

supplies from the State Water Project (SWP). The bill amends the San Luis Act of 1960, which prohibits water transfers between the SWP and users in the San Luis Unit of the CVP.

Given the likelihood of water shortfalls in the future, I believe that voluntary transfers will become an increasingly important water management tool to address future supply needs. Your legislation is consistent with current state and federal policies aimed at encouraging voluntary water transfers and will likely play a key role in facilitating such transfers. In addition, in furtherance of state and federal policies to encourage water transfers, it is appropriate to remove barriers that might otherwise restrict transfers between the two projects.

I also support Representative George Miller's recent amendment to H.R. 3077 that conditions the transfer of water between the SWP and the San Luis Unit on measures to prevent irrigation drainage problems or degradation of water quality. I am pleased that you and your colleagues on the House Resources Committee were able to reach agreement on this language during the recent markup session.

As the legislation moves through the House in the closing days of this year's session, please let me know if I can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

GRAY DAVIS.

An important issue raised by any proposal to provide additional supplies of irrigation water to the San Luis Unit is subsurface drainage. Discharges of subsurface agriculture drainage from the San Luis Unit contributed to the deaths of hundreds of waterfowl at the Kesterson Reservoir site in the mid 1980s, and, while farmers and water districts in the San Joaquin Valley have made great progress in recent years, drainage management in the San Luis Unit continues to be a critical and unresolved issue.

I had the opportunity to participate with Secretary Babbitt just yesterday in doing a tour of the San Luis Unit and had the chance to see some of the terrific work that the water districts are doing there in order to try to manage their drainage water.

The Committee on Resources accepted an amendment on this subject offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the senior Democrat on the committee. The gentleman from California's amendment would allow the State to deliver water to the San Luis Unit only after specific requirements have been met to protect water quality.

The purpose of the Miller amendment is to ensure that irrigation water deliveries from the State Water Project to the Federal San Luis Unit service area are carefully managed and are not directed to lands that are known to contribute to agricultural drainage problems with the resultant adverse effects on water quality in the San Joaquin River, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, or San Francisco Bay. I was pleased to accept the gentleman from California's amendment during the committee's consideration of H.R. 3077. Governor Davis' letter also expresses his support for this amendment.

Madam Speaker, San Luis Unit farmers are the only farmers in the State of

California who must farm under an outdated legal restriction that prevents them from supplementing their water supplies. H.R. 3077, as amended, will correct this inequity and will encourage responsible water use and cooperation among California water users.

I urge my colleagues to support the enactment of H.R. 3077, as amended.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH), a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 3077, I want to express my support for this bill on the floor. As we all know, water is a precious commodity in the State of California and particularly in the great Central Valley. I have seen the extra mile that water users in this area have taken to conserve water. This is not enough, however, because their water supply reliability has been significantly reduced and no certainty in supply is on the horizon for California agriculture and urban water users.

The Central Valley has a long agricultural history, producing over 250 of California's crops. With its fertile soil, temperate climate, and water supply capabilities, the Central Valley produces 8 percent of the agricultural output in the United States, on less than 1 percent of our Nation's farmland. Valley farmers grow nearly half of the fresh fruits and vegetables grown in the entire Nation.

At the same time, the Central Valley is the fastest growing region in the State, placing an ever-increasing demand on its urban water requirements. While agricultural and urban water demands are often in competition with one another, neither can be provided for unless a reliable supply of water is made available. Long-term environmental and habitat restoration needs of the Central Valley ecosystem must also be addressed, squeezing still more water out of a dwindling supply. Currently, under the CVPIA, over one million acre-feet of water is provided for environmental purposes each year.

The demands for agricultural, environmental and urban water uses in the great Central Valley are endless. Since water is directly tied to the economy, any disturbance in its supply will almost certainly result in the loss of jobs and agricultural production. By the year 2020, a net loss of 2.3 million acre-feet of water is projected for agricultural use. This is unacceptable and irresponsible. The impact of such a decline would be devastating. Thus, an adequate water supply should and must be secured.

For these reasons, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 3077. This measure gives water users the ability to obtain water from

the State of California by facilitating water transfers at the San Luis Unit. Currently, the San Luis Act prohibits the State from allowing water to go through the San Luis Unit of the Central Valley Project. This will be corrected under H.R. 3077 and some of the tremendous strains on water supplies in the State will be alleviated.

Again, I support this bill and urge its passage.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3077, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 359, H.R. 3002, and H.R. 3077.

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

There was no objection.

#### OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. McHUGH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2904) to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to reauthorize funding for the Office of Government Ethics, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2904

*by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 405 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking "1997 through 1999" and inserting "2000 through 2003".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on October 1, 1999.

#### SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO DEFINITION OF "SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE".

(a) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 202(a).—Subsection (a) of section 202 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purpose of sections 203, 205, 207, 208, 209, and 219 of this title the term 'special Government employee' shall mean—

"(I) an officer or employee as defined in subsection (c) who is retained, designated, appointed, or employed in the legislative or executive branch of the United States Government, in any independent agency of the United States, or in the government of the District of Columbia, and who, at the time of

retention, designation, appointment, or employment, is expected to perform temporary duties on a full-time or intermittent basis for not to exceed 130 days during any period of 365 consecutive days;

“(2) a part-time United States commissioner;

“(3) a part-time United States magistrate;

“(4) an independent counsel appointed under chapter 40 of title 28 and any person appointed by that independent counsel under section 594(c) of title 28;

“(5) a person serving as a part-time local representative of a Member of Congress in the Member’s home district or State; and

“(6) a Reserve officer of the Armed Forces, or an officer of the National Guard of the United States, who is not otherwise an officer or employee as defined in subsection (c) and who is—

“(A) on active duty solely for training (notwithstanding section 2105(d) of title 5);

“(B) serving voluntarily for not to exceed 130 days during any period of 365 consecutive days; or

“(C) serving involuntarily.”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 202(c).—Sub-section (c) of 202 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(c)(1) The terms ‘officer’ and ‘employee’ in sections 203, 205, 207 through 209, and 218 of this title shall include—

“(A) an individual who is retained, designated, appointed, or employed in the United States Government or in the government of the District of Columbia to perform, with or without compensation and subject to the supervision of the President, the Vice President, a Member of Congress, a Federal judge, or an officer or employee of the United States or of the government of the District of Columbia, a Federal or District of Columbia function under authority of law or an Executive act;

“(B) a Reserve officer of the Armed Forces or an officer of the National Guard of the United States who is serving voluntarily in excess of 130 days during any period of 365 consecutive days; and

“(C) the President, the Vice President, a Member of Congress or a Federal judge, but only to the extent specified in any such section.

“(2) As used in paragraph (1), the term ‘Federal or District of Columbia function’ shall include, but not be limited to—

“(A) supervising, managing, directing or overseeing a Federal or District of Columbia officer or employee in the performance of such officer’s or employee’s official duties;

“(B) participating in the Federal or District of Columbia government’s internal deliberative process, such as by providing regular advice, counsel, or recommendations to the President, the Vice President, a Member of Congress, or any other Federal or District of Columbia officer or employee, or by conducting meetings involving any of those individuals; or

“(C) obligating funds of the United States or the District of Columbia.”.

(c) NEW SECTION 202(f).—Section 202 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) The terms ‘officer or employee’ and ‘special Government employee’ as used in sections 203, 205, 207 through 209, and 218, shall not include enlisted members of the Armed Forces, nor shall they include an individual who is retained, designated, or appointed without compensation specifically to act as a representative of an interest (other than a Federal or District of Columbia interest) on an advisory committee established pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act or any similarly established advisory committee whose meetings are generally open to the public.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2904.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2904 accomplished the two objectives that are critically important to ensuring honesty in government and impartiality in the executive branch of government. First, it reauthorizes the Office of Government Ethics through the year 2003. Second, it amends Title XVIII of the United States Code to clarify the definition of the term “special government employee.”

The Office of Government Ethics is a small agency in the executive branch. Its appropriation for fiscal year 2000 is only \$9.1 million, and there are only about 84 full-time equivalent employees in its work force. Nevertheless, it performs a vital function. The Office’s mission is to ensure impartiality and integrity in the operation of the Federal Government.

The Office oversees compliance with a variety of ethics laws in the executive branch. It issues rules and regulations on matters such as conflicts of interest, post-employment restrictions, standards of conduct, and financial disclosures.

The Office also reviews financial disclosure statements of certain presidential nominees and appointees, and when necessary, recommends corrective action for violations of ethics laws.

In addition, the Office of Government Ethics trains employees in ethics, provides formal and informal guidance on the interpretation and application of various ethics laws, and evaluates the effectiveness of conflict of interest and other ethics laws.

The Subcommittee on Civil Service of the Committee on Government Reform held an oversight hearing on the Office of Government Ethics shortly before the August recess. That hearing showed that the Office has performed its duties very well. There is no question that the Office has earned reauthorization by this Congress.

It was also vitally important, Madam Speaker, that this Congress clarify section 202 of Title XVIII to make it easier to determine who is a “special government employee” and therefore, subject to conflict of interest law and financial disclosure requirements.

Special government employees are informal advisors to presidents and

other government officials. Some are compensated, some serve without pay. But in either case, if the integrity of government processes is to be protected, these advisors must be subject to the same conflict of interest laws and financial disclosure requirements as regular government employees.

This is not a new subject for the House. The need for this legislation was first brought to our attention as a result of the Travelgate hearings held by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight during the 104th Congress.

Those hearings revealed and a subsequent report adopted by the Committee on Government Reform found that certain advisors to the President used their influence to promote their own business interests by actively encouraging the firing of career employees in the White House Travel Office. As a result, the committee’s report on the Travelgate investigation recommended that this Congress amend the law to provide clear standards for determining who is a “special government employee.”

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), who is not with us at this time, as I hope everyone in the body recognizes having suffered an injury in his home State and from which we wish him a speedy recovery, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology, has held two hearings on this issue. Witnesses at those hearings also testified in favor of clarifying the definition of “special government employee.” Language substantially similar to section 2 of this bill was developed through those hearings.

During the 104th Congress, the House passed essentially the same language in H.R. 3452, the Presidential and Executive Office Accountability Act. Although most of that bill became Public Law 104-331, the “special government employee” language was dropped in the conference.

The need for a clearer definition remains, however. I urge all Members to seize this opportunity to promote integrity in government by passing this bill, H.R. 2904, today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, earlier this year, the Subcommittee on Civil Service held a hearing on the Office of Government Ethics which gave the subcommittee an opportunity to establish a record of how the agency is operating. OGE’s mission is not only to prevent and resolve conflicts of interest and to foster high ethical standards for Federal employees, but also to strengthen the public’s confidence that the government’s business is conducted with impartiality and integrity.

OGE does this by reviewing and certifying the financial disclosure forms filed by presidential nominees requiring Senate confirmation; serving as a

primary source of advice and counseling on conduct and financial disclosure issues, and by providing information on the promoting and understanding of ethical standards in executive agencies.

OGE and its staff are well regarded by the Federal agencies with whom they do business. There is no question that they do an outstanding job.

Witnesses at the hearing testified that OGE has played an essential and significant role in fostering the public's trust in the integrity of government. Therefore, I support the 4-year reauthorization of OGE and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), our subcommittee chairman, for all of his efforts, our chairman and our ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and certainly the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) for his comments today.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Again, I want to express our appreciation to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), who currently serves as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, for introducing H.R. 2904 to authorize the Office of Government Ethics, and also to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, for his strong support of this legislation. As well, let me thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, and also the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform, for their combined support. Without this cooperative effort, Madam Speaker, we would not be here today.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) of the Subcommittee on the Constitution for their cooperation in expediting consideration of this measure. I also wish to express our appreciation to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, for his strong support for clarifying the definition of "special government employee." As we recognize, Madam Speaker, these kinds of initiatives, it takes the cooperative effort of many, and we thank yet another gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) for adding the "special government employee" language to this initiative.

Madam Speaker, although language before the House differs in some minor respects from the bill reported by the Committee on Government Reform, there really is no substantive difference. Working closely with the Office of Government Ethics, we have simply clarified the bill. Promoting the

integrity of the Federal Government is critically important if our citizens are to have confidence in its operation. Nothing has made that clearer than our experience with the administration and its unprecedented reliance upon a host of informal advisors such as Harry Thomason, Paul Begala, Dick Morris, and numerous other outsiders who worked on the President's health care task force during his first term. Whether paid or unpaid, full-time or part-time, Madam Speaker, these advisors must be held to the same high ethical standards as regular government employees. Good government demands no less.

Congress has the opportunity today to ensure that existing conflict of interest laws and financial disclosure requirements deter these high-level advisors from using their role to promote their own business interests. I urge all Members to support H.R. 2904.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2904, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1515

#### JOSEPH ILETO POST OFFICE

Mr. MCHUGH. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3189) to designate the United States post office located at 14071 Peyton Drive in Chino Hills, California, as the "Joseph Ileto Post Office."

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3189

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

#### SECTION 1. JOSEPH ILETO POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States post office located at 14071 Peyton Drive in Chino Hills, California, shall be known and designated as the "Joseph Ileto Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Joseph Ileto Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3189 was introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) on November 1 of this year. This legislation designates the building of the United States Postal Service located at 1407 Peyton Drive in Chino Hills, California, as the Joseph Ileto Post Office.

This legislation honors Mr. Ileto, an employee of the United States Postal Service who was slain while on duty in a hail of bullets by a white supremacist on August 10, 1999.

According to an affidavit filed in Federal court, the gunman had, just an hour before the shooting, opened fire at a Jewish community center in Los Angeles, wounding five children and employees. While making his rounds, Mr. Ileto encountered the assassin who, according to the affidavit, thought it would be a good idea to kill a non-white person who was also a government employee as a target of opportunity.

Mr. Ileto was the oldest of five children, born and raised in the Philippines and named after St. Joseph, the patron saint of the worker. He emigrated to the United States when he was 14 years old. After completing high school, he studied at East Los Angeles College, earning an associate degree in engineering in 1983. He lived with his brother in Chino Hills, and he cared for his recently widowed mother in Monterey Park.

He worked two jobs, at ABX Filters Corporation, where he tested electronic filters for heart pacemakers, and part-time as a substitute mail carrier. He was substituting for a regular letter carrier when he was killed, at age 39. Joseph Ileto took the postal position 2 years ago because he was seeking better pay in an outside job.

Mr. Ileto was known for his goodness, his good humor, his willingness to help, and for being reliable. Joe was known to be a humble man, never wanting to be the center of attention, just wanting to blend into the crowd. His work ethic and reliability won him a Special Achievement Award from the Postal Service. He was also very competitive, and loved playing games and watching the Los Angeles Lakers and the Dodgers.

He was a skilled chess player and was ranked at the master level. The Los Angeles Times and magazines devoted to chess recognized him for his achievements in that regard. His father taught him to play that game at the age of 7.

Uniformed postal workers, in a caravan of more than 100 trucks, paid their respects to their fallen colleague. Every mail carrier in his post office attended the funeral, along with many others from the postal community. Retired mail carriers offered to deliver the mail that day so everyone who knew Joseph could attend, exemplifying the model of mail carriers everywhere, that an injury to one is an injury to all.

Madam Speaker, it is important to note that the Post Office in Chino is