waldron, a town of 400 in Arkansas; and we were talking about what we can do as community, fighting this war community by community.

But there is a Federal role. And the argument is, well, the Constitution does not allow this. But the Constitution says that the United States Government must protect itself, it is its responsibility, from enemies, foreign and domestic. And this is an enemy that affects our national security, and it is a very appropriate role for our Federal Government to be involved in this battle.

The Federal Government and the communities have a job to do. We must

do it together. We must work together, both Democrats, Republicans, independents, all fighting together to win this. I ask for your support for this resolution.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to point out, once again, that up until just very recently in our history, it was assumed that the Federal Government did not have this authority. To assume that we do have this, I guess that is why we call it a war, to say that this is national defense.

But prohibition, obviously, when they passed that amendment to the Constitution, recognized that the Congress could not pass laws. And like I mentioned in 1937, when Roosevelt decided that we should attack medical marijuana, that he would do it through raising taxes. So it is only in recent history that we have decided that this is a Federal project. The record is just not very clear it has been very successful.

I am concerned not only about the drug usage, obviously, and the fact that the war has failed, but with those things that are so negative when it comes to violation of liberties.

The other day there was a story in the media that said there was a child suffering from an acute attack of asthma. Now, there was another asthmatic in the class, and she did what seemed to come natural to her: She went and gave her a whiff of her nebulizer and the girl immediately came out of her acute asthma attack. She was quickly apprehended under a Federal statute saying that she was disobeying the Federal law on the use of drugs.

Now, it might be advisable to caution a young child about giving medications to another, but this was very obvious and very clear. She happened to have been a hero with the other students and she was certainly a hero for the girl she helped.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C. (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Drug-free schools should be a redundancy. I regret that the expression is not, and I hope that we are looking for ways to make it a redundancy instead of a slogan.

As it turns out, the best argument for the tobacco bill, or at least a good tobacco bill this year, may not just be tobacco but its role in other drugs. We have struck out so often on drugs, we might well look at tobacco.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to find a junkie that did not begin with tobacco or alcohol. That is the entryway to marijuana and to hard drugs. A youngster gets to feeling good off of a soft drug, like tobacco or alcohol, and he wants to find out more. Yet we have very little concentration there. And it looks like this Congress may actually go home without a tobacco bill.

I was just at the dedication of the Ronald Reagan Building and Inter-

national Trade Center and heard very moving remarks by Mrs. Reagan. I am not one of those who made fun of her notion "Just Say No," because I think that there are a significant number of youngsters who will say no if we stand up and say "Just Say No." But we must ask about the rest. What about those who need more; who is going to take responsibility for them? They are, after all, only children. I applaud her for beginning there. It is up to this body to go the rest of the way.

Who really needs our help are parents. They find competition from the media and from the streets often to be overwhelming.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise today to underscore one of the greatest unnecessary obstacles to the education of our children: drugs. We all know the word; we all know the problem.

Drugs are a fact of life for America's children and we have to deal with that. Over half of all high school seniors have tried an illegal drug and nearly one in two can buy marijuana within an hour. There is not a community, a school, a family in this Nation that is immune to the destructive pervasiveness of drugs.

□ 1515

We all know it is past time to stop paying lip service and get on with the war on drugs and start with positive and specific action. Stalemate is unacceptable. The administration's effort to curb this trend has been sadly negligent. We know that. It ranges from "no commitment" to "wrong message."

While cocaine and heroin prices have steadily declined and teen drug has skyrocketed, the administration has cut international interdiction by \$1 billion and drug arrests have fallen by 12 percent. Let me tell my colleagues, as the chairman of the House Committee on Intelligence, that stopping supply is possible and it matters. We cannot continue to let drugs stand in the way of the safety and education of our children, obviously.

So we are committed to attacking the drug epidemic on all fronts, from production to the school room. Working together, I think we can reduce the flow of drugs in this country by 80 percent in the next few years. And then we are going to go after the remaining 20 percent, because we do not need drugs.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to myself.

I wanted to clarify a couple of things that were said here earlier. One is, in fact, when the government cut back its interdiction effort, we saw the street prices on cocaine and crack drop and

the epidemic swept across America. Another question is whether or not certain rights have been violated unintentionally or even intentionally. They should not be. We need to be careful of that.

But, in fact, the little 2-year-old in Fort Wayne and the 5-year-old who were shot down in a drive-by shooting had their rights violated as well. We have to get control of this drug epidemic in our homes, in our neighborhoods, and in our schools.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). All time has expired.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we have 2 additional minutes, divided equally between the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

It has been said here several times that we have not done enough in the fight on drugs, and certainly that is true. Anyone who has visited, though, the schools in our district realize that a lot of the drug activity in those schools that are plagued with the worst deterioration of their buildings and they lack proper lighting and unmaintained grounds which really are a breeding ground for drug sales and use.

I offered an amendment that would have added that into this resolution. Of course, that was defeated. Regardless, I will support the resolution because where so many of my colleagues have said we have not done enough and we are losing the fight on drugs, that may be true, but that is no reason not to do anything. And what we are trying to do with this resolution, especially in the resolve clauses, is demonstrate that we, as a Nation, feel we should be more committed to that fight.

And the results portion of the resolution talk about the coordination between Federal law enforcement and local law enforcement in the fight against drugs. It tries to bring everybody together, the resolution does. It says, "All Government leaders and parents share a role in raising the awareness of this issue and offering constructive alternatives to illegal drug use."

I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS), who has been a leader on this effort, who serves on the drug task force and who is the sponsor of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding, and I thank my colleagues for considering this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following two letters for the RECORD, one from the Partnership for a Drug-Free America and one from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, endorsing this resolution:

PARTNERSHIP FOR A
DRUG-FREE AMERICA,
New York, NY, January 29, 1998.

Congressman MICHAEL PAPPAS,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PAPPAS: The Partnership for a Drug-Free America strongly supports H.Res. 267 and any constructive efforts directed toward the goal of drug-free schools.

The Partnership is currently providing creative development, production, and programmatic support to the anti-drug media campaign being administered by the Office of National Drug Control Policy. The objective of the campaign is simple—to effectively reach young people and parents through media exposure at levels achieved during the late 1980's and very early 1990's—with the goal of reducing drug use in the 9 to 17 year old age group by 50 percent or more.

The media campaign is, of course, one piece of what must be a comprehensive effort to reduce and ultimately eliminate drug use among our young people. Effective programs to remove drugs from our nation's schools will provide yet another key component in creating an environment for youth in which drugs do not play a role.

Your leadership and support on this issue is greatly appreciated. Please let me know if the Partnership may be of any assistance as a resource for the development of school based anti-drug programs.

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. BONNETTE,
President and CEO.

—
U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, February 3, 1998.

Hon. MICHAEL PAPPAS,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PAPPAS: I was pleased to receive your letter and a copy of your bill H.Res. 267, calling on our country to eliminate illicit drugs from our nation's schools by the year 2000. The U.S. Chamber shares your concern about the use of drugs by students and by those in the workplace. In fact, we recently announced our policy priorities for 1998, including a greater involvement of the business community in efforts to crackdown on crime and drug use in their local communities and places of business. The fear and reality of crime saps the spirit and productivity of workers and is detrimental to the overall well being of all communities.

Therefore, on behalf of the more than three million members of the U.S. Chamber federation I am pleased to announced our support for H.Res. 267 and look forward to working with you to accomplish the goals it establishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. DONOHUE,
President and CEO.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 267 expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the citizens of the United States must remain committed to combat the distribution, sale, and use of illegal drugs by our Nation's youth. We must all remain committed to this cause, all of us.

When it came to the issue of sexual harassment, our society made it clear, "no" meant "no." When it came to reducing drunk driving, we were firm in our resolve that "If you drive drunk and risk the lives of others, you will be punished." So I stand here today with the same determination. When it comes to drugs, "no" means "no."

So let me put the pushers of drugs on alert. When they are caught, they will be arrested and found guilty and they will go to jail, period.

We are all in this together, to protect our schools, streets, neighborhoods and communities. In this fight, I am convinced that it will be local solutions that will solve this national problem. The poison, yes, the poison, that threatens our youth also threatens our Nation's future. We need to continue to push for efforts in this Congress that will deter the demand for drugs and end the supply. Beyond that, I will do whatever I can to highlight the success of local community programs that are on the front lines of this battle in our communities.

I often have the opportunity to meet with school groups visiting Washington, D.C., from my district. I also spend a great deal of time in New Jersey visiting classrooms and speaking with students of all ages. One of the things that I ask them is what is the most important issue facing them. Hands down, the number one issue that they tell me is drugs.

We cannot deny the problem. We cannot not look the other way. We must accept its existence and face it head on from the bottom up, from each of our communities to those of us here in Washington, D.C.

Marijuana use among teens, as has been mentioned before, is on the rise because, by many, it is deemed "socially acceptable." Well, it is not acceptable and we need to say it. We all need to say it. The President, the Congress, we all need to say it. But if we work together, parents, public officials, and young people, we can ensure that the lives of our children are safer, more productive, and free of the drugs that cripple the mind and destroy the soul.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indulgence of the House. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. We are making a statement. Talk is cheap, but I believe if this Congress does not make itself very, very clear that use of drugs among our young people, sale of drugs to our young people is not acceptable, we will not make progress.

This is a war that can be won, but we have to remain committed to do so. We have to speak so very, very clearly in a unified voice. And I certainly believe that this resolution is an important step in that process.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 267, legislation which states congressional support of fighting the effects of illegal drugs on our children.

The threat posed by illegal drugs is one of the major national security threats facing our

Nation. This is not empty hyperbole, but the cold truth. The vast majority of the illegal drugs in this country come from overseas. The sooner we realize that drugs are as much a foreign as a domestic problem, the more effective our response will be.

While opponents argue that we spend too much on combating drugs, I contend that we cannot ignore the true cost of drug use on our society. In addition to the costs associated with supply and demand reduction, drug use costs billions each year in health care expenses and lost productivity. Moreover, it has intangible costs in terms of broken families and destroyed lives.

As chairman of our House International Relations Committee, I have long been dedicated to fighting the scourge of illegal drugs. Regrettably of late, this is a battle which as a nation we are losing.

During the 1980's, we made remarkable progress in reducing teenage drug use, and eliminating the view that drugs and drug use were socially acceptance. Between 1979 and 1992, there was a 50 percent drop in "past month" drug users from over 25 million down to 12 million.

Our focus during this period was two-fold, and followed a dual track of reducing both supply and demand. Regrettably, this administration sharply curtailed interdiction funding and placed greater emphasis on demand reduction. The end result has been: a sharp increase in the supply of drugs available on our streets, the highest purity levels ever encountered, and a resurgence of teenage drug use. From 1992 to 1996, teenage marijuana use doubled. More disturbing is the data showing a significant rise in heroin use among our teenagers.

In essence, the Clinton administration's policy of focusing on demand reduction is being overwhelmed by the current state of the drug market. With many of our cities literally awash in heroin, the drug dealers are using supply to create demand.

In order to effectively combat the problem of illegal drug use, we must employ a balanced approach of simultaneously reducing supply and demand. In addition, it requires efforts by all levels of government and society.

This reduction emphasizes this approach and calls for Congress and the administration to work with local communities, schools and parents to develop and implement meaningful anti-drug policies.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this worthy piece of legislation. For too long we have had a disjointed approach to combating teenage drug use. If, as a nation, we are willing to reduce teenage use of tobacco, surely we can do the same for the use of illegal drugs.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution represents an important commitment by the House of Representatives. I am proud that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are willing to stand up and lead in the fight against drug use among our nation's youth.

Building on this good effort, I will be introducing specific bills that bolster efforts to reduce drug use and I hope my colleagues will join me in those efforts.

I have drafted a resolution to encourage every Member to establish or support an anti-drug coalition in their community. Last year when we passed the Drug-Free Communities Act to provide matching grants to such coalitions, I started an effort to get Members involved in such efforts. Both the Republican

Conference and the Democratic Caucus endorsed the idea, and, to date, 76 Members have committed to getting involved. I would like to increase that number to 435.

Later this week, I plan to introduce legislation to promote drug-free workplace programs among small businesses, including special programs for parents in the workplace to help them keep their kids drug-free. Later in the month, I will be introducing legislation to improve treatment in our prisons and jails so that inmates can return as drug-free members of society and, in many cases, set an example for their children. I look forward to working with other Members on their proposals to address this tremendous problem.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of House Resolution 267, a resolution which expresses our commitment to fighting the scourge of illegal drugs in our schools and Nation.

We hear on a regular basis about how drugs are destroying our schools and ripping apart families. Teenage years are hard enough without our children having to face the threat of drugs on a daily basis. A survey conducted for The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (CASA) found that 76 percent of high school students and 46 percent of middle school students say drugs are kept, used or sold on school grounds.

We also know that while marijuana use by 8th, 10th, and 12th graders declined from 1980–1992, from 1992–1996 such use dramatically increased—by 253 percent among 8th graders, 151 percent among 10th graders, and 84 percent among 12th graders.

Mr. Speaker, the survey also shows that 500,000 8th graders began using marijuana in the 6th and 7th grades, and that those who use marijuana are 85 times more likely to use cocaine than those who abstain from marijuana.

Former HEW Secretary and President of the National Center on Addiction and Drug Abuse, Joseph Califano, Jr., recently spoke on the gravity of the problem. He said "While our schools used to be sanctuaries for students, many have become candy stores of dangerous substances—cigarettes, alcohol, inhalants, marijuana, heroin, cocaine and acid—sold or used by classmates on the school grounds."

It is important that we remain committed to eradicating the use of drugs from our schools and making sure that everyone—students, parents, teachers—know that there is zero tolerance when it comes to the use of illegal drugs.

I urge all my colleagues to join in supporting this important resolution.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of House Resolution 267, a resolution which expresses our commitment to fighting the plague of illegal drugs.

In a report released by the Office of National Drug Control Policy last December, statistics paint the picture of the extent of the drug problem in this country:

An estimated 12.8 Americans—about 6 percent of the household population aged twelve and older—have used drugs within the past 30 days.

Every year drug abuse kills 14,000 Americans and costs taxpayers nearly \$70 billion.

Drug abuse fuels spouse and child abuse, property and violent crime, the incarceration of

young men and women, the spread of AIDS, workplace accidents, motor vehicle accidents, and absenteeism.

Drug use among our Nation's youth has, unfortunately, increased 126 percent among eighth graders between 1991 and 1996.

Every day, an average of 6,488 American children and teens try marijuana for the first time; 1,786 try cocaine; and 386 try heroin.

Other surveys show:

More than one-half or 54.3 percent of our high school seniors have tried an illicit drug, and about one in four or 26.2 percent use illicit drugs on a regular or monthly basis.

And the prevalence of the problem cuts across all gender, race, and geographic groups.

As I've mentioned on other occasions, I believe one of the leading causes of the drug scourge in this country is the decline and break-up of the American family. If we can get our families back together, then I believe we will begin to make real progress in the war on drugs. It starts at this most basic unit of society. If we can turn the tide in the family, then we can turn the tide in the nation.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution represents one step in turning the tide. It sends a message that the distribution, sale and use of illegal drugs in schools will simply not be tolerated. It's a message that's much-needed and overdue.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution that expresses the sense of the House that all schools should be drug-free and that the sale, distribution and use of illegal drugs at school is unacceptable. I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this important resolution.

As the former Superintendent of North Carolina's public schools, I know firsthand that we cannot expect our children to learn in drug-infested surroundings. We cannot expect our teachers to provide quality instruction in an arena infiltrated by the scourge of drugs. And we cannot expect our families, parents, businesses and communities to support our public education system unless we are doing everything possible to make our schools drug-free.

A recent survey conducted for the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University found that seventy-six percent of high school students and forty-six percent of middle school students say drugs are kept, used or sold on school grounds. These appalling statistics are simply unacceptable.

House Resolution 267 also states that all federal, state and local drug fighting agencies should work together with schools and parents to ensure that a renewed effort be made to fight drug use; and that all governmental leaders and parents should share in raising the awareness of this issue. Finally, the resolution states that Congress and the president should set a goal to end the distribution, sale and use of illegal drugs in the Nation's schools by 2000, and to work with local communities and parents to achieve this goal.

I urge all my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans alike—to join me in passing this important resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 267, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 267.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

□ 1700

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Without objection, the minimum time for electronic voting on the first postponed suspension, House Concurrent Resolution 220, may be reduced to 5 minutes if that vote occurs without any intervening business, other than rising of the Committee after the last electronic vote in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 6.

There was no objection.

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Pursuant to House Resolution 411 and rule XXIII, 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. 6.

□ 1702

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. 6) to extend the authorization of programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, April 29, 1998, title XII was open for amendment at any point.

LIMITING DEBATE ON AMENDMENT NO. 73

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on amendment numbered 73, and all amendments thereto, be limited to 2 hours, equally divided and controlled by Representative RIGGS of California or his designee and Representative CLAY of Missouri or his designee.

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

There was no objection.

VACATING PROCEEDINGS ON AMENDMENT NO. 54
OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, with the concurrence of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), I ask unanimous consent that the request of April 29, 1998, for a recorded vote on the Roemer amendment numbered 54 be vacated and that proceedings by which the Committee considered and adopted that amendment by voice vote be vacated.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wanted to discuss with the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) an amendment that we had been working on in committee, starting actually at the subcommittee level and then going into the full committee and then going to the House floor, where I offered amendment to provide more flexibility for students to combine their loans for government subsidized and unsubsidized loans before trying then or being forced to go out into the private lending market, where they would take on added costs and where the rate might be 9 or 10 or 11 percent, but try to keep them at the 8.25 percent rate and thereby reduce costs, provide more flexibility and less regulation to many of the students that are trying to get into these markets and coming out with more and more debt once they graduate from school.

This is exactly what we have heard everywhere in our field hearings throughout the country, where the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and I had a field hearing in South Bend, Indiana, and heard from about 20 different colleges about trying to provide more flexibility to our schools and less regulation.

This is an idea whose time has come, trying to help so many of the students that are coming out of school with debt. But we also realized that there may be a scoring problem here; and because CBO has been busy scoring other bills, we have not been able to finally get a score on this.

I know the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) have worked hard to try to provide this flexibility and lessen the burden on students. I had asked for a rollcall vote on this loan flexibility amendment. My colleague had agreed to that. And I believe he and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), as well, had agreed to support the amendment.

However, we still do not have a final scoring on this amendment. And in the interest of trying to make sure that we have bipartisan support for this amendment, I would like to get the feelings of my colleague on his support for this idea, that he has worked very hard on, and engage him in a colloquy.

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

Mr. ROEMER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Indiana represents that great institution Notre Dame. As I mentioned during committee consideration, I think this loan flexibility agreement has a great deal of merit. I thank my colleague for bringing this to our attention, and I will continue to work with him on this proposal as we move to conference on H.R. 6.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the commitment of the gentleman to do that. I appreciate the commitment of the gentleman to students trying to get a lower rate. And I very much appreciate the hard work of the gentleman on this bipartisan bill to try to reduce regulations and increase flexibility.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, at this point let me ask a parliamentary inquiry. Is it proper for me to ask unanimous consent at this point to vacate the rollcall vote numbered 54?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is the pending request.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from California is granted, and the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE
OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 411, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. PAUL of Texas;

Amendment No. 51 offered by Mr. OWENS of New York;

Amendment No. 44 offered by Mr. McGOVERN of Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a

recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. PAUL:

Page 50, line 13, at the end of paragraph (1) add the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall not use the social security account numbers issued under title II of the Social Security Act as the electronic personal identifier, and shall not use any identifier used in any other Federal program as the electronic personal identifier."

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 112, noes 286, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

AYES—112

Aderholt	Goodlatte	Obey
Archer	Hall (TX)	Pastor
Armey	Hastings (WA)	Paul
Barcia	Hayworth	Pease
Barr	Herger	Petri
Bartlett	Hill	Pickering
Barton	Hinchey	Pombo
Boehner	Hobson	Portman
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)
Bonior	Hostettler	Redmond
Brady	Hulshof	Regula
Bunning	Hutchinson	Rogan
Callahan	Hyde	Ryun
Camp	Inglis	Salmon
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
Chabot	Kanjorski	Scarborough
Chenoweth	Kasich	Schaffer, Bob
Coburn	Kelly	Sensenbrenner
Collins	Kingston	Sessions
Condit	Kleczka	Shadegg
Cooksey	Kolbe	Shimkus
Crane	Kucinich	Smith (MI)
Crapo	Largent	Snowbarger
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Snyder
DeFazio	Linder	Souder
DeLay	Livingston	Stearns
Doolittle	Lofgren	Stump
Duncan	Lucas	Sununu
Ehlers	Manzullo	Thornberry
Emerson	McDermott	Thune
Ensign	McIntosh	Tiahrt
Everett	McKinney	Wamp
Filner	Metcalf	Watkins
Frank (MA)	Mica	Watts (OK)
Gephardt	Moran (KS)	White
Gibbons	Nethercutt	Wicker
Gillmor	Ney	
Goode	Nussle	

NOES—286

Abercrombie	Borski	Cook
Ackerman	Boswell	Costello
Allen	Boucher	Cox
Andrews	Boyd	Coyne
Bachus	Brown (CA)	Cramer
Baesler	Brown (FL)	Cummings
Baker	Brown (OH)	Cunningham
Baldacci	Bryant	Danner
Ballenger	Burr	Davis (FL)
Barrett (NE)	Burton	Davis (VA)
Barrett (WI)	Buyer	DeGette
Bass	Calvert	Delahunt
Bentsen	Campbell	DeLauro
Bereuter	Canady	Deutsch
Berman	Capps	Diaz-Balart
Berry	Cardin	Dickey
Bilbray	Castle	Dicks
Bilirakis	Chambliss	Dingell
Bishop	Clay	Dixon
Bliley	Clayton	Doggett
Blumenauer	Clement	Dooley
Blunt	Coble	Doyle
Boehlert	Combest	Dreier
Bono	Conyers	Dunn

Edwards	LaHood	Riggs
Ehrlich	Lampson	Riley
Engel	LaTourette	Rivers
English	Lazio	Rodriguez
Eshoo	Leach	Roemer
Etheridge	Lee	Rogers
Evans	Levin	Rohrabacher
Ewing	Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Farr	Lewis (GA)	Rothman
Fattah	Lipinski	Roukema
Fawell	LoBiondo	Royal-Allard
Fazio	Luther	Royce
Foley	Maloney (CT)	Rush
Ford	Maloney (NY)	Sabo
Fowler	Manton	Sanchez
Fox	Markey	Sanders
Franks (NJ)	Martinez	Sandlin
Frelinghuysen	Mascara	Sawyer
Frost	Matsui	Saxton
Gallegly	McCarthy (MO)	Schumer
Ganske	McCarthy (NY)	Scott
Gejdenson	McCollum	Serrano
Gekas	McCrary	Shaw
Gilchrest	McDade	Shays
Gilman	McGovern	Sherman
Goodling	McHale	Shuster
Gordon	McHugh	Sisisky
Goss	McInnis	Skeen
Graham	McIntyre	Skelton
Granger	McKeon	Slaughter
Green	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Greenwood	Meek (FL)	Smith (OR)
Gutierrez	Millender	Smith (TX)
Gutknecht	McDonald	Smith, Adam
Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)	Solomon
Hamilton	Miller (FL)	Spence
Hansen	Minge	Spratt
Hastert	Mink	Stabenow
Hefley	Moakley	Stark
Hefner	Moran (VA)	Stenholm
Hilleary	Morella	Strickland
Hilliard	Murtha	Stupak
Hinojosa	Myrick	Talent
Holden	Nadler	Tanner
Hooley	Neal	Tauscher
Horn	Northup	Taylor (MS)
Houghton	Norwood	Taylor (NC)
Hoyer	Oberstar	Thomas
Hunter	Olver	Thompson
Istook	Ortiz	Thurman
Jackson (IL)	Owens	Tierney
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Oxley	Towns
Jefferson	Packard	Traficant
Jenkins	Pallone	Turner
John	Pappas	Upton
Johnson (CT)	Pascarella	Velazquez
Johnson (WI)	Paxton	Vento
Johnson, E. B.	Payne	Walsh
Jones	Pelosi	Watt (NC)
Kennedy (MA)	Peterson (MN)	Weldon (FL)
Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (PA)	Weldon (PA)
Kennelly	Pickett	Weller
Kildee	Pitts	Wexler
Kilpatrick	Pomeroy	Weygand
Kim	Porter	Whitfield
Kind (WI)	Poshard	Wise
King (NY)	Price (NC)	Wolf
Klink	Quinn	Woolsey
Klug	Radanovich	Wynn
Knollenberg	Ramstad	Yates
LaFalce	Rangel	Young (AK)
	Reyes	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—34

Bateman	Harman	Rahall
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Schaefer, Dan
Blagojevich	Kaptur	Skaggs
Carson	Lantos	Smith, Linda
Christensen	Latham	Stokes
Clyburn	Lowey	Tauzin
Cubin	McNulty	Torres
Davis (IL)	Meeks (NY)	Visclosky
Forbes	Menendez	Waters
Fossella	Mollohan	Waxman
Furse	Neumann	
Gonzalez	Parker	

□ 1730

Ms. GRANGER and Messrs. EVANS, FOX of Pennsylvania, ENGEL and RIGGS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. FRANK of Massachusetts, BONIOR, HOBSON, NETHERCUTT, HYDE, LEWIS of Kentucky, WATKINS, SMITH of Michigan and Ms.

MCKINNEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 122, I was detained due to inclement weather. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) (a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

Pursuant to House Resolution 411, the Chair (1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make announcements that he will reduce to a minimum grants under this section, in accordance with the competitive criteria established by the Secretary, to institutions of higher education, in order to establish, oversee the operation of, and provide technical assistance to, projects described in paragraph (2).

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. OWENS

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 44 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 51 offered by Mr. OWENS:

Page 68, after line 11, insert the following new section (and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly):

SEC. 206. POSTSECONDARY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION RECRUITMENT

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

(1) There are more than 200,000 to 400,000 vacancies in various categories of information technology jobs.

(2) From 1996 to 2005, more than 1,300,000 new computer scientists, engineers, and systems analysts will be required in the United States to fill vacant jobs, which equals 136,800 new workers per year.

(3) Systems analysts will experience the largest job growth, accounting for a 103 percent increase in the number of new positions from 1996 (506,000) to 2005 (1,025,000).

(4) The shortage of information technology workers transcends industries, affecting the manufacturing, service, transportation, health care, education, and government sectors. Within each sector, vacancies exist at all levels from aides and mechanics to programmers and designers.

(5) The information technology worker shortage is having an adverse effect on the viability of businesses in the United States and on the Nation's competitiveness. Industry surveys report that half of industry executives cite the lack of workers skilled in technology as the number one obstacle to their company's growth. An additional 20 percent of industry executives identify the lack of information technology workers as a major obstacle to their company's growth.

(6) A major factor affecting the short supply of information technology workers is the mismatch between what universities teach and what industry needs.

(7) It is in the national interest to promote special initiatives which effectively educate and train our domestic workforce to keep pace with these expanding job opportunities.

(8) Institutions of higher education have the capacity and resources to provide a role of oversight and technical assistance to a wide range of local entities, including community-based organizations, participating in a comprehensive education and training program for potential technology workers.

(9) Higher education institutions must be responsive to the digital environment and expand both their outreach efforts and on-campus activities to train and certify indi-

viduals to close the information technology worker gap.

(b) AMENDMENT.—Title II is amended by adding at the end the following:

“PART G—INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION RECRUITMENT

“SEC. 281. PARTNERSHIPS FOR POSTSECONDARY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION RECRUITMENT

“(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

“(b) PROJECTS.—Projects under this section shall be projects implemented by a community-based organization described in subsection (b), or by the institution of higher education receiving the grant, to provide postsecondary information technology education and employment procurement assistance to eligible individuals described in subsection (c).

“(c) RESTRICTIONS.—An institution of higher education shall be eligible to receive only one grant under this section, but may, subject to the requirements of this section, use the grant to enter into contracts with more than one community-based organization. A community-based organization shall not be eligible to enter into a contract under this section with more than one institution of higher education.

“(d) PERIOD OF GRANT.—The provision of payments under a grant under this section shall not exceed 5 fiscal years and shall be subject to the annual approval of the Secretary and subject to the availability of appropriations for each fiscal year involved.

“(e) COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS.—

“(f) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), a community-based organization described in this subsection is an entity that, at the time the entity enters into a contract with an institution of higher education for a project under this section, and throughout the duration of that contract—

“(g) (i) is—

“(g) (ii) a governmental agency; or

“(g) (iii) an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code; and

“(h) (i) is one of the following:

“(h) (ii) a local partnership (as defined in section 4 of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994) receiving a grant under section 302 of such Act.

“(h) (iii) an entity organized and operated for religious purposes.

“(h) (iv) an entity furnishing school-age child care services after school.

“(h) (v) a community-based college computer recruitment center.

“(h) (vi) an entity furnishing adult education.

“(h) (vii) a library.

“(h) (viii) a museum.

“(h) (ix) any other entity organized and operated for cultural, literary, or educational purposes.

“(i) LIMITATION.—An entity shall not be considered a community-based organization described in this subsection unless, at the time the entity enters into a contract with an institution of higher education for a project under this section, it has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Secretary that—

“(A) it has the capacity successfully to recruit eligible individuals described in subsection (c) for participation in a project described in subsection (a), consistent with the enrollment requirements in subsection (d)(2)(E);

“(B) it is providing an educational service, social service, or employment procurement service; and

“(C) in the case of an entity that independently manages its own finances, it has been in existence 2 years or more.

“(c) **ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.**—An eligible individual described in this subsection is an individual who—

“(i) has submitted a satisfactory application to receive postsecondary information technology education recruitment assistance through a project under this section; and

“(2) has a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate.

“(d) **DUTIES.**—

“(1) **INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—An institution of higher education receiving a grant under this section shall use the funds provided under the grant to carry out the following duties:

“(A) Final selection of community-based organizations described in subsection (b) desiring to provide, at one or more sites, in accordance with a contract with the institution of higher education and this section, postsecondary information technology education and employment procurement assistance to eligible individuals described in subsection (c).

“(B) Entering into a contract with each community-based organization selected under subparagraph (A) under which the institution and the organization agree to carry out the duties respectively required of them under this section with respect to each site described in subparagraph (A).

“(C) With respect to each site described in subparagraph (A)—

“(i) design of a process for the recruitment of students from site to enroll in college courses or matriculate in college programs;

“(ii) provision of such funding for the establishment and initial operation of the site as was specified in the grant application submitted by the institution to the Secretary;

“(iii) approval of final site selection and preparation;

“(iv) initial orientation and training of personnel employed to manage and operate the site;

“(v) design and certification of the instructional and academic programs, and oversight of the implementation of the programs;

“(vi) oversight of equipment purchases and contracts for equipment maintenance; and

“(vii) selection of an outside contractor for periodic evaluation of the management and operation of the site.

“(2) **COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A community-based organization implementing a project under this section with an institution of higher education, at one or more sites, shall carry out the duties described in this paragraph, with respect to each such site, subject to the oversight and guidance of the institution.

“(B) **GENERAL DUTIES.**—The organization—

“(i) shall undertake final site selection and preparation;

“(ii) shall recruit and hire a site director;

“(iii) shall carry out any supplementary instructional, academic, or educational activities specified in the contract with the institution of higher education that are not described in subparagraph (D);

“(iv) shall assemble an advisory committee composed of individuals residing in the community in which the site is located, as well as industry representatives, who desire to assist the organization in ensuring that the

goals of the organization are consistent with the goals and needs of the community population;

“(v) shall provide to the institution other evidence of volunteer support from among individuals residing in the community in which the site is located and industry representatives;

“(vi) shall recruit eligible individuals for enrollment, subject to subparagraph (E);

“(vii) shall maintain waiting lists of eligible individuals desiring to enroll in the project's programs;

“(C) **SITE REQUIREMENTS.**—The organization shall ensure that each site—

“(i) has a minimum of 20 fully functioning computers with sufficient capacity to perform all of the computer operations that are the subject of the curriculum specified in subparagraph (D);

“(ii) in addition to the space for the computers described in clause (i), has—

“(I) a classroom space with the capacity for seating a minimum of 30 students;

“(II) a separate office for the site director;

“(iii) is real property subject to the control of the organization or the institution, through a lease or other legal instrument, for a period of not less than 5 years;

“(iv) is open to enrolled individuals not less than 12 hours per day; and

“(v) is located within walking distance of public transportation.

“(D) **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CURRICULUM.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The organization shall ensure that each site offers enrollees a curriculum that includes a broad range of course work in information technology.

“(ii) **COURSES LEADING TO CERTIFICATION.**—Such curriculum shall include course work leading to a certification of competence in areas of information technology recognized by the National Skill Standards Board established under the National Skill Standards Act of 1994.

“(iii) **SPECIFIC COURSES.**—The computer training offered shall include courses in basic computer competence, on-the-job upgrade assistance, and advanced computer competence.

“(E) **ENROLLMENT REQUIREMENTS.**—The organization shall ensure that its enrollment of eligible individuals at each site is consistent with the following:

“(i) Not less than 50 percent of the eligible individuals shall be, at the time of enrollment, individuals—

“(I) to whom a credit was allowed under section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for the preceding taxable year;

“(II) who are recipients of assistance under a State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act;

“(III) who are a member of a household participating in the food stamp program; or

“(IV) who are considered low-income pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Secretary under this section.

“(ii) Not less than 50 percent of the eligible individuals shall be, at the time of enrollment, under 25 years of age.

“(iii) No prerequisite relating to net worth, income, or assets may be applied to any eligible individual who, at the time of enrollment, is over 50 years of age, except that this requirement shall not be construed to supersede clause (i).

“(e) **IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECTS SOLELY BY INSTITUTIONS.**—The Secretary may make a grant under this section to an institution of higher education that desires to implement a project under this section without the participation of a community-based organization described in subsection (b), if the institution agrees to carry out all of the duties required of such an organization under this section, in addition to the duties other-

wise required of an institution of higher education. The Secretary shall, in awarding grants under this section, give priority to institutions of higher education whose grant application includes an assurance that the institution will contract with one or more community-based organizations in accordance with this section.

“(f) **APPLICATIONS.**—To apply for a grant under this section for any fiscal year, an institution of higher education shall submit an application to the Secretary in accordance with the procedures established by the Secretary. The application shall specify the institution's preliminary selections for the community-based organizations (if any) with which the institution proposes to contract, and shall include information with respect to preliminary site selections.

“(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

“(h) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

“(I) **ADULT EDUCATION.**—The term 'adult education' has the meaning given such term in section 312 of the Adult Education Act.

“(2) **COMMUNITY-BASED COLLEGE COMPUTER RECRUITMENT CENTER.**—The term 'community-based computer center' means a computer center—

“(A) funded by both the Federal Government and at least one private sector entity;

“(B) located in a low-income community (as determined by the Secretary); and

“(C) organized and operated for the purpose of providing families with access to computer resources that otherwise would not be available to them.

“(3) **FOOD STAMP PROGRAM.**—The term 'food stamp program' has the meaning given such term in section 3(h) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977.

“(4) **LIBRARY.**—The term 'library' has the meaning given such term in section 213 of the Library Services and Technology Act.

“(5) **MUSEUM.**—The term 'museum' has the meaning given such term in section 272 of the Museum and Library Services Act.”.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman in view of the fact that this amendment was debated some time ago, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes to explain the amendment before the vote takes place.

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

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Objection is heard.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 234, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

AYES—172

Abercrombie	Bentsen	Brown (CA)
Ackerman	Berman	Brown (FL)
Allen	Berry	Brown (OH)
Andrews	Bishop	Campbell
Baesler	Blagojevich	Capps
Baldacci	Blumenauer	Cardin
Barcia	Bonior	Clay
Barrett (WI)	Borski	Clayton
Becerra	Boucher	Clement

Lazio	Nussle	Serrano
Leach	Oberstar	Shays
Lee	Obey	Sisisky
Levin	Olver	Skeen
Lewis (GA)	Ortiz	Skelton
Lipinski	Owens	Slaughter
LoBiondo	Pallone	Smith (NJ)
Lofgren	Pappas	Smith, Adam
Luther	Pascrell	Snyder
Maloney (CT)	Pastor	Spratt
Maloney (NY)	Payne	Stabenow
Manton	Pease	Stark
Markey	Pelosi	Stenholm
Martinez	Peterson (MN)	Strickland
Mascara	Pickett	Stupak
Matsui	Pomeroy	Tanner
McCarthy (MO)	Poshard	Tauscher
McCarthy (NY)	Price (NC)	Taylor (MS)
McDermott	Ramstad	Thompson
McGovern	Rangel	Thurman
McHale	Redmond	Tierney
McIntyre	Reyes	Torres
McKinney	Riley	Towns
Meehan	Rivers	Traficant
Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Turner
Menendez	Roemer	Velazquez
Millender-	Rogan	Vento
McDonald	Ros-Lehtinen	Waters
Miller (CA)	Rothman	Watkins
Minge	Royal-Allard	Watt (NC)
Mink	Rush	Watts (OK)
Moakley	Sabo	Waxman
Mollohan	Sanchez	Wexler
Moran (VA)	Sanders	Weygand
Morella	Sandlin	Wise
Murtha	Sawyer	Woolsey
Nadler	Schumer	Wynn
Neal	Scott	Yates

Wamp	White	Young (AK)
Weldon (FL)	Whitfield	Young (FL)
Weldon (PA)	Wicker	
Weller	Wolf	
NOT VOTING—25		
Bateman	Harman	Rahall
Carson	Hastings (FL)	Schaefer, I.
Christensen	Kaptur	Skaggs
Clyburn	Lantos	Smith, L.
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Stokes
Forbes	McNulty	Tazin
Fossella	Meeks (NY)	Visclosky
Furse	Neumann	
Gonzalez	Parker	

[Roll No. 125]
YEAS—406

Doggett	Kildee
Dooley	Kilpatrick
Doolittle	Kim
Doyle	Kind (WI)
Dreier	King (NY)
Duncan	Kingston
Edwards	Kleckza
Ehlers	Klink
Ehrlich	Klug
Emerson	Knollenberg

□ 1751

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 124, I was detained due to inclement weather. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. McKEON. 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. GUTKNECHT), having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6), to extend the authorization of programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Concurrent Resolution 220, by
the yeas and nays; and

House Resolution 267, by the yeas and nays.

REGARDING AMERICAN VICTIMS OF TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 220, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 220, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 0, not voting 26, as follows:

NOES—187

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING FURTHER AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 10, FINANCIAL SERVICES COMPETITION ACT OF 1997

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House of a schedule change on H.R. 10, and that is the Financial Services Act of 1998.

Out of concern for the scheduling interest of Members on both sides of the aisle, the majority leader has agreed to consider this legislation on the House floor next week instead of this week. As a result, the Committee on Rules will extend the time for filing of amendments from 5 p.m. Tuesday; that is, today, until 5 p.m. on Wednesday, May 6, tomorrow.

The Committee on Rules will then hold a hearing on a rule at 12 noon on Thursday, May 7, the day after tomorrow. The committee will then meet to grant a rule early next week, probably on Tuesday.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by Wednesday, May 6, at 5 p.m. to the Committee on Rules in Room H-312 of the Capitol.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2497

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2497, the Medicare Beneficiary Freedom to Contract Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SUDAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-247)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on developments concerning the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, and matters relating to the measures in that order. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c). This report discusses only matters concerning the national emer-

gencies with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067.

1. On November 3, 1997, I issued Executive Order 13067 (62 Fed. Reg. 59989, November 5, 1997—the “Order”) to declare a national emergency with respect to Sudan pursuant to IEEPA. Copies of the Order were provided to the Congress by message dated November 3, 1997.

The Order blocks all property and interests in property of the Government of Sudan, its agencies, instrumentalities, and controlled entities, including the Central Bank of Sudan, that are in the United States, that hereafter come within the United States, or that are or hereafter come within the possession or control of United States persons, including their overseas branches. The Order also prohibits (1) the importation into the United States of any goods or services of Sudanese origin except for information or informational materials; (2) the exportation or reexportation of goods, technology, or services to Sudan or the Government of Sudan except for information or informational materials and donations of humanitarian aid; (3) the facilitation by a United States person of the exportation or reexportation of goods, technology, or services to or from Sudan; (4) the performance by any United States person of any contract, including a financing contract, in support of an industrial, commercial, public utility, or governmental project in Sudan; (5) the grant or extension of credits or loans by any United States person to the Government of Sudan; and (6) transactions relating to the transportation of cargo. The Order also provided a 30-day delayed effective date for the completion of certain trade transactions.

2. Executive Order 13067 became effective at 12:01 a.m., eastern standard time on November 4, 1997. On December 2, 1997, the Department of the Treasury’s Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) issued General Notice No. 1, interpreting the delayed effective date for pre-November 4, 1997, trade contracts involving Sudan if the preexisting trade contract was for (a) the exportation of goods, services, or technology from the United States or a third country that was authorized under applicable Federal regulations in force immediately prior to November 4, 1997, or (b) the reexportation of goods or technology that was authorized under applicable Federal regulations in force immediately prior to November 4, 1997. Such exports or reexports were authorized until 12:01 a.m. eastern standard time, December 4, 1997, and nonfinancing activity by United States persons incidental to the performance of the preexisting trade contract (such as the provision of transportation or insurance) was authorized through 12:01 a.m. eastern standard time, February 2, 1998. If the preexisting trade contract was for the importation of goods or services of Sudanese origin or other trade transactions relating to goods or

services of Sudanese origin or owned or controlled by the Government of Sudan, importations under the pre-existing trade contract were authorized until 12:01 a.m. eastern standard time, December 4, 1997.

3. Since the issuance of Executive Order 13067, OFAC has made numerous decisions with respect to applications for authorizations to engage in transactions under the Sudanese sanctions. As of March 12, 1998, OFAC has issued 55 authorizations to nongovernmental organizations engaged in the delivery of humanitarian aid and 77 licenses to others. OFAC has denied many requests for licenses. The majority of denials were in response to requests to authorize commercial exports to Sudan—particularly of machinery and equipment for various industries—and the importation of Sudanese-origin goods. The majority of licenses issued permitted the unblocking of financial transactions for individual remitters who routed their funds through blocked Sudanese banks. Other licenses authorized the completion of diplomatic transfers, preeffective date trade transactions, and the performance of certain legal services.

4. At the time of signing Executive Order 13067, I directed the Secretary of the Treasury to block all property and interests in property of persons determined, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, the Government of Sudan. On November 5, 1997, OFAC disseminated details of this program to the financial, securities, and international trade communities by both electronic and conventional media. This information included the names of 62 entities owned or controlled by the Government of Sudan. The list includes 12 financial institutions and 50 other enterprises.

5. OFAC, in cooperation with the U.S. Customs Service, is closely monitoring potential violations of the import prohibitions of the Order by businesses and individuals. Various reports of violations are being aggressively pursued.

6. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from November 3, 1997, through May 2, 1998, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Sudan are reported to be approximately \$425,000, most of which represent wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of State (particularly the Bureaus of Economic and Business Affairs, African Affairs, Near Eastern Affairs, Consular Affairs, and the Office of the Legal Adviser), and the Department of Commerce (the Bureau of Export Administration and the General Counsel’s Office).

7. The situation in Sudan continues to present an extraordinary and unusual threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. The declaration of the national emergency with respect to Sudan contained in Executive Order 13067 underscores the United States Government opposition to the actions and policies of the Government of Sudan, particularly its support of international terrorism and its failure to respect basic human rights, including freedom of religion. The prohibitions contained in Executive Order 13067 advance important objectives in promoting the antiterrorism and human rights policies of the United States. I shall exercise the powers at my disposal to deal with these problems and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 5, 1998.

REPORT ON PEMIGEWASSET RIVER IN NEW HAMPSHIRE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I take pleasure in transmitting the enclosed report for the Pemigewasset River in New Hampshire. The report and my recommendations are in response to the provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Public Law 90-542, as amended. The Pemigewasset River study was authorized by Public Law 101-357.

The study was conducted by the National Park Service with assistance from a local study committee. The National Park Service determined that the 32.5-mile study segment is eligible for designation based upon its free-flowing character and outstanding scenic, recreational, geologic, fishery, and botanic values. However, in deference to the wishes of local adjoining communities, six of seven of whom voted against designation, and the State of New Hampshire, I am recommending that the Congress not consider designation at this time. If the local communities and/or the State should change their position in the future, the question of designation could be reevaluated.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 5, 1998.

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE STATE OF SMALL BUSINESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States;

which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Small Business:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to present my fourth annual report on the state of small business. In short, the small business community continues to perform exceptionally well. For the fourth year in a row, new business formation reached a record high: 842,357 new firms were formed in 1996.

The entrepreneurial spirit continues to burn brightly as the creativity and sheer productivity of America's small businesses make our Nation's business community the envy of the world. My Administration has worked hard to keep that spirit strong by implementing policies and programs designed to help small businesses develop and expand. We have focused our economic strategy on three pillars: reducing the deficit, opening up markets overseas, and investing in our people through education and technology. Our efforts with respect to small business have been concentrated in a number of specific areas, including directing tax relief to more small businesses, expanding access to capital, supporting innovation, providing regulatory relief, opening overseas markets to entrepreneurs, and strengthening America's work force.

A BALANCED BUDGET AND TAXPAYER RELIEF

When I took office, the Federal budget deficit was a record \$290 billion. I determined that one of the best things we could do for the American people, including small business, would be to balance the budget. Because of our hard choices, the deficit has been reduced for 5 years in a row. By October 1997, the deficit had fallen to just \$22.6 billion—a reduction of \$267 billion or 90 percent. These lower deficits have helped to reduce the interest rates, an important matter for all small businesses.

Small business owners have long recognized the importance of this issue. At each of the White House Conferences on Small Businesses—in 1980, 1986, and 1995—small businesses included on their agenda a recommendation to balance the Federal budget. With passage of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, I signed into law the first balanced budget in a generation. The new budget will spur growth and spread opportunity by providing the biggest investment in higher education since the GI bill more than 50 years ago. Even after we pay for tax cuts, line by line and dime by dime, there will still be \$900 billion in savings over the next 10 years.

And at the same time we are easing the tax burden on small firms. My Administration and the Congress took the White House Conference tax recommendations seriously during deliberations that led to the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997. The new law will direct billions of dollars in tax relief to small

firms over the next 10 years. Small businesses will see a decrease in the estate tax, an increase to 100 percent over the next 10 years in the percentage of health insurance payments a self-employed person can deduct, an updated definition of "home office" for tax purposes, and a reduction in paperwork associated with the alternative minimum tax.

Significant new capital gains provisions in the law should provide new infusions of capital to new small businesses. By reducing the capital gains tax rate and giving small business investors new options, the law encourages economic growth through investment in small businesses.

ACCESS TO CAPITAL

For so many small business owners, gaining access to capital continues to be a very difficult challenge. The U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) plays a key role as a catalyst in our efforts to expand this access. The SBA made or guaranteed more than \$13 billion in loans in 1997. Since the end of fiscal year 1992, the SBA has backed more than \$48 billion in loans to small businesses, more than in the previous 12 years combined. In 1997, the SBA approved 45,288 loan guaranties amounting to \$9.46 billion in the 7(a) guaranty program, a 23 percent increase from 1996, and 4,131 loans worth \$1.44 billion under the Certified Development Company (CDC) loan program.

Included in the 1997 loan totals were a record \$2.6 billion in 7(a) and CDC loans to more than 10,600 minority-owned businesses and another record \$1.7 billion in roughly 10,800 loans to women-owned businesses. Over the last 4 years, the number of SBA loans to women small business owners has more than tripled, and loans to minority borrowers have also nearly tripled.

The Small Business Investment Company (SBIC) program, the SBA's premier vehicle for providing venture capital to small, growing companies, produced a record amount of equity and debt capital investments during the year. The program's licensed SBICs made 2,731 investments worth \$2.37 billion. In 1997, 33 new SBICs with combined private capital of \$471 million were licensed. Since 1994, when the program was revamped, 111 new SBICs with \$1.57 billion in private capital have entered the program.

And in the past year, the SBA's Office of Advocacy developed a promising new tool to direct capital to dynamic, growing small businesses—the Angel Capital Electronic Network, or ACE-Net. This effort has involved refining Federal and State small business securities requirements and using state-of-the-art Internet technology to develop a brand new nationwide market for small business equity.

GOVERNMENT SUPPORT FOR SMALL BUSINESS
INNOVATION

As this report documents, small firms play an important role in developing innovative products and processes and bringing them to the marketplace. Federal research and development that strengthens the national defense, promotes health and safety, and improves the Nation's transportation systems is vital to our long-term interests. Our Government has instituted active policies to ensure that small businesses have opportunities to bring their innovative ideas to these efforts.

The Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) programs help ensure that Federal research and development funding is directed to small businesses. In fiscal year 1996, more than 325 Phase I and Phase II STTR awards totaling \$38 million went to 249 small businesses. Also in 1996, the SBIR program invested almost \$1 billion in small high technology firms. The program has touched and inspired individuals like Bill McCann, a blind—and once frustrated—trumpet player who used SBIR funding to help start a company that designs software to automatically translate sheet music into braille. Today, Dancing Dots Braille Music Technology is rapidly expanding the library of sheet music available to blind musicians.

Other initiatives include the National Institute of Standards and Technology's (NIST) Advanced Technology Program, enabling small high technology firms to develop pathbreaking technologies, and NIST's Manufacturing Extension Partnership, which helps small manufacturers apply performance-improving technologies needed to meet global competition. Two of the SBA's loan programs—the 7(a) and 504 loan programs—currently assist 2,000 high technology companies. And the SBA's ACE-Net initiative is especially designed to meet the needs of these dynamic high technology firms.

Because they give small firms a footing on which to build new ideas and innovative products, these efforts benefit not only the small firms themselves, but the entire American economy.

REGULATORY RELIEF

A pressing concern often identified by small businesses is unfairly burdensome regulation. My Administration is committed to reforming the system of Government regulations to make it more equitable for small companies. In 1996, I signed into law the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act, which strengthens requirements that Federal agencies consider and mitigate unfairly burdensome effects of their rules on small businesses and other small organizations. A small business ombudsman and a new system of regulatory fairness boards, appointed in September 1996, give small firms new opportunities to participate in agency enforcement actions and policies. Because agencies can be challenged in court, they have gone to

extra lengths to ensure that small business input is an integral part of their rulemaking processes.

Many agencies are conducting their own initiatives to reduce the regulatory burden. The SBA, for example, cut its regulations in half and rewrote the remaining requirements in plain English. All of these reforms help ensure that the Government maintains health, safety and other necessary standards without driving promising small companies out of business.

OPENING OVERSEAS MARKETS

Key in my Administration's strategy for economic growth are efforts to expand business access to new and growing markets abroad. I want to open trade in areas where American firms are leading—computer software, medical equipment, environmental technology. The information technology agreement we reached with 37 other nations in 1996 will eliminate tariffs and unshackle trade in computers, semiconductors, and telecommunications. This cut in tariffs on American products could lead to hundreds of thousands of jobs for our people.

Measures aimed at helping small firms expand into the global market have included an overhaul of the Government's export controls and reinvention of export assistance. These changes help ensure that our own Government is no longer the hurdle to small businesses entering the international economy.

A 21ST CENTURY WORK FORCE

American business' most important resource is, of course, people. I am proud of my Administration's efforts to improve the lives and productivity of the American work force. We know that in this Information Age, we need a new social compact—a new understanding of the responsibilities of government, business, and every one of us to each other.

Education is certainly the most important investment we can make in people. We must invest in the skills of people if we are to have the best educated work force in the world in the 21st century. We're moving forward to connect every classroom to the Internet by the year 2000, and to raise standards so that every child can master the basics.

We're also training America's future entrepreneurs. The SBA, for example, has improved access to education and counseling by funding 19 new women's business centers and 15 U.S. export assistance centers nationwide. And we are encouraging businesses to continue their important contributions to job training. The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 encourages employers to provide training by excluding income spent on education for employees from taxation.

We are taking steps to improve small business workers' access to employee benefits. Last year, I signed into law the Small Business Job Protection Act, which, among other things, makes it easier for small businesses to offer pension plans by creating a new small

business 401(k) plan. We made it possible for more Americans to keep their pensions when they change jobs without having to wait before they can start saving at their new jobs. As many as 10 million Americans without pensions when the law was signed can now earn them because this law exists.

Given that small businesses have created more than 10 million new jobs in the last four years, they will be critical in the implementation of the welfare to work initiative. That means the SBA microloan and One-Stop Capital Shop programs will be uniquely positioned to take on the "work" component of this initiative. The work opportunity tax credit in the Balanced Budget Act is also designed as an incentive to encourage small firms, among others, to help move people from welfare to work.

A small business starts with one person's dream. Through devotion and hard work, dreams become reality. Our efforts for the small business community ensure that these modern American Dreams still have a chance to grow and flourish.

I want my Administration to be on the leading edge in working as a partner with the small business community. That is why an essential component of our job is to listen, to find out what works, and to go the extra mile for America's entrepreneurial small business owners.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 5, 1998.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER
OBSERVED THURSDAY, MAY 7, 1998

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, as America prepares to observe the National Day of Prayer this Thursday, I wish to share a story I heard on the radio recently. It is the story of an exceptional group of young people at Lutheran High School Westland, a Christian school in Westland, Michigan, and their efforts to express their religious beliefs.

Last month, the students at the school, acting on their own initiative, built a display of 2,000 small white crosses on the school's lawn to represent roughly 4,000 abortions that are performed daily in America.

The students peacefully, yet powerfully, wanted to express their opposition to abortion. Shortly after the crosses went up, however, complaints were filed. The display was called tacky and political in an attack printed in the local newspaper.

Fortunately, through community support and true dedication by the students, the cross display remained on the school's lawn for a full week as originally planned.

But we have to pause to ask would the display have been criticized at all if the crosses represented deaths from cancer or drunk driving accidents instead of abortion? I fear, especially as we near the National Day of Prayer, that this story is yet another example of the way in which freedom of religious expression is coming under attack in our Nation.

America was built upon Judeo-Christian values, but this very important element of our culture is now all too often not only ignored but also frowned upon. Children have been barred from bowing their heads in private prayer, from writing of their religious beliefs in school papers, and even from bringing the Bible to school.

I think it is a sad commentary on our Nation that we can have a serious debate on the House floor about using taxpayer dollars to buy hypodermic needles for drug addicts, and, yet, a child cannot read the Bible in his or her school library.

This is the very reason that the Religious Freedom Amendment, introduced by my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), is so important to our Nation. The Religious Freedom Amendment protects the freedom of religion which we have enjoyed for so long under our Constitution, but which has been suppressed by recent court actions and trends.

It retains the First Amendment safeguard against official religion and keeps school prayer voluntary, but protects it just as other forms of free speech are protected.

In other words, the Religious Freedom Amendment protects religious expression like school prayer and the students' display at Lutheran High School in Westland, Michigan. It also, of course, retains the right of others to express their disapproval of any such display or to abstain from group prayer.

The key is everyone's rights are protected. Again, I repeat, the key is everyone's rights are protected. This was the case in Westland where, fortunately, the Religious Freedom Amendment was not necessary this year, as the students were not required to remove their display.

The school officials and students are quick to point out that the criticism of their cross display actually turned into a positive by generating publicly an overwhelmingly amount of support for their cause. But it is not always the case, as I indicated earlier. Other displays of religious expression, including private prayer, have been banned by law in locations nationwide.

In my opinion, and in the opinion of 75 percent of Americans polled, it is critical for Congress to pass legislation that ensures the religious liberties once again receive full protection in

America. I urge my colleagues to support the Religious Liberties Amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and others on the House side.

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

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

CINCO DE MAYO

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, today is Cinco de Mayo, the 5th of May, which is celebrated throughout the Americas. It is a day of celebration for those who have their roots and heart in Mexico. It is a special day in history for Mexican and Mexican-Americans because, on the 5th of May in 1862, a very small, poorly armed band of Mexicans defeated, in an unbalanced contest, their colonial oppressors; as history records, too, that just several years after defeating their oppressors, that Mexican independence was lost and there was oppression in the country.

□ 1830

That is the day we celebrate today. I come before the House tonight, and I have come many times to talk about the situation in our country relating to illegal narcotics. And I wish I could come here and celebrate the Cinco de Mayo with other Mexican Americans and supporters of Mexico but, in fact, I am not here to praise Mexico but to condemn Mexico on this occasion.

In fact, today, Mexico is a source of 50 percent of the hard narcotics entering the United States of America. Not only are these drugs entering the United States, but they are also corrupting the Mexico that these Mexican individuals fought on the 5th of May in 1862 to free their country and their people. Drugs are oppressing Mexico and they are destroying the United States of America.

We have tried to work with Mexico. I serve on the Committee on National Security of the Congress that deals with our national drug policy. We did not decertify Mexico last year or this year, and we should have. And I have sponsored resolutions and supported them in both instances, but they have not passed, for whatever reasons. But we should have decertified Mexico.

Mexico, to date, has not extradited one drug felon or one drug offender to the United States. And one reason they were not decertified was because we sought their cooperation in these areas such as extradition.

Mexico, to date, has, in fact, refused to allow our agents to arm themselves. Mexico, in fact, has not signed a mari-

time agreement. And the only other country is Haiti, and they have not done that because they have not organized their government. But Mexico is the only country I know of in the Western Hemisphere to not sign a maritime agreement. And the list goes on and on of failure to cooperate.

So we are not celebrating a happy Cinco de Mayo here in Congress. I am not. I am concerned that, again, that Mexicans who fought for freedom, for independence, for the right of the people to live in an open society and a free society are being oppressed because of drug trafficking within the country of Mexico and the drugs that have come into the United States.

If my colleagues do not think it is a problem, 50 percent of those hard drugs coming into the United States have put 2 million Americans behind bars. We have 20,000 deaths in the United States that are drug related. The cost to the American taxpayer is now \$16 billion. And we can lay at the doorstep of the Mexican Government the responsibility for so many of these illegal narcotics coming into the United States.

It is a sad commentary that our neighbors, in fact, are sending chemical weapons into the United States and chemical destruction, which is also destroying that country and its freedom that was fought for by these heroes on May 5th of 1862.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that I can come a year from now, on May 5th, 1999, and say that indeed the Mexicans have cooperated as neighbors, as friends in this hemisphere to gain their own people's freedom from the drug trafficking, from corruption and from the depression that it has brought to their society, and also free our country from the oppression, from the deaths that it has caused and from the drugs that are on our streets, in our schools, and in our communities.

FUNDING FOR THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, today I call on both the Democratic and Republican leaders of the House to pass the \$18 billion International Monetary Fund as soon as possible. It is urgent for Hawaii's citizens, workers, and the businesses that I represent.

In early winter 1997, economies in South Korea, Thailand, Malaysia, and Indonesia collapsed. The effects on Hawaii have stifled recovery from the deepest recession the State has experienced in 50 years.

Problems began when the Japanese economy faltered in 1991. Tourism and direct foreign investment plunged. Devaluation of the yen and now other

Asian currencies have resulted in the Hawaii recession.

Unemployment is at 6.5 percent. And by the way, Mr. Speaker, the 6.5 percent may not seem very high to some others in the country who have experienced much greater percentages in times past, but for Hawaii that is a very, very high number.

Tourism last month dropped 14 percent from March a year ago. Costs for the Japanese tourist or businessperson are more than 50 percent higher than they were in 1991. Investment decline has resulted in construction contract receipts falling 40 percent since 1991. Business and individual bankruptcy are at record high levels.

Business, labor, industry, and government in Hawaii are working on solutions but cannot provide direct economic aid to Asian countries or restructure Asian economies. Only Congress can and must do that in conjunction with the IMF.

Current funding proposals have been derailed over unrelated issues, such as abortion. There are adequate vehicles for dealing with those issues, and the leadership should drop them and bring an IMF bill to the House floor immediately.

Economists indicate it will take 1 to 3 years for Asian economies to recover, even with IMF aid. Although there is no quick fix, we must start now, because Hawaii and the U.S. economies are being damaged by inaction. And I stress the U.S. economy in general as well as that of Hawaii in particular, Mr. Speaker.

Knowing the relationship between IMF and America's foreign trade, which includes tourism and the movement of investment capital, President Clinton recently said that IMF funding was something "we owe to the future of this country and to our children." That certainly applies to Hawaii.

That is why I wrote today to the Speaker and Democratic leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) urging immediate action. I have the letter here, Mr. Speaker, and I will submit it as part of my remarks.

Threat of economic destabilization remains, and delay is only intensifying the problem. The IMF must be allowed to do its job, including helping restructure the economic systems in Asia which resulted in the need for the multibillion-dollar bailout. But the IMF cannot do its job without the funding necessary to stabilize these economies.

Mr. Speaker, we must not put America's economic well-being at risk by ignoring the Asian financial crisis. We must not put Hawaii's economic well-being at risk by ignoring the Asian financial crisis. I urge that the IMF bill, the International Monetary Fund bill, be brought to the House floor immediately.

Mr. Speaker, the letter I earlier referred to is as follows:

NEIL ABERCROMBIE,
1ST DISTRICT, HAWAII,
May 5, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
U.S. Capitol Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On behalf of the people of Hawaii who have been suffering through the toughest economic times in more than half a century, I urge that the funding bill be brought to the House floor expeditiously. I am deeply concerned about the failure of the House of Representatives to act on the \$18 billion in emergency funding for the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to deal with the Asian financial crisis.

As you may know, during the last quarter of 1997, a financial crisis swept through several Asian countries. In response, the IMF came up with proposals to strengthen the economies of Thailand, South Korea, Indonesia and Malaysia and, in the process, reduce the threat of destabilization to the rest of Asia and the Pacific Rim. In this regard, it is vital that Congress provide the IMF with the necessary resources to adequately deal with the Asian financial crisis. Failure to enact IMF funding potentially jeopardizes our nation's ability to sustain economic growth. In Hawaii, the effects are more immediate. The Asian financial crisis, combined with the problems of the Japanese economy, has already had a negative economic impact on the state. Continued neglect by Congress will exacerbate this situation and make it more difficult for Hawaii to deal with its greatest economic challenge since statehood.

Since 1991, Hawaii's economy has been stagnant. Since that time, the bankruptcy rate has skyrocketed and our unemployment rate has grown and now ranks among the highest in the nation. The primary reason for Hawaii's economic problems can be attributed to the decline in travel and tourism from Japan and other Asian countries as well as the consequences of direct foreign capital being withdrawn from investment in the state. In March, the number of visitors to Hawaii was down by 40,000 compared to the same time last year. The most dramatic loss was in the number of East-bound visitors from Asia which declined 14 per cent. Equally profound is the impact of the Yen currency devaluation. Today, it costs a Japanese tourist or businessperson 50 percent more to stay in Hawaii than it did in 1991. No sector of Hawaii's economy has been left untouched. Take for instance the construction industry; contract receipts for construction fell in 1997 to \$2.9 billion, down from \$3.2 billion in 1996, continuing into a 40 percent decline since 1991.

Emergency funding for the IMF will not provide a quick fix to the Asian financial crisis. The situation in Asia developed over decades and economists have indicated that the IMF-supervised policy adjustments will take one to three years before they take hold. Yet, passage of the \$18 billion in emergency financing for the IMF funding is a necessary step in resolving the crisis. I fear that inaction by Congress will only intensify the problem.

I understand there are many members of Congress who hold strong views on issues which have become inextricably and unfairly linked to the IMF funding bill. Congress has many legislative vehicles with which to deliberate issues such as the abortion policies of other nations. Holding the IMF funding hostage to unrelated issues is not fair and runs counterproductive to the efforts of all sectors of Hawaii society—business, industry, labor and government—to resolve our economic problems. Although there are steps that all of those parties can and are taking, it is far beyond their authority to address

the need to restructure economies of Asian countries. That is the proper role for the IMF, Congress, and the federal government.

I strongly urge that you and the other members of the Republican leadership take immediate steps to resolve the emergency funding issues for the IMF. We should not put the well-being of our nation's economy at risk by ignoring the Asian financial crisis. Emergency funding for the IMF cannot be held captive to unrelated issues.

Sincerely,

NEIL ABERCROMBIE
Member of Congress

SOUTH DAKOTANS SEND MESSAGE OF ZERO TOLERANCE IN WAR ON DRUGS

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up this evening for just a moment on the discussion that the gentleman from Florida started earlier, having to do with the whole war on drugs.

When we discuss the war on drugs in America today, we hear a lot about the phrase "zero tolerance." I think zero tolerance means different things in different places. What I would like to do today is talk a little bit about the definition of zero tolerance in my home State of South Dakota.

We are fortunate in South Dakota to have a relatively low crime rate compared with other parts of the country. In fact, we never really thought that we had a drug problem. Drugs were something that were dealt with in the metropolitan areas of this country and, frankly, we did not think much about drugs in rural America.

But that is changing, due in part to a new drug called methamphetamine, or "meth," or "crank" for short. In 1997, meth seizures in South Dakota doubled. Oftentimes this drug makes it into the Midwest from Mexico via the interstate. It is becoming a heartland epidemic in neighboring States like Iowa and Missouri as well.

Last year South Dakota joined Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, and Missouri in being designated as part of the high-intensity drug trafficking area. The drug lends itself to rural areas. Manufacturing methamphetamine is a messy and smelly process. Cooking up meth creates a pungent, easily detectable odor.

As a result, many meth manufacturers choose to set up in rural areas. They find an old building on a abandoned Midwestern farmstead and they are in business. If they have access to an interstate highway, they have a way to ship it out. Once they are in business, the rural nature of our communities make it very difficult to catch the dealers. In fact, it is pretty hard. My colleagues can imagine trying to get an undercover narcotics agent slipped into a town of 300 people, unnoticed.

The close-knit neighborliness, which has so long insulated us in rural areas

from drug problems, is now working against us as we fight this drug. But we are fighting it. In South Dakota, zero tolerance means zero tolerance.

Just yesterday, drug agents in Lincoln County, South Dakota brought drug dogs in to do an unannounced search of cars parked outside a high school. The drug dogs inspected 21 cars. Officers searched 7. Marijuana or drug paraphernalia were found in 5. All five students are charged in either adult or juvenile court. Now, school administrators said they were not notified in advance about the search, and they say if they had been notified, they would have invited the officers inside to search not just cars but lockers, too.

Law enforcement officials in South Dakota tell me that school officials do not just give lip service to the phrase "zero tolerance." They back it by cooperating with and inviting law officers in for random unannounced searches. As a result, school searches have increased from 43 in 1995 to 103 in 1997.

And school officials are not the only ones who support it. Law enforcement officers tell me that students support it as well. The vast majority of kids in America do not want to be offered drugs in the hallways of their schools. The vast majority of kids want to feel safe, secure, and free from peer pressure when they go to their lockers to get their books. Most kids know it is easier to say no if there are no drugs in school to start with, in the first place, to say no to. And most kids are fully behind the zero tolerance policy.

And so are their parents. When South Dakota law enforcement officers bring those dogs into the school, they know they are doing so with the full support of parents, teachers, and students. That allows them to bring meaning back into the phrase "zero tolerance."

We will not achieve zero tolerance unless we have everyone's cooperation and support. Parents say they want drug free schools, but are they prepared to face up to the fact that their child may be the one who is dealing drugs in school? Are they prepared to look for the signs of drug use and take action when they see them? Are they prepared to lead by example?

Less than a week ago a 24-year-old woman, with four children under the age of 7, was arrested for selling methamphetamine to two 17-year-olds, a 16-year-old and a 15-year-old. She was indicted on eight felony drug charges, including distributing methamphetamine to children while raising four children of her own.

Another law enforcement officer said he recently arrested a 15-year-old girl on drug charges. She was buying the drugs from her boyfriend. She was buying them for her mother. These parents are not sending the right message to the children of America. The message of zero tolerance is the message we ought to be sending.

There is a serious cultural breakdown in America today in the message

that we are sending to our young people. Now, students can say they want drug free schools, but are they prepared to stand up to the peer pressure and say no when push comes to shove? Are they prepared to take a stand personally, irrespective and regardless of the consequences?

We are all responsible for ridding our schools and communities of drugs. Parents have to teach kids how to say no. Kids have to put the training to work. And teachers and law enforcement officers have to do everything in their power to keep those drugs from entering our schools in the first place. We need to stop this problem. It is one we have to work together on.

REVISING THE BANKRUPTCY CODE

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, I want to turn our attention to an issue that probably has not caught the momentum of the national media or the attention of our constituents back home.

When we first begin to hear about any discussions on revising the bankruptcy code, long yawns begin to come out of those who might want to understand what we are engaged in. Certainly I think when we talk about credit card debt and credit cards and 19 percent, 21 percent, and 30 percent interest rates, most consumers would understand, Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about.

The bankruptcy code and the bankruptcy procedures were used to allow both businesses and consumers to, with dignity, remain in their communities and restructure their debts; in many instances help to keep employees employed, and help to keep people with a roof over their head.

In 1978, the last time we reformed or reviewed or revised the bankruptcy code, we took, Mr. Speaker, some 5 deliberative years. We studied, we assessed, we questioned. Now, unfortunately, as H.R. 3150 moves toward markup in the Committee on the Judiciary, I venture to say that we have looked and given this bill as much attention as we would give a quick hot dog while we are eating it at a baseball game. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that this massive overhaul of the bankruptcy code is too fast, too far, and too soon.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared today to ask the President of the United States to veto this bankruptcy bill, which we expect, as I said, to be before the Committee on the Judiciary next week and, yes, to be before the House in the coming weeks and for the President to sign.

Let me share with my colleagues my concerns. First of all, I think it is important that we in America take credit lightly and sometimes frivolously. Maybe it is because we are bombarded

with letters from credit card companies time after time after time, from the minute we graduate from high school, the time we are in college, to take this card, take that card, use this credit, use that credit. And, of course, if someone says use it, we will. So I do support educating the public about the responsible use of credit.

But there are certain gaping holes in this credit review or the review of the bankruptcy code: one, less than 10 hearings, less than 20 hours of testimony. And, in fact, let me say to those who have been pushing elevating credit card debt over their mortgages, over providing food for the family, over taking care of their children, the problem is, when we had hearings, only 4 percent of all credit card debt is actually defaulted on.

How many of us have had the frequent "hellos" from the harassing calls from credit card companies. I can venture to say these folk get their money. Only 4 percent default. But yet this bill elevates credit card debt above mortgages, above serious responsibilities, like child support.

In an amendment that I offered in committee last week, which was turned back, I offered to protect, in protected income, child support for our children; those bankrupt petitioners who had to pay child support and those bankrupt petitioners who receive child support. Protected income so that the credit card companies would not take the money that they had for their children.

□ 1845

Was it accepted? No, it was not. And as well, I cannot imagine why tithe and charitable deductions should not be protected income. In the spirit of volunteerism, in the freedom of religion, in protection of religion, why would we not want to protect the bankrupt petitioners from those who believe in tithe and donating, as we would those who want to pay credit card debt?

I simply say that this meager utilization of the process of review gives me shudders as to what kind of bill will come to the floor of the House. Voluminous pages, but with little knowledge; only five hearings, a markup coming up before we had any serious markup in subcommittee. This legislation is moving too quickly.

My objections have been echoed by the National Bankruptcy Conference, the American Conference on Bankruptcy, the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges, the National Association of Chapter 13 Trustees; and 57 of the Nation's leading professors of bankruptcy law, with over 500 years of experience collectively, have said this is moving too fast. If they revise this bankruptcy code, what they could have rather than having the scales of justice, they will have the unequal weights, the debtors down here and the creditors up here.

Mr. Speaker, that is not a fair way to address the working men and women.

This is a drive-by approach to revising the bankruptcy code.

Our Constitution tells us that there is a fair balance between the responsibilities of those in this country with the rights that they have. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that it is crucial that, one, we protect our children; two, we respect the freedom of religion by tithing; we respect our children by supporting protected income for support contributions.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, let me simply say this bill is moving too fast. Let us support the 24 percent of American women and men who are supported and their children supported by child support. This bill should go back to committee; and, if not, it should be vetoed by the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment this evening to discuss the many troubling issues that are currently swirling around the world of consumer and commercial bankruptcy. And in particular, H.R. 3150, the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1998, scheduled for full committee mark-up in the Judiciary Committee next week. In general, I must say that I am particularly concerned about the financial impact that on-going abuses of our present bankruptcy system could have on the American taxpayer, and how we, in the Congress, can take action to minimize them. However, I seriously question whether H.R. 3150, as it now stands, is the best means to accomplish this goal. Frankly, in its philosophical approach and legislative function, it appears to unnecessarily burdening the rights of the bankrupt debtor. I believe unequivocally that our reforms must be balanced in their treatment of both debtor and creditor. Sure, some debtors probably do abuse the current bankruptcy system, but let us not pretend that creditors do not do so also.

Many financial institutions just seem to be too loose in their extension of credit to consumers, and it would seem that they continue the practice because it is profitable for them. As Mr. Lloyd Cutler of Wilmer, Cutler and Pickering, shared with us in one of our hearings, only 4 percent of all credit card debt is actually defaulted upon, and therefore, that is not the source of the problem. If this is the case, why are we being urged by the credit industry to change the current bankruptcy laws? Either way you look at this issue, it is definitely a questionable move for Congress to seek to insulate the credit industry from their own questionable lending policies, and H.R. 3150 seems to do this.

But, friends and colleagues, this is not the only problem with this bill. I must openly question Subcommittee Chairman GEKAS' schedule of a total five hearings on this subject over the three weeks before the April recess, and then, a rush to mark-up this bill immediately after. But as if that was not bad enough, the Chairman actually offered two substantial revisions of this bill by way of substitute, within 48 hours of the Subcommittee mark-up of the bill. This process has been more than merely a "rush to judgment", actually, it has been a travesty.

My objections about the swift consideration of this legislation, as I am sure that I can speaking for the rest of my colleagues on the side of the aisle, are not well-crafted partisan tactics to delay Chairman GEKAS' legislation, but instead, legitimate and heart-felt concerns

about the rapidity of this process. Furthermore, these objections have been echoed by the National Bankruptcy Conference, the American College of Bankruptcy, the National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges, the National Association of Chapter 13 trustees, and 57 of the nation's leading professors of bankruptcy law, amongst others. But despite it all, the spending train called H.R. 3150, continues to rush along. For decades now, bankruptcy legislation in the Congress has been a bi-partisan effort. Our bankruptcy laws traditionally have been carefully shaped by the contrasting views of the two parties; but not now.

Ultimately, I think that the Chairman's brisk "drive-by" approach to the complexities presented to us by bankruptcy reform, will have drastic consequence for our constituencies. Consumer bankruptcy reform, must not be taken lightly. Simply stated, the Congress should not attempt to pass untested legislative policy without first reviewing every reasonable option, possibility, and alternative to radical structural reform. If not, let me say it again, the American people are the ones that will have to deal with the consequences of our hasty choices.

I need not remind anyone that we have not been elected to act as social scientists empowered by the Constitution of this great country to test our ideological theories on this nation's millions of unexpected human subjects. Rather, we are the chosen Representatives of the People of the United States charged to protect and serve their interests to the fullest extent of our powers. But how can we fulfill this sacred responsibility to our constituents if we do not take the necessary time to contemplate serious matters?

I know that there are legitimate merits to this legislative initiative (like its debtor education provisions), but I also know that there are still both detected and undetected deficiencies in it as well. We must take the time to analyze, criticize, contest, debate, consider and then review these measures before taking decisive action. This is why the Congress took five(5) years to pass reforms after the last report by the National Bankruptcy Review Commission; because these weighty matters truly deserve our lasting and full attention. As distinguished as our witnesses were in the hearings on this matter, hearings do not make up the totality of the process of legislative review; in the end, every member must have the necessary time to make up their own mind. Now, all we can do is wonder what could have and what should have been, if this process had worked right.

Another primary issue of concern for me with H.R. 3150, has been its utter disregard for the care and safety of our children. In subcommittee, I offered an amendment to this bill that was "turned back" by the Chair, which would have protected the right of bankrupt parents to continue to make or receive adequate child support payments for their children, even though, they were participating in a Chapter 13 repayment plan. More importantly, however, my amendment allows a parent to pay or receive an amount that exceeds their court-mandated child support contribution. We need parents to give as much as they can to the support of their children.

Listen to the staggering statistics, only 24% of families headed by a woman never married to the father receive regular child support payments, and in addition to the fact that only

54% of the families headed by a woman divorced from the father receive regular and full child support payments. So what is the result on our children? 50% of White children in single parent households, who do not receive regular and full child support, live at or below the poverty line. While 60% of Hispanic children and 70% of Black children in single parent households live at or below the poverty line. And frighteningly, Chairman GEKAS has offered a bill that would seek to widen this poverty gap. Under current law, child support payments are considered a non-dischargeable, priority debt in a bankruptcy proceeding, but under the Gekas bill, our children will be battling with Visa, Mastercard and your local department store, Macy's, Foley's, Hecht's, Hudson's or Neiman-Marcus, to receive their sorely-needed monthly payments.

The answer is as simple as this. I believe that our laws should seek to protect those who can protect themselves, most notably, our children. My amendment to H.R. 3150 would not encourage debtors to evade their financial responsibilities, it merely allows bankrupts to continue to care for their children. Just because an individual files for bankruptcy, that does not mean that they should be forced to abdicate their most essential duties. Often bankrupt debtors are parents, too, and they deserve the same opportunity to care for their children. If not, these funds will be left as prey for the many creditors seeking to take a significant portion of a debtor's available income. If it is a choice between enriching a powerful multi-national conglomerate and the welfare of a child, every day of the week and twice on Sunday, I would choose the child. Thus, I urge you friends, colleagues and those within the sound of my voice, to work diligently with me to care for the truly innocent members of our society, our children. Thank you.

REGARDING RELEASE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY MR. AND MRS. HUBBELL

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it would be useful for us to reflect on some of the matters that have transpired over the last several days in this political thunderstorm that is the continuing efforts by independent counsel Kenneth Starr to get the President.

I find most troublesome the recent conduct of the distinguished chairman of the committee I once chaired, the old Government Operations Committee. I refer to none other than the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and his actions on the day the grand jury returned the indictments against Mr. and Mrs. Webster Hubbell.

Chairman BURTON released private and confidential conversations of Mr. and Mrs. Hubbell, and Mr. Hubbell's attorney, carefully selecting those portions that he believed would be most damaging to the First Lady. This release was designed and calculated to embarrass the Hubbells and, in the bargain, to conceal those portions of the conversation that contradicted the

tenor and content of the selected portions of the conversations that were disclosed. In addition, it has been reported that Chairman BURTON and his staff not only withheld information, but they also made mistakes, serious mistakes, in transcription.

At a minimum, these disclosures violated the spirit and, I believe, the letter of the law of the Privacy Act and the privilege any person enjoys when he or she speaks with a spouse or an attorney. The Department of Justice forwarded this information to this Congress with the understanding that any disclosure would be handled with discretion.

I wish I could say that happened here. There has been no shortage of critical commentary about the scope, the timing, and the techniques Mr. Starr has used. By the same token, we in the House of Representatives must carefully consider our responsibilities while we await any report Mr. Starr may be preparing and guard against mimicking his excessive practices.

Clearly, we must guard against bias or inappropriate procedures, including premature and indiscreet disclosures of sensitive information. To do less is to lack the discipline and the judgment necessary to meet this important responsibility.

According to public accounts, the Speaker may well ask the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) to participate and consider the product of Mr. Starr's \$40 million so-called "independent investigation." The recent actions of the gentleman from Indiana do not bode well for how he might handle secret grand jury information.

Obviously, we already have a barometer of how this senior Republican Member of the House will approach his responsibilities. I cite this as further evidence of the plea I have issued more than once that the Committee on the Judiciary and not Chairman BURTON or any special committee is the only appropriate forum to consider any report if one is ever to be submitted by Mr. Starr. Any effort to assign this task to a special committee should be seen for what it is, an ill-disguised, politically motivated effort to get the President and to protect the majority in the House of Representatives.

As chairman of the former Government Operations Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is in the singular position of representing and embodying the integrity of his committee's review, as well as the integrity of the process by which it does its work. And while I am confident that he would disagree, I am sure that many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have been troubled by disclosures of information which we know to be selective, incomplete and wrong.

We can only hope that any product that might be issued by his committee is not similarly flawed.

SOCIAL SECURITY: WHERE IS IT GOING, WHAT SHALL WE DO?

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to do a bipartisan presentation, I think; and that is about Social Security, where are we going, what shall we do.

I suspect a lot of people are going to be tired of hearing about Social Security. But I think it is so important that every American, either retired or somebody that is going to be retired some day, look at the problem of Social Security, what is happening, and at this summer and fall election, talk to their candidates that are running for Congress about what they are doing for preserving Social Security.

I have this chart here that represents the bleak future of Social Security. As my colleagues see, on the top left of this chart that goes from up until about 2013 is the new projection of where there is going to be more tax revenue coming in from the working taxpayers of this country than is needed to pay benefits.

Now, what happens in Social Security since we started in 1935? The existing workers pay in their taxes and immediately it goes out to pay benefits for existing retirees. This chart shows that we are going to have more tax revenue coming in than is required to pay out benefits for the next 12 to 14 years. Dorcas Hardy, by the way, thinks we are going to actually run out of money as early as 2005 or 2006.

Now, in terms of what the excess money is, and that money is approximately \$70 billion this year, \$80 billion this year, \$100 billion the year after next, is being borrowed from Social Security to balance the budget.

Now, when the trustees came out with their report last week, they said, well, really Social Security is not going to go broke until the year 2032. But what does that mean? If there is less money coming in as early as 2005, maybe 2014, maybe 2013, maybe earlier, how is government going to come up with the funds that are necessary to fill our obligation to meet Social Security benefits?

Now, looking at this chart, if we are looking at the year 2018, in terms of today's dollars, there is going to be \$100 billion that the general fund is going to have to come up with to pay the existing benefits, to pay back what it is has been borrowing from the Social Security Trust Fund.

In terms of the 2018 dollars, it is going to be approximately \$600 billion, \$600 billion that is either going to have to be borrowed, have other expenditures of the Federal Government reduced to come up with that money, or increase taxes.

Let me say a word about tax increases that have been used to solve the Social Security dilemmas in the past. Listen to this one: Since 1971, So-

cial Security taxes have been increased 36 times in the rate or the base. More often than once a year we have increased the taxes on American workers in order to solve the shortage problems. Whenever there is less money coming in in Social Security taxes than is required for benefit payments, we have increased taxes.

Over the years, since 1935 when we started the program, any time there are more revenues, what the tendency has been for politicians is to increase benefits. And of course, the largest change to the Social Security program was an amendment to the Social Security Act in 1965 that started our Medicare program, another serious problem that we need to face up to.

But, look, my message today is, let us not put off our efforts to work towards a solution. I have got a couple of bills introduced, in fact, the only bill that has been introduced in the House that has actually been scored by the Social Security Administration to keep Social Security solvent for the next 100 years.

I have got another bill that says, look, if there are any surpluses, let us start using those surpluses coming into the Federal Government. And "surpluses" is defined, if my colleagues will excuse the technical expression, under a unified budget. That means where we are including everything we borrow from Social Security, we consider revenue; and therefore, that is the way we have come up with a definition that there is going to be a surplus this year.

But let us start getting that surplus out of town, using it to set up private retirement investment accounts for everybody that is paying a FICA tax so that they can decide what they want, how they want to invest their money, within limitations. It is going to be required, it can only be used for their retirement. But let us not pretend that the problem is not serious. Let us get at it. Let us take Social Security seriously, and let us look at the solutions; and hopefully, next year we will come up with a legislative solution that will be passed into law.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR TERRY SANFORD

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, recently, on Earth Day, Senator Terry Sanford of North Carolina was buried in Durham, North Carolina; and I deeply regretted that I could not be there.

In many ways, Senator Sanford was responsible for that because of opportunities that he had given me as a young person. I was able to be in my district where the President and the Vice President of the United States were visiting and participating in Earth Day ceremonies.

It was because of Senator Sanford, "Mr. Sanford" as we knew him when

we were students at Duke, that I and many like me have had our chances to get ahead in life and to try and participate fully in the political life of this country.

I first came to know Terry Sanford, then a recent governor of North Carolina, in 1970, when he became president of Duke University. And, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues know what the climate was like then on most college campuses. It was a time of emotional turmoil and consternation, great riffs over Vietnam and civil rights; and certainly Duke had seen its share of them. Initially, many of us who were students said, how could someone who has been in political life come to be president of this academic institution?

□ 1900

Mr. Sanford soon showed us wrong and showed us the kind of person he was. We learned how he was able to bring together many disparate elements and get everyone sitting down. I guess there are several incidents that describe how Terry Sanford worked and lived. The one that came most to my mind was one day he had only been in office at Duke for a few months, word came that the gathering of some of our more radical students had gathered out on the campus drive and were getting set to march on the administration building. They had actually blockaded the circle by which all traffic could get into the university. Rather than having them march down, Terry Sanford, new President at Duke, new kid on the block, he marched out to the traffic circle. There he confronted, and I still remember one bearded student looking at him and saying, "Do you know what we're going to do?" President Sanford said, "What is it you propose?" He said, "Well, we're going to march right down and take over Allen Building, the administration building." He stepped back, he looked at them, gave that wry chuckle of his and said, "Well, good luck. I've been trying to take it over for months." Safe to say, that demonstration broke up right there. Indeed President Sanford, then in his true style, invited everyone to come to Allen Building and to meet with him and, of course, as he often did, held regular meetings and hours with students.

Another time in a campaign that I worked in that he was involved in, some of us were being critical of another staff member, a young person, just like us. I still remember him looking at us and saying, "Nobody is ever going to be able to say that I didn't give somebody a chance." That was what his life was all about. It was giving young people, all people, but particularly young people chances.

He gave voice to a number of us who were still students in 1972 when we were looking for a presidential race and a candidate that espoused what we believed in. He took on that dark horse presidential race. It was not an easy one for him. Obviously he did not get the nomination. But on the way to

fighting for that nomination, he gave hundreds of us a chance to participate and to become stakeholders in this democratic process. I just wonder how many students he turned from being simply angry and frustrated, turned to being full participants in people making an investment in our system today.

Indeed, you can look at any role of government officials or business officials or people taking an active role in their community and you can find Terry Sanford's handiwork and signature in all of them. He ran for the Senate from North Carolina and he was elected for a term and he represented North Carolina well. This was as someone who at a time when most of us might think of retirement, Terry Sanford was always serving. He fascinated me because no matter what increase in years he might have, he could always communicate directly with young people, in terms that young people related to. You trusted him, he brought you in, he made you part of what you wanted to do. There are thousands of places and thousands of people across this world tonight who are doing something that probably they would not have done had it not been for Terry Sanford. I think that is the highest tribute that can be paid to Mr. Sanford. People, a lot of us, have opportunities today that we never would have had had he not given us a voice and a vehicle by which to express them. And so that is the job that all of us need to dedicate ourselves in his memory.

I would say to Mr. Sanford, you left our Nation much better, you enriched countless lives. Many generations are going to have enhanced opportunities because of you. Thank you, Mr. Sanford.

REFORMING THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House tonight on important legislation. The American taxpayers are expecting that we will work together in a bipartisan fashion to change the IRS and to scrap the code. The fact is that if you have seen the Senate Finance Committee hearings both recently and in the past, in the fall of 1997, we learned firsthand how the IRS agents, many of them presently employed by the agency, testified under anonymity with cloaks over their head, with scrambled speech, in order to reveal for the first time just how widespread the culture of fear is at an agency which has been out of control for some time, has caused havoc to the American citizens. We know that most employees, the great majority, are doing their job, but the fact is that at the IRS, we have set into circumstances the kind of problems that need to be cured.

Right now we heard about from IRS agents that there are quotas for prosecutions, for audits, for investigations, that in fact there has been a situation where the agency has called for each field office to have a certain number of audits and investigations, much like you would have for a sales organization. That is not how you can run an IRS.

The fact is this agency needs to turn to a taxpayer-oriented, taxpayer-friendly agency, one that is going to be there to help the American public. And so I have introduced, Mr. Speaker, the Taxpayer Bill of Rights III to answer those complaints that were raised at the Senate Finance Committee hearings. My bill will do the following. It will change the burden of proof. Instead of the taxpayer being presumed guilty and the IRS commissioner being presumed to be correct, the taxpayer will be presumed to be innocent and the burden of proof will be on the commissioner to prove otherwise. Under my bill, there will be no more fishing expeditions. There will be expanded probable cause for any investigations by the IRS. And there will be no more quotas. It is no more appropriate for us to have quotas on tickets for law enforcement agencies any more than it is appropriate to have quotas for IRS investigations and audits.

Under my Taxpayer Bill of Rights, the most important feature would be to make sure that the IRS, when they have overreaching and they go beyond the law, that they are responsible for their own business, individual and legal losses that they cause corporations and they cause individuals or any other entities that file taxes with the IRS.

The Taxpayer Bill of Rights would also call for whistleblower protection. If you report wrongdoing at the agency, then you cannot be audited for coming forward to tell the truth.

Finally, if you want to settle a claim that you have with the IRS, then the IRS must appoint a mediator for the purpose of settling that claim. We have in the United States, Mr. Speaker, over 100,000 IRS employees but only 43 taxpayer advocates, less than one per State. We need to change the balance so that we put the "Service" back in the Internal Revenue Service. We can make these changes if we work with the new commissioner, who has expressed an interest in reforming the agency.

We look forward to working with IRS employees to make this a reality and working also with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. PAXON) to make sure we scrap the code and replace it with one that is flatter and fairer to the American people.

I thank the Speaker for this time to address these important issues of scrapping the code and reforming the IRS. I look forward to working with my colleagues in a bipartisan fashion to pass these items.

DISCUSSION OF ISSUES
AFFECTING NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take out this 60-minute special order as we today completed in the Committee on National Security the markup of the 1999 defense authorization bill, the authorization bill that lays out the funding framework for defense spending for the next fiscal year. I will be joined tonight by many of the most distinguished Members of this body as we discuss issues affecting national security in this country and the difficult problem that we are facing. The people of America unfortunately have a misconception. That misconception is in fact that we are spending so much more money today on defense than we have in the past.

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of simple comparisons, if we compare today defense spending to what it was in the 1960s. I pick that time because we were at relative peace. It was after Korea and before Vietnam. John Kennedy was the President. In the 1960s we were spending each year 52 cents of every Federal tax dollar brought to Washington on national defense, 9 percent of our country's gross national product. In this year's defense bill, we are spending 15 cents of the Federal tax dollar on national security, 2.9 percent of our gross national product. In fact, the defense budget is the only area of spending that the White House and the Congress have cut for 13 consecutive years, cut in very dramatic ways. Those have been bipartisan cuts, some of which I have supported, some of which I have concerns with. But while the defense spending in this country has gone down in terms of overall spending authority at the Federal level, we must understand some very important facts, Mr. Speaker.

In the 1960s, we had a draft. Young people were taken out of high school. They served their country for 2 years. They were paid far less than the minimum wage. Today we have an all-volunteer military. No one is drafted. Our young people are well-paid, many are married, they have advanced college degrees, we have housing costs, education costs, health care costs. So quality of life becomes a major part of what we spend our defense dollar on. So today, Mr. Speaker, a much larger portion of that relatively smaller amount of money compared to the 1960s goes for the quality of life of our troops.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the fastest growing part of defense spending today is environmental mitigation. We are spending \$12 billion this year to clean up both nuclear materials as well as materials that are nonnuclear. That is all coming out of our defense budget.

On top of all of that, Mr. Speaker, deployments of our troops in this decade are at an all-time high. In fact, in the past 6 and 7 years we have deployed our troops 25 times at home and abroad. That compares to the previous 40 years where our troops were only deployed a total of 10 times. None of those 25 deployments in this decade, Mr. Speaker, were budgeted for. None of them were planned for. So the cost of all those deployments has had to be eaten out of our defense budget, further cutting the available dollars that we have to modernize, to put into new technology.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense has given us a number of \$15 billion in contingency costs that we have taken out of DOD spending in the past 6 years to pay for those deployments around the world. Bosnia alone by the end of the next fiscal year will have cost us \$9.42 billion. All of that money has come out of the defense budget.

Because of all of those reasons, Mr. Speaker, we are facing a crisis, a crisis in being able to provide the kinds of equipment, readiness and support that our troops need to do the job on behalf of this country. Tonight I invite our colleagues to join with me as we dedicate the next hour to focusing on these difficult issues of how we spend our defense dollar.

To start off that discussion, I would like to yield at this time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on National Security, who is in fact a leader working in a bipartisan way with our colleagues on the other side and has been a tireless advocate for the defense needs of this country.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) indicated, as chairman of the Committee on National Security, that committee charged under the Constitution with providing our country with the proper defense, I feel duty bound to report to the Congress and to the American people the status of our national security.

Tonight, and in other sessions to follow, some of my colleagues and myself, members of the Committee on National Security, in a bipartisan manner, will endeavor to call attention to the various threats confronting our country and our ability to defend against these threats.

Mr. Speaker, I have served in Congress for 28 years. I have seen Presidents, Secretaries of Defense, Chairmen of Joint Chiefs of Staff, Senators, and Congressmen come and go. I have seen hot wars, cold wars, contingency operations, budget wars, a hollow military, buildups and builddowns, I have seen all of it. But despite all of this and despite the end of the Cold War, I have never been more concerned about the national security of our country than I am tonight.

I realize that is a strange statement to make, since we are no longer at war.

But during the Cold War, the threat was obvious to people. You could see the threat. But since the end of the Cold War, people are unaware of the many serious threats and how unprepared we are to deal with them properly. Many people ask in this day and time, where is the threat? They say the threat is not imminent.

My answer would be to look at today's papers. Look around you. Take your pick. Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, China, North Korea, Russia in turmoil, Islamic fundamentalism, terrorism. Take your pick. It is like the former Director of the CIA said, with the end of the Cold War, it is like we have slain a dragon and found the jungles filled with very poisonous snakes of various kinds.

Let me list a few of them for you. ICBMs, intercontinental ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads. Any country which possesses these weapons is a threat to our security. Even though we have an ABM treaty with the Soviet Union, that country does not exist any longer. That is no defense against ICBMs from Russia. What if we had just an accidental launch of an intercontinental ballistic missile? Even if one were launched against this country, contrary to what most people think, we could not defend against that one missile coming into this country killing literally millions upon millions of people, and we are defenseless. You are defenseless against that one accidentally launched missile.

□ 1915

How about China? China has ICBMs targeted on us. We do not have any ABM treaty with China.

You have not got to be a superpower in this day and time to wage the horrors of mass destruction warfare on the rest of the world. You can be a rogue Nation or a terrorist group for that matter; you can put together weapons of mass destruction in laboratories in low-tech, inexpensive ways; you can marry them up with cruise missiles which can be bought across borders; you can launch these cruise missiles from various platforms of various kinds at least, extending the range of these types of missiles to bring everyone within the range of these weapons of mass destruction carried by cruise missiles.

We also have shorter-range ballistic missiles, and we do not have an effective theater missile defense to defend against these types of missiles.

One of the most hideous kinds of weapons of mass destruction I can conceive of is something called anthrax, a bag of which can be released in the winds over, say, Washington, D.C., killing hundreds of thousands of people before we can inoculate, and we have no defense against that terrible thing. Can you visualize trying to defend against that type of a weapon?

And we have something called, our scientists are concerned about, something called the EMP effect, electromagnetic pulse effect. If a terrorist

group or someone were to destroy, were to detonate a nuclear weapon up above the United States, without killing anyone, it could shut down all the electrical systems that are not hardened in the United States. Can you imagine what that would do to all of our systems, electronics and defense systems, automobiles even, and all the rest if everything was shut down and we were defenseless from that explosion, without killing anyone?

All these threats exist today and many more, too. These threats are right here today, tonight. And we do not have the defense, a proper defense against these things as we stand here talking about it.

Why?

Because we have made the same mistakes we have made after every war. We cut back too much, too fast, too deep, and we have done to our military what no foreign power has been able to do before.

Many American lives were lost in World War II because we had allowed our forces to be cut back so much after World War I. And then after World War II, we destroyed and cut back the biggest and best military the world has ever known. In a few short years, no intelligence agency ever predicted something called Korea, and again we were unprotected. I call these things that are happening the "end between" war syndrome, and we are going through that right now.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to list a few facts to bear out what I am talking about. As Mr. WELDON said, the administration's request for the fiscal year 1999 defense budget represents the 14th consecutive year of real decline in defense spending. Also, defense spending under the balanced budget agreement falls more than \$54 billion short over the next 5 years of keeping pace even with record low inflation.

Again, today's military forces are 32 percent smaller than 10 years ago. In the past decade alone, we have closed over 900 bases around the world and about 97 bases here in this country at home. Our aircraft are being cannibalized. The Army, which conducted 10 operational events outside of normal training and alliance commitments during the 31-year period of 1960 to 1991, has conducted 26 operational events in 7 years since 1991. The Marine Corps, which undertook 15 continuous operations between 1982 and 1989, has conducted 62 since the fall of the Berlin Wall. Training and readiness accounts are being readied to pay for these contingency operations, the smaller forces being asked to do more with less.

And one very telling item, I think: Still, after all the cutbacks we have experienced and the identified readiness shortfalls that we have, our national military strategy provides that we are supposed to be able to fight two nearly simultaneous major regional contingencies at the same time, or near the same time, something like an Iran or Iraq and a North Korea. Many people

believe we do not have the force now, since we have cut back so much just since Desert Storm, to even do one of those major regional contingencies.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, in today's edition of the European Stars and Stripes, there was an article entitled "Cohen Takes Aim At Readiness, Leaders Fear Return to the Hollow Force," and in it General Wesley Clark, who heads the United States European Command and is in charge of our troops in Bosnia, was quoted as saying back-to-back peacekeeping or humanitarian operations like the kind we have experienced since 1994 hinder the ability of combat units to maintain their readiness for high-intensity operations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the text of the entire article I was pointing out:

[From the European Stars & Stripes, May 5, 1998]

COHEN TAKES AIM AT READINESS—LEADERS FEAR RETURN TO HOLLOW FORCE DAYS

(By Jon R. Anderson)

WASHINGTON.—Defense Secretary William Cohen is gathering his top brass over concerns about dwindling readiness.

On April 23, Cohen started what will become a series of meetings on readiness issues with Joint Chiefs Chairman Gen. Henry H. Shelton, along with the four service chiefs and a handful of other senior leaders.

One senior Pentagon official said the "tank sessions," as such high-level gatherings are called, are designed to address Cohen's concerns that readiness reporting is not as accurate or predictive as it needs to be.

"There's a lot of anecdotal evidence out there that readiness is slipping. What the secretary is trying to do is get to the bottom of it all and see if we really have a problem," the official said.

The look at readiness began as Congress considered a supplemental budget bill designed to cover \$2 billion in unexpected costs for operations in the Middle East and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Congress passed the bill and President Clinton signed it amid warnings from Pentagon officials that training and all nonessential operations would grind to a virtual standstill without the funding.

But it's no secret things are already tight throughout all corners of the military.

Defense spending is at its lowest level in recent memory, and while forces have been cut considerably, much of the remaining funds have been fenced for weapons modernization efforts. That means little is left over for things like training and maintenance.

Everyone from top regional commanders to pilots, platoon leaders and ship drivers out at sea are raising the specter of a return to the hollow force days of the 1970s. Indeed, stories in the press and reports within the military itself suggest cracks are already beginning to show.

A March 20 report from the General Accounting Office, the investigative arm of Congress, said that half of the Army's 10 divisions were suffering from significant manpower shortages.

In 1st Armored Division's 1st Brigade, for example, only 16 out of 116 tanks had full crews and were qualified for combat, the GAO reported. In 1st Infantry Division, two brigades were short almost half of the infantrymen needed to man Bradley fighting vehicles.

During the latest flair in tensions with Iraq, ships deploying to the Persian Gulf

were struggling with manpower shortages of their own. The nuclear-powered aircraft carrier George Washington, for example, which is supposed to be manned by as many 6,000 sailors, was staffed with only 4,500. That's 1,000 fewer than it had on its last cruise to the region just two years ago.

All four services are having trouble keeping their aviators from leaving. Despite bonus increases and other incentives, pilots still are leaving in droves.

"The lessons learned about a hollow military after World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict and Vietnam must not be ignored now," the head of the U.S. European Command, Gen. Wesley K. Clark, told the Senate on March 3.

Funding shortfalls, for example, have caused "significant shortages" in spare parts for the F-15E squadrons in Europe, he said. So much, in fact, that the "get-well date is not until May of 1999."

Clark also warned Congress that "back-to-back peacekeeping or humanitarian operations of the kind we have experienced since 1994 hinder the ability of combat units to maintain their readiness for high-intensity combat operations."

The Pentagon is trying to gauge the severity of the problem.

"We're trying to find out what our threshold of pain is. And make sure we're not anesthetized to it," said another top official privy to the content of Cohen's meetings.

At the same time, he said, there is a sense that perhaps some of the military's top leadership may be reluctant to be forthcoming with bad news on readiness.

"No one wants to look like the kid who cried wolf. It's a matter of what point do you say 'I'm concerned' without appearing like you're maneuvering for additional resources."

Another problem, he added, was that "military people are can-do people—they'll make do with what they've got and do whatever it takes to get the job done."

That attitude, he said, is both a virtue and an Achilles' heel. "It really is a strength, but on the other hand, if you don't fix what might just be a small problem early enough, it will just become a real big problem later on."

In that vein, Cohen and Shelton want to see if better management tools can be put in place to provide top commanders with a way to gauge readiness issues before they become a problem.

Currently, the Defense Department uses two systems to monitor readiness.

The Joint Monthly Readiness Review, or "Jammer" in military-speak, is designed to assess how actual forces on the ground in the various regional commands would be distributed if two wars were to break out in different parts of the world. The scenarios alternate each month between a clash with Iraq starting first, followed shortly by combat in Korea, or the reverse, with Korea flaring up first.

The second readiness gauge is the Status of Readiness and Training System, also called SORTS, which tracks how individual units are manned, how much maintenance needs to be done on vehicles and gear, and how training is going.

While both systems provide a good "here and now" perspective, they lack the ability to identify trends.

"There is some frustration that Jammer and SORTS don't give us everything we need," said Navy Capt. Steve Petrepaoi, spokesman for Shelton. "What we want is a way to identify problems before they happen."

For example, he said, Jammer "captured the problems with pilot and infantry shortages, but we got it as it was happening, not ahead of the curve."

Officials say the biggest problem has been managing the readiness levels in units that are not on the first-to-fight roster.

War plans call for some units to be ready to fight at a moment's notice. Those are mostly forward-deployed forces and units in the United States on call for rapid deployment. It's those units that have priority for manning along with training and maintenance funds.

Mr. Speaker, we have already instituted many reforms designed to save funds to allow us to do the things we need to do to have the world's best military and properly defend this country. On broad defense reforms, the national security and this House's track record speaks for itself. The committee has pursued forms of various kinds on multiple fronts. We have instituted acquisition reforms, including acquisition work force reductions. We have instituted support services reforms. We have privatized nonessential military jobs, and last year the House passed a Defense Reform Act with 400 votes.

In spite of all these things and against a backdrop of 14 consecutive years of real decline on the defense spending, and confronted with billions of dollars in readiness, quality of life, and modernization shortfalls, we need to do more things. Therefore, in the context of the first Federal budget with a surplus in 3 decades, and also in view of today's strong economy, I am calling on the powers that be, the leadership on both sides of the aisle, the President, to renegotiate the defense caps put on defense on the balanced budget agreement.

We have to provide for the common defense. That is our government's first and most important responsibility. We stand ready to work with anyone to ensure that America maintains the military befitting our Nation's superpower status.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with a passage from scripture; this means a lot to me. We have heard before the quote from Isaiah that calls upon people to beat your swords into plow shares and your spears into pruning hooks. But in Joel 3:9 we hear these words: Wake up the mighty men, beat your plow shares into swords and your pruning hooks into spears.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Thank you very much for that eloquent statement and for your tireless leadership on behalf of the men and women who serve this country. We deeply appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, continuing on with this special order, national security has been a bipartisan issue in this body, and we have had many outstanding Members from the other side who have been key leaders in our efforts to provide additional resources for the security of our country and for the support of our men and women.

In fact, over the past 3 years in a bipartisan effort, we have plused-up funding over the President's request for defense by \$10 billion, \$6 billion, and \$9 billion respectively, and one of those champions from the other side who has

been at the forefront consistently on these issues and continues that role today as the ranking member of the House Committee on National Security is our good friend, our colleague, and a great American, IKE SKELTON. Congressman, I yield to you.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend and my colleague from Pennsylvania taking out this special order, for in my opinion it is one of the most important special orders in which we will participate. So I compliment the gentleman for his foresight in doing this.

Mr. Speaker, in your eye, come with me this past January and helicopter with me with three other Members of Congress from the base camp near Skopje, Macedonia, out to one of the far outposts of Americans keeping watch to see that the potential enemies or potential encroachers will not come into that sad and unhappy country. And come with me as we shake hands with those soldiers after they do their formal inspection of arms for me as the chairman of the small delegation, and stand there while I talk to this young Springfield, Missouri, soldier on what he is doing; see the pride in his eyes; talk to him about how well he likes what he is doing, how he enjoys the Army and the challenges. And yet he is thinking of the folks back home and his family. He is there for 6 months, it is going to be a long 6 months for him, but yet he is doing what he intended to do when he joined the Army.

Now a few months earlier, come with me, Mr. Speaker, and see a United States aircraft carrier as it prepares to leave for 6 months in the Mediterranean, in the Adriatic, then the Persian Gulf. See those families, those young sailors, men and women, climbing aboard that aircraft carrier giving that 3-year-old son a hug. See them wave as the ship is towed out into the harbor by those tugs, and know that those young families that are waving goodbye to the loved ones will not see them for 6 months, and yet you can see pride not only in the sailors that are leaving but in the men and women and the children who are waving farewell.

That is who I wish to speak about tonight, the young men, the young women in all colors of American uniforms, the fine people that they are. And I can say without any hesitation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) that they are the finest that we have ever had, and yet the ironic and sad situation in which we find ourselves is that we are not able to support them as they should be.

That is sad. That is real sad because they are quality young people, and they are doing their job for America.

We have serious problems overseas. The question is asked, where is the enemy? The enemy, my colleagues, is instability. We are the only superpower in this world. We are the ones whose presence, whose leadership, has brought peace and stability, some

places more than others, but we are looked to for that military leadership. And we cannot do it in the future unless we keep that young soldier from Springfield or those young sailors aboard that aircraft carrier happy, challenged, and that we take care of their families.

Oh, we talk about a number of pieces of hardware, and they are important. We talk about modernization; that is very important.

□ 1930

I speak about those young people today that need the support of the people in this Congress.

Recently I sent a letter, with all of the ranking Democrats and Republicans, regarding this very issue: the need for increased spending for our national security. It is no light thing; it is no small thing. If we could only have a predictable percentage of the gross national product, this committee on which I serve, this Congress in which I serve, and the administration which executes what we order here could have some stability, some planning capability. The young people who are in would know that they have a future, that they might want to stay for 20, 25 or 30 years without the fear of reduction in force. These are the things of which I speak.

Mr. Speaker, why is there a problem today? I am convinced there is a problem today because there is a gap, sadly, Mr. Speaker, a growing gap, between civilian America and military America. When the draft was in force, nearly every family had some experience with someone wearing a uniform.

Well, the draft ended, as my colleagues know, back in 1973, as it should have, because we went to an all-volunteer force, and it works. It works extremely well. Quality young people, quality leaders, excellent military education, really proud of them.

Yet, because of the fewer and fewer young people coming from fewer and fewer families across our country, those who normally in the olden days would write their Member of Congress to please look after little Johnny because he is on a submarine in the Pacific; please look after Lucy, my daughter, as she serves at Lackland Air Force Base; please look after my Marine son who is a guard in an embassy in what used to be the old Soviet sphere; we do not get that support, we do not get those letters, because there are fewer and fewer American families that have that experience. I know their heart is with the young people in uniform, but out of sight, out of mind.

There are fewer people to write us, and we in this Chamber are creatures of those we represent in whose shoes we stand, and if they are not contacting us because there are not that many that have families that are serving in uniform, consequently, it is off our screen as well as theirs. It is this gap between civilian America and military America that concerns me.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have to do something. I will do my best. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is doing his best. And I compliment our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) for his efforts. Others will speak on this issue. I know the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) will join in this matter. I thank the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the American people.

One last thing, Mr. Speaker. I do not want, and I will repeat, I do not want this discussion tonight, as serious as it is and the fact that it should convince people across our country of the need for additional resources to take care of the young people and to take care of our national security, but I do not want this to dampen the spirits of the young people who are in uniform. I say to them, Mr. Speaker, we need them; we need them now more than ever. We need them not just in numbers, but we need their quality.

So wherever we are, whether we are a Member of Congress, whether they are neighbors of ours back in Missouri, or wherever we are from, let us say a good word to the young person that is wearing the uniform; let us tell them we are proud of them, stay the course, because sooner or later they will be called upon to defend the American flag and the American interests.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those eloquent words and for his leadership on national security issues in this Congress. The gentleman is an example of an outstanding member dedicated, as is our chairman, to the issue of providing for the support of our troops at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, our special order tonight goes from Pennsylvania to South Carolina to Missouri to Texas. I would now yield to our distinguished member of the Committee on National Security from the great State of Texas, who has been a champion and a leader on issues involving one of the most troublesome situations in the world, and that is the security of nuclear material, nuclear fissile material, especially those materials that are in the former Soviet states.

So, with that, I would yield to our good friend and colleague, an outstanding member of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for yielding and for his leadership in keeping our defense at the forefront of the issues we should be talking about in this body.

I thought that the chairman's comments outlining some of the threats we face, and the ranking member's comments emphasizing the importance of people in our military, which are our key asset, were very powerful. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the first function of this Federal Government is to

provide for the defense of the people, and that that job is getting harder and not easier.

We face some enormous challenges, and one of the challenges is we have to transform our military structures and the organizations and cultures and doctrines to meet the challenges that we face in the future, many of which our chairman has outlined. That is a tough job. We also have to make sure that we have the resources necessary in order to keep the American people safe.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go from the broad issues that have been discussed so far to just talk about a little piece of it and how this budgetary constraint is affecting even a small piece, but an important piece of our defense efforts, and that is our nuclear weapons program which is not within the Department of Defense, but within the Department of Energy, yet it is part of the overall defense budget.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think anyone will contest that our nuclear deterrence was absolutely essential and probably the key to winning the Cold War during our struggle with the Soviet Union, and it is still important in deterring others around the world who may wish us ill. As nuclear capability spreads to more and more countries, as our chairman mentioned; as chemical and biological capabilities spread around the world to more and more countries, and other terrorist-like organizations; as the capability to take those horrible weapons and deliver them very quickly with missiles, as that technology spreads, nuclear weapons continue to be the umbrella under which the rest of our defense efforts will fall.

We build our nuclear weapons to last about 20 years. They are fast approaching the end of their design life. They age and change just like other machines do, but they age and change in ways that we do not fully understand. Yet, while all of this aging and changing is going on, we have decided that we are not going to test nuclear weapons anymore. We are going to have to find other ways to make sure they work, to make sure they are safe, to make sure the people who work around them are safe; and that represents an enormous challenge.

Some people have said it is kind of like we have a fleet of cars out there on the parking lot through all the weather and the change that goes on in the conditions year after year, and we can x-ray them and inspect them, but we cannot ever turn them on, we cannot ever turn the key. They have to be in as good shape though that if we do ever need to turn on the key, we can instantly spring out at 100 miles an hour. That is just one way of looking at the enormous challenge we face.

The way we decided to do that is, as I mentioned, not to test, but through a program called stockpile stewardship. That involves our computer capability. It involves testing components, little pieces of the nuclear weapons; it in-

volves new diagnostic machines to x-ray and look at them in various ways to see what is happening on the inside; and all of that has to go on while we are losing the people who built the weapons to begin with as they age and dwindle and leave, many of them leave, the nuclear weapons complex.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line to all of this is that we face an enormous technological challenge. A number of scientists whom I visited with recently say the only thing this country has ever attempted this difficult is the original Manhattan Project and trying to land a man on the moon. It is that tough technologically and scientifically to make sure these things are safe and reliable without testing.

But it is also expensive. These machines are expensive. It is expensive to conduct these tests. It is expensive to keep the right, knowledgeable scientific talent available there, working on these problems. And while we are doing all that, we have the regular maintenance and upkeep and other things that go along with the nuclear weapons stockpile that have to go along as well.

Now, to do all that, we have received testimony that it takes at least \$5 billion a year, and yet the President's request this year was \$4.5 billion, and it is tough to come up with that amount. And this job is only going to get tougher as the years go by and these weapons age and we lose more of the people, it is going to be even more expensive. Yet, if we miscalculate slightly, if we shave off a little bit here and a little bit there, and a problem develops, that problem will have enormous consequences for the future of our security, for others' reliance upon our nuclear umbrella. For the safety of the people who work with and around these nuclear weapons, it has tremendous consequences.

That is just a small example of some of the importance, some of the effects that not putting the right resources into these programs can have for our children's future and our children's security. All of the strategic systems upon which our victory in the Cold War was based are aging and becoming more difficult to maintain, and really we are not doing anything in the foreseeable future to replace them at all. We are going to have to put in the spare parts just to keep them going.

It is an enormous challenge. It will require the best minds that we have, but it will also require the dollars necessary to keep this effort going. I think that in a way, the nuclear weapons challenge, even though it is less than 2 percent of the whole defense budget, is an example of the kinds of challenges we face throughout the defense budget and an example of the dangers that my more senior colleagues have talked about so far.

So I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), for yielding and giving me the opportunity to contribute.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague, an outstanding member of the Committee on National Security, for his leadership, especially in the area of nuclear material, control and security, and our stockpile stewardship.

One of the items that our distinguished colleague did not mention, which is also of great concern both to him and to us, is the security of the Russian nuclear stockpile. It was last year, Mr. Speaker, in May, when I led a delegation to Moscow and we sat in the office of General Alexander Lebed, who was at one time a key defense advisor to Boris Yeltsin. General Lebed was talking to us about his concerns relative to the security of the Russian nuclear forces, as well as the Russian military in general; and he told us some real horror stories. One of the ones that was really picked up by our national media was that when General Lebed reported to Boris Yeltsin, one of his responsibilities was to account for 132 suitcase-sized nuclear bombs, nuclear devices called Small Atomic Demolition Devices, SADDMs, that both the U.S. and Russia had built at one time, but we destroyed all of ours in the arms control process, he was charged by Yeltsin to account for the 132 devices that Russia built.

And he said, Members of Congress, I could only find 48. And we said, what do you mean, General Lebed? How could you only come up with 48 of the 132? After all, these are devices that have a capacity of one kiloton, which is one-tenth of the capacity of Hiroshima; it could wipe out the entire inner-city area. He said, that is it. We do not know the status of the others.

I came back to Washington and with my colleagues we debriefed the intelligence community. They said, Mr. Congressman, we have no idea about the whereabouts of these devices. Initially, the Russian Government denied they ever existed in the fall of last year, and finally in December, the defense minister, former general of the Soviet command staff, the strategic staff, General Sergeyev, told me in a meeting in Moscow, yes, Mr. Congressman, we built these devices, yes, we have not destroyed them all, but by the year 2000 we will have destroyed them.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, we are just not sure whether or not one of these devices could or has gotten into the wrong hands, and we must understand that even though we would perceive Russia to be all that more stable, one could easily make the case that Russia is more destabilized today than at any point in time in the last 50 years.

□ 1945

And unfortunately, that instability comes while they still maintain a nuclear arsenal that can hit our country and still maintain these kinds of small demolition devices that in the wrong hands could wreak havoc on any American city. That is the kind of concern that we have to address with a very

limited and increasingly smaller defense budget.

Mr. Speaker, joining us in this effort is the gentleman from the great State of Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and someone who has become a champion on security issues and a strong advocate and very knowledgeable Member on missile defense and the implications of that.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding to me. I am delighted to have the opportunity to be here with my colleagues on the Committee on National Security, most particularly with the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

As the gentleman has indicated, our efforts here on the committee and the subcommittees which makes it up are of a bipartisan nature. It has been my honor and privilege over the years to serve under Mr. Aspin and Mr. Dellums and now the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE). During that time, I think that we have grown in our respect for one another and certainly I want to acknowledge the commitment that has been made by all of the Members, regardless of their party and background, to the security interests of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there is a popular fashion in political circles these days with respect to the idea of limited service in the Congress. That, I suppose, has its place in the discussions that ensue throughout the Nation as to how we can best serve our country and our national interests. But I can assure my colleagues that with respect to our national security interests and the defense interests of this country, what is required is a commitment and a dedication of years, I might even say decades standing, in order to be able to provide the broadest possible umbrella of knowledge and perspective as we come to these very crucial decisions by our Nation as we enter the next century.

Mr. Speaker, I dare say, not speaking for Chairman SPENCE by any stretch of the imagination, that in his 28 years of service here to the Nation and service to our committee, that even today he feels there is much to be learned, much that we have to share with one another in order to come to a proper perspective. And why? The reason is that we do in fact have 435 votes in this House, 218 votes to make a majority. Those who say that votes do not count, those who say that this is just business as usual, those who denigrate the Congress of the United States, let alone the House, and more particularly those who do not understand that when it comes to the security interests of this Nation, that we have to have knowledgeable, dedicated people who are on a nonpartisan basis going to pursue what those interests are and how to achieve them. If we do not have that understanding, then we are doing a disservice to this Nation.

Now, for the record, I would like to indicate that the Committee on National Security approximates, I would say, approximately 10 percent of the House of Representatives and I think represents a very broad perspective, probably reflecting the ideological and philosophical commitments of the House of Representatives as a whole.

In that context what we have is individuals assigned to committees who then make it their business to immerse themselves into the business of that committee. I am going to focus this evening just particularly on the subcommittee on which I am privileged to serve under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON). That is the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development.

Now, on the surface it sounds pretty simple. We do the research and then we develop from that research. But let me just read a summary of today's action that was taken in committee, a summary of the bill language: Navy mine countermeasures program management; future aircraft carrier transition technologies; the manufacturing technology program; national missile defense policy; limitation on the funding of medium extended air defense systems, the MEAD system that the gentleman referred to; funding for the cooperative ballistic missile defense programs; the counterproliferation support; and the ballistic missile program elements.

Mr. Speaker, I can say these things and they roll off of my tongue and my colleagues are familiar with what they mean. But the implications of this are stunning in terms of the dollar value and, of course, in terms of the strategic value associated with the national interests of this Nation and in fact the security interests of the world.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, who I would venture to say, I think without contradiction, is the leading exponent and expert, certainly congressional expert, with respect to missile defense, someone who I might say is always prepared, would agree that unless and until we are prepared just in one context that I will mention alone, unless we are prepared to deal with missile testing as well as training associated with the weapons systems that we are acquiring, the weapons systems we are researching, the weapons systems we are developing, unless we are prepared to deal with the missile testing element in that, we will not be prepared to move forward in meeting our strategic national interests. We will be unprepared.

Now, it sounds strange. How can we possibly not be prepared with billions of dollars at stake, with years and years of research, with all kinds of development capabilities, major corporations, in fact international corporations the size of which will almost beggar the imagination of the ordinary citizen contemplating them, how could we not possibly be prepared? The reason is that the technology involved

just in the recitation of some of the program elements that I have just outlined, the technology involved is so expensive, the technology involved is so complicated and detailed, the sophistication, Mr. Speaker, is almost beyond comprehension.

I just recently visited the Comanche helicopter development facility in Florida, and asked just to have a briefing, Mr. Speaker, on the capacity of the helicopter not to have information intercepted, on being able to have the communications system, a highly sophisticated system, not be compromised in any way. This is very, very important, Mr. Speaker, because if we do not have this, if there is not a clear understanding of what the technology is and how we can protect the communications interests associated with the Comanche helicopter, it becomes available to those who could do us harm or wish us ill in the future.

Mr. Speaker, we have to deal with questions of technology transfer. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Chairman SPENCE) know, I am, shall we say, an adamant opponent of the transfer of technology for profit's sake, presumed profit's sake, maybe individual dollar profits for some corporations and individuals, but certainly not for the profit of the interests of the United States. I oppose that.

Mr. Speaker, the dollars that have been spent and the time and the energy and the intellectual input that has gone into just the communication system of the Comanche helicopter system is such that a full appreciation for the work of the committee I think would follow from any honest person's evaluation of what we are trying to accomplish.

So as we contemplate research and development, I think that we have to take into account, Mr. Speaker, how are we going to do the funding? How are we going to achieve this?

What is happening right now, and if the gentleman from Pennsylvania would care to engage in a bit of dialogue with me on it at this point, I think can elucidate this a little and illustrate it. Mr. Speaker, I realize the time is short so I will try to make this a summation.

In my service on the committee, in trying to deal with issues, for example, like missile testing, the assumption I think of most Americans is that there is an adequate missile defense right now to meet any challenge that might come to the United States. But the fact are that those systems do not yet exist?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. And in order to accomplish this we will have to have a testing and training range. Now, in this instance I happen to be familiar with it because it involves the Pacific Missile Testing Range in Hawaii in the Pacific. The necessity is, is it not, to upgrade

these facilities to prepare us for the missile testing that will take place within the context of a Navy and Army and an Air Force which will have next-generation capabilities, not yet in existence but in process of coming on line now?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Absolutely.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. And in this context, in order to provide for this we have to understand, there will be a significant change in the very context within which we will have an Armed Forces. For example, there will be ships in the near future, this is not something that is put off into Star Trek time or some imaginary world of science fiction, but right now we are developing ships, are we not, that will drastically reduce the personnel that will be on those ships, but drastically increase the amount of sophisticated technology necessary to bring these ships on line and into service.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Absolutely.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, in that context, then, I think the gentleman would agree that we have to find a funding mechanism that will not, as the gentleman indicated, cannibalize one program at the expense of another. I am sure he would agree with that. I also think he would agree that what we face right now, perhaps even more importantly, reflecting back on the comments of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), if we fail to find ways to fund adequately our procurement, our research, our development, our weapons systems and our acquisition of those systems, if we fail that we will hurt readiness. We will hurt the capacity of the individuals and the groups who make up our Armed Services to be able to prepare themselves for the contingencies that they might face, and that in fact is where we find ourselves today.

So I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman WELDON) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) for the opportunity to participate with them and indicate as a member of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities and the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, that I recognize fully the necessity of finding the proper funding mechanism and the proper funding balance in order to provide a defense that we can say with full confidence to the American people we will be able to provide for the security interests of this Nation.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) for those very pertinent remarks and I would just highlight before I introduce the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) that the gentleman from Hawaii cites the need for robust missile defense programs and testing. The largest loss of military life in this decade was when 28 young Americans were

killed in Desert Storm by a low-complexity Scud missile that we could not defend against.

And in January 1995, for those who say we do not need national missile defense, Russia was forewarned of a weather rocket launch by Norway. When that day came for that rocket launch by Norway, the Russian intelligence is so decimated that they misread that as a deliberate launch by American nuclear powered submarine. They put their full offensive system on alert and activated the black boxes controlled by the three top Russian leaders. That gave them 15 minutes to either deactivate or allow to continue an all-out nuclear response against the U.S.

With 7 minutes left, Mr. Speaker, President Yeltsin overruled General Kalashnikov and that response was called off.

That is not a Steven Spielberg movie script. That is what happened in January 1995 that almost brought us to the brink of nuclear war because Russian misread a Norwegian weather rocket that they had been forewarned of.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), my good friend and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement, a tireless advocate for this Nation's military.

□ 2000

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding the time. Let me ask the Speaker how much time we have left in the special order, because I know the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel wants to talk as well?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). There are 8 minutes left.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, let me know, I am sure my friends will time me and let me know when we have divided that time equally, and I will then yield back so Mr. BUYER can speak.

Let me just start by thanking my friend for bringing this special order together and the chairman for giving us an historic backdrop with all of the wars that he has seen and the police actions and Presidents coming and going, Secretaries of Defense coming and going, and seeing the backdrop in which we find ourselves right now with this trough of military spending. When I say trough, I mean we are spending \$100 billion less in real money than we were spending in the 1980s for national security.

I want to expand a little bit on the statement that was made by my friend, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE). We had a focus group in my area in San Diego recently. That is where we sit behind the screen, and we get to see what our constituents really think of us. I think that is quite a lesson also.

But we also get to see what they think about very serious issues. And we are asked that question. The question was asked of our constituents, who are

very sophisticated people, do we have a missile defense? Most of them thought we did.

When the moderator said, what is the defense, one of them said, well, I think we scramble the jets. Of course, a jet cannot take down an intercontinental ballistic missile. Another one said, I think we hit them with cruise missiles. Of course, that does not work, because a cruise missile goes exceedingly slow. It is like throwing a rock at a 30.6 bullet.

One other said, I thought Ronald Reagan took care of that. They really did. They thought that his announcements in the 1980s took care of the problem. So the facts are, when the Secretary of Defense was before us, I asked him that lead-off question, can we stop today a single, as Chairman SPENCE said, a single ballistic missile coming into an American city? The answer is no, not one.

Let me just say for the sake of our listeners what the State of defense is today with respect to force structure. Since 1991, we have cut defenses in this way: We have gone from 18 Army divisions to only 10. We have gone from 24 fighter airwings to only 13. So we have cut our air power almost in half.

We have cut our Navy from 546 to 333 ships. So we have cut our Navy by almost 40 percent. We went from 18 divisions to 10. So today we have 10 Army divisions. That is exactly the number of Army divisions we had in 1950 when we felt, like a lot of experts have said today in the administration, that there is no chance of America being involved in a war in the near future because we are the high-tech Nation. We have all these things that nobody will mess with and realizes that we have the ability to do a lot of high-tech things to our adversaries that they cannot respond against.

That was the same theory that prevailed in 1950, in June of 1950 when North Korea swept across the line. We had the atom bomb, so we thought nobody would mess with us. North Korea attacked, almost drove us into the ocean. We threw the 25th Infantry Division into the Osan pass. It was annihilated. General Dean, the commander of the 25th Infantry Division, was captured. And the United States was almost driven into the sea. We barely held what is known as the Pusan perimeter at the south end of that peninsula.

Later, the Communist Chinese come across the line, so they did not respect the atom bomb either. Even though we had the high-tech, we had a heck of a fight on our hands, and we lost 50,000 Americans because we were not prepared.

So I would just conclude by saying I thank you for this special order tonight. We are approximately 72 percent less in modernization funding then we were a few years ago. It is our job to get on with the job of rebuilding America's defenses. I thank my friend for the time.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank our gentleman and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Procurement. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) and then I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise here as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, and I also witnessed a lot of strain on military readiness.

Last year, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) released a report on military readiness, which I believe sounded an alarm on the strain of the Armed Forces today. Following his lead, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a field hearing at Ft. Riley, Kansas in March to look at the readiness of our late deploying Army divisions.

In addition, we asked the GAO to look into these divisions, and here is what we found. The 10th division, only 138 of 162 infantry squads were fully or minimally manned. At the 2nd and 3rd brigades, the 25th division, 52 out of 162 infantry squads were minimally filled.

At the 1st brigade of the 1st division, only 56 percent of the authorized infantry soldiers for its Bradley fighting vehicles were assigned. At the 4th infantry division, 13 of 54 squads in the engineer brigade had no personnel assigned or had fewer personnel assigned than required.

At the hearing, we heard concerns from a variety of army officers and staff NCOs. The company of the 3rd brigade of the 4th infantry division said, "We are in danger of becoming an Army of privates," as senior NCOs were taken from the line units to fill critical billets in recruiting and drill instructor duty. And peacekeeping missions, we are left with NCOs who do not have senior status leading these squads.

Also, the sergeant major of the 1st brigade, 1st infantry division, stated that "Our shortfall in assigned non-commissioned officers does negatively impact readiness."

We found approximately 330 NCOs are missing out of the brigades of the follow-on divisions. That is very, very serious if we are called upon to use them in a wartime scenario.

Mr. Speaker, I have a GAO report from which I took information, and I would ask unanimous consent to place that into the RECORD.

The report referred to is as follows:

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEES ON READINESS AND MILITARY PERSONNEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MILITARY READINESS—OBSERVATIONS ON PERSONNEL READINESS IN LATER DEPLOYING ARMY DIVISIONS

(Statement of Mark E. Gebicke, Director, Military Operations and Capabilities Issues, National Security and International Affairs Division)

Mr. Chairmen and Members of the Subcommittees:

I am pleased to be here to discuss our preliminary finding from our ongoing evaluation of personnel readiness in the Army's five later-deploying divisions. These divisions constitute almost half of the Army's active combat forces and, according to Army officials, are critical to the success of specific war plans and the national military strategy.

This morning, I would first like to summarize our preliminary observations regarding personnel readiness in the later-deploying divisions. Then, I would like to describe in more detail the (1) extent of personnel shortages in the divisions and the extent to which these shortages are reflected in readiness reports, (2) key factors contributing to personnel shortages and the impact such shortages have on readiness, (3) Army's plans for correcting such shortages should these divisions be called upon to deploy, and (4) issues to be considered in dealing with personnel shortages. Unless otherwise indicated, the information provided reflects what we found at the time of our visits to the later-deploying divisions during the period August 1997 through January 1998.

SUMMARY

In the aggregate, the Army's five later-deploying divisions had an average of 93 percent of their personnel on board at the time of our visits. However, aggregate data does not fully reflect the extent of shortages of combat troops, technical specialists, experienced officers, and noncommissioned officers (NCO) that exist in those divisions.

The readiness reporting system that contains the aggregate data on these divisions does not fully disclose the impact of personnel shortages on the ability of the divisions' units to accomplish critical wartime tasks. As a result, there is a disconnect between the reported readiness of these forces in formal readiness reports and the actual readiness that we observed on our visits. These disconnects exist because the unit readiness reporting system does not consider some information that has a significant impact on a unit's readiness, such as operating tempo, personnel shortfalls in key positions, and crew and squad staffing.

The Army's priority in assigning personnel to these divisions, Army-wide shortages of personnel, frequent deployments to peacekeeping missions, and the assignment of soldiers to other tasks outside of their specialty are the primary reasons for personnel shortfalls.

The impact of personnel shortages on training and readiness is exacerbated by the extent to which personnel are being used for work outside their specialties or units. According to commanders in all the divisions, the collective impact of understaffing squads and crews, transferring to other jobs the NCOs from the crews and squads they are responsible for training, and assigning personnel to other units as fillers for exercises and operations have degraded their capability and readiness.

If the Army had to deploy these divisions for a high-intensity conflict, these divisions would fill their units with Individual Ready Reserve Soldiers,¹ retired servicemembers, and newly recruited soldiers. However, the Army's plan for providing these personnel includes assumptions that have not been validated, and there may not be enough trained personnel to fully staff or fill later-deploying divisions within their scheduled deployment times.

Solutions, if any, to these problems will depend upon how the Army plans to use these divisions in the future.

Before I continue, I want to provide you with additional background about the Army's divisions.

Footnotes at end of article.

BACKGROUND

Today's Army faces an enormous challenge to balance risks and resources in order to meet its many missions. Since 1990, active Army ranks have been reduced from 770,000 to 495,000 personnel, a reduction of about 36 percent. Simultaneously, world events have dictated that forces be trained and ready to respond to potential high-intensity missions in areas such as Korea and the Persian Gulf while conducting peace enhancement operations around the world.

The Army currently has 10 active combat divisions compared to the 18 it had at the start of Operation Desert Storm in 1991. Four of the 10 divisions are considered contingency divisions and would be the first to deploy in the event of a major theater war. These units are the 82nd Airborne, 101st Air Assault, 3rd Infantry, and 1st Cavalry divisions. The 2nd Infantry Division, while not a contingency force division, is already deployed in Korea.

The remaining five divisions, which are the focus of my testimony, are expected to deploy in the event of a second simultaneous or nearly simultaneous major theater contingency or as reinforcements for a larger-than-expected first contingency. These units are the 1st Armor, 1st Infantry, 4th Infantry, 10th Infantry, and 25th Infantry divisions. Also, these divisions have been assigned the bulk of the recent peacekeeping missions in Bosnia and Haiti, and the 4th Infantry division over the last 2 years has been conducting the Army's advanced war-fighting experiment.

Appendix I provides a list of the Army's current active divisions and the locations of each division's associated brigades.

PERSONNEL SHORTAGES ARE SIGNIFICANT IN LATER-DEPLOYING DIVISIONS

In the aggregate, the Army's later-deploying divisions were assigned 66,053, or 93 percent, of their 70,665 authorized personnel at the beginning of fiscal year 1998. However, aggregate numbers do not adequately reflect the condition that exists within individual battalions, companies, and platoons of these divisions. This is because excess personnel exist in some grades, ranks, and skills, while shortages exist in others. For example, while the 1st Armor Division was staffed at 94 percent in the aggregate, its combat support and service support specialties were filled at below 85 percent, and captains and majors were filled at 73 percent.

In addition, a portion of each later-deploying division exists only on paper because all authorized personnel have not been assigned. All these divisions contain some squads, crews, and platoons in which no personnel or a minimum number of personnel are assigned. Assigning a minimum number of personnel to a crew means having fewer personnel than needed to fully accomplish wartime missions; for example, having five soldiers per infantry squad rather than nine, tank crews with three soldiers instead of four, or artillery crews with six soldiers rather than nine. We found significant personnel shortages in all the later-deploying divisions. For example:

At the 10th Infantry Division, only 138 of 162 infantry squads were fully or minimally filled, and 36 of the filled squads were unqualified.

At the 2nd and 3rd brigades of the 25th Infantry Division, 52 of 162 infantry squads were minimally filled or had no personnel assigned.

At the 1st Brigade of the 1st Infantry Division, only 56 percent of the authorized infantry soldiers for its Bradley Fighting Vehicles were assigned, and in the 2nd Brigade, 21 of 48 infantry squads had no personnel assigned.

At the 3rd Brigade of the 1st Armor Division, only 16 of 116 M1A1 tanks had full crews

and were qualified, and in one of the Brigade's two armor battalions, 14 of 58 tanks had no crewmembers assigned because the personnel were deployed to Bosnia. In addition, at the Division's engineer brigade in Germany, 11 of 24 bridge teams had no personnel assigned.

At the 4th Infantry Division, 13 of 54 squads in the engineer brigade had no personnel assigned or had fewer personnel assigned than required.

The significance of personnel shortfalls in later-deploying divisions cannot be adequately captured solely in terms of overall numbers. The rank, grade, and experience of the personnel assigned must also be considered. For example, captains and majors are in short supply Army-wide due to drawdown initiatives undertaken in recent years. The five later-deploying divisions had only 91 percent and 78 percent of the captains and majors authorized, respectively, but 138 percent of the lieutenants authorized. The result is that unit commanders must fill leadership positions in many units with less-experienced officers than Army doctrine requires. For example, in the 1st Brigade of the 1st Infantry Division, 65 percent of the key staff positions designated to be filled by captains were actually filled by lieutenants or captains that were not graduates of the Advanced Course. We found that three of the five battalion maintenance officers, four of the six battalion supply officers, and three of the four battalion signal officers were lieutenants rather than captains. While this situation represents an excellent opportunity for the junior officers, it also represents a situation in which critical support functions are being guided by officers without the required training or experience.

There is also a significant shortage of NCOs in the later-deploying divisions. Again, within the 1st Brigade, 226, or 17 percent of the 1,450, total NCO authorizations, were not filled at the time of our visit. As was the case in all the divisions, a significant shortage was at the first-line supervisor, sergeant E-5, level. At the beginning of fiscal year 1998, the five later-deploying divisions were short nearly 1,900 of the total 25,357 NCOs authorized, and as of February 15, 1998, this shortage had grown to almost 2,200.

CURRENT READINESS REPORTS DO NOT FULLY DISCLOSE PERSONNEL SHORTFALLS

In recent years, in reports and testimony before the Congress, we discussed the Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS), which is used to measure readiness, and reported on the need for improvements. SORTS data for units in the later-deploying divisions have often reflected a high readiness level for personnel because the system uses aggregate statistics to assess personnel readiness. For example, a unit that is short 20 percent of all authorized personnel in the aggregate could still report the ability to undertake most of its wartime mission, even though up to 25 percent of the key leaders and personnel with critical skills may not be assigned. Using aggregate data to reflect personnel readiness masks the underlying personnel problems I have discussed today, such as shortages by skill level, rank or grade. Compounding these problems are high levels of personnel turnover, incomplete squads and crews, and frequent deployments, none of which are part of the readiness calculation criteria. Yet, when considered collectively, these factors create situations in which commanders may have difficulty developing unit cohesion, accomplishing training objectives, and maintaining readiness.

Judging by our analysis of selected commanders' comments submitted with their SORTS reports and other available data, the problems I have just noted are real. However,

some commanders apparently do not consider them serious enough to warrant a downgrade in the reported readiness rating. For example, at one engineer battalion, the commander told us his unit had lost the ability to provide sustained engineer support to the division. His assessment appeared reasonable, since company-and battalion level training for the past 4 months had been cancelled due to the deployment of battalion leaders and personnel to operations in Bosnia. As a result of this deployment, elements of the battalion left behind had only 33 to 55 percent of its positions filled. The commander of this battalion, however, reported an overall readiness assessment of C-2, which was based in part on a personnel level that was over 80 percent in the aggregate. The commander also reported that he would be able to achieve a C-1 status in only 20 training days. This does not seem realistic, given the shortages we noted. We found similar disconnects between readiness conditions as reported in SORTS and actual unit conditions at other armor, infantry, and support units.

MANY FACTORS HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO PERSONNEL SHORTFALLS IN LATER DEPLOYING DIVISIONS

Many factors have contributed to shortfalls of personnel in the Army's later-deploying divisions, including (1) the Army's priority for assigning personnel to units, commands and agencies; (2) Army-wide shortages of some types of personnel; (3) peacekeeping operations; and (4) the assignment of soldiers to joint and other Army command, recruiting, and base management functions.

Later-deploying Divisions Receive Low Priority for Staffing

The Army uses a tiered system to allocate personnel and other resources to its units. The Army gives top priority to staffing DOD agencies; major commands such as the Central Command, the European Command, and the Pacific Command; the National Training Center; and the Army Rangers and Special Forces Groups. These entities receive 98 to 100 percent of the personnel authorized for each grade and each military occupational specialty. The 2nd Infantry Division, which is deployed in Korea, and the four contingency divisions are second in priority. Although each receives 98 to 100 percent of its aggregate authorized personnel, the total personnel assigned are not required to be evenly distributed among grades or military specialties. The remaining five later-deploying divisions receive a proportionate share of the remaining forces. Unlike priority one and two forces, the later-deploying units have no minimum personnel level.

Army-wide Shortages of Personnel Have Contributed to Shortfalls

Army-wide shortages of personnel add to the shortfalls of later-deploying divisions. For example, in fiscal year 1997, the Army's enlistment goal for infantrymen was 16,142. However, only about 11,300 of those needed were enlisted, which increased the existing shortage of infantry soldiers by an additional 4,800 soldiers. As of February 15, 1998, Army-wide shortages existed for 28 Army specialties. Many positions in squads and crews are left unfilled or minimally filled because personnel are diverted to work in key positions where they are needed more.

Also, because of shortages of experienced and branch-qualified officers, the Army has instituted an Officer Distribution Plan, which distributes a "fair share" of officers by grade and specialty among the combat divisions. While this plan has helped spread the shortages across all the divisions, we noted significant shortages of officers in certain specialties at the later-deploying divisions.

Peacekeeping Operations Have Exacerbated Shortfalls

Since 1995, when peacekeeping operations began in Bosnia-Herzegovina, there has been a sustained increase in operations for three of the later-deploying divisions: the 1st Armor Division, the 1st Infantry Division, and the 10th Infantry Division. For example, in fiscal year 1997, the 1st Armor Division was directed 89 times to provide personnel for operations other than war and contingency operations, training exercises, and for other assignments from higher commands. More than 3,200 personnel were deployed a total of nearly 195,000 days for the assignments, 89 percent of which were for operations in Bosnia. Similarly, the average soldier in the 1st Infantry Division was deployed 254 days in fiscal year 1997, primarily in support of peacekeeping operations.

Even though the 1st Armor and 1st Infantry Divisions have had 90 percent or more of their total authorized personnel assigned since they began operations in Bosnia, many combat support and service support specialties were substantially understrength, and only three-fourths of field grade officers were in place. As a result, the divisions took personnel from nondeploying units to fill the deploying units with the needed number and type of personnel. As a result, the commanders of nondeploying units have squads and crews with no, or a minimal number of, personnel.

Other Assignments of Soldiers Have Created More Shortfalls of Personnel

Unit commanders have had to shuffle personnel among positions to compensate for shortages. For example, they assign soldiers that exist in the largest numbers—infantry, armor, and artillery—to work in maintenance, supply, and personnel administration due to personnel shortages in these technical specialties; assign soldiers to fill personnel shortages at a higher headquarters or to accomplish a mission for higher headquarters; and assign soldiers to temporary work such as driving buses, serving as lifeguards, and managing training ranges—vacancies in some cases which have resulted from civilian reductions on base.

At the time of our visit, the 1st Brigade of the 1st Infantry Division had 372, or 87 percent, of its 428 authorized dismount infantry. However, 51 of these 372 soldiers were assigned to duties outside their specialties to fill critical technical shortages, command-directed positions, and administrative and base management activities. These reassessments lowered the actual number of soldiers available for training to 75 percent daily.

In Germany, at the 2nd Brigade of the 1st Infantry Division, 21 of 48 infantry squads had no personnel assigned due to shortages. From the remaining 27 squads that were minimally filled, the equivalent of another five squads of the Brigade's soldiers were working in maintenance, supply, and administrative specialties to compensate for personnel shortages in those specialties. The end result is that the brigade only had 22 infantry squads with 7 soldiers each rather than 48 squads with 9 soldiers each.

ARMY OFFICIALS BELIEVE READINESS AND TRAINING HAVE BEEN DEGRADED

According to Army officials, the reduction of essential training, along with the cumulative impact of the shortages I just outlined, has resulted in an erosion of readiness due to the cumulative impact of the shortages I just outlined. Readiness in the divisions responsible for peacekeeping operations in Bosnia has been especially affected because the challenges imposed by personnel shortages are compounded by frequent deployments. Universally, division officials

told us that the shortage of NCOs in the later-deploying divisions is the biggest detriment to overall readiness because crews, squads, and sections are led by lower-level personnel rather than by trained and experienced sergeants. Such a situation impedes effective training because these replacement personnel become responsible for training soldiers in critical skills they themselves may not have been trained to accomplish. At one division, concern was expressed about the potential for a serious training accident because tanks, artillery, and fighting vehicles were being commanded by soldiers without the experience needed to safely coordinate the weapon systems they command.

According to Army officials, the rotation of units to Bosnia has also degraded the training and readiness of the divisions providing the personnel. For example, to deploy an 800-soldier task force last year, the Commander of the 3rd Brigade Combat Team had to reassign 63 soldiers within the brigade to serve in infantry squads of the deploying unit, strip nondeploying infantry and armor units of maintenance personnel, and reassigned NCOs and support personnel to the task force from throughout the brigade. These actions were detrimental to the readiness of the non-deploying units. For example, gunnery exercises for two armor battalions had to be canceled and 43 of 116 tank crews became unqualified on the weapon system, the number of combat systems out of commission increased, and contractors were hired to perform maintenance.

According to 1st Armor and 1st Infantry division officials, this situation has reduced their divisions' readiness to the point of not being prepared to execute wartime missions without extensive training and additional personnel.

RETIREES, INDIVIDUAL READY RESERVISTS, AND NEW RECRUITS WOULD BE USED TO FILL SHORTFALLS

If the later-deploying divisions are required to deploy to a second major theater contingency, the Army plans to fill personnel shortfalls with retired servicemembers, members of the Individual Ready Reserve, and newly trained recruits. The number of personnel to fill the later deploying divisions could be extensive, since (1) personnel from later deploying divisions would be transferred to fill any shortages in the contingency units that are first to deploy and (2) these divisions are already short of required personnel.

The Army's plan for providing personnel under a scenario involving two major theater contingencies includes unvalidated assumptions. For example, the plan assumes that the Army's training base will be able to quadruple its output on short notice and that all reserve component units will deploy as scheduled. Army officials told us that based on past deployments, not all the assumptions in their plans will be realized, and there may not be sufficient trained personnel to fully man later-deploying divisions within their scheduled deployment times. Finally, if retired personnel or Individual Ready Reserve members are assigned to a unit, training and crew cohesion may not occur prior to deployment because Army officials expect some units to receive personnel just before deployment.

SOLUTIONS DEPEND ON EXPECTATIONS FOR LATER-DEPLOYING FORCES

Finding solutions to the personnel problems I have discussed today will not be easy, given the Army's many missions and reduced personnel. While I have described serious shortfalls of personnel in each of later-deploying divisions, this condition is not necessarily new. What is new is the increased operating tempo, largely brought about be-

cause of peacekeeping operations, which has exacerbated the personnel shortfalls in these divisions. However, before any solutions can be discussed, the Army should determine whether it wants to continue to accept the current condition of its active force today, that is, five fully combat-ready divisions and five less than fully combat-capable divisions.

The Army has started a number of initiatives that ultimately may help alleviate some of the personnel shortfalls I have described. These initiatives include targeted recruiting goals for infantry and maintenance positions; the advanced war-fighting experiment, which may reduce the number of personnel required for a division through the use of technology; and better integration of active and reserve forces. Efforts to streamline institutional forces⁴ may also yield personnel that could be used to fill vacancies such as those noted in my testimony.

If such efforts do not yield sufficient personnel or solutions to deal with the shortages we have noted in this testimony, we believe it is important that the Army, at a minimum, review its current plans for rectifying these shortfalls in the event of a second major theater war. In particular, if the Army expects to deploy fully combat-capable divisions for such a war, it should review the viability of alleviating shortfalls predominately with reservists from the Individual Ready Reserve.

This concludes my testimony. I will be happy to answer any questions you may have at this time.

FOOTNOTES

¹The Individual Ready Reserve is comprised of officers and enlisted soldiers with prior military service who are completing their 8-year military service obligation or who are not assigned to units. The majority of these personnel have no annual training requirements.

²Three of the 18 divisions were composed of 2 active brigades and 1 reserve component brigade. Today, the 10 divisions are composed of all active duty units.

³The system assigns each unit a readiness rating from C-1 to C-5. A C-1 unit can undertake the full wartime mission for which it is organized and designed; a C-2 unit can undertake the bulk of its wartime mission; a C-3 unit can undertake major portions of its wartime mission; C-4 and C-5 units are at lower levels of readiness. Each commander reporting readiness may use his/her professional judgment to either upgrade or downgrade the calculated overall C-rating by one level but must provide a written justification in the form of "commander's comments."

⁴The Army's institutional force provides generally nondeployable support to the Army infrastructure, including training, doctrine development, base operations, supply, and maintenance.

APPENDIX I

ACTIVE ARMY DIVISIONS

Contingency Divisions

1st Cavalry Division—headquarters and three brigades at Fort Hood, TX.

3d Infantry Division—headquarters and two brigades at Fort Stewart, GA, one brigade at Fort Benning, GA.

82d Airborne Division—headquarters and three brigades at Fort Bragg, NC.

101st Airborne Division—headquarters and three brigades at Fort Campbell, KY.

Forward Stationed Division

2d Infantry Division—headquarters and two brigades in Korea, one brigade at Fort Lewis, WA.

Later Deploying Divisions

1st Infantry Division—headquarters and two brigades in Germany, one brigade at Fort Riley, KS.

1st Armored Division—headquarters and two brigades in Germany, one brigade at Fort Riley, KS.

4th Infantry Division—headquarters and two brigades at Fort Hood, TX, one brigade at Fort Carson, CO.

10th Mountain Division—headquarters and two brigades at Fort Drum, NY.

25th Infantry Division—headquarters and two brigades at Schofield Barracks, HI, one brigade at Fort Lewis, WA.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield the last 2 minutes of the special order to our friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS).

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I take my job as a Member of Congress very seriously. No responsibility is more important than Congress' role to provide for the Senate defense. This responsibility, before all others, is why we are here. Yet, today, we face threats. Our troops face threats. Our allies face threats. Our interests face threats.

The May 1, 1998 Washington Times reported that China has at least 13 intercontinental ballistic missiles aimed at American soil. We cannot defend against an attack because we cannot afford national missile defense. Our troops in Korea and elsewhere have missiles of mass destruction with chemical and biological weapons aimed at them. We cannot protect them either. It is not just missiles.

New technology poses new threats. For example, computer hackers in a rogue nation can break into our computers and cripple our military communications systems.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for arranging this special order today to focus on the plight of the Department of Defense (DoD) and its ever declining budget. This is the 14th straight year that DoD funding has decreased. Readiness is suffering because DoD does not have enough funds to train its soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines. Readiness is suffering because military personnel are leaving the force because they are away from their families too often and when they are home, their quality of life is declining. If the force is not ready, it cannot protect this nation.

Bedsies readiness concerns, the force also cannot protect the nation if its equipment is not the best in the world. The planned budgets do not provide sufficiently to upgrade the military's equipment. How can we send these young men and women to battle without the best equipment?

The Army in particular is suffering greatly under the current and future budget plans. The Army is doing much more with much less. Since the end of the Cold War, the size of the force has shrunk by 300,000. At the same time, however, Army deployments have increased by 300%. Sixty percent of the forces committed to the multiple operations across the world is Army. Even so, the Army receives less than one fourth of DoD's funding. The Army simply does not have the funding necessary to complete all of the missions being required of it.

Due to insufficient budgets planned for the future, the Army is being forced to make cuts that are unacceptable and it is being forced to make these cuts in ways that do not make sense. Just today, I was in a meeting concerning civilian cuts to Army training posts. We were told that cuts have to be made because—bottom line—the budget is too low. At the same time, the Army is looking at ways to privatize some of its activities. The Army is

supposed to study which jobs can be outsourced and maintain the personnel for the jobs which cannot be outsourced. Due to budgetary constraints, however, the Army is cutting in a haphazard manner—losing many of those civilians who really may be essential to Army activities.

The vast decline in the national security budget is requiring these cuts to be made in ways that do not make sense. We are eating our seed corn. The average age of a DoD civilian is now close to 50 years old. Within five years, it would seem that all those with experience and knowledge will make it to retirement and leave. This will leave our defense department without individuals with any institutional knowledge.

I urge the President and my colleagues in Congress to increase the defense budget. As a Vietnam veteran, I understand the need for quality equipment. I understand the need for high morale in soldiers. As a former civil servant, I understand the importance of civil servants to running an agency and the need for high morale among their ranks to operate well. If the defense budget is not increased in the outyears, the military's equipment will be insufficient and the personnel—both uniformed and civilian—will continue to be demoralized. And—we will no longer be able to claim to be the best and strongest military in the world.

Without our strong military, we would not be the country that we are today. Remember that we could actually have lost several wars this century and we could all be speaking German.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

RWANDAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, during World War II, the world stood by and watched as innocent men, women, and children were exterminated for no other reason than their ethnicity. The world said never again.

Well, 50 years later in Rwanda, the world stood by and watched as innocent men, women, and children were exterminated for no other reason than their ethnicity. Knowing that a genocide was about to occur, the world turned away or said this is not my problem. During the genocide, many said this is bad, but they did not act. After the genocide, the world offered reasons and apologies for its inaction.

Mr. Speaker, the world forgot the promise it made right after World War II. Indeed, the promise of "never again" was left tragically unfulfilled.

In 1994, close to 1 million people were killed in a planned and systematic genocide.

Today the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights of the Committee on International Relations held an important hearing to begin answering some important questions. How could the world tolerate such violence? Who is responsible? Why did the international community fail to respond? How can we stop the continuing cycle of violence in the Great Lakes region?

I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, (Mr. SMITH) for his courage and compassion for addressing this important issue. I think it is important that people understand the history of the relationship between the indigenous peoples of Rwanda.

Prior to the 20th century colonialism, Rwandan Hutus and Tutsis were identified, not by their ethnicity, but by their economic status. For example a Tutsi was considered a wealthy and prominent person in the community, while Hutus were often poor. However, if a Tutsi were to lose his or her wealth, they would then be considered a Hutu. Similarly, a Hutu who had climbed an economic ladder would then be considered a Tutsi. Thus, a distinction was not based on ethnicity but by standing in the community.

However, after centuries of living together in relative peace, Rwandan Hutus and Tutsis were taught to fear and mistrust one another because of disparaging treatment at the hands of Belgian colonialists.

The Belgians treated Tutsis as an upper class, providing them with an education and important government positions, while relegating the majority Hutu population to agricultural work and manual labor. Furthermore, the Belgians began requiring Hutus and Tutsis to carry identification cards, further creating an atmosphere of fear and hatred.

The strong animosity created by the colonialists was maintained after independence as extremist Hutu leaders sought to strike back at Tutsis by removing them from all positions of power and refraining from punishing those who committed acts of violence against Tutsi civilians.

The ethnic cleansing of Tutsis in the early 1960s led to an exile population that was spread across Uganda, Zaire, Burundi, and Tanzania. Persecution and expulsion of minority Tutsis and moderate Hutus continued throughout the 1980s and early 1990s until the tragic events unfolded that led to the 1994 genocide.

I provide this history, Mr. Speaker, to enlighten those who find it convenient to attribute the Rwandan genocide to the irrational, quote, "tribal hatred and bloodthirstiness of Africans." Rather, what subsequent investigations have revealed is that the killings

were not spontaneous expressions of inevitable hatred, but a well-orchestrated, patterned genocide planned for and prepared by extremists, indeed, ethnic extremists to be sure, but essentially extremists concerned with holding on to power and wealth that they had come to control after 20 years in power.

The tribal card was played by these extremists who accused any Hutu who did not join in their cause of betraying Hutus and using propaganda and fear, the twin tactics of Nazis and Fascists in Europe, to intimidate many to join them in killing. Those who resisted, many of them being moderate Hutus, were themselves murdered.

What makes the genocide even more tragic, Mr. Speaker, is that the United States, United Nations as well as the United States and its allies, could easily have prevented this slaughter.

After the death of 10 Belgian United Nations peacekeepers at the hands of extremist militias known as Interahamwe, Belgium decided to remove all of their troops. To keep from appearing as if they were acting alone, the Belgian Foreign Minister telephoned U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher and asked if the United States would call for the withdrawal of all UNAMIR troops.

The United States agreed, and despite the calls for additional assistance from General Romeo Dallaire, the United Nation's Supreme Commander in Rwanda, the Security Council voted to withdraw all but a few of the peacekeepers.

Most of the Interahamwe were armed with nothing more than machetes and clubs. Thus, a well-armed force of a few thousand strategically placed peacekeepers could have stopped or at least greatly reduced the killing.

Regardless, eventually the truth will be known.

It is interesting that Secretary General Kofi Annan will be in Kigali tomorrow. Perhaps his visit will shed some light on the reasons why the United Nations and the international community abdicated its responsibility in 1994.

Mr. Speaker, there is a definition for the word genocide. However, just as the Holocaust can only be appreciated after viewing the tragic footage taken during and immediately after World War II, I have brought some visual aids that truly define the Rwandan genocide. These photographs are the result of the inaction of the United States, the United Nations, and U.S. allies.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, I have personally seen images like the ones that I will show when I traveled to Rwanda. And as disturbing as these photographs are, I assure my colleagues that the effect in person is much greater.

I would like to thank the witnesses that testified in our hearing today, some of whom traveled great distances to be with us. They came because of

the tragedy that the world knows as Rwanda. They came because they viewed the hearing as an important step in informing the Congress and the American people of what went wrong in Rwanda and how we can help to make things right. But although these witnesses traveled great distances to be with us, I regret that the United States Department of State deemed the hearing investigating this tragedy, the death of 1 million men, women, and children, unworthy of their traveling just across town.

In the weeks leading up to today, State Department officials telephoned my office on more than one occasion expressing their displeasure with the idea of this hearing. One person actually raised their voice at my staff, asserting that this hearing was completely unnecessary. All of this opposition raises the question as to whether certain State Department officials believe that such efforts are truly unworthy of their participation, or perhaps there is another reason why they did not want the event of today to take place.

Mr. Speaker, I must state that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and I, along with the other members of the committee, are not engaging in this exercise simply to embarrass specific leaders and individuals; rather, we proceed with the recognition that to change the future one must first recognize the mistakes of the past.

President Clinton's historic trip to Rwanda was an important first step toward the United States rehabilitating itself for abdicating its leadership and morality in 1994. However, we must go further. We must begin to work in partnership with the Rwandan Government so that its people and the people of central Africa can begin to recover from this horrendous chapter in world history.

Formulating an effective policy can only be accomplished through learning from previous mistakes, from rehabilitation. And so it must be clear that our purpose for asking how and why is not simply to condemn, but rather to ensure that never again really means never again.

The Great Lakes region has vast natural and human resources, offering enormous economic potential. Crafting an effective partnership with this region will benefit the people of central Africa and the United States.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a colleague of mine who serves on the House Committee on International Relations with myself, the gentleman from the great State of Alabama (Mr. EARL HILLIARD).

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) for yielding to me.

I am deeply disturbed, and I have been deeply disturbed, about the position and the policy that our country takes as it pertains to certain countries. And I would like to draw a con-

trast between various countries and just look at the position that our country has taken.

We have spent, since 1945, more than a trillion dollars in the Middle East dealing with the so-called peace or warring situation between basically four or five countries that involve perhaps less than 50 million people. We have spent in the last 5 years more than \$200 million in Bosnia. And, once again, we are trying to participate in, I guess, a peace effort. If one looks at the situation as it is occurring now in Ireland, in England, we realize that our country has been involved in trying to work out a peaceful accord.

I applaud the effort of our country in each one of those situations, and I am glad that my country is in a position to make an effort and to be so important that either we can come in and work for peace or be invited to come in and participate in the peace process in each one of those instances.

But I recall, as a member of the Alabama House of Representatives and as a member of the Alabama Senate, when I had to come to Washington, and colleagues who were similarly situated had to come and force our country or to lobby our country, the State Department, and other governmental officials, to get involved, and I am speaking of the very early sixties, in the South Africa situation on the side of democracy and on the side of justice. It took us many years, and even then it was a very difficult situation.

I also recall just recently, in the last 5 years, since I have been in the United States Congress, when the Congressional Black Caucus had to lobby our State Department and our government to get involved with a situation just a couple hundred miles from our shores, in Haiti, on the right side, on the side of democracy and on the side of justice.

And if we look at those two situations and look at the total of five situations that I have mentioned, Bosnia, the Middle East, Ireland, South Africa, and Haiti, we could somewhat draw a contrast and understand why our country did not go to the aid of Rwanda; why we did not get involved and do the right thing.

I will leave it to the viewers to draw what I would consider a logical conclusion, but any time we get involved with countries that are predominantly of the white race, immediately we shower them with all kinds of aid, assistance and money, and we get involved with our Army, our Air Force, and any other type of weapon we have at our disposal. But when it comes to countries that might have any lineage of an African situation, maybe like South Africa or like Haiti or like Rwanda, we have to, those of us who are interested, have to beg our country to come in, even though it might be in its interest.

Now, there are those of us who wish to get away from the old situation that existed in our country a couple hundred years ago, from the situation of segregation that existed a few decades

ago, or from the situation of discrimination based on color and race that exists now. Unfortunately, when we have situations that recur, like Rwanda, like Haiti, and when we see what is happening in Bosnia and the Middle East, it is difficult for us to walk away without looking at the contrast.

And I lay the blame on our State Department. First of all, it does not recruit fairly. It does not have diversity. And if we look at the State Department, we can understand why it discriminates continuously against African Americans and against any nation that may have Africa as a base, whether it is Haiti or Jamaica or any other country.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I would just like to draw the gentleman's attention to the fact that the African-American foreign service officers have filed a lawsuit against the State Department, because they have reached a point where they are frustrated with their inability to be promoted and the inability of the State Department to move African Americans up through the system and utilize all of their talents.

As a result of that, unfortunately, rather than trying to settle this lawsuit, the State Department is fighting the lawsuit, is fighting settling the lawsuit. And so that would be one indication of an attitude that may exist at the State Department, that might explain why it is that it is so difficult for certain decisions that would benefit the people, the world, of people of color to be made.

Mr. HILLIARD. The gentlewoman is very kind when she says a situation that "may" exist. I would go further and say a situation of discrimination and still continual segregation that does exist. But even so, let me go back to the Rwanda situation, because that is the one that we are speaking about now.

I have here a letter of May 4, 1994, from the then chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DONALD PAYNE), where he invited our government as a world leader to get involved in the Rwanda situation. And he writes this letter as chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus. He stated that a vote had been taken and that this not only was the consensus but it was the position of the Black Caucus that our country should intervene, and he outlined things that could be done.

He received, and no other members of the Congressional Black Caucus received a reply. Did not receive a reply. That was May 4, 1994. June 16, 1994 he wrote back and reminded them of the first letter he had sent and he outlined once again the atrocities that were taking place and the need for the help, and that was also cosigned by then Congressperson Kweise Mfume. He did not receive a letter from the State Department. Not even a letter saying we received your letter or any type of notation.

Then, on July 20, 1994, in frustration, the Congressional Black Caucus sent

the President a letter, and the State Department, stating our frustration with not being able to get an audience with the President or those persons at the State Department who would have jurisdiction over the matter dealing with Rwanda. So that there was total inaction as it pertained to Rwanda.

Now, let me tell my colleagues something. I do not need people who profit from segregation and discrimination to come and apologize to me for something that was done years ago and something that is continuing to exist.

□ 2030

And it does not benefit the hundreds of thousands of Hutus and the Tutsis that were killed in Rwanda for someone to belatedly go, years later, and say, "I was sorry that we did not get involved." We do not need those type expressions anymore.

I thought that after World War II and after what had been done to the Jews that we were tired of apologizing and that we were interested in action. And we have the means and everything that is necessary to prevent, and we had it in 1994, to prevent genocide; and we failed to act. My colleagues cannot forgive and forget inaction. It was unnecessary.

We should have gotten involved, and there was a request by more than 35 Members of this body to get involved. Our country failed to do so. And excuses now equate to zero as far as I am concerned.

Never again should we permit this to happen. But in order to make sure it does not happen again, we have got to change the policies and the complexion of our State Department. If they are going to be there and not be sensitive to a third of the world's population, then there is no use for them to be there. There is a need for equal treatment throughout this world. And if we are going to set up ourselves, this country, as the world's policemen, then we ought to do it fairly and not like it was done.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, we have been joined by our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS). But before I yield to my colleague, I would like to just point to my map so that we can be clear as to exactly what we are talking about.

The country of Rwanda is a very, very small, densely populated country in the Great Lakes region of Africa, in east central Africa, bordered on the north by Uganda, here on the east by Tanzania, on the south by Burundi, and in the west by the Democratic Republic of Congo.

We have got an active war situation that is going on in Burundi and in Rwanda; and unfortunately, with the instability that is emanating basically from Rwanda, it is spilling over into all of these other countries in the region. We know that the Democratic Republic of Congo, formerly Zaire, sits in the heart of Africa. And, therefore, if we are interested in stability, rehabilita-

tion, democratization in central Africa and the Democratic Republic of Congo, we have got to do our level best to contain the instability in this region. Because it is this instability that caused the instability and the march westward of Laurent Kabila who eventually over took Mobutu in the first place.

So I wanted to point out exactly the area that we are talking about and why this is so important. Because literally all of central Africa depends on peace, stability, rehabilitation, economic development in this area right here and settling this question once and for all.

I now yield to my colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Georgia for sharing this special order. It brings a whole lot of light to a situation that is still very clouded in a lot of minds. Certainly, as a person who does not serve on the Committee on International Affairs and who is not familiar with the details, I found some of her remarks that she made so far very enlightening.

I am very concerned and would like for my colleague to clarify in a few minutes the situation with respect to the fact that when this conflict broke out, there were a lot of people who absolved themselves by saying, this is an internal matter in Rwanda. It is a matter of them establishing law and order. It is their business. Or they would say, it is a civil war between two groups. It is up to them. The sovereign state of Rwanda should be left to solve its own problems, people would say.

But my colleague, in her opening remarks, indicated, and I read a few articles in the past few days, indicated there was involvement already by outside powers to a great extent. First of all, there was involvement by the French on an ongoing basis; and I would like to know just what their role was. There was involvement by the Belgians, as they were the largest part of the peacekeeping force. And the United Nations was there officially to carry out a certain purpose.

This was not just a matter of letting law and order take its course inside the sovereign state of Rwanda. We already had involvement there, whereas, in the final analysis, yes, the people who went out and took the machetes and hacked the people to death or stabbed them to death or shot them to death, God will hold them guilty for that. They are the primary perpetrators of the murder and the genocide.

But let us take a look at what the involvement was, because I am concerned about the judgment that is always passed down on Africa. My colleagues know, "What happened in the Congo was all the Congolese fault. It is the fault of black people not being able to govern themselves," et cetera. And yet we know from history that what happened in the Congo was very much shaped by the interference of outside powers, that Mobutu was maintained by the Central Intelligence Agency of

the United States; that Lumumba was not murdered by somebody who was an employee of the Central Intelligence Agency; probably he was murdered probably by an agent of Moey Shumbi. After somebody in Washington made a comment that they did not care about what happened to Lumumba, they made it clear they wanted Lumumba out of the way.

So in the history of these conflicts, repeatedly, even in Somalia, where it is said the Cold War powers were out of it, they did not care what happened in Somalia and there was no interest the United States had, particularly; it turns out Italy and some oil companies based in Italy had some great interest there and some oil companies in this country had some great interests too.

So I think it is important, going back to Rwanda, that we get clear that there was involvement already by powers outside of Rwanda. If my colleague does not mind recapitulating some of the things she alluded to.

Ms. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the 20th century there has been outside involvement on the continent of Africa; and unfortunately, the African peoples are dealing today with the ramifications and the effects of that outside intervention.

Even the lines that are drawn that represent country boundaries are nothing in relation to the boundaries of the kingdoms that were existent before the arrival of the European colonialists. And, unfortunately, the history of U.S. involvement on the African continent has always been a nod and a wink to our European allies to allow them to work their will, to do whatever they wanted to do on the African continent; and they knew that as long as they were acting in their national interest that they would have the backing of the United States.

That is why the United States, my friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD), was at first on the wrong side in South Africa's fight. They were on the wrong side in Mozambique and in Angola. They were on the wrong side in countless example after example of interaction on the African continent to suppress the voices of those authentic African voices that were struggling for nationalism and liberalization from the colonial yoke and to promote those that would become mere puppets of the colonial empires.

Mr. OWENS. If the gentlewoman would continue to yield for just a minute, the French, I admired their politics domestically, the French people do not let their government push them around right now. They are not allowing themselves to be put in a situation where large numbers of unemployed people are just left out there to suffer. They have got a lot of involvement. And the Government of France is certainly responsive to its people.

How could the French do something dirty or something oppressive in Africa? Were the French in Rwanda responsible for any of this?

Ms. McKINNEY. Well, absolutely. What the French are doing right now is having an investigation of what their role was.

Mr. OWENS. Of their own foreign policy?

Ms. McKINNEY. That is right. Because there were members of parliament who did not know, who were uninformed about what the French Government was actually doing on the ground.

And then, of course, we have read in newspaper reports emanating from France that the attitude of the Mitterand government was that these are just black people killing each other and that is what black people do. And so then, of course, it was all right for the French to continue to arm the Rwandans despite the fact that this is the kind of thing that was happening. This is genocide.

Mr. OWENS. The French continued to arm the Hutus after the genocide started?

Ms. McKINNEY. Yes.

Mr. HILLIARD. Continued to arm them?

Ms. McKINNEY. They continued.

This is an example of what was happening. Here is a baby that was hacked to death, as my colleagues can see, its limbs hacked off. This is one genocide site. And people went to seek shelter and refuge in churches and in schools because they were told that this was a place of safe haven. Even in the churches they were shot to death, macheted to death, hacked to death by the thousands. Here we can see the remaining skulls at one of these genocide sites, obviously a school or a church.

Here is a young woman who has been hacked. This is what was happening on the ground while we in Washington and in Belgium and in Paris looked the other way. This is what was happening on the ground in Rwanda.

Mr. OWENS. Did we really look the other way? If the French were continuing to arm the Hutus, did they not choose sides and consider that they wanted to be on the side of the victim and they really wanted the Hutus to succeed? I am not saying the French Government, knowingly, from Paris, but certainly the representatives of the French Government in Rwanda. And the Belgians, I think they withdrew in order to make it easier for the Hutus to slaughter the people they wanted to slaughter. So they were all choosing the Hutus as the winners, obviously.

Ms. McKINNEY. This was a civil war as well as a genocide.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, this may have been a civil war. But it was also a civil war in Bosnia. And the European countries got involved, and this country got involved; and we have had troops there, and we still have got troops there.

Mr. OWENS. If the gentlewoman would yield further, we did not just get involved in Rwanda. We were already involved. The United Nations was al-

ready there. We did not have to go get involved; we were there already.

Mr. HILLIARD. We did not wait on the United Nations. We took the lead in Bosnia after the Europeans got involved, before the United Nations made a declaration. And that is what is so ironic about all this.

But let me tell my colleagues this. The United Nations had made a declaration in the Rwanda situation, but yet the Western powers stood back except for France. And after Belgium pulled out, they just left it to those who were powerful. And these pictures my colleague showed, did she realize that they were not of soldiers, they were not of males with guns, that the victims were women and children?

□ 2045

Ms. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I visited Gekangordo, which is a site of genocide at a school. In Gekangordo, the stench of death hangs in the air. This is 3 years after the killing. At Gekangordo, there are 27,000 bodies that have been unearthed thus far. There may be more there. When you go there and you see what happened, it is impossible to walk away from that and not be deeply, deeply affected. Unfortunately, at the hearing today, the New Yorker article that came out, the New Yorker article came out yesterday about the genocide facts. This article was written by Phillip Gorovitch, who talks about the fact that General Dallaire, who was the United Nations representative, general on the ground, sent a fax up to the United Nations and said, we have got an informant who only requires safe haven asylum in either France, the United States or Belgium. This informant has told us that there are plans for an extermination of the Tutsi people. I am going to go in and remove the weapons caches within 36 hours. We now know that the chief of staff to Kofi Annan sent a response back to General Dallaire to not go, to not remove those arms caches, and instead go tell the extremist Rwandan government that we know what you are going to do. So the United Nations itself now then becomes complicit because the United Nations had the information.

Mr. HILLIARD. And failed to act.

Ms. McKINNEY. And failed to act. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. HILLIARD. If the gentlewoman will yield, I have some facts. The first one I am going to talk about a minute. It says genocide occurred primarily between April and June of 1994. If you recall, the first letter that the Congressional Black Caucus sent to the President and to the State Department was May 4. We had reported to them what was taking place. We continued to send letters and did not receive any answers. More than 1 million persons were killed. That means during the time that our State Department filed the letters from the Congressional Black Caucus in file 13 probably as many as 300,000 people were killed each

month. They failed to even acknowledge that anything was occurring. More than 400,000 women were raped.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Further, I would just like to add that the United Nations allowed a general to testify in the Senate and talk about the success of the United Nations in Bosnia. We for our hearing today requested that General Dallaire be allowed to testify at our hearing. General Dallaire was willing to testify at our hearing, but the United Nations declined an acceptance or declined permission for him to testify and so he did not testify at our hearing today. Nor did General Dallaire or Kofi Annan appear before the Belgian parliament and its own inquiry of what happened. They invoked diplomatic immunity.

Mr. HILLIARD. If the gentlewoman will yield, how many more times will this occur? If we are going to use the resources of this Nation to police the world, we ought to do it fairly. If we are going to withdraw from that position, then we ought to do that. But we should not discriminate. And we should fairly participate in every situation whether it directly or indirectly affects us.

There was a slogan that I did not agree with, but it says something that he who has power should use it. I often think that if you use it wisely, then perhaps you would not have to use it. Just the thought that you have power and that it would be used wisely and fairly would prevent situations like Rwanda from occurring. But if you have got it, if you have it and you selectively use it, then you will invite situations like Rwanda, because they always would calculate that we do not have to worry. There is not enough oil in Rwanda for them to be concerned. So we can do that and be successful.

Mr. OWENS. I would just like to say that I agree with 99 percent of what you are saying. But the thrust of us being the policeman to the world, I do not think we want to make it that directly.

Mr. HILLIARD. We have assumed that role.

Mr. OWENS. The power of the United States should be used in concert with other forces, primarily in concert with the United Nations. We should try to strengthen and create the United Nations and create the world order where we do not have to always be the power that serves the function of policeman. We should look at public policy.

Right now we have a United Nations arrears that this Nation owes that it is not paying. For the country that has the largest responsibility with the United Nations not to pay weakens the United Nations a great deal, and we do not create that world order which would send a message to people out there that they should not get involved in this kind of activity. The leaders of Rwanda probably thought they could under the cloak of Rwandan sovereignty get away with it and they probably would have gotten away with

it if there had not been a guerilla war force that came in and took over. They may be sitting there right now and justifying the genocide just as Saddam Hussein is sitting there justifying himself in Iraq.

Mr. HILLIARD. What the gentleman says is correct. The United States should react as it deals with world situations through organized bodies, such as the United Nations. However, even as late as one and a half months ago, the United States indicated if Saddam Hussein did not allow the inspectors to come in, it would not wait on any United Nations resolution or any other body. It would take it on its own to intervene. We did that in Korea. We did not wait on the United Nations. We got involved. We did it in Vietnam. We did not wait on the United Nations. We got involved.

When it is in the interest of this country or when the powers to be at the State Department and at the very top decide that they are going to do something, they do not wait on the world body. What you say ought to be the case, that should be our policy, but in actuality it is not our policy.

Mr. OWENS. We should establish a war crimes tribunal so that these people know that they are going to be brought to justice in the end. We want to send a message to people like the dictators in Nigeria right now that we are not going to sit by and tolerate them having sovereign immunity to do whatever they want to do. The whole world should have some kind of standard that is clear out there and we ought to move in the direction of supporting that kind of thing through the United Nations and the World Court and make it clear that you are not going to get away with it. By doing that, we would prevent a lot of the kind of genocides that are taking place, too many have taken place, we have this one that happens to be the biggest one, but we are leaving out Cambodia and Yugoslavia and Serbia. They were about to destroy one of the oldest cultured cities in the world, Sarajevo. So it could break out anywhere. We have got to send a clear message that the world will not tolerate it. Part of the reason that message will be accepted as meaningful is that the United States stands behind it, with its force and its power, stands behind a doctrine which says we will not tolerate sovereign predators wiping out whole groups of people or doing other kinds of things that really are just not acceptable in this civilization.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I would like to mention and commend other Members of Congress who at least spoke out on this issue at the time. We know that from the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) submitted those three letters to the President three times and to the State Department, and three times he received absolutely no response. But the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Mica) also spoke out on this issue and the

need for U.S. intervention to stop the genocide, to stop what was happening, to save those innocent lives. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) also spoke out against what he saw as inaction on the part of the administration. I would also like to thank the people who came to the hearing today and testified.

Mr. Dick McCall from USAID was the only person who was given authorization to show up at the hearing today. And so the absence of the State Department then raises more questions than it answers. Because as we got testimony from all of the witnesses, we understand that there are some answers that reside within the highest levels of the State Department, and the American people and the Members of Congress and the Congressional Black Caucus and all of the people who did speak out and the countless Americans who were concerned at the time and who are now concerned deserve to know the answers.

We also had Ambassador Shaharyar Khan travel all the way from Pakistan to be with us. Senator Alain Destexhe, who promoted the investigation in Belgium, traveled all the way from Belgium to be with us. Kathi Austin, Holly Burkhalter, Alison Des Forges, Jeff Drumtra and Mr. Francois-Xavier Nsanzuweza all came from various points around the globe to be with us today at today's hearing. Yet the State Department could not emerge from Foggy Bottom to tell us what the heck was going on, what did they know, and when did they know it.

Mr. OWENS. Again, I hope that the committee that the gentlewoman sits on will seriously push for some remedies that would help avoid these situations in the future that they would never happen again with the United States sitting on the sideline, that we would have a clear way to intervene and we send a clear message that President Clinton has called us an indispensable Nation. One reason we are is that we have the economic power and the military power. We will use our power in concert with the rest of the world to guarantee that there will never be any millions of people being killed while the rest of the world sits by and watches without intervening.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I would just like to say that we know what happened in Rwanda. I have not made it through all 1,180 pages of this book, Rwanda, Death, Despair and Defiance, which was written by Rakiya Omaar at African Rights in London. I went to London to meet with Rakiya, to hear firsthand what she had to say as she interviewed hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of genocide survivors and of the genocide there in the prisons in Rwanda. We know what happened in Rwanda, thanks to Rakiya Omaar.

□ 2100

Thanks to Senator Alain Destexhe in Belgium we know what happened in Belgium. We know why the Belgian

troops withdrew, and he has come to the United States to help us to understand what happened in Belgium. Thanks to French parliamentarians we are beginning to understand what happened in Paris, what motivated Paris French behavior on the ground in Rwanda. Three governments were forewarned, and two of them are now asking themselves why they stood by and let 1 million people be slaughtered. The United States and the United Nations must do the same.

Senator Destexhe delivered a letter to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) today and to our committee requesting that the United States hold a similar investigation; since the United States was one of three countries privy to the information that a genocide was about to take place, that the United States ought to look at it in critical self-examination to make sure that never again means never again.

I yield to my colleague from Alabama.

Mr. HILLIARD. Thank you very much. You gave credit to those persons who were properly due; however, you failed to mention one, and that is the Congresswoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY). Let me personally thank you for your hard work and for your forthrightness and for your determination to come forth without any type of political fear of repercussions and let this country know what it should have been doing at the time and even now.

It has been 4 years since about a million persons were killed in 90 days when our country failed to react, and I thank you for not letting this country forget its inaction. Never again, I agree with you, but I thank you.

And I have for the RECORD something that I will submit, but I would like to just read the last paragraph:

I would like to acknowledge the hard work of my good friend from Georgia and thank her for making time for us to speak out on such a horrifying issue. We should not sit idly by while people are being slaughtered. Never ever again.

So I thank you and I commend you for a job well done.

COMMENT ON RWANDAN GENOCIDE

Never . . . again!

Never again!

Those two simple words are used when referring to the Holocaust.

However, I come to the House floor this evening with a heavy heart to speak on something that should have never happened again. I am here to speak on what is the fourth anniversary of the Rwandan genocide.

It has been four years since one million Rwandan people were slaughtered by their former friends and neighbors. I am talking about the loss of one million people in the span of just 90 days.

One million people murdered in 90 days.

To reach this number in 90 days required Hutus (who-toos) to butcher 463 Tutsis (tootsies) and moderate Hutus every hour of every day for 90 straight days.

The total pre-genocide population of Rwanda was about 7 million people. After only three

months, one-seventh of Rwanda's population—men, women and children—lay dead in the streets. To put this massacre in some type of perspective. . . . The killings would be the same as slaughtering every African-American man, woman and child—approximately 37 million people—or one-seventh of the United States population in just 90 days.

We can discuss how terrible it is that this event even took place, but what really must be discussed is whether it ever had to happen at all.

It has been discovered that the international community, including the United States Government, was aware that genocide in Rwanda was imminent. A hearing was held just this morning in the House International Relations Committee on this very issue. And in that hearing, witnesses who were on the front lines in Rwanda reported that the United Nations, and the governments of the United States, France, United Kingdom, Belgium, and other countries, were fully apprised of not only escalating tension between Hutus and Tutsis, but more importantly, the United Nations and these governments were made aware of plans for mass genocide by the Hutus against the Tutsis.

Even with knowledge of the planned genocide, the United Nations peace-keeping troops were reduced from 2,500 to only 270.

I repeat . . . only 270 troops were retained, even with knowledge of a planned mass genocide.

I cannot accept that the State Department and the administration would have knowledge of this situation and not inform members of Congress. I am further angered by the fact that the State Department failed to appear at our hearing this morning, hiding behind ridiculous department rules.

The value of African lives cannot . . . and will not, be so easily cast aside. I will not allow the administration of this country to serve lip service to its commitment to African issues—but more importantly African lives.

I, with other members here tonight, plan to get to the bottom of this issue, and determine exactly who knew what, and when they knew it. Belgium, France, and the United Nations are all currently going through some form of truth-seeking process. It is high time the United States did the same.

We will find out who knew in advance that genocide was imminent. And where there was knowledge of any inaction, we must speak out and hold those people and governments accountable—even those here in the United States.

I would like to acknowledge the hard work of my good friend from Georgia, and thank her for making time for us to speak out on such a horrifying issue. We should not sit idly by while people are being slaughtered.

Never . . . ever . . . again!

Ms. MCKINNEY. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this time to make this presentation to our colleagues and the Congress and to our audience, the American people.

Never again is supposed to mean never again, and we now must demand that we understand fully what happened and why it happened.

Unfortunately, the State Department chose to not show up at a very important hearing. They chose to duck the

answers of the people who came to present their questions. And in response to that, then, I have to add my voice to the tens of other people who were at that hearing today who were calling for an investigation.

I now call for an investigation of what happened so that indeed when we say never again the world community will know that never again means never again.

Bruxelles, Belgium, May 5, 1998.

Hon. BENJAMIN GILMAN,

Chairman, House Committee on International Relations, Rayburn Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GILMAN: I am writing to recommend that the United States Congress undertake an investigation into the events surrounding the 1994 genocide in Rwanda. During that time, I was the Secretary General of Médecins sans Frontières (Doctors without Borders). In this capacity, I visited Rwanda just before and just after the genocide. In 1995, I became a Member of Parliament and initiated the Belgian Senate Committee of Inquiry on the Rwanda genocide.

Our Committee of Inquiry heard testimony from 95 witnesses, including Belgian Ministers, Diplomats and members of the Military. The Committee also consulted all documents from 1993 and 1994 in the Foreign Affairs and Defense Ministries, including all correspondence between Kigali and Brussels.

Two main questions were addressed: Before the genocide, were the Belgian authorities and others aware of the fact that it was under preparation? After the genocide started on 7 April, 1994, why did the UN decide to withdraw almost all its forces from Rwanda?

Concerning the period before the genocide, our Committee concluded that: ". . . at the latest in mid-January 1994, the Belgian authorities had a series of relevant information regarding, if not the preparation of genocide, at least the existence of the preparation of large scale massacres . . . On the other hand, several actors (UN, other states . . .) that had the same type of information did not give it the necessary importance" (page 506)

Although the Committee decided not to be more specific about the "other states," this is clearly a reference to France and the United States. We based that conclusion on various evidence, in particular documents from the files of the Belgian Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs. Among others, we found 19 documents in which there is mention of a Machiavellian plan of destabilization and massacres. There is no reason to believe that similar information was not at the disposal of the American and French Ambassadors and the UN Representatives. Most important is a cable sent on January 11, 1994, almost three months before the genocide, by General Dallaire, the Commander of the UN forces in Rwanda (UNAMIR), to the UN Headquarters in New York, based on information provided to him by a key informer. This cable revealed a fairly detailed plan explaining how the genocide was organized in Kigali. It mentions that the principal aim of Interhamwe (the militia of the President's party) in the past was to protect Kigali from the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF). He noted that a campaign was under way by Interhamwe to register all Tutsi in Kigali, he says he suspected that this was for their extermination. He quotes an Interhamwe informant as saying that in twenty minutes his personnel could kill up to 1,000 Tutsi.

This cable's importance cannot be overestimated. How many times has the United

Nations received from its Force Commander in a country a warning of a possible, even probable, extermination?

In the cable, General Dallaire announced his intention to take action within 48 hours and requested protection for his informer. UN Headquarters answered that the action he had planned to take was not authorized because it did not fall within the UNAMIR mandate. Dallaire was instructed to contact the three ambassadors from Belgium, France and the United States, and ask them to intervene with President Habyarimana of Rwanda. He was also instructed to request from these countries protection and asylum for his informer.

The contents of the cable shared with the American, French and Belgian Ambassadors in Kigali. According to the special representative of Secretary General Boutros Ghali, "They expressed serious concern and indicated that they would consult with their capital and would act accordingly." On January 13, 1994, all three ambassadors met President Habyarimana and expressed their concern that the Arusha Peace Agreements (which were supposed to bring a peaceful transition in Rwanda) were being violated by his political party and his supporters. Apart from this, very little was done to stop the perpetrators of the genocide. I strongly believe that if General Dallaire's cable had been widely publicized at the time, the genocide could have been avoided.

We should remember that nearly one million people were killed in less than three months in Rwanda in 1994. We should also recall that the Rwandan killings were an attempt to eradicate an entire people, and as such constitute one of very few unequivocal genocides in the twentieth century. A crime of this nature and scale demands full investigation. The Rwandan genocide demonstrated that the lesson of the Holocaust still has not been learned. At the end of the day, everyone is accountable for their actions when genocide crimes against humanity are at stake.

Belgium, France, the United States and the United Nations also share a responsibility for not doing more—indeed, doing almost nothing—to prevent or stop the killings. The genocide of the Tutsi in Rwanda took place in a country where 2,500 UN blue helmets were deployed and supposed to maintain peace and protect human lives. They could have prevented the killings, both before and during the genocide.

The role of Belgium in this tragedy has been fully examined by the Belgian Senate Committee. That of France is currently being investigated in the French Parliament. The victims, but also humanity at large, deserve to know the full truth concerning the two others major international players—the United States and the United Nations.

To conclude, I would first like to note that I fully welcome the initiatives of the Clinton Administration to prevent further genocide and bring justice in the Great Lakes region, initiatives which were taken after the presidential trip to Africa.

However, more needs to be done. A full investigation on the part of the United States can help to improve the chances that such suffering will not be repeated. In attempting to move forward, the past must be taken in account. The 1994 genocide remains a central issue to understanding the situation in the Great Lakes region. It also highlighted the deep inadequacies in the way the international community responds to signs of impending crisis. We cannot prevent future tragedies if we do not come to terms with the past; in the United States as in Belgium,

that process must involve examining the role this government played in Rwanda in 1994.

Sincerely,

ALAIN DESTEXHE,
*Member of the Parliament of Belgium,
President, International Crisis Group*

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentlelady from Georgia, Ms. MCKINNEY, for organizing this Special Order. Her dedication to Africa is exemplary.

Mr. Speaker, four years ago the people of Rwanda suffered unimaginable horror. Up to one million Rwandans were slaughtered by their countrymen in only three months. Radicals associated with the Government of Rwanda organized the killings of Tutsis and moderate Hutus. The killing only stopped when the Rwandan Patriotic Front, now the government of Rwanda, overthrew the genocidal regime.

The atrocious events of 1994 will scar Rwanda for generations. Indeed, the entire world has become a less humane place because of them. Earlier today, the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights of the Committee on International Relations, chaired by our distinguished colleague, CHRIS SMITH, held a hearing on many aspects of the 1994 Rwandan genocide. The genocide remains relevant today, Mr. Speaker, because the conditions in Central Africa make another genocide possible.

Ethnic and cultural rivalries are still deadly in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Burundi and Rwanda. Innocent men, women and children—in all three countries—are being killed today because of the groups to which they belong.

The United States failed to intervene in the 1994 genocide, Mr. Speaker. I hope that by reflecting on the events of those horrible three months, we can do more to avert tragedy next time.

Again, let me thank the gentlelady from Georgia, Ms. MCKINNEY, for organizing this special order, and also the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, for holding his hearing earlier today.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the House and other citizens about a major issue which we will have on the floor of this body in 1 month.

Mr. Speaker, we have a great reverence and respect in the United States of America, and properly so, for the Constitution that was assembled and ratified by the States some 200 years ago, and the very first liberty that was put in the Bill of Rights, added to the original Constitution, is religious freedom.

The first amendment begins, Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and with those plain simple words the Founding Fathers intended to establish two basic simple concepts. First, that this land would not have any official church so designated by an act of the Federal

Government; secondly, that we would have the maximum of religious liberty in the United States of America.

Why did so many people come to this country if not seeking a land where they could freely exercise their religious beliefs and where they could exercise it right next to someone who might have some differences of faith but who would have not only a tolerance but a respect for those differences; who would say to one another, you may have your belief and I may have mine, and we believe that all men have a God-given right to acknowledge God according to the dictates of their own conscience; worship who, where, or how they may, and we respect that right, and we are not offended by the fact that someone may have a differing religious belief.

But, Mr. Speaker, it started 36 years ago that the Supreme Court took that very plain and simple language, that very plain and simple meaning, and they started to twist it, they started to distort it, they started to make misdirected rulings and basically said that if you are on public property, like a school, if you are on public property and you engage in an act of prayer or other religious expression, that that is the same as if this Congress had said that we are going to select for the American people what their faith must be. They said basically that an individual or a group of people coming together when they are on public property is the same as telling people what their beliefs must be as establishing a national church, an official religion. They are not the same thing at all.

But in 1962 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that even when, even when students voluntarily choose to recite a prayer together, even when there was no compulsion that was involved, that was unconstitutional. And so began the controversy that has continued for a generation over voluntary prayer in public schools.

It has gotten so bad, Mr. Speaker, that the add-on decisions from the U.S. Supreme Court just made it worse. For example, in 1985, and Mr. Speaker, this was a decision that came from your home State of Alabama; the State of Alabama had passed a law that said, well, the Supreme Court says we cannot have vocal prayers by groups of students in public school, but we will permit students to have a moment of silence. A moment of silence was permitted by the Alabama law, and in 1985 the United States Supreme Court, just across the street from the Capitol building over here, the United States Supreme Court said permitting a moment of silence was unconstitutional because it could be used by students for silent prayer.

Now I thought the Constitution at least guaranteed the right to remain silent, but not if you are using that silence in a school to offer a prayer. That was the U.S. Supreme Court. That is part of the warped rulings that have so

twisted the first amendment that people cannot recognize the results that are achieved under it.

In 1992 they said if it is at a public school graduation, if there is a prayer there, that was unconstitutional because, and this case was from Rhode Island and it was a rabbi that was asked to offer the prayer, but because students were expected to be respectful of the prayer, just as they were expected to be respectful of the other things that occurred during the graduation.

Because they were expected to be respectful, the Supreme Court said, oh, no, having a prayer at graduation of school; my goodness, that too is unconstitutional because some students might think that just by being silent, others may think that they are joining in the prayer. And therefore to protect them, no matter what the majority wants, no matter how it steps upon and stomps upon the beliefs and the wishes of other people engaging in free exercise of religion and free speech, the U.S. Supreme Court said the prayer at that graduation was unconstitutional.

And there have been other decisions. In 1980, out of Kentucky, the Supreme Court ruled that to permit the Ten Commandments to be posted in a public school was unconstitutional.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know the Ten Commandments are the basis of our laws. They are the starting point for the laws not only in the U.S.A. but in so much of the entire world, and they are common to many different cultures and to different faiths. But the U.S. Supreme Court said they cannot be put on the wall of a public school.

And yet here in this House Chamber I see right before me, right before my eyes as I face the opposite wall, Mr. Speaker, is the large bas-relief, the image, of Moses, the great law giver, the one who brought the stone tablets down from Mt. Sinai with the Ten Commandments written with the finger of God.

The walls of the Supreme Court have the Ten Commandments depicted upon them.

We open sessions of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, with prayer.

The U.S. Supreme Court opens with "God save the United States and this honorable Court."

And we have right above your head, Mr. Speaker, the words that we find on currency in America, "In God We Trust." And do you know that is under attack? There are people who want to take that off currency.

And let us take the State of Ohio. Ohio has a State motto, and it is kind of akin to ours, of "In God We Trust." Theirs is, "With God All Things Are Possible." They are being sued right now, Mr. Speaker, to stop that from happening. They are being sued by those who say, oh, you cannot say with God all things are possible in a public setting that involves public property, such as the grounds of the State capital of Ohio or anyplace else where they may want to put their State motto.

And the ACLU is suing in West Virginia to stop prayers at high school football games, and we have communities all over the country that have different suits pending. For example, I was reading one today, a community near Kansas City, Missouri, and in that community one of the emblems on their city seal is a fish, and the ACLU is saying oh, my goodness, that is one of the emblems of the Christian faith, so let us have it taken off.

Where will this intolerance stop? When will it end? When will the faith of the American people be able to be expressed freely? When will the Supreme Court stop things such as this and their rulings against nativity scenes, menorahs? Just came down a number of years ago, came out of Pennsylvania, at the courthouse there, I believe it was Allegheny County in Pennsylvania, and they had, among different holiday displays they had a nativity scene, they had a Jewish menorah, they had other things, too. But the Supreme Court said it is possible to look at that nativity scene and see it by itself and not notice the other secular emblems that might be on display. And they said if you have a display such as that, you have to balance it with Santa Claus, plastic reindeer, Frosty the Snowman. It is what we call the plastic reindeer test, except now the courts, they had a Federal court ruling in New Jersey just this last December saying, well, even though you have balanced a nativity scene with other secular emblems, Santa, Frosty, and so forth, no, the nativity scene still must go because it is too powerful, and it is more powerful than the secular emblems.

I am tired of all that. I am tired of that and so many other cases that I can describe, whether it be from the Supreme Court, the Federal appellate courts or the Federal courts, or whether it be the intimidation that it creates where schools say, my goodness, we have got to really, really stay away from anything, even if it is legal, because we do not want to get sued and we do not want to have these huge legal bills.

And every year, and it is about this time that probably there are letters going out again that the ACLU and their fellow believers, I guess, send out letters to schools saying, "Don't you dare have a prayer at your graduation unless you want to be sued."

I remember the case in Texas, in Galveston, at I believe it was Santa Fe or Santa Fe Ball High School at Galveston where a Federal judge told them, "Well, because of another court ruling, I'll let you have a prayer at graduation if the students insist on it, but I will have a U.S. marshal there, and that U.S. marshal will arrest anyone if they mention the name of Jesus Christ as part of that prayer."

□ 2115

He said that on the record. There is a transcript of it that the Federal judge said that.

Mr. Speaker, I have to come back to the gentleman's home State of Alabama. Alabama is suffering under an order from a Federal judge right now that was issued last year from Judge Ira Dement, and Judge Dement's order has really taken things to a new height.

I want to share some of the words that Judge Dement has written in a ruling that was issued just a few months ago, as requested by people who wanted to stop prayer that they were still having in some schools in Alabama in different settings. And this is what Judge Dement's order says: He said, The schools there are permanently enjoined from "permitting prayers, biblical and scriptural readings and other presentations or activities of a religious nature at all school-sponsored or school-initiated assemblies and events, including, but not limited to, sporting events, regardless of whether the activity takes place during instructional time, regardless of whether attendance is compulsory or noncompulsory, and regardless of whether the speaker or presenter is a student, school official, or nonschool person."

Regardless of the circumstances, at any time, whether it is during class time or not class time, whether it is on the school grounds or off the school grounds, whether one has to be there as a student or one does not have to be there as a student, if there is a prayer from anyone, the judge said, they are going to answer to him.

Mr. Speaker, he is not kidding. He has, at the expense of the school system, hired monitors to patrol the school and the hallways, and they have had student after student after student after student be expelled because they do not believe a Federal judge should have that much control over their freedom of speech and their freedom of religion. And if a group of students want to get together and they want to have a prayer, then why is it that only the opinion of the one that does not like it is the one that counts; and the opinions of those who want to have a prayer, their opinions are ignored?

Mr. Speaker, in addition to prayer, we start sessions of this House with the Pledge of 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. And Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court made a proper ruling in relation to the Pledge of Allegiance. The case came out of West Virginia.

The Supreme Court said, no student can be compelled to say the Pledge of Allegiance, but they did not give a student that did not like it the right to stop their classmates or censor their classmates who wanted to say it.

Mr. Speaker, that is the standard we ought to be applying to school prayer. Nobody should be forced to participate, of course not. But that does not give

them the right to show their intolerance by trying to censor their classmates that may want to say it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I will if the gentleman will let me make one point first, and that is simply the point to which I am building, that we have to do something about it.

We are going to be having a vote in this House in a month on doing something about it, and it is called the Religious Freedom Amendment, to make it possible for students to have prayer in public schools, to make it possible for the Ten Commandments to be displayed, to make it possible to have holiday displays, recognizing the religious traditions or heritage or beliefs of the people, and to correct the abuses of our first amendment, the beautiful language of the first amendment which has been corrupted by the Supreme Court.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, I am a co-sponsor and have plans to support the gentleman's amendment and congratulate the gentleman who, over the past now, 4 years now, correct?

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is 3 years. Well, closer to 4 now, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. KINGSTON. Four years to get this done, and I do not think anyone would ever have anticipated how long it would take to get this to the floor, particularly when we have so many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who have sponsored, in some form or the other, school prayer, voluntary school prayer amendments.

I do have a question, though, that has been raised by some people in my district that have expressed some concerns, and I think I mentioned some of them to the gentleman.

In the case of a classroom, as I envision this, say first period in the morning, after rollcall, whatever, should a student lead a school prayer, he or she would have a right to, after the Religious Freedom Amendment is adopted by the requisite number of States, correct?

Mr. ISTOOK. Yes. This would not permit government to tell them that they must pray, it would not permit government to tell them what the content of the prayer would be; but absolutely correct, I say to the gentleman, it would permit students to initiate prayer as part of their school day when they start it. Or it might be the school assembly or it might be a football game or graduation or some other school activity. The point is, it would be a permitted activity, but never compulsory.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, what would keep a teacher from salting the group for one particular religion over the other or encouraging the favoritism of one religion over the other?

Mr. ISTOOK. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is interesting that, of course, people are concerned that we do not use the pressure or influence of government to try to tell them what their faith or what their religion should be. And, of course, government might act through Congress, it might act through a school board, it might act through a principal or a teacher. The key there is to make sure that we reinforce the prohibition on government acting to compel anyone to be engaged in any particular religious activity.

I think the best way that we can focus upon that is by looking at the text of the Religious Freedom Amendment, which is the proposed constitutional amendment. Let me share it. I think the text itself helps to answer your questions.

The text of the Religious Freedom Amendment, which is House Joint Resolution 78, reads as follows:

To secure the people's right to acknowledge God according to the dictates of conscience, neither the United States nor any State shall establish any official religion. But the people's right to pray and to recognize their religious beliefs, heritage or traditions on public property, including schools, shall not be infringed. Neither the United States nor any State shall require any person to join in prayer or other religious activity, prescribe school prayers, discriminate against religion, or deny equal access to a benefit on account of religion.

So we have, several places in the amendment, placed language meant to safeguard. For example, we have the language, "according to the dictates of conscience," which parallels language that is found in a number of State constitutions, to make it clear that the rights of an individual conscience remain inviolate. We do not want to step upon anyone's. We have the requirement that we do not require any person to join in prayer or any other religious activity, and we do not have a government prescription that a prayer must occur, nor what the content should be.

So it really goes back to the principle that is followed in schools in so many other ways, and that is, they provide students an opportunity to take turns so that it is not just one type of prayer or one particular faith's way of saying a prayer that is heard, but different people will have their opportunities on different occasions.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman this question, which is less than friendly.

Mr. ISTOOK. Okay.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if we have a minority religion in a group, say the predominant members of a class predominantly are Christian, Jewish and Muslim, and we have another child out there who is 7 years old, and we are going around the circle with the Big 3, but he has some obscure religion. I do not know what would be an example; say he is a Zen. How do we keep that 7- or 8-year-old from being proselytized by the other religions because he is going to be a little bit em-

barrassed to stand up for his religion because of peer pressure? At that age, nobody has the fervency of their convictions, but children know what the majority is doing and in order to fit in, often they want to do what it takes to fit in with the majority.

Mr. ISTOOK. Certainly.

Mr. KINGSTON. So, Mr. Speaker, they do not have that spiritual maturity that would allow them to tolerate it and say, well, let us go ahead and have that person's prayer today.

How would this deal with that?

Mr. ISTOOK. Sure. Certainly we recognize that different children will have different levels of maturity; and it is not something, of course, when we talk about people that may feel sometimes like they are not necessarily part of a group, it may not be religion. It may be how people dress, it may be how people look, it may be how people talk, it may be the shoes they wear, it may be what type of music they choose for listening. It can be all sorts of things.

I think that we do a disservice if we say that we know that children are going to have differences among them in other respects and that part of learning and part of growing is understanding that there are differences and learning to cope with those, but if we set apart religion and say, but if it is a religious difference, that is somehow a threatening topic, and that we must protect children from knowing that there are some differences.

I think we need to look at the words of a Supreme Court Justice, Potter Stewart. I am going to paraphrase him; I have the exact quote, but not in front of me.

When he was talking about this discussion, when he dissented from what the Supreme Court did, from what his fellow justices did, and he said several interesting things. One of them was that we cannot expect children to learn about diversity, to learn that different people will have different beliefs and different faiths, if we try to isolate them and shield them from that knowledge until they are adults, as though it were some type of dangerous activity or something that is reserved for adults. If we do that, he says, we will foster in people the belief that this is something that is threatening, that it is something that needs to be pushed aside and pushed away or kept in a corner, rather than something that should be understood.

Basically, we are teaching intolerance at an early age if we tell people it has to be suppressed rather than respected when they have those differences, and that is where the schools should properly show the proper respect, whether they say, well, different people have had a chance and this person does it a little differently and we ought to respect that and learn from it. That is how we learn tolerance and diversity.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, on that subject, let us say we have somebody who is a goat worshiper.

Mr. ISTOOK. I am sorry?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, a goat worshiper, a devil worshiper or a bizarre type of religion. Now, they want to have equal time. Do we want our child in the room when that prayer is taking place? That would probably, it might in a Christian parent cause a little concern, the same way it would cause the goat worshiper's parent to have concern when the Christian prayer is going on.

Now, I only say that to the degree that, as our society gets more and more diverse, it is reasonable to expect in a country of 260 million people some folks who are in a very minority, extreme minority-type religion who pray perhaps in a bizarre way; and by that I mean, maybe they do not bow their heads when they pray, maybe they scream or something. And I am only phrasing this question in a hypothetical right now, but it is still very possible for some fringe religions to get under the Religious Freedom Amendment equal time in the classroom, so to speak, and it is fair, the way the gentleman has bent over backwards to draw this thing so fair that it will happen.

How does the gentleman answer those concerns?

□ 2130

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I think the first thing of course that we all need is perspective on it, because frequently I find that some people want to construct what they think is a trap. They will first say, oh, the Religious Freedom Amendment is only meant to enthrone the rights and the beliefs of a majority of Americans, and therefore to suppress those who may not be among the majority in their beliefs. They are wrong in what they assert because obviously we are trying to be evenhanded.

Then they take the other side of the argument and they say, oh, well, if that is the case then it is also bad because there may be some people, such as the gentleman described, whose practices are distasteful to others. And, therefore, they say no matter which way we go, they are against it.

The real agenda of course of such persons is they just are not tolerant toward other people's faith in prayer, whether in the minority or majority. But in a situation such as the gentleman described, the perspective to understand is that there may be some very rare and isolated occasions when someone may wish to offer a prayer that others will find distasteful. But should we say that because there will be very, very rare occasions of that, therefore we must suppress and stifle and censor the millions and millions of positive, uplifting prayers of hope, of vision, of seeking for faith and seeking for guidance in the day?

It is sort of like having free speech in our society. In fact, it is a parallel to free speech in our society. We all recognize that part of the price of free

speech is there will be occasions when someone does not go into the bounds of pornography, which is illegal, but does get into the bounds of tastelessness and offensive speech that nevertheless we recognize is protected.

The same is true of religious expression. And I would submit that actually the cases such as the gentleman has described of someone who has something that is distasteful to others, and of course they can choose if they wish, if something is that distasteful to them, if they want to leave the room or something that is fine. Like I say, it would be a very, very rare occasion.

But those cases usually have already been protected by Supreme Court decisions. There is one, for example, protecting the Santeria religion that involves animal sacrifice. I believe the case involved the City of Hialeah, which said a community could not outlaw the way they were killing animals as part of their sacrificial rituals because that was protected by freedom of religion. That is under the First Amendment as it is now.

But the same Supreme Court does not wish to protect majority faiths. They have ruled against a cross, for example, in a city park in San Francisco that has been there for 65 years. They say that has to come down, a cross being included among numerous symbols on the seal of the City of Edmond, Oklahoma, in my district, similar rulings in Oregon and Hawaii, in Stowe, Ohio, against the inclusion of a Christian emblem among multiple other emblems and they say that is unconstitutional, yet that same Supreme Court has said that a Nazi swastika is constitutionally protected. That was in a case in Skokie, Illinois, where the American Nazis were walking through the street with the swastika and the Court ruled that the symbol of hate is constitutional, but the symbol of hope is unconstitutional.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that there is a special place in hell for a number of Federal court judges, as I am sure there will be for Members of Congress.

Mr. ISTOOK. Let us hope that there are some special places above for many of us as well.

Mr. KINGSTON. Probably plenty of room for judges and congressmen and many others.

Who will decide if the school puts up the Ten Commandments or the Articles of Goat Worship? The reason I ask that, yesterday I was at the dedication of the Coastal Middle School in Savannah, Georgia. I was at the dedication of the Freedom Shrine, which the Chattooga County Exchange Club has given to many, many schools, and it is a great thing and it has the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, George Washington Inaugural Address and all sorts of good documents of American history. And as I was looking at the Freedom Shrine I was wondering how do they decide which documents go? Do you put the Gettysburg Address

in there or Lincoln's second inaugural speech?

Mr. ISTOOK. A beautiful, moving document.

Mr. KINGSTON. Yes, so those judgments have to be made, and the Chattooga County Exchange Club does that. I do not know how they do that, but they do it. But who decides if the Ten Commandments gets put on the wall or the Articles of Goat Worship?

Mr. ISTOOK. I think this is an interesting question, and I think that the issue is really freedom. Frankly, that it is not our job to make those decisions from Washington, D.C. Those decisions for a local community can be made in a local community, so long as they are not trying to establish or endorse a particular or official religion. So I do not think that the Congress of the United States should even attempt, and I do not think it is our place to try to say court houses in Georgia, in Colorado, in Alabama, in Oklahoma, in California, or any place else for the United States Congress to establish the standards of what can be put on the walls of county court houses or city halls all around the country, nor do I think it is the role of the U.S. Supreme Court.

In other words, we have bodies that make those decisions right now. People made the decision what art work is going to hang in the Chamber of this Congress. That decision included the visage of Moses and there are also the images of a couple of popes, as I am sure the gentleman is probably well aware, among people with legislative or legal significance.

So when we are asked the question who decides, I think that is going to be basically an issue of who is involved in that community or in that State, if it may be a decision that involves the State facility, and of course then when it becomes a national facility, we have the Ten Commandments depicted in the U.S. Supreme Court Chambers, and that is a decision for the U.S. Supreme Court. What is in the Chambers of Congress is a decision for Congress. We have different Federal agencies, State agencies and local ones.

I think what we have to do is get away from this "big brother" notion that says that the Supreme Court is the fount of all wisdom and it should describe standards and everyone else has to follow those standards before they can hang something on the wall. The test should not be whether we have hung something on the wall which everyone likes or some people like and others do not like. The test should be did we actually take some action that truly tries to make people follow a faith selected for them as opposed to choosing to put up something that was significant to the religious traditions, heritage or beliefs of that particular community, which obviously will differ in some places around the country. That is called diversity.

What we have to do is to get away from this terribly false politically correct notion that we cannot do anything

unless everybody agrees. If we are told that if we say or do something which may give offense to another, and the problem may be in their thin skin, not in what we set out to do or to express, but if we are told that only if everybody agrees with something that is the only circumstance when we can utter it, that is a totally false standard. That flies in the face of the concept of freedom. It flies in the face of free religion, it flies in the face of free speech, and yet that is increasingly what we are being told that everyone, everyone must stifle and suppress their religious expression and their religious beliefs and accept muzzling and censorship of it just to make sure that there is not one person sitting there that chooses to take offense.

It is about time that we understand that the intolerance frequently is not on the part of someone that is voicing a religious opinion. The intolerance is on the part of the one who wants to shut them up.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, let me ask the gentleman this question. This is endorsed by a number of Christian groups.

Mr. ISTOOK. And those of many other faiths as well.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman has worked hard with such groups. Can the gentleman tell me the non-Christian groups who are supporting this?

Mr. ISTOOK. I do not have the full list with me, but for example we have an organization of Jewish rabbis which is called Toward Tradition.

Mr. KINGSTON. Is the Jewish rabbi group, is this a large group or an outsider group?

Mr. ISTOOK. I do not know the actual number of how many hundreds or thousands of rabbis are in this particular organization. It is a national organization of rabbis. The American Conference of Jews and Blacks, the American Muslim Network, those are some of the non-Christian groups. And of course there are many that are Christian groups, and we would expect that of course because that is the faith of most Americans.

Mr. KINGSTON. Does this religious freedom amendment have a web page, a freestanding web page?

Mr. ISTOOK. It certainly does.

Mr. KINGSTON. Because I think if people want to have some of these questions answered, and I know the gauntlet the gentleman has gone through in the last four years, having answered just about every question that has ever been raised on this, but not everybody has heard the questions or the answers.

How do they find this out? How do they find out some non-Christian groups that are endorsing it?

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the reference there. The web page that we have established for reference is religiousfreedom.house.gov, and I should caution people, do not put a www in front of it, or they will get a

totally different web page. But it is religious freedom, all one word, religiousfreedom.house.gov.

There, as the gentleman is aware and I appreciate him pointing it out, we have a wealth of information. Detailed legal analysis and going through different Supreme Court decisions and other decisions and citing this. Copies of many of the endorsement letters that we have received. Papers discussing how does this fit in with the notion of separation of church and State. How does it fit in with the claims different people make about well are we a captive audience to this? All of these different questions that are sometimes posed are discussed and answered at that web site. So it is a great resource that people can utilize to get more information. We even have made it easy for people to download and if they want to copy and distribute documents as handouts to other people, it is a very useful place.

Mr. KINGSTON. If they have a particular question, they should first search the web page and then if they cannot find their question and answer they need to contact the office of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

Mr. ISTOOK. Correct. And we have an e-mail set up on the web page for that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman give his address for people who do not have computers.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mailing address? Certainly. They can reach me, and the last name is spelled I-S-T-O-O-K, Congressman Istook at 119 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

I would like to take a moment to mention a couple of other aspects about the religious freedom amendment because as the gentleman from Georgia knows, this has not been a lightly pursued undertaking. It is only because it has been 36 years now since the Supreme Court rendered its original decision suppressing prayer in so many circumstances in public schools and all the other approaches have basically been tried and exhausted and the route of the constitutional amendment is the only one left to be workable.

But we have tried to make sure as we mentioned before, frankly. There is more language here to safeguard against any effort at government control of religion, there is more text in the amendment devoted to those safeguards than there are to express that students should have the right to pray in public schools and that the religious traditions or heritage or beliefs should be something that could be freely expressed.

I, like so many other parents with children in public school, have gotten sick of looking at all the times when we go to school, we think it is going to be a special occasion, maybe it is a special school activity or pageant in December. They have the school choir and we say, well, they are going to sing some different holiday songs. We hear

“Here Comes Santa Claus” and “Walking in a Winter Wonderland” and “Rudolph and “Frosty the Snowman,” but we do not hear “Silent Night” or “O Come All Ye Faithful” or Jewish Chanukkah songs, and it is because of the fear of lawsuits and in some cases actual court decisions that have gone that far.

The U.S. Post Office a couple of years ago took down the banners that said Happy Chanukkah or Merry Christmas in the Post Office.

□ 2145

They will not let those be displayed anymore. They had to fight with some people to keep issuing the Christmas holiday stamps.

Take the Internal Revenue Service. One of its big offices in California issued an edict to all of their workers saying, on your own desk and in your personal work space, you cannot have any type of religious item or symbol. It might have been a Bible. It could have been a Star of David. It could have been a little nativity scene, a picture of Christ. Whatever it was, they said those were taboo. They cannot be there on your own desk.

I wrote the IRS, and I have said, why have you done this? They sent back a letter to me. They said items which are considered intrusive, such as religious items or sexually suggestive cartoons or calendars must be prohibited. That was their full description of the restricted items, a religious item or something that is sexually suggestive.

Mr. KINGSTON. This was the IRS?

Mr. ISTOOK. This was the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. KINGSTON. They are doing such a good job on tax simplification and tax clarity that they have enough time to worry about something that is offensive.

Mr. ISTOOK. Yes. The ones that they categorize as offensive, if it is a religious symbol or if it is sexually suggestive or pornographic. But do you see the connection? Why do they lump a religious item or symbol in the category of things that are offensive to people? That is exactly what they have done. They treat it as something that is suspect or something that is dangerous, which is wrong to do.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the IRS is cracking down on people posting things that are offensive to most people, then obviously, you cannot put up an IRS sign, because that is far more offensive than most of the other items that they are talking about.

Mr. ISTOOK. Maybe they should have banned an emblem of the IRS itself since that is, as you point out, offensive to many people.

But that is such a dangerous trend. But you see, it is not only the IRS. If you read the Supreme Court decision in the case of Lee v. Weisman, that is the graduation prayer case, in it, Justice Kennedy, writing on behalf of the Supreme Court, says, Assuming as we must that the prayer which the rabbi

offered at the graduation was offensive, so the Supreme Court said we must assume that a prayer at a public school graduation is an offensive act. Four of the justices disagreed. It was a 5 to 4 decision.

Mr. KINGSTON. What year was this?

Mr. ISTOOK. This was 1992. In this particular case, and I would like to read something from the words of the justices who disagreed with what their brethren on the court had done. The four justices who dissented from this were Scalia, Thomas, Rehnquist, and White. Let me read what they said. This goes back to something that the gentleman from Georgia asked before about what happens when we are able to recognize, yes, we have got some differences of opinion among religion, and it is not a threat to anyone.

This is what those four justices, Scalia, Rehnquist, White and Thomas wrote in their dissent in *Lee v. Weisman*, and I quote now their words: "Nothing, absolutely nothing is so inclined to foster among religious believers of various faiths a toleration, no, an affection for one another than voluntarily joining in prayer together to the God whom they all worship and seek. Needless to say, no one should be compelled to do that. But it is a shame to deprive our public culture of the opportunity and, indeed, the encouragement for people to do it voluntarily. The Baptist or Catholic who heard and joined in the simple and inspiring prayers of Rabbi Guttermann on this occasion was inoculated from religious bigotry and prejudice in a manner that cannot be replicated. To deprive our society of that important unifying mechanism in order to spare the nonbeliever what seems to be the minimal inconvenience of standing or even sitting in respectful nonparticipation is as senseless in policy as it is unsupportable in law."

So they were talking about what we were discussing before, that the act of people of different faiths sharing a common respectful experience creates, as they said, not just a toleration, but an affection for one another and an appreciation of what we have in common, because it emphasizes the things which we share, rather than emphasizing the ways in which we differ.

Mr. KINGSTON. Now, I want to ask another question, though. You say in some of your frequently asked questions that the Religious Freedom Amendment does not permit teachers or any other agent of the government to proselytize or to dictate that any person must join in prayer or to prescribe what prayer should be said. Where is that wording in here?

Then what would keep the teacher from praying?

Mr. ISTOOK. What we have here is a clear requirement, because a teacher, of course, as any person who is part of local government, is considered an agent of State government. That is a binding rule of law. Local government is a subset of State government. So

when we say, "Neither the United States nor any State shall require any person to join in prayer or other religious activity," you are saying that no agent of government can dictate to people you have got to pray or we are going to pressure you to participate in some sort of religious activity. That is to avoid just trying to get people to join in the prayer if they may not want to do so, but trying to make sure that you are also not trying to push them into any other type of religious activity. So we have tried to make sure that we cover that as well as other concerns of people with that language.

Mr. KINGSTON. But that would mean you could have prayer which is not student led. You could have teacher-led prayer.

Mr. ISTOOK. You can have the initiative for prayer that must come, not from government, but from the students, because following that, we have the requirement that it says, "Government shall not prescribe school prayers." That means two things. You do not prescribe or dictate that they must occur. Secondly, you do not prescribe or select the content of those prayers.

Is it possible, for example, let us take a case such as the graduation case in Rhode Island, the *Lee v. Weisman* case, Rabbi Leslie Guttermann was invited to offer the prayer. Should students, on some occasion, invite someone else to join the prayer? Yes. That could be permitted. But the initiative must come from the students, not from government.

Let me tell you a personal story that relates to that, because I recall, in 1963, when I was a student in junior high school in Fort Worth, Texas. That day, our whole school had let out briefly to walk down to the highway to see the motorcade where the President of the United States was passing by as he was going to downtown Fort Worth to Carswell Air Force Base and passing our community to do so to get on to Airforce One and make a quick hop over to Dallas where he was shot and killed. That was November 22nd, 1963. I recall, of course, we had just seen the President that morning, the shock as the first, the rumors and then the confirmation spread through the school.

You can imagine, of course, as from your own experiences, because we are of the generation where everybody knows where they were the day that John F. Kennedy was assassinated, and I recall on that occasion, despite what the Supreme Court had ruled just the year before, and I cannot tell you to this day who offered it, but the whole school shared in the prayer over the school intercom.

If you took the case today and the order that Judge Dement has issued in the State of Alabama, whoever offered that prayer could be put in prison under the judge's order. So we need to recognize that there are extraordinary circumstances, and there are extraordinary deeds, and there are times that we need to reinforce the common

bonds, just as these four justices said in their dissent, that we need to reinforce those common bonds.

□ 2200

So that, I think, is the best answer we can give to the question that the gentleman posed when someone says, well, gee, if I cannot do what I want to do and to do it right now, that my constitutional rights are being infringed upon. I do not think we want to teach our kids that and certainly the Religious Freedom Amendment would not do that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me ask the gentleman this. Some of the critics feel that right wing Christian extremists are pushing this. And I have seen literature that labels groups who advocate this amendment.

Mr. ISTOOK. And they probably labeled the gentleman, who is one of the cosponsors, as a right wing religious extremist. Of course, they are wrong on that.

Mr. KINGSTON. That would not be the first time. The question, though, this is a constitutional amendment. Therefore, it has to pass this House by 290 votes.

Mr. ISTOOK. Yes, by 290 votes. By two-thirds of those who vote. If everybody votes, it would be 290.

Mr. KINGSTON. Now, the gentleman has 152 co-sponsors.

Mr. ISTOOK. Approximately that number; correct.

Mr. KINGSTON. And there are people who will support this but will not co-sponsor it.

Mr. ISTOOK. Correct.

Mr. KINGSTON. But it would appear to me the gap between 152 and 290 is still a large one.

Mr. ISTOOK. That is typical, of course, because most pieces of legislation have far fewer co-sponsors than they do have people who actually vote for them.

Mr. KINGSTON. And if people want to find out if their Representative is a co-sponsor, they can go to that Web page.

Mr. ISTOOK. They can go to the Web page and we have that information for them there.

Mr. KINGSTON. Now, should this pass the House, it has to get 60 votes in the Senate.

Mr. ISTOOK. Here is the requirement, for this or any other constitutional amendment. The requirement that is set forth, in I think either article 5 or 6 of the Constitution, sets up the way that the Constitution is amended.

Now, the way the Supreme Court does it, they issue a ruling which bends or twists or distorts or breaks the Constitution, and then we have to go through this process to correct it. So the way the Founding Fathers intended is, we have to have a vote on a constitutional amendment that is approved by two-thirds of the House and by two-thirds of the Senate and then is ratified by three-fourths of the State legislatures.

Now, it is important to note that in the process of ratifying it, we do not need a two-thirds vote within a State legislature. We only need a simple majority. But we have to have the simple majority from three-fourths.

It is also important to note the President of the United States and the governors of the several States do not have any formal or official role in any constitutional amendment. It is something that is done through the legislative bodies, both in the Congress and in the State legislatures. And the Religious Freedom Amendment specifies a period of 7 years for the States to consider ratification of this.

Mr. KINGSTON. Does the gentleman have a similar piece of legislation being introduced and worked in the Senate?

Mr. ISTOOK. Our intent is first to have the House vote, which will create the incentive for the Senate vote. And there are multiple Members of the Senate who are potential principal sponsors in the other body.

Mr. KINGSTON. But the reality is this has a long, long way to go. As far as the gentleman from Oklahoma has gone with it, he is only at the starting gate still.

Mr. ISTOOK. But we are at a key position, because this amendment has been approved by the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary, and approved by the House Committee on the Judiciary. That is the first time a committee of this House has ever approved an amendment on voluntary school prayer. Only one other time, in 1971, did we have a vote in this body on such a proposal, and that was done with a mechanism that bypassed the committee process.

So even though, as the gentleman correctly notes, the Constitution establishes a deliberately difficult process for any constitutional amendment, we have come through the necessary stages to bring it to a vote in this House. And it will be the first vote in this body since 1971.

And that is something that, frankly, ought to embarrass the many Congresses that have met year after year since then. Because if we look at public opinion polls since 1962, consistently three-fourths of the American people say we want a constitutional amendment to make it possible to have voluntary prayer in public schools again. Not compulsory, but not with the kind of restrictions they put on efforts to have prayer in public schools today. So it is long overdue for this body to act.

And I want to make note, too, that this is what has happened before, when the U.S. Supreme Court went in one direction and the Congress and the American people said it is the wrong direction. The most prominent of the constitutional amendments that have been adopted to correct the Supreme Court was the 13th amendment to abolish slavery, because the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott decision had said

Congress and the States do not have the power and do not have the right to abolish slavery. That took a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time and the opportunity this evening to address this important issue to restore the full range of religious freedom that the Founding Fathers intended; that the first amendment in its simple terms was meant to represent before it was twisted, unfortunately, by the court decisions. And I certainly look forward to the vote that we will be having in this House in a month, and I hope that the citizens who are represented by the Members of this Congress will talk to the Members of this Congress and tell them that they need to be supporting the religious freedom amendment.

FEDERAL LANDS AND WATER ISSUES IN THE WEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RILEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, my district is the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado. This is a very unique district. First of all, geographically, this district is actually larger than the State of Florida. There is the State of Florida. My district, here, is the State of Colorado. The district that I represent goes from north to south, about like that. This land mass here, or the Third Congressional District, this is geographically larger than the State of Florida.

This evening I want to visit a little while on government lands; the mass of government lands in the West, what the difference is between land in the East and land in the West, what the historical perspective is of how that land was settled under the Manifest Destiny; and then I want to move on to the subject and discuss water in the West, because water in the West is clearly much more complicated than water issues in the East, and an entirely different type of system has been devised to address the uniqueness of water in the West.

So let us start first of all with some statistics. The Federal Government owns about 688 million acres of land. Now, a lot of homeowners out there may have a home on a quarter of an acre of land. Imagine 688 million acres. That is what the Federal Government owns. And 95 percent, 95 percent, of that 688 million acres is in the West.

This map that I have up here is titled "Government Lands." Take a look at the difference between the western half of the United States and the eastern half of the United States. Take a look.

And we should not include Alaska, which on this map, by the way, is shown on half the scale as the other States. So Alaska really would be twice that size.

Now, the key to this land ownership out here is what we would call multiple

use. Now, Colorado is not unlike that. In Colorado, as you can see from my district, there are about 20 million acres, 20 million acres in the Congressional District that I represent, that is owned by the Federal Government.

Now, the historical perspective of how this land mass came about was really driven through the Manifest Destiny. We began the acquisition of our lands under that idea to stretch the scope of the Nation. We wanted to go from the Atlantic out to the Pacific. And the district that I represent actually came through several different things. One was the Louisiana Purchase, and that occurred in 1803; the secession from Mexico, which occurred in 1848; and the purchase from Texas in 1850. So there is a good portion of the district that I represent that actually used to belong to the country of Mexico. So the Louisiana Purchase, secession from Mexico, and the purchase from Texas is how a lot of this land was acquired by the United States.

Now, let me step back for a moment. What the agenda was of the government in Washington, D.C. was to go west, young man, go west. They wanted to get into this new land that was acquired through the Louisiana Purchase. They wanted civilization to go out into the West and make it one large unified country. Well, what they did is they did several things. They had the Homestead Act. In the areas like Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri, there was lots of very, very fertile farmland. And the government decided the best way to persuade people to go out to these States was to give them land grants, or let them homestead; i.e. if people would go out there, if they would work the land for a certain period of time, the government would actually deed the land to them. Maybe 160 acres. Maybe 320 acres.

And that actually, in these States which are very, very fertile, was enough to make a living off of. A family could have a farm off 160 acres. They could farm 320 acres and support a family back then. But what they discovered, first of all, was not a lot of settlers wanted to go up in the mountain terrain of the West. The winters were very, very difficult. The winters were very, very harsh.

And furthermore, the government discovered that when people went to the West, they could not do it on 160 acres. In fact, 160 acres in some areas of the district that I represent, one can hardly run one cow on it. The government believed that they really could not politically give away the thousands of acres that would be necessary for a rancher or a farm family or the settlers to make a living. So what they decided, since there was such a large mass of Federal land, was to go ahead and retain the ownership of this Federal land, keep the ownership in the government's hands but under the doctrine of multiple use.

What is multiple use? Multiple use is simply best defined by a sign that was

on all the Federal lands when I grew up, and that sign said welcome, you are now entering, for example, White River National Forest, a land of many uses. They wanted this to be a land of many uses.

Unfortunately, in the last two decades, we have seen people who really, in my opinion, do not know this land, have tried to take away the land of many uses concept and put on a sign that says no trespassing.

Now, I am not speaking from inexperience. My family actually settled in Colorado, down about right there, 1872, up in Boulder. I was born over here on the western slope. So since 1872, and I am proud of the fact I have two daughters that are pioneer daughters, meaning that our family was here before the State of Colorado became a State.

My wife's family, they are up here. They have a ranch. It is 115 years old. Right up there. David and Sue Ann Smith. They still run it. Cattle operation. Takes a lot of land to run a cattle operation.

But what has happened on this multiple use concept is, first of all, especially for my colleagues who are from the East, understand that multiple use is critical for our life-style out there. And when we mention multiple use, or use of the Federal lands, a lot of my colleagues say, well, we are talking about grazing, cattle grazing; we are talking about ski areas. But the picture is much, much broader and much, much more critical than that, although we certainly should not downplay the critical importance of tourism in Colorado and the fundamental foundation of ranching as it is to the West.

But the fact is multiple use has many uses. First of all, water. In my particular district, the district that I represent, water is either stored upon Federal land, it runs across Federal land, or originates on Federal land. In order for the populations in my particular district to get water, we have to depend upon multiple use, or the lands of many uses on the Federal lands, to do that.

If we were to shut off the Federal lands, as many people would like to do, we would shut off the water supply to the population that has elected me to represent them back here in Washington, D.C. Not just water supply. Radio towers. A lot of my colleagues in the East take for granted, for example, States that have very, very little Federal land, take for granted the fact that they can have a cellular telephone tower, or they can have a radio tower or the power lines.

□ 2215

There are a lot of electrical power lines that the only way we can get electricity to the population that I represent depends on the amount for multiple use of Federal lands. Same thing with microwave. Same thing with cellular telephones. In fact, in the district that I represent, I am not sure that there is a highway out there that at

some point is not dependent upon being able to cross Federal lands.

Now, these Federal lands are massive. The Federal Government has designed a management technique to carry out the philosophy of multiple use, and that management technique involves several agencies. It involves, of course, the Forest Service, Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Land Management, National Parks. And they are granted. These Federal agencies are given several different tools under which to manage this large mass of land.

Now, the most obvious on this ranch, the most obvious lack of management is kind of a free-for-all. And frankly, when they settled the West many, many years ago, the government kind of let them go, free for all. "Go out there, conquer the land." And of course, we did not have the environmental technology we have today, but there was a lot of damage done.

In fact, some of our rivers in Colorado still run with some of the mineral that had seeped from the mining back in there. But as time went on, the government became a little better, a little smarter; and so did the population. And let me stress, so did the population. The people that know that land the best are not the governmental bureaucrats, they are not the government employees out there. The people that know that land the best are the people that grew up on that land. And there are a lot of great, long-time families that care about that land as much as they care about their children.

Let us go back to the management tools. So we have got the free-for-all over here, which clearly is an idiotic, frankly, management tool to use. It would never pass today and it should not pass as a management tool for today. And the other tool we have clear over on this extreme is the designation called "wilderness areas."

Now, "wilderness" sounds very fuzzy. It is a very good word. I was in a town meeting, in fact, about a week ago and I asked the people there, "How many people in this room do not like the word 'wilderness'?" Everybody likes the word "wilderness."

But understand what it does. Basically, the word "wilderness" locks up the land. That is the designation of the "no trespassing" sign that I spoke of. There are appropriate areas in the West where the "wilderness" designation, that is what they call it, the "wilderness" designation is appropriate.

For example, I have got a bill myself on the Spanish Peaks that I am a co-sponsor on with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS). Spanish Peaks, we go clear to the very top of the peaks. It is an appropriate designation for wilderness. It is an appropriate area for, in essence, a lockout.

But my colleagues will find many environmental groups, the national Sierra Club, Earth First, and by the way, most of these are headquartered not in this area, they are headquartered back here in the East, primarily in Washington D.C., who come into this area and try and dictate, not compromise with common sense, but try and dictate the policies of their special interests on the management of these Federal lands. Frankly, they have been pretty successful. What kind of impact has it had? The kind of impact that it has, it drives our ranching communities.

I tell my colleagues, our ranching community is vital, not just for the State of Colorado, not for the cattle markets, not for the sheep markets, but for the wholesome style of living that that signifies. The West is what the United States is known for. And these families, and again look at my in-laws, David and Sue Ann Smith, we can still see the cabins where their

land or the biggest chunk of this Federal land and put it into wilderness areas. They now are trying to put big chunks of this land in wilderness areas, lock them out, keep the people out of it. Well, that is the most extreme tool. By the way, if we employ that tool of management, it is totally, totally inflexible and it cannot be changed except under the rarest of circumstances. And I cannot imagine, even if we were at war and we needed the resources off that, I cannot imagine getting the votes necessary that would unlock that wilderness area.

So we have the wilderness area over here as a management tool. We have the free-for-all over here. And in between we have the Forest Service, National Parks, and the BLM that have a number of tools that they can utilize to manage these lands. And with the exception of the Federal Wilderness designation, every other tool that the Forest Service, for example, has or that the BLM has or National Parks has, has flexibility. Remember, wilderness has no flexibility. Once we are in it, we are locked in it forever. But the other management tools have flexibility.

The reason they have flexibility is that, who knows what the future brings. We may find that the technology on how to handle the environment or what to do with the resources out there demands a different management tool than the one we have under it today. But because of our discovery of technology or better management tools, we think we should shift it over here or shift this one over here. We have got that flexibility.

Now, I want to tell my colleagues, I know a lot of employees of the United States Forest Service. I know a lot of employees at the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, Park Services. If we allow them to do their job, I think they can do a pretty good job. They are a dedicated bunch of people.

But, unfortunately, what happens out there is we have special-interest groups, for example, the national Sierra Club, Earth First, and by the way, most of these are headquartered not in this area, they are headquartered back here in the East, primarily in Washington D.C., who come into this area and try and dictate, not compromise with common sense, but try and dictate the policies of their special interests on the management of these Federal lands. Frankly, they have been pretty successful. What kind of impact has it had? The kind of impact that it has, it drives our ranching communities.

I tell my colleagues, our ranching community is vital, not just for the State of Colorado, not for the cattle markets, not for the sheep markets, but for the wholesome style of living that that signifies. The West is what the United States is known for. And these families, and again look at my in-laws, David and Sue Ann Smith, we can still see the cabins where their

grandparents came and homesteaded in that area. And they are very dependent frankly upon multiple use of Federal land. So is everybody in Meeker, Colorado. So is everybody in Grand Junction. So are the skiers. It is very heavily depended upon.

If we can allow the Federal employees to do their jobs and do them with a little anecdote of common sense, we can protect this land, we can live off this land, and we can preserve this land for everybody's use. But, please, do not be taken in by some of these special interest groups that are going to try and convince us, first of all, that there is gross abuse going on here on these Federal lands, that these Federal lands are being degraded.

They can always find an example here and there. Gosh, I am a Catholic. We can look in the Catholic church and we can find an example of a bad person here or there in our religion. But that does not mean that we revamp the entire system. It is the same thing here.

When somebody talks to us about going to Colorado or we need this wilderness area out here, ask them what the impact would be if we went to New York City and put a wilderness area in Central Park, or if we went out here on the Mall in Washington, D.C., and made the Mall a wilderness area, gave it a wilderness designation.

What would happen to it? Nobody gets to go on it. We want to preserve this for the future. Meaning no one has access to the National Mall. The country would not tolerate that for 2 seconds, and they should not tolerate that for 2 seconds.

Well, we in the West face the same kind of challenges. Let the people in the West live as my colleagues do. Let us enjoy the historical perspective and listen to our opinions on what could help the land, how to preserve the land.

Last week I had an opportunity to speak here and I named several ranchers. Bill Volbraught has got a ranch in Evergreen, Colorado. Al Stroobauts has a farm in Virginia, and he has a ranch in Colorado. The Smiths, they ranch up in Meeker. The Strangs, a former U.S. Congressman, ranches in Carbondale. His brother ranches up in Meeker.

Go out and spend just a few minutes with these people. Go to Golden Bears Ranch out in the Glenwood Canyon, Glenwood Springs, Colorado, near Aspen. A lot of my colleagues know where Aspen is. Spend a few minutes with these people. See how important the concept of multiple use is. But more important than that, see how important the management and love of that land pours out of their hearts.

When they pick up a handful of soil, when they point out an elk, when they take us down and show us the stream, take us trout fishing, or show us how generation after generation has been raised through 4-H, calves or 4-H sheep or at the county fair, we will have a much, much better understanding of how important this area is and the ability to live in this area and the abil-

ity to have multiple use, how important that is for the entire United States.

Let me move from Federal land ownership over to something that is important to all of us, and that is water. I think an interesting thing about water is to talk a little about how much water is necessary for each and every one of us to have on a daily basis.

I bet none of my colleagues know that it takes a thousand gallons of water a day, a thousand gallons of water a day, to grow the necessary food to give each person in these Chambers three balanced meals. The average person, when they cook for those meals and drink, 2 gallons a day. A washing machine uses about 20 gallons per load, a dishwasher, 25 gallons per load. Taking a shower, oh, 7 to 9 gallons per shower.

Now, growing food, and by the way, growing foods is the biggest consumption of water in the country. Growing foods, to get one loaf of bread, this is a hard statistic to believe, to get one loaf of bread takes 150 gallons of water for one loaf of bread. One egg to produce, when that egg finally comes out, we have gone through 120 gallons of water. Quart of milk, 123 gallons of water. One pound of tomatoes, just to raise one pound of tomatoes, it takes 125 gallons of water. One pound of oranges, 47 pounds. And one pound of potatoes, 23 gallons.

If we took 50 glasses of water, just to give a comparison, 44 glasses of that 50 glasses of water, so we own 50 glasses of water, 44 of those glasses have to go straight to agriculture. That is how critical water is for our food supply in this country. Three glasses of those 50 glasses would be used by industry. Two glasses would be used by the major cities. And a half a glass of water is used in the country for the smaller population that we have.

Now, water is critical. When we look around the world, we say the world has lots of water. Ninety-seven percent, 97 percent of the water in the world is salt water; less than 3 percent is pure water. Now, if we take a look at the map, and going back again, if we take a look here and we draw a line somewhere between Kansas and Missouri, so we go down about like this, that area right there, we will find that 73 percent of the stream flow, 73 percent of the water in the United States, is here in the East, 73 percent. So that line represents 73 percent.

Over here we are going to find that 12.7 percent of the country's water supply is up here in the Pacific Northwest, and the remaining 13 or 14 Western States over here have 14 percent. So about a percent per State. So 14 States only have 14 percent of the water supply.

Now, in the East, one of their problems with water is how to get rid of it. In the West our problem is how do we save it. Take, for example, the State of Colorado. Colorado is a very arid State. Colorado is the highest State in the

country. In fact, the district that I represent is the highest district in the country. It is a mountainous district. We have 54 mountains over 14,000 feet in my district.

But in Colorado we do not get much rainfall. Where we get our water, and by the way they call the State of Colorado "The Mother of All Rivers." Colorado, when we get our water, comes from the melting of the snow on the high peaks. Colorado is the only State in the lower 48, the only State where all of our free-flowing water goes out. We do not have water that flows into the State of Colorado. It is a critical issue.

And the water we get, as I mentioned earlier, comes from the snow melt off the top of the mountain peaks. That is called the spring runoff. But the springs runoff only occurs for a period of time, about 60 to 90 days; and during that 60-to-90-day period of time, if we do not store that water, we lose that water.

Now, the beauty of water is it is the only natural resource that is renewable. For example, if we use a gallon of gasoline, it is gone forever once we burn it up. We use a gallon of water and a gallon of water up here in the mountain range, by the time a gallon of water leaves the headwaters there and gets down here, say, to the Utah border, that gallon of water has the equivalent of 6 gallons of water. And so on, it just goes.

□ 2230

It is the only natural resource that is a renewable resource. It is a critical resource for us. But in the East, there is I think somewhat of a lack of perhaps understanding of how critical water storage is for us to have water outside that 60 to 90-day period of time that we experience the spring runoff. Colorado is a State that is the headwaters for four major rivers, the Arkansas, and the Arkansas flows on into Kansas, goes over to Kansas. Up here in Nebraska it is the Platte, and the Platte flows up that direction. We have a river that originates here and goes up into Nebraska, the Platte. We have the Arkansas that goes down here into Kansas, we have the Rio Grande that goes down here into New Mexico. And we have got the Colorado River. By the way the Colorado River is called the mother of rivers. The Colorado River supplies water for 18 or 19 different States and the country of Mexico. That river goes west, and flows into the State of Utah, eventually makes its way to the Pacific Ocean and down for the country of Mexico. In fact, out of Colorado, to show you how important that water and how important the snowfall is up there, 75 percent of the water in the Colorado River, which again goes about like this, 75 percent of that water comes off those mountain peaks in the congressional district that I represent. As of late, we have seen a lot of effort, again by some special interest groups, who in my opinion do

not understand how critical water storage is for our species, how important water storage is for our crops, how important our water storage is for our animals and the whole works. These people do not understand that. Some of these organizations, maybe even more frightening is they do understand it. Some of these special interest organizations cannot wait to take down a dam out in the West.

First of all, we use those dams to store the water, as I mentioned earlier. Second, this statistic is probably, oh, 4 years old, so I do not know if it is still accurate today, I think it is, there is not a gold meadow fishing stream in Colorado that is not below a dam. The other thing is the hydroelectric power that comes off those dams is probably the cleanest type of power you can get. You go to some foreign country and they chuckle when they see that there are people in our country who want to do away with hydroelectric power. They say it is such a clean power.

We know how to take care of these resources. We have got the National Sierra Club, the President of the National Sierra Club named as his top priority to drain Lake Powell. Lake Powell may not mean a lot to you here in the Chambers, but I can tell you it is a critical, critical water resource, not just for the power, not just for the recreation, not just for the drinking but for the environment as a whole. It is a critical body of water out in the West. We need your support. I need your support. This Nation needs your support, to understand how important and how critical water in the West has become and will remain, how just one little innocent bill that goes out of these Chambers addressing either multiple use on Federal lands or impacting the utilization of water in the West, how one little bill out of here can have a major, major impact on the lifestyles of the people that settled the West.

They have a saying in Colorado that water runs as thick as blood. That is true. We used to have a joke out there that you can mess around with a man as long as you leave his water alone and a couple of other things. Certainly water has risen to the top as a critical issue. Let me just recap, because our lesson really tonight or the discussion I wanted to have with my colleagues out here was Federal lands and why we feel in the West sometimes under siege by some of our colleagues here in the East. In fact, it is kind of interesting. You take a look at some of these so-called environmental ratings put out again by these special interest organizations. Take a look. This demonstrates pretty clearly to me the lack of understanding of some of these organizations of the lifestyle in the West, of the needs of the West. Take a look. You will find high environmental ratings over here. Once you come to the West, you will see noticeably lower environmental ratings by these special interest groups. My bet is most of the

people putting those kind of charts together have never sat foot on a mountain in the district that I represent, have never sat down with a Mike Strang or a David Smith or a Bill Volbraught or an Al Stroobauts or Leslie Volbraught or Kit Strang or Sue Ann Smith and asked these people how important land is, how they take care of the land and would they mind just spending a few hours kind of shadowing them around the ranch so they have some kind of an appreciation of what goes on.

The use of these Federal lands, the management of these Federal lands here is very, very important. I just ask that each of you this evening, before you criticize those of us in the West who feel that we are under attack, who constantly feel that we are being trampled upon because of a lack of understanding, I ask that you take a little time the next time one of these issues comes up and study the issue or come out to the West, not on a vacation to Aspen or Vail, although they are beautiful places to visit, they are in my district, but go out to a small little town like Silt, Colorado or Meeker, Colorado or maybe go out in the east to Sterling, Colorado and just visit with some of those people and see how a Federal policy in Washington, D.C. can devastate a lot of history, a lot of family and a lot of love for that land. The final thing I want to revisit very quickly is this water issue. Remember that most of the water in the country, you have already got here in the East. That in the West for us to have this water, we have to, one, manage it, and I think we do a pretty good job of it, two, we have to have water storage, and we need to use common sense. The way to build water storage projects today has changed from the way we built water projects 20 or 25 years ago. We have got more advanced technology. We know how to get a bigger bang for the buck. We know how to get a bigger bang for the environment. We know how to build these projects in such a way that we can minimize, in fact enhance.

The days of mitigation of the environment are over. Now, when you have a project like a dam water storage project, you are not going to be expected just to mitigate the environmental impacts you have. We now expect you to enhance the environment, make it better. We can do that and we are doing that. But to my colleagues here, do not just automatically say any water storage project in the West must be pork, must be disastrous to the environment, because it is our lifeblood. When you come west of the Mississippi, that is our lifeblood. All of this region, we have got to have water.

In conclusion, one of the people that I have enjoyed the most up here learning from, a fellow who is a tugboat captain, who has lived this land, who understands this land, who understands common sense and is under siege by the government ownership of land is the gentleman from Alaska (Mr.

YOUNG). Some of these special interest groups write him off, "Oh, my gosh, he's terrible." But not many of them have ever been on a tugboat with him. Not many have ever been up to Alaska to see the kind of wilderness that he is so proud of. Not many of the critics have gone out there and visited with some of the natives or some of the people out in Alaska that live off the land. The same thing in my district, the same thing in Utah, in the district of Mr. HANSEN. The same thing in a lot of others, Mr. ENSIGN in Nevada.

I appreciate your time this evening. I will be back again. As long as I represent the Third Congressional District in this fine body, you can count on me standing up for the rights, not just of the citizens I represent but the rights of the future generations, so that they too, without having to be wealthy, they too can live on the land and enjoy the land that I have been privileged to do.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business in the district.

Ms. Carson (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business in the district.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and for the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. SKAGGS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. BATEMAN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. NEUMANN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

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. SKELTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. ISTOOK, for 5 minutes, on May 6.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1998—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John Shadegg	2/5	2/8	Germany	565.50
Stephen Scott	3/6	3/10	Singapore	971.56	4,939.00
Kristi Remington	3/6	3/10	Taiwan	2,530.00
Harold Gossett	3/6	3/10	Singapore	971.56	4,939.00
Andrew Su	3/6	3/10	Taiwan	2,530.00
Gilbert Macklin	3/6	3/10	Singapore	971.56	4,939
	3/10	3/21	Taiwan	2,520.00	4,939.00
Committee total	25,884.30	33,730.89	563.07	60,168.26

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAN BURTON, Chairman, Apr. 21, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Apr. 21, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 11 AND JAN. 20, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Tony Hall	1/11	1/15	Russia	1,170.00	4,961.00	6,131.00
Hon. Lincoln Diaz-Balart	1/14	1/18	Belgium	852.00	(3)	852.00
	1/18	1/20	France	598.00	(3)	598.00
Committee total	2,620.00	4,961.00	7,581.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

JERRY SOLOMON, Chairman, Apr. 17, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMES V. HANSEN, Chairman, Apr. 3, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL ARCHER, Chairman, Apr. 1, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

²If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL ARCHER, Vice Chairman, Apr. 6, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO HUNGARY, BOSNIA, AND ITALY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 5 AND MAR. 9, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Codel Young (Identical itinerary for all Members and employees listed on the attachment except as noted below)	3/5	USA						(³)			
3/6	3/7	Hungary			197.00			(³)			197.00
3/7	3/7	Bosnia						(³)			
3/7	3/8	Italy			258.00			(³)			258.00
3/8	3/8	Bosnia						(³)			
3/8	3/9	Italy			258.00			(³)			258.00
3/9		USA						(³)			
Hon. C.W. Bill Young	3/8	3/8	Macedonia					(³)			
Kevin Roper	3/8	3/8	Macedonia					(³)			
Doug Gregory	3/8	3/8	Macedonia					(³)			
Hon. Tom Sawyer		3/9	Italy					2,776.00			2,776.00
Identical itinerary:											
Hon. C.W. Bill Young					713.00			(³)			713.00
Hon. Henry Bonilla					713.00			(³)			713.00
Hon. Tillie Fowler					713.00			(³)			713.00
Hon. Charles Bass					713.00			(³)			713.00
Hon. George Nethercutt					713.00			(³)			713.00
Hon. Tom Sawyer					713.00			2,776.00			3,489.00
Hon. Neil Abercrombie					713.00			(³)			713.00
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson					713.00			(³)			713.00
Hon. David Minge					713.00			(³)			713.00
Hon. Allan Boyd					713.00			(³)			713.00
Kevin Roper					713.00			(³)			713.00
Doug Gregory					713.00			(³)			713.00
Patrick Murray					713.00			(³)			713.00
George Withers					713.00			(³)			713.00
Committee total											

¹Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.²If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³Military air transportation.

BILL YOUNG, Apr. 1, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE MEXICO-U.S. INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jim Kolbe	5/16	5/18	United States		387.38			(³)			387.38
Hon. Benjamin A. Gilman	5/16	5/18	United States		386.63			(³)			386.63
Hon. Joe Barton	5/16	5/18	United States		385.88			353.00			738.88
Hon. Tom Campbell	5/16	5/18	United States		385.88			(³)			385.88
Hon. David Dreier	5/16	5/18	United States		391.88			(³)			391.88
Hon. Sam Gejdenson	5/16	5/18	United States		386.63			(³)			386.63
Hon. Silvestre Reyes	5/16	5/18	United States		388.13			(³)			388.13
Everett Eisenstat	5/16	5/18	United States		386.63			(³)			386.63
Shelly Livingston	2/18	2/22	United States		612.71			316.00			928.71
	4/27	4/30	United States		744.04			346.00			1,240.16
	5/15	5/18	United States		589.59			170.00			759.59
John Mackey	5/16	5/18	United States		385.88			(³)			385.88
Denis McDonough	5/16	5/18	United States		397.47			(³)			397.47
Fran McNaught	5/16	5/18	United States		385.88			(³)			385.88
Roger Noriega	5/16	5/18	United States		385.88			(³)			385.88
Kimberly Roberts	5/16	5/18	United States		385.88			(³)			385.88
Delegation expenses:											
Representational functions										27,946.23	27,946.23
Translation/Interpreting										3,350.57	3,350.57
Miscellaneous										524.68	524.68
Committee total					6,986.37			1,185.00		31,971.60	40,142.97

¹Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.²If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³Military air transportation.

JIM KOLBE, Chairman, Mar. 26, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Representational										27,053.51	27,053.51
Translation/Interpretation										3,130.18	3,130.18
Miscellaneous										7,297.93	7,297.93
Committee total										37,481.62	37,481.62

¹Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.²If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOUGLAS BEREUTER, Mar. 27, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE U.S. CONGRESS-EUROPEAN COMMUNITY INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Delegation expenses:											
Representational									27,796.63		27,796.63
Translation									5,265.00		5,265.00
Miscellaneous									197.73		197.73
Committee total									32,759.36		32,759.36

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Mar. 27, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE BRITISH-AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOUGLAS BEREUTER, Mar. 26, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE CANADA-U.S. INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Doug Bereuter	9/11	9/15	Canada		355.15			(3)			355.15
Hon. Pat Danner	9/11	9/15	Canada		355.15			(3)			355.15
Hon. Phil English	9/11	9/15	Canada		355.15			(3)			355.15
Hon. Porter Goss	9/11	9/15	Canada		355.15			(3)			355.15
Hon. Lee Hamilton	9/11	9/15	Canada		355.15			(3)			355.15
Hon. Alcee Hastings	9/11	9/15	Canada		355.15			(3)			355.15
Hon. Amo Houghton	9/11	9/15	Canada		355.15			(3)			355.15
Hon. Donald Manzullo	9/11	9/15	Canada		355.15			(3)			355.15
Hon. James Oberstar	9/11	9/15	Canada		355.15			(3)			355.15
Hon. Collin Peterson	9/11	9/15	Canada		355.15			(3)			355.15
Hon. Mark Sanford	9/11	9/15	Canada		355.15			(3)			355.15
Hon. Cliff Stearns	9/11	9/15	Canada		355.15			(3)			355.15
Allison Kiernan	9/11	9/15	Canada		354.33			(3)			354.33
Allison Kiernan	9/22	9/25	U.S.		342.20			618.00			960.20
Ken Nelson	9/11	9/15	Canada		354.33			(3)			354.33
Frank Record	9/11	9/15	Canada		354.33						354.33
Bob Van Wicklin	9/11	9/15	Canada		354.33			(3)			354.33
Carl Ek	9/11	9/15	Canada		354.33			(3)			354.33
Delegation expenses:											
Miscellaneous									562.86		562.86
Representational									8,537.50		8,537.50
Committee total					6,375.65			618.00		9,100.36	16,094.01

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

AMO HOUGHTON, Cochairman, Mar. 27, 1998.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO BRAZIL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 28 AND APR. 2, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Monica Azare	3/28	4/2	Brazil		700.00			1,975.00			2,675.00
Committee total					700.00			1,975.00			2,675.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MONICA AZARE, Apr. 14, 1998.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8935. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting

the Service's final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Undersized Regulation for the 1998-99 Crop Year [Docket No. FV98-993-1 FR] received May 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8936. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Olives Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV98-932-1 FR] received May 1,

Standards [Docket Number FV-98-301] received May 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8937. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Cantaloups; Grade

1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8938. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida and Imported Grapefruit; Relaxation of the Minimum Size Requirement for Red Seedless Grapefruit [Docket No. FV98-905-2 FIR] received April 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8939. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Temporary Suspension of a Proviso for Exporting Juice and Juice Concentrate; Establishment of Rules and Regulations Concerning Exemptions from Certain Order Provisions; and Establishment of Regulations for Handler Diversion [Docket No. FV97-930-4 FIR] received April 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8940. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin; Issuance of Grower Diversion Certificates [Docket No. FV97-930-5 FIR] received April 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8941. A letter from the Administrator, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—United States Standards for Rye [7 CFR Parts 800 and 810] received April 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8942. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5982-6] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8943. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Sulfentrazone; Establishment of Tolerances Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5983-6] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8944. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5982-3] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8945. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Propiconazole; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions Correction; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5983-1] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8946. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Vinclozolin; Pesticide Tolerance Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5982-2] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8947. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Myclobutanil; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5982-4] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8948. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Lambda-cyhalothrin; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-300509; FRL-5728-8] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8949. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Cyclanilide; Pesticide Tolerances, Correction; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5982-7] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8950. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Cymoxanil; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-300653; FRL-5788-5] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8951. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Various Inert Ingredients; Tolerance Exemptions [OPP-300649; FRL-5787-9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8952. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Safener HOE-107892; Extension of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300650; FRL-5788-1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8953. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director, U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Changes in Reporting Levels for Large Trader Reports [17 CFR Part 15] received April 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8954. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director, U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Trade Options on the Enumerated Agricultural Commodities [CFR Parts 3, 32 and 33] received April 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8955. A letter from the Chief, Programs and Legislation Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting notification that the Commander of Air Education and Training Command is initiating a multi-function cost comparison of the base operating support functions at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, pursuant to 10

U.S.C. 2304 nt.; to the Committee on National Security.

8956. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on a study of the capacitor and resistor industries in the United States, pursuant to Public Law 105-85; to the Committee on National Security.

8957. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Removal of Regulations (RIN: 1820-AB43) received April 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8958. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Mergers and Transfers Between Multiemployer Plans (RIN: 1212-AA69) received May 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8959. A letter from the Acting Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report, "Indicators of Equal Employment Opportunity- Status and Trends," which describes and analyzes statistical information on employment of women and minorities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8960. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medical Devices; Reports of Corrections and Removals; Lift of Stay of Effective Date [Docket No. 91N-0396] received April 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8961. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Use of Alternative Analytical Test Methods in the Reformulated Gasoline Program; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review (CRA) [FRL-5983-5] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8962. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5980-8] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8963. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Approval and Promulgation of Section 182(f) Exemption to the Nitrogen Oxides (NO) Control Requirements for the Lake Charles Ozone Nonattainment Area; Louisiana; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5981-8] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8964. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of New Jersey; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5987-9] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8965. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical

Amendments to Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Delaware: Open Burning and Non-CTG RACT Regulations; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5983-3] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8966. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Significant New Uses of Certain Chemical Substances Correction; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5982-9] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8967. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to District of Columbia; Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5981-2] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8968. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Texas; Revised Geographical Designation of Certain Air Quality Control Regions; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5981-6] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8969. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; Involuntary Acquisition of Property by the Government [FRL-5847-9] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8970. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5980-9] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8971. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Correction to Heading of Federal Register Publication Announcing Final Authorization of Revisions to Arizona Hazardous Waste Program [FRL-5982-1] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8972. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Approval of Section 112(I) Program of Delegation; Wisconsin Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5983-2] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8973. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Acid Rain Program; Nitrogen Oxides Emission Reduction Program [FRL 6006-2] (RIN: 2060-AF48) received April 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8974. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arizona State Implementation Plan Revision, Maricopa County Environmental Services Department [AZ059-0005; FRL-6004-5] received April 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8975. A letter from the Director, Office of

Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Halogenated Solvent Cleaning [AD-FRL-6007-5] (RIN: 2060-A104) received April 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the

Committee on Commerce.

8976. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—IM Program Requirement-On-Board Diagnostic Checks; Amendments to the Final Rule [AMS-FRL-6007-3] (RIN: 2060-AE19) received April 29, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the

Committee on Commerce.

8977. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Polymers [Docket No. 92F-0290] received May 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8978. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Status of Certain Additional Over-the-Counter Drug Category II and III Active Ingredients [Docket Nos. 75N-183F, 75N-183D, and 80N-0280] (RIN: 0910-AA01) received May 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8979. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report of political contributions by nominees as chiefs of mission, ambassadors at large, or ministers, and their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

8980. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report of political contributions by nominees as chiefs of mission, ambassadors at large, or ministers, and their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

8981. A letter from the Executive Director, District of Columbia Retirement Board, transmitting the personal financial disclosure statements of Board members, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—732 and 1—734(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8982. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a list of all reports issued or released in March 1998, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8983. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Correction of Administrative Errors [5 CFR Part 1605] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8984. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8985. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, trans-

mitting a monthly listing of new investigations, audits, and evaluations; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

8986. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Forest Exchanges [WO-420-1050-00-24 1A] (RIN: 1004-AC97) received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8987. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting a proposed plan pursuant to the Indian Tribal Judgement Funds Act, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 1401; to the Committee on Resources.

8988. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Western Pacific Crustacean Fisheries; Vessel Monitoring System; Harvest Guideline; Closed Season [Docket No. 980415098-8098-01; I.D. 031998A] (RIN: 0648-AK22) received May 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8989. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Deep-water Species Fishery by the Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 971208297-8054-02; I.D. 042098A] received May 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8990. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Species in the Rock Sole/Flathead Sole/“Other Flatfish” Fishery Category by the Vessels Using Trawl Gear in Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 971208298-8055-02; I.D. 042198A] received May 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8991. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 9 [Docket No. 970523122-8022-02; I.D. 041897B] (RIN: 0648-AH52) received May 1, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8992. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the Eastern Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 971208297-8054-02; I.D. 041498B] received April 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8993. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Fisheries by Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 971208297-8054-02; I.D. 041498A] received April 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8994. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone

Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Central Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 971208298-8055-02; I.D. 033098B] received April 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8995. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 971208297-8054-02; I.D. 041098A] received April 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8996. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2074; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8997. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2074; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8998. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2074; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8999. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the annual report on applications for court orders made to federal and state courts to permit the interception of wire, oral, or electronic communications during calendar year 1997, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519(3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9000. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Guidelines Establishing Test Procedures for the Analysis of Pollutants; Application for Approval of Alternate Test Procedures [FRL-5835-9] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9001. A letter from the Office of the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Rail General Exemption Authority—Nonferrous Recyclables [STB Ex Parte No. 561] received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9002. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Reporting Health Care Professionals to State Licensing Boards (RIN: 2900-AI78) received April 28, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

9003. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2007 of the Social Security Act to provide grant funding for 20 additional Empowerment Zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9004. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Customs Service Field Organization; Establishment of Sanford Port Of Entry [T.D. 98-35] received April 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9005. A letter from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting notification that the assets of the Hospital Insurance (HI) Trust Fund are expected to be exhausted in 2008, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 13951(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

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. 1021. A bill to provide for a land exchange involving certain National Forest System lands within the Routt National Forest in the State of Colorado (Rept. 105-506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 419. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1872) to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-507). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOSS: Permanent Select Committee on the Intelligence. H.R. 3694. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105-508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of Rule X and clause 4 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. MCCOLUM, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. PEASE, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H.R. 3789. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to enlarge Federal Court jurisdiction over purported class actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 3790. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. STARK, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 3791. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to establish requirements concerning the operation of fossil fuel-fired electric utility steam generating units, commercial and industrial boiler units, solid waste incineration units, medical waste incinerators, hazardous waste combustors, chlor-alkali plants, and Portland cement plants to reduce emissions of mercury to the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. DREIER, and Mr. SOLON):

H.R. 3792. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to redesign the \$1 bill so as to incorporate the preamble to the Constitution of the United States, a list describing the Articles of the Constitution, and a list describing the Articles of Amendment, on the reverse side of such currency; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE (for himself, Mr. HEFNER, and Mrs. CLAYTON):

H.R. 3793. A bill to require the establishment of research and grant programs to identify and field test methods, practices,

and technologies for the efficient, healthful, and environmentally sound disposal of animal waste; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. HARMAN:

H.R. 3794. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit children covered under private health insurance under a State children's health insurance plan to continue to be eligible for benefits under the vaccine for children program; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 3795. A bill to establish a program to provide for a reduction in the incidence and prevalence of Lyme disease; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on National Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon:

H.R. 3796. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey the administrative site for the Rogue River National Forest and use the proceeds for the construction or improvement of offices and support buildings for the Rogue River National Forest and the Bureau of Land Management; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3797. A bill to compensate the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma for the taking of certain rights by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. PORTER):

H. Con. Res. 271. Concurrent resolution welcoming His Holiness Karekin I, Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos of All Armenians, upon his visit to the United States, commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Diocese of the Armenian Church in America, and acknowledging the substantial contributions of Armenian-Americans to society and culture in the United States; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 192: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky.

H.R. 414: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 687: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 790: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 880: Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 953: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 979: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 1362: Mr. SPENCE and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1375: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. PORTMAN.

H.R. 1401: Mr. BOYD and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1505: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1524: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1737: Ms. DELAURIO.

H.R. 1786: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1861: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1995: Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 2088: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2094: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 2130: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 2257: Mr. LAMPSON and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 2374: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 2409: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2499: Mr. HYDE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. EVANS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 2509: Ms. STABENOW, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mr. SOLOMON.
 H.R. 2568: Mr. DICKEY.
 H.R. 2670: Mrs. THURMAN.
 H.R. 2714: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 2754: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2760: Mr. REDMOND.
 H.R. 2817: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 2820: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 2863: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 2868: Mr. DUNCAN.
 H.R. 2888: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2914: Mr. MANTON and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 2990: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. BAESLER, Ms. LEE, Mr. KING of New York, and Mrs. CHENOWETH.
 H.R. 3024: Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 3048: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. SPRATT.
 H.R. 3050: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3053: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. LARGENT.
 H.R. 3099: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 3140: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. GRAHAM.
 H.R. 3156: Mr. HYDE.
 H.R. 3158: Mr. POMBO and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3181: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3187: Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 3217: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. BOEHNER.
 H.R. 3283: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 3382: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 3400: Mr. HILLIARD.
 H.R. 3433: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. NETHERCUTT.
 H.R. 3438: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3464: Mr. FARR of California and Mr. HILLIARD.
 H.R. 3506: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. PEASE, Mr. BOB SCHAFER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. PICKETT.
 H.R. 3510: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 3523: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. McHALE, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. EVERETT.
 H.R. 3535: Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. LARGENT.
 H.R. 3550: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 3567: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. GREENWOOD.
 H.R. 3572: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
 H.R. 3584: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SENSEN-BRENNER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. FURSE.
 H.R. 3601: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. SALMON.
 H.R. 3605: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 3610: Mr. HEFNER and Mr. HOBSON.
 H.R. 3613: Ms. DANNER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 3615: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. COYNE, and Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 3636: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. HYDE.
 H.R. 3640: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. DOOLEY of California.
 H.R. 3661: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. GREEN.
 H.R. 3702: Mr. LANTOS.
 H.R. 3711: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 3727: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3749: Mr. METCALF.
 H.R. 3760: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. HILLIARD.
 H.J. Res. 64: Mr. ROYCE.
 H.J. Res. 99: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. METCALF.
 H. Con. Res. 127: Mr. PAPPAS.
 H. Con. Res. 175: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
 H. Con. Res. 181: Mr. REDMOND, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DREIER, and Mr. CHABOT.
 H. Con. Res. 188: Mr. BONIOR.
 H. Con. Res. 203: Mr. ALLEN.
 H. Con. Res. 220: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
 H. Con. Res. 233: Mr. SANDLIN.
 H. Con. Res. 239: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. MILLER of California.
 H. Con. Res. 249: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
 H. Con. Res. 264: Mr. MURTHA, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. MOAKLEY.
 H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. POSHARD, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H. Res. 37: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. COX of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GREEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. ROTHRMAN.
 H. Res. 392: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. PORTER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2497: Mr. FORBES.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 6

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL

AMENDMENT No. 79: At the end of the bill add the following new title:

TITLE XI—NONDISCRIMINATION PROVISION

SEC. 1101. NONDISCRIMINATION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—No individual shall be excluded from, any program or activity authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, or any provision of this Act, on the basis of race or religion.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to preclude or discourage any of the following factors from being taken into account in admitting students to participation in, or providing any benefit under, any program or activity described in subsection (a): the applicants income; parental education and income; need to master a second language; and instances of discrimination actually experienced by that student.

H.R. 6

OFFERED BY: MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMENDMENT No. 80: At the end of the bill add the following new title:

TITLE XI—ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION

SEC. 1101. SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that, in an effort to change the culture of alcohol consumption on college campuses, all college and university administrators should adopt the following code of principles:

(1) For an institution of higher education, the president of the institution shall appoint

a task force consisting of school administrators, faculty, students, Greek system representatives, and others to conduct a full examination of student and academic life at the institution. The task force will make recommendations for a broad range of policy and program changes that would serve to reduce alcohol and other drug-related problems. The institution shall provide resources to assist the task force in promoting the campus policies and proposed environmental changes that have been identified.

(2) The institution shall provide maximum opportunities for students to live in an alcohol-free environment and to engage in stimulating, alcohol-free recreational and leisure activities.

(3) The institution shall enforce a "zero tolerance" policy on the illegal consumption and binge drinking of alcohol by its students and will take steps to reduce the opportunities for students, faculty, staff, and alumni to legally consume alcohol on campus.

(4) The institution shall vigorously enforce its code of disciplinary sanctions for those who violate campus alcohol policies. Students with alcohol or other drug-related problems shall be referred to an on-campus counseling program.

(5) The institution shall adopt a policy to discourage alcoholic beverage-related sponsorship of on-campus activities. It shall adopt policies limiting the advertisement and promotion of alcoholic beverages on campus.

(6) Recognizing that school-centered policies on alcohol will be unsuccessful if local businesses sell alcohol to underage or intoxicated students, the institution shall form a "Town/Gown" alliance with community leaders. That alliance shall encourage local commercial establishments that promote or sell alcoholic beverages to curtail illegal student access to alcohol and adopt responsible alcohol marketing and service practices.

H.R. 6

OFFERED BY: MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMENDMENT No. 81: At the end of the bill add the following new title:

TITLE XI—DRUG AND ALCOHOL PREVENTION

SEC. 1101. DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE PREVENTION.

(a) GRANTS AND RECOGNITION AWARDS.—Section 111, as redesignated by section 101(a)(3)(E), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(e) ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION GRANTS.—

"(1) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may make grants to institutions of higher education or consortia of such institutions and contracts with such institutions and other organizations to develop, implement, operate, improve, and disseminate programs of prevention, and education (including treatment-referral) to reduce and eliminate the illegal use of drugs and alcohol and their associated violence. Such contracts may also be used for the support of a higher education center for alcohol and drug abuse prevention which will provide training, technical assistance, evaluation, dissemination and associated services and assistance to the higher education community as defined by the Secretary and the institutions of higher education.

"(2) AWARDS.—Grants and contracts shall be made available under paragraph (1) on a competitive basis. An institution of higher education, a consortium of such institutions, or other organizations which desire to receive a grant or contract under paragraph (1) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as

the Secretary may reasonably require by regulation.

“(3) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall make every effort to ensure—

“(A) the equitable participation of private and public institutions of higher education (including community and junior colleges), and

“(B) the equitable geographic participation of such institutions.

in grants and contracts under paragraph (1). In the award of such grants and contracts, the Secretary shall give appropriate consideration to institutions of higher education with limited enrollment.

“(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

“(f) NATIONAL RECOGNITION AWARDS.—

“(i) AWARDS.—For the purpose of providing models of alcohol and drug abuse prevention and education (including treatment-referral) programs in higher education and to focus national attention on exemplary alcohol and drug abuse prevention efforts, the Secretary of Education shall, on an annual basis, make 10 National Recognition Awards to institutions of higher education that have developed and implemented effective alcohol and drug abuse prevention and education programs. Such awards shall be made at a ceremony in Washington, D.C. and a document describing the programs of those who receive the awards shall be distributed nationally.

“(2) APPLICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A national recognition award shall be made under paragraph (1) to institutions of higher education which have applied for such award. Such an application shall contain—

“(i) a clear description of the goals and objectives of the alcohol and drug abuse programs of the institution applying,

“(ii) a description of program activities that focus on alcohol and other drug policy issues, policy development, modification, or refinement, policy dissemination and implementation, and policy enforcement;

“(iii) a description of activities that encourage student and employee participation and involvement in both activity development and implementation;

“(iv) the objective criteria used to determine the effectiveness of the methods used in such programs and the means used to evaluate and improve the program efforts;

“(v) a description of special initiatives used to reduce high-risk behavior or increase low risk behavior, or both; and

“(vi) a description of coordination and networking efforts that exist in the community in which the institution is located for purposes of such programs.

“(B) ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.—All institutions of higher education which are two- and four-year colleges and universities that have established a drug and alcohol prevention and education program are eligible to apply for a National Recognition Award. To receive such an Award an institution of higher education must be nominated to receive it. An institution of higher education may nominate itself or be nominated by others such as professional associations or student organizations.

“(C) APPLICATION REVIEW.—The Secretary of Education shall appoint a committee to review applications submitted under subparagraph (A). The committee may include representatives of Federal departments or agencies whose programs include alcohol and drug abuse prevention and education efforts, directors or heads (or their representatives) of professional associations that focus on prevention efforts, and non-Federal sci-

entists who have backgrounds in social science evaluation and research methodology and in education. Decisions of the committee shall be made directly to the Secretary without review by any other entity in the Department of Education.

“(D) REVIEW CRITERIA.—Specific review criteria shall be developed by the Secretary in conjunction with the appropriate experts. In reviewing applications under subparagraph (C) the committee shall consider—

“(i) measures of effectiveness of the program of the applicant that should include changes in the campus alcohol and other drug environment or climate and changes in alcohol and other drug use before and after the initiation of the program; and

“(ii) measures of program institutionalization, including an assessment of needs of the institution, the institution's alcohol and drug policies, staff and faculty development activities, drug prevention criteria, student, faculty, and campus community involvement, and a continuation of the program after the cessation of external funding.

“(3) AUTHORIZATION.—For the implementation of the awards program under this subsection, there are authorized to be appropriated \$25,000 for fiscal year 1998, \$66,000 for each of the fiscal years 1999 and 2000, and \$72,000 for each of the fiscal years 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004.”.

(b) REPEAL.—Section 4122 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7132) is repealed.

H.R. 6

OFFERED BY: MS. MILLENDER-MCDONALD

AMENDMENT No. 82: At the end of the bill add the following new title:

TITLE XI—TEACHER EXCELLENCE IN AMERICA CHALLENGE

SEC. 1101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Teacher Excellence in America Challenge Act of 1998”.

SEC. 1102. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to improve the preparation and professional development of teachers and the academic achievement of students by encouraging partnerships among institutions of higher education, elementary schools or secondary schools, local educational agencies, State educational agencies, teacher organizations, and nonprofit organizations.

SEC. 1103. GOALS.

The goals of this title are as follows:

(1) To support and improve the education of students and the achievement of higher academic standards by students, through the enhanced professional development of teachers.

(2) To ensure a strong and steady supply of new teachers who are qualified, well-trained, and knowledgeable and experienced in effective means of instruction, and who represent the diversity of the American people, in order to meet the challenges of working with students by strengthening preservice education and induction of individuals into the teaching profession.

(3) To provide for the continuing development and professional growth of veteran teachers.

(4) To provide a research-based context for reinventing schools, teacher preparation programs, and professional development programs, for the purpose of building and sustaining best educational practices and raising student academic achievement.

SEC. 1104. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.—The term “elementary school” means a public elementary school.

(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term “institution of higher education”

means an institution of higher education that—

(A) has a school, college, or department of education that is accredited by an agency recognized by the Secretary for that purpose; or

(B) the Secretary determines has a school, college, or department of education of a quality equal to or exceeding the quality of schools, colleges, or departments so accredited.

(3) POVERTY LINE.—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.

(4) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP.—The term “professional development partnership” means a partnership among 1 or more institutions of higher education, 1 or more elementary schools or secondary schools, and 1 or more local educational agency based on a mutual commitment to improve teaching and learning. The partnership may include a State educational agency, a teacher organization, or a nonprofit organization whose primary purpose is education research and development.

(5) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL.—The term “professional development school” means an elementary school or secondary school that collaborates with an institution of higher education for the purpose of—

(A) providing high quality instruction to students and educating students to higher academic standards;

(B) providing high quality student teaching and internship experiences at the school for prospective and beginning teachers; and

(C) supporting and enabling the professional development of veteran teachers at the school, and of faculty at the institution of higher education.

(6) SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The term “secondary school” means a public secondary school.

(7) TEACHER.—The term “teacher” means an elementary school or secondary school teacher.

SEC. 1105. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—From the amount appropriated under section 1111 and not reserved under section 1109 for a fiscal year, the Secretary may award grants, on a competitive basis, to professional development partnerships to enable the partnerships to pay the Federal share of the cost of providing teacher preparation, induction, classroom experience, and professional development opportunities to prospective, beginning, and veteran teachers while improving the education of students in the classroom.

(b) DURATION; PLANNING.—The Secretary shall award grants under this title for a period of 5 years, the first year of which may be used for planning to conduct the activities described in section 1106.

(c) PAYMENTS; FEDERAL SHARE; NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—

(1) PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall make annual payments pursuant to a grant awarded under this title.

(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the costs described in subsection (a)(1) shall be 80 percent.

(3) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the costs described in subsection (a)(1) may be in cash or in-kind, fairly evaluated.

(d) CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY.—

(1) 2ND AND 3D YEARS.—The Secretary may make a grant payment under this section for each of the 2 fiscal years after the first fiscal year a professional development partnership receives such a payment, only if the Secretary determines that the partnership,

through the activities assisted under this title, has made reasonable progress toward meeting the criteria described in paragraph (3).

(2) 4TH AND 5TH YEARS.—The Secretary may make a grant payment under this section for each of the 2 fiscal years after the third fiscal year a professional development partnership receives such a payment, only if the Secretary determines that the partnership, through the activities assisted under this title, has met the criteria described in paragraph (3).

(3) CRITERIA.—The criteria referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) are as follows:

(A) Increased student achievement as determined by increased graduation rates, decreased dropout rates, or higher scores on local, State, or national assessments for a year compared to student achievement as determined by the rates or scores, as the case may be, for the year prior to the year for which a grant under this title is received.

(B) Improved teacher preparation and development programs, and student educational programs.

(C) Increased opportunities for enhanced and ongoing professional development of teachers.

(D) An increased number of well-prepared individuals graduating from a school, college, or department of education within an institution of higher education and entering the teaching profession.

(E) Increased recruitment to, and graduation from, a school, college, or department of education within an institution of higher education with respect to minority individuals.

(F) Increased placement of qualified and well-prepared teachers in elementary schools or secondary schools, and increased assignment of such teachers to teach the subject matter in which the teachers received a degree or specialized training.

(G) Increased dissemination of teaching strategies and best practices by teachers associated with the professional development school and faculty at the institution of higher education.

(e) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this title, the Secretary shall give priority to professional development partnerships serving elementary schools, secondary schools, or local educational agencies, that serve high percentages of children from families below the poverty line.

SEC. 1106. AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each professional development partnership receiving a grant under this title shall use the grant funds for—

(1) creating, restructuring, or supporting professional development schools;

(2) enhancing and restructuring the teacher preparation program at the school, college, or department of education within the institution of higher education, including—

(A) coordinating with, and obtaining the participation of, schools, colleges, or departments of arts and science;

(B) preparing teachers to work with diverse student populations; and

(C) preparing teachers to implement research-based, demonstrably successful, and replicable, instructional programs and practices that increase student achievement;

(3) incorporating clinical learning in the coursework for prospective teachers, and in the induction activities for beginning teachers;

(4) mentoring of prospective and beginning teachers by veteran teachers in instructional skills, classroom management skills, and strategies to effectively assess student progress and achievement;

(5) providing high quality professional development to veteran teachers, including the

rotation, for varying periods of time, of veteran teachers—

(A) who are associated with the partnership to elementary schools or secondary schools not associated with the partnership in order to enable such veteran teachers to act as a resource for all teachers in the local educational agency or State; and

(B) who are not associated with the partnership to elementary schools or secondary schools associated with the partnership in order to enable such veteran teachers to observe how teaching and professional development occurs in professional development schools;

(6) preparation time for teachers in the professional development school and faculty of the institution of higher education to jointly design and implement the teacher preparation curriculum, classroom experiences, and ongoing professional development opportunities;

(7) preparing teachers to use technology to teach students to high academic standards;

(8) developing and instituting ongoing performance-based review procedures to assist and support teachers' learning;

(9) activities designed to involve parents in the partnership;

(10) research to improve teaching and learning by teachers in the professional development school and faculty at the institution of higher education; and

(11) activities designed to disseminate information, regarding the teaching strategies and best practices implemented by the professional development school, to—

(A) teachers in elementary schools or secondary schools, which are served by the local educational agency or located in the State, that are not associated with the professional development partnership; and

(B) institutions of higher education in the State.

(b) CONSTRUCTION PROHIBITED.—No grant funds provided under this title may be used for the construction, renovation, or repair of any school or facility.

SEC. 1107. APPLICATIONS.

Each professional development partnership desiring a grant under this title shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may require. Each such application shall—

(1) describe the composition of the partnership;

(2) describe how the partnership will include the participation of the schools, colleges, or departments of arts and sciences within the institution of higher education to ensure the integration of pedagogy and content in teacher preparation;

(3) identify how the goals described in section 1103 will be met and the criteria that will be used to evaluate and measure whether the partnership is meeting the goals;

(4) describe how the partnership will restructure and improve teaching, teacher preparation, and development programs at the institution of higher education and the professional development school, and how such systemic changes will contribute to increased student achievement;

(5) describe how the partnership will prepare teachers to implement research-based, demonstrably successful, and replicable, instructional programs and practices that increase student achievement;

(6) describe how the teacher preparation program in the institution of higher education, and the induction activities and ongoing professional development opportunities in the professional development school, incorporate—

(A) an understanding of core concepts, structure, and tools of inquiry as a foundation for subject matter pedagogy; and

(B) knowledge of curriculum and assessment design as a basis for analyzing and responding to student learning;

(7) describe how the partnership will prepare teachers to work with diverse student populations, including minority individuals and individuals with disabilities;

(8) describe how the partnership will prepare teachers to use technology to teach students to high academic standards;

(9) describe how the research and knowledge generated by the partnership will be disseminated to and implemented in—

(A) elementary schools or secondary schools served by the local educational agency or located in the State; and

(B) institutions of higher education in the State;

(10)(A) describe how the partnership will coordinate the activities assisted under this title with other professional development activities for teachers, including activities assisted under titles I and II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq., 6601 et seq.), the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (20 U.S.C. 5801 et seq.), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.), and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.); and

(B) describe how the activities assisted under this title are consistent with Federal and State educational reform activities that promote student achievement of higher academic standards;

(11) describe which member of the partnership will act as the fiscal agent for the partnership and be responsible for the receipt and disbursement of grant funds under this title;

(12) describe how the grant funds will be divided among the institution of higher education, the elementary school or secondary school, the local educational agency, and any other members of the partnership to support activities described in section 1106;

(13) provide a description of the commitment of the resources of the partnership to the activities assisted under this title, including financial support, faculty participation, and time commitments; and

(14) describe the commitment of the partnership to continue the activities assisted under this title without grant funds provided under this title.

SEC. 1108. ASSURANCES.

Each application submitted under this title shall contain an assurance that the professional development partnership—

(1) will enter into an agreement that commits the members of the partnership to the support of students' learning, the preparation of prospective and beginning teachers, the continuing professional development of veteran teachers, the periodic review of teachers, standards-based teaching and learning, practice-based inquiry, and collaboration among members of the partnership;

(2) will use teachers of excellence, who have mastered teaching techniques and subject areas, including teachers certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, to assist prospective and beginning teachers;

(3) will provide for adequate preparation time to be made available to teachers in the professional development school and faculty at the institution of higher education to allow the teachers and faculty time to jointly develop programs and curricula for prospective and beginning teachers, ongoing professional development opportunities, and the other authorized activities described in section 1106; and

(4) will develop organizational structures that allow principals and key administrators

to devote sufficient time to adequately participate in the professional development of their staffs, including frequent observation and critique of classroom instruction.

SEC. 1109. NATIONAL ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reserve a total of not more than 10 percent of the amount appropriated under section 1111 for each fiscal year for evaluation activities under subsection (b), and the dissemination of information under subsection (c).

(b) NATIONAL EVALUATION.—The Secretary, by grant or contract, shall provide for an annual, independent, national evaluation of the activities of the professional development partnerships assisted under this title. The evaluation shall be conducted not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Teacher Excellence in America Challenge Act of 1998 and each succeeding year thereafter. The Secretary shall report to Congress and the public the results of such evaluation. The evaluation, at a minimum, shall assess the short-term and long-term impacts and outcomes of the activities assisted under this title, including—

(1) the extent to which professional development partnerships enhance student achievement;

(2) how, and the extent to which, professional development partnerships lead to improvements in the quality of teachers;

(3) the extent to which professional development partnerships improve recruitment and retention rates among beginning teachers, including beginning minority teachers; and

(4) the extent to which professional development partnerships lead to the assignment of beginning teachers to public elementary or secondary schools that have a shortage of teachers who teach the subject matter in which the teacher received a degree or specialized training.

(c) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall disseminate information (including creating and maintaining a national database) regarding outstanding professional development schools, practices, and programs.

SEC. 1110. SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.

Funds appropriated under section 1111 shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local public funds expended for the professional development of elementary school and secondary school teachers.

SEC. 1111. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

H.R. 1872

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL

AMENDMENT No. 2: Page 28, line 8, strike “and”; on line 13, strike the period and insert “; and”; and after line 13, insert the following new paragraph:

“(5) to permit COMSAT to offer domestic and international services without restriction utilizing INTELSAT, Inmarsat, and other facilities.

H.R. 1872

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL

AMENDMENT No. 3: Page 28, line 8, strike “and”; on line 13, strike the period and insert “; and”; and after line 13, insert the following new paragraph:

“(5) to permit COMSAT to offer domestic services utilizing INTELSAT, Inmarsat, and other facilities, subject to such restrictions as the Commission may impose by regulation as necessary for the protection of the public interest.

H.R. 1872

OFFERED BY: MR. GILMAN

AMENDMENT No. 4: Page 33, line 5, strike “the Congress”; and insert “the Committees on Commerce and International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and Foreign Relations of the Senate”.

Page 33, beginning on line 20, strike “Committee on” and all that follows through “of the Senate” on line 22 and insert the following: “Committees on Commerce and International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and Foreign Relations of the Senate”.

H.R. 1872

OFFERED BY: MRS. MORELLA

AMENDMENT No. 5: Page 6, after line 8, insert the following new subsection:

“(e) TAKINGS PROHIBITED.—In implementing the provisions of this section, and sections 621, 622, and 624 of this Act, the Commission shall not—

“(1) restrict the services that COMSAT may offer utilizing facilities in which it has lawfully invested; or

“(2) otherwise restrict the activities of COMSAT in a manner which would create a liability for the United States under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.

Page 11, after line 11, insert the following new subsection:

“(d) TAKINGS PROHIBITED.—In implementing the provisions of this section, the Commission shall not—

“(1) restrict the services that COMSAT may offer utilizing facilities in which it has lawfully invested; or

“(2) otherwise restrict the activities of COMSAT in a manner which would create a liability for the United States under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.

H.R. 1872

OFFERED BY: MRS. MORELLA

AMENDMENT No. 6: Page 6, after line 8, insert the following new subsection:

“(e) TAKINGS PROHIBITED.—In implementing the provisions of this section, and sections 621, 622, and 624 of this Act, the Commission shall not restrict the activities of COMSAT in a manner which would create a liability for the United States under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.

Page 11, after line 11, insert the following new subsection:

“(d) TAKINGS PROHIBITED.—In implementing the provisions of this section, the Commission shall not restrict the activities of COMSAT in a manner which would create a liability for the United States under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.

H.R. 1872

OFFERED BY: MR. TAUZIN

AMENDMENT No. 7: Page 28, beginning on line 14, strike section 642 through page 29, line 24, and redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly.

H.R. 1872

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT No. 8: At the end of the bill, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.

No funds authorized pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2

through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the “Buy American Act”).

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 6. PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS.

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, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspensions, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

H.R. 3694

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 105. LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED.

(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), notwithstanding the total amount of the individual authorizations of appropriations contained in this Act (including the amounts specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102), there is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1999 to carry out this Act not more than 90 percent of the total amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act (determined without regard to this section).

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund by section 201.

H.R. 3694

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT No. 2: At the end of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. 105. LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED.

(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), notwithstanding the total amount of the individual authorizations of appropriations contained in this Act (including the amounts specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102), there is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1999 to carry out this Act not more than 95 percent of the total amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act (determined without regard to this section).

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund by section 201.