

The JASON Project is driven largely by private sector initiative and supported mainly by industry contributions. But there is also a role for federal programs to improve science education.

There is no doubt that the federal role in K-12 education is limited and that the federal resources available are but a small fraction of the national investment in K-12 education. But the federal government can be a catalyst for constructive change in our schools, if its relatively small education investment is wisely directed.

School budgets are tight and meager resources are available for such things as supporting experimentation with new curricular materials or training teachers on how to implement science standards in the classroom. The federal science and math education programs can provide an important supplement that can have an influence on reform efforts out of proportion to the size of the investment.

In addition to providing financial resources, the federal government can bring to bear the scientific talent available in federal laboratories as an important resource for support of teachers, many of whom are unprepared to teach science and math subjects.

An example of a Federal program to help train science and math teachers is a recent initiative involving the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy's national labs. Teachers from school systems participating in NSF's education reform programs will be eligible to attend in-service training programs at the labs where they will use state-of-the-art facilities and instrumentation.

The program will provide hands-on experience and help improve teachers' skills in integrating the tools of computer simulation and modeling with implementation of science and math standards. In California, the Lawrence Berkeley Lab, Lawrence Livermore Lab, and the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center will participate in the program.

Another example of an innovative federal education programs is the NASA Student and Teacher Excellence Project, or STEP. STEP includes participation by some schools from San Bernardino County in my district.

STEP has several complementary components to increase student performance in science and math. It will draw on NASA's resources to develop curriculum tied to real-world problems; it will provide professional development opportunities for teachers; and it will provide for home access by students and parents to STEP resources.

The last component is a particularly important innovation which will greatly enlarge student access to the educational materials and draw in participation by parents.

As I indicated earlier, there are no simple answers for improving K-12 science and math education. Federal, state and local government, and the private sector all have important roles. We must identify best practices and effective programs, and then work to achieve their widest dissemination. Much remains to be done, but we cannot afford not to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by simply making one more plea, that we must give attention to this most critical need. We owe it to our Nation. We certainly owe it to our future.

Our jobs will ultimately follow where the skills are located. If our companies are now having to hire mostly people

that are non-American born, we can be sure that our companies cannot remain competitive until we make sure that every American child is excited about math and science.

We must start with teacher preparation. Many of our best teachers graduated more than 10 years ago from college. Our colleges did not have the integrated system of including our technologies at that time, so most of our teachers will have to return for further education.

That further undergirds the notion that education is lifelong, and teachers more and more will have to continue to return for their offerings of improving their skills, but our institutions must be responsible for offering those needed skills. Mr. Speaker, we will continue working.

AMERICA'S NATIONAL DRUG POLICY AND THE ROLE OF CONGRESS IN REDUCING DRUG USE BY AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House again tonight to talk about the subject of our national drug policy, and what Congress can do to improve the situation relating to the abuse and misuse of illegal narcotics, not only by our young people but by all Americans.

I come before the House as chair of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources, which has been charged with trying to help develop a better policy, better legislation, and better action by Congress to deal with the growing social problem that we have.

Tonight I am sure that the eyes of the Nation are focused on Kosovo, where we have a very difficult international situation, and probably rightfully so. We have thousands of our troops in potentially harm's way. We have our pilots and other dedicated military involved in that conflict.

I believe that the focus of attention tonight also is on the tragic shootings in Colorado. I believe some young people were involved there. A large number of young people were killed in that tragic incident.

Rightfully, America should be concerned about Kosovo. America should be concerned about international situations and also about a situation where we have death and mayhem of young people in our Nation. It is a very serious situation. I know that both the Colorado situation and Kosovo will capture the attention of the Nation for the next number of days.

As a courtesy to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), who has expressed concern about what has happened in that State, Mr. Speaker, I yield to him at this time for his comments on that, again, tragic situation.

PRAY FOR PARENTS AND CHILDREN, VICTIMS IN TRAGIC COLORADO HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTINGS

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I come here tonight to ask everyone listening, watching around America, I come here to ask you for your prayers for those parents who have lost children in this incredible, horrible, devastating event.

There are no words any of us can utter from this position, even in this House, that can ever soothe the hearts of the people who have lost their family members. But it behooves us all to think about how precious life is and how quickly it can be taken away any time, any place, anywhere.

It must make us all think again about turning to God and asking for his counsel and for wisdom which we all need in order to address these kinds of issues and others that will confront us.

So I have no other speeches to make. I have no other words to utter than to simply say again to everyone, please pray for the grieving, pray for the lost, and pray that this never, ever happens again.

Mr. MICA. Again, my prayers are with the gentleman from Colorado and with the families who have experienced this great tragedy in their community. Again, it is something that will be reflected in the news reports for the coming days just as Kosovo and other tragic events of our Nation.

Tonight I came to the House to really address another social tragedy that is facing our Nation. As I said, I chair the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources and trying to formulate some legislative efforts, some actions by this Congress to deal with a situation that has taken last year the lives of 14,000 Americans.

We have an illegal narcotics and drug abuse problem in this country that is reaching unparalleled proportions, particularly among our young people. I want to review again, and I did this last week, and I have done this a couple of times before, the situation that led I believe to the current problem we see with epidemic narcotics use by our young people across the Nation and the drug situation that faces almost every community across our land.

In 1993, when I came to Congress and I was in the minority, the majority party at that time, the Democrats that controlled both the House, the other body, and the White House, I think that they made some very tragic mistakes at that point in, first of all, cutting the resources of the drug czar's office, almost eliminating all of the staff in the drug czar's office.

The next step that was taken was to appoint a Surgeon General that in fact did not take the drug situation seriously, that helped advocate a policy of "just say maybe" to our young people, and this of course eventually has had consequences as we see in the drug statistics which I will cite.

Unfortunately, the administration also, and the majorities of 1993 to 1995, with the concurrence of the administration, they held majorities again in

this body, the other body, they cut the source country programs where drugs are produced, slashed some of the funds to countries. I for one believe it is most cost effective if we stop illegal narcotics at their base of production, in the country of origin, in the fields where they are produced. I think that the cuts that were made back then had some tragic results, and we will talk about them.

The next thing that the administration did, and the Democrat-controlled Congress, was to take the military out of the drug war, to a large extent cut the Coast Guard resources. The Coast Guard is important in protecting our shores. Even the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was protected up until that time by our Coast Guard.

Again, this theme of "just say maybe" and tolerance to illegal narcotics has eventually found its way into the minds of our young people, and we are now suffering with tremendous problems, particularly in the abuse of heroin.

Let me cite some statistics, if I may, tonight. The number of Americans who used heroin in the past month increased since 1992. The number of Americans who used heroin in the past month increased from 68,000 in 1993 to 325,000 in 1997. This is from a national household survey on drug abuse.

Now, I come from Florida. I come from central Florida. Florida has been particularly hard-hit by this epidemic of illegal narcotics, and in particular heroin. Heroin deaths in Florida increased by 51 percent from 1997.

I reported this last week to the House and my colleagues, and I thought that these statistics were quite remarkable and should get everyone's attention. There were in Florida 206 heroin deaths in 1997. I also thought that that was a very startling figure, and I have some additional information tonight I would like to reveal.

Orlando's 36 deaths yielded the highest death rate. So although we had, maybe, a lower number of heroin deaths in central Florida than larger populations, south Florida areas, we ended up with 3.6 deaths per 100,000 population, the highest death rate in Florida.

Heroin deaths again have just blossomed and mushroomed out of proportion. We have a new drug czar who was the deputy director of the Office of National Drug Policy, Jim McDonough. Jim McDonough stated in the Miami Herald that the drug problem in Florida, and his quote is, "is totally out of control." That is from the Miami Herald comment and quote from him, April 7, 1999, recently.

What is interesting is that change in the pattern of drug trafficking in central Florida. A recent article in the Orlando Sentinel pointed out that \$20 hits, \$20 doses of heroin were being sold in central Florida last year that were considered as much as 90 percent pure narcotic. That means the purity level was 90 percent.

Ten, 15 years ago, the heroin that we saw on the streets in the United States was 10, 12 percent pure. The heroin that we are seeing today is particularly deadly. Ninety percent pure is what they are seeing. Formerly on the street, this article says that the product of heroin that was found there had a much less deadly content; and that is one of the reasons we are seeing so many tragic deaths in central Florida.

According to Tim Moore, the director of the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, at these purity levels heroin is killing many of our first-time users. I quoted again how dramatically the number of deaths have increased in the State of Florida and in central Florida. Unfortunately, the news in Florida is actually worse than was reported for 1998.

I bring to the floor a copy of an article that appeared this week. The headline is, "News on Heroin Gets Even Worse", and it is from this Monday's Orlando Sentinel.

This report indicates that in some counties up to 20 percent of the people who died after taking heroin did not make the statewide list that I cited last week and again tonight of 206 deaths which were released several weeks ago. This is because the State Medical Examiner's Commission tracks only what it considers to be fatal overdoses. College students who drop dead after drinking beer and taking heroin were not counted. The same was true for motorists killed in an automobile accident while stoned on heroin. This is also part of this report revealed in an Orlando Sentinel article this week.

In contrast, the Florida medical examiners have a long-standing practice of reporting in Florida every cocaine-related death. State officials reported 1,128 such fatalities. That is deaths by cocaine in Florida in 1998. That is a startling figure by itself.

But we see that the figures that I have been given previously on heroin deaths were not accurate. They are even higher, and the situation gets much worse. Again, in the Orlando area, which has the highest rate of heroin deaths in Florida, State guidelines prompted the Orange-Osceola medical examiners, our local county examiner's office, to disregard eight heroin deaths. The office reported 36 deaths in two counties, not the 44 that actually took place.

In Daytona Beach, the Volusia County medical examiner discounted one of five heroin deaths. So, again, this practice is not common just to central Florida and Orange County and Osceola, but Volusia County. In West Palm Beach, the medical examiner's office reported 19 heroin deaths. The office spokesman said two more deaths from 1998 had been confirmed and 19 more cases were still pending.

So the epidemic that we have heard about is even worse than what has been initially reported. The Florida Department of Law Enforcement is now ask-

ing the State's 24 medical examiners to expand the way they track the drug deaths. Florida has also asked the medical examiners to create a separate category for users who die after taking one or more drugs, which is a problem that appears to be on the rise.

In the Orlando area and somewhere else, the trend appears to be abuse of heroin and cocaine with alcohol, all of which, I might tell my colleagues and those listening, has a very deadly effect again with this high purity, high content of heroin. Even small doses of heroin can be fatal when taken with beer, wine, or whiskey. The research clearly shows this. Alcohol increases the odds of a fatal heroin overdose by a factor of 22. The three heroin deaths that were discounted in Orlando in 1998 involve victims who died after taking heroin and alcohol, according to this report.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked about what has happened in central Florida, what has happened in our Nation. From 1993, when we had this change in policy, when we had this lack of direction by the administration, the lack of attention to the national drug problem, heroin use among our teens has increased in a 5- or 6-year period 875 percent.

□ 1900

I have mentioned the deaths in central Florida. Up dramatically. Actually undercounted, as we reported from this article released this week in this investigative report by the Orlando Sentinel, a situation totally out of control with, again, our young people.

I want to do something tonight to show my colleagues and to show the American public and those listening that we have a very serious situation. We have thousands of deaths in Florida. We have hundreds of deaths in central Florida. We have over 14,000 deaths across the Nation from drug overdoses or drug-related deaths.

This situation is not making the front page every day across our country, even though we have a heroin epidemic, a methamphetamine epidemic across this land, and other hard drugs. But these heroin deaths and these other deaths have a face and a name on them; and tonight I want to share with my colleagues just for a few minutes a photograph that I hope will be riveted in everyone's mind forever.

I want to show my colleagues that this death and destruction has a face on it and it is a face one can never forget. It is a face that was provided to me by a mother who lost a son to heroin in central Florida. It is a face that this mother and other mothers who gathered together, dozens of mothers in central Florida and parents who gathered together, some of whom I met with, related their stories of how their young people did not realize the purity of heroin, they did not realize the effects of heroin, they did not realize the impact of heroin or hard drugs on their bodies and their minds.

What I am going to show my colleagues should happen to no parent and should happen to no young person in our Nation. This is a picture of a man who is 26 years old. He was loved by his parents, the Stevens family. Loved by his family. He had a life to live. He was loved by his parents, and this young man died tragically of a drug overdose of heroin. I am going to show this picture only for a few seconds because it is quite shocking.

If there are young people watching, I do not want them to look if they do not want to. But this is the face of these 14,000 people who are dying of drug overdoses. This is the tragedy that we see. This is how this mother found her son and this is the sad effect of heroin on our young people across this Nation.

The glory that is portrayed by drug use and abuse in Hollywood and pop songs, this is the result; and this is what happens to those young people, and this is a face, a very tragic face.

This is how that young man ended up, on a sofa, and then in a morgue. The mother gave me permission to show this and has also put other pictures of her loved one from these police reports in a videotape, along with photos and evidence gathered from other scenes of tragic deaths of young people in central Florida, because they want to let the parents know what is happening. They want to let the young people know what is happening. They want the people who are considering using heroin and other hard drugs to know what is going to happen to their loved ones, to their bodies.

I had described to me a scenario of what happens when a person ingests heroin into the body, and I will describe that, if I may, tonight, to give those who are listening, my colleagues, a flavor of what happens and the horror of the death that these young people, thousands and thousands of them, have experienced across our Nation.

Heroin is ingested into the body. There is a period of time, usually within 30 seconds, where the drug hits the nervous system. Euphoria and a warm sensation overcomes the user. The user is beginning to feel the effects of the respiratory system breaking down and the user's breathing becomes labored.

As the respiratory system breaks down, the breathing becomes very slow. A corresponding drop in the body temperature begins and the heart becomes irregular. If the user is conscious at this point, this is the stage where fear grips the user.

Soon, the body is demanding more oxygen, and the user's respiratory system cannot accommodate the growing need for oxygen. The user feels cold. Fluid begins to enter the lungs. This is the beginning of the drowning stage.

So first there is the choking stage and the drowning stage.

Sometimes, during this phase, blood vessels and capillaries begin to rupture, as evidenced by the photograph that we saw of the young Mr. Stevens. The blood on the face of the heroin

user is a result of blood vessels rupturing. It is not a very pretty sight. It is not a way for anyone to meet their Maker.

Entering into the final phase, the user is now in great distress and experiencing severe pain throughout the chest and throat, much like a heart attack. The user's head is splitting with pain. The amount of fluid in the lungs has increased. The user is now in excruciating pain and begins to drown as his lungs fill with fluid.

The pain is now overwhelming and the user becomes fitful, jerking wildly and thrashing at the air. This continues for a time until the user becomes unconscious and begins seizures. Death is slow and inevitable.

And this is how these young people end up, unfortunately. This is how a young person in central Florida ended up paying with his life for this use and abuse of drugs. And, in particular here in central Florida, as I have said, we have this incredible epidemic of heroin use.

The high purity in this heroin, mixed sometimes with alcohol, mixed sometimes with other drugs, the results are inevitably fatal. And this has been repeated over and over and over and over again, to the tune of thousands and thousands of people across our land.

So I bring a message tonight that is not very pleasant, but a message, I think, that is very necessary about what is going on and about how people end up who become the victims of this surge of heroin that we see coming into our communities.

My next point to my colleagues, Madam Speaker, is where is this heroin coming from? I submit, my colleagues, that we know exactly where this heroin is coming from. And let me point out tonight how we know where heroin and other hard drugs are coming from, and let us take just a moment to look at this chart.

Our Drug Enforcement Administration has a very sophisticated system of tracking illegal narcotics, and in particular in this case, heroin. It is almost like a DNA tracking where they can trace a DNA back to an individual. This is so sophisticated, this heroin signature tracking program, that they can tell exactly where the heroin came from, what country, almost what field.

Seventy-five percent of the heroin entering the United States in this 1997 analysis came from South America. Seventy-five percent came from South America; another 14 percent from Mexico. Add those up and we have 89, nearly 90 percent of the heroin coming into the United States, this highly deadly, very pure heroin is coming in from two places, South America and from Mexico.

We know about 90 percent, 99 percent of this heroin that is now coming from South America is coming from Colombia, one country, and we know the balance is coming from Mexico. We have 6 percent from southwest Asia and 5 percent from Southeast Asia. But

through the sophisticated tracking and analysis program DEA can tell us exactly where these narcotics are coming from, and this deadly heroin that I spoke of.

Now, the question is, what has the administration done about stopping this? We know this heroin is coming in. I have shown very graphically what the heroin does to our young people. I have cited 14,000 deaths in the last 6, 7 years of this administration. Nearly 100,000 Americans have met their death through these sorts of drug-related incidents, and no one is paying attention to this.

The Clinton administration does not pay attention to where these drugs are coming from. In fact, as I said, most of the heroin is coming from South America and, in particular, from Colombia.

What is absolutely amazing, if we were to look at this chart for 1992 and 1993, we would see almost zero percent of heroin coming in from Colombia. There is very little heroin produced in Colombia, and there was a small percentage of heroin coming in from Mexico, much smaller than the 14 percent we see there.

Over the history of this administration, what has this administration done to keep illegal narcotics from coming, and in particular deadly heroin and cocaine coming from Colombia? We know it is produced there, and heroin is now produced there.

Actually, what they did is, they blocked all of the aid, all of the assistance to Colombia on a repeated basis.

I cannot tell my colleagues, as a member of the committee with jurisdiction, working with other Members of the Congress, how many times we wrote, requested, how many times this new majority has funded equipment and ammunition resources to go to Colombia that we have been blocked repeatedly by this administration.

So now, today, I am here. And instead of being a small producer of cocaine, Colombia is now the largest producer of cocaine. Previously, the cocaine came from Bolivia and from Peru. Now we have the distinction of Colombia winning this award, this deadly award, for being the biggest producer of cocaine. Because, again, this administration blocked any type of assistance to stop the production and growing of coca.

Additionally, and of even greater concern, is the heroin production, again of incredible proportions, that has grown up as an industry in Colombia since 1993. Again, the administration failed to get equipment, helicopters, parts, ammunition, assistance, resources to Colombia to deal with this problem.

Additionally, they cut the source country programs of eradication of coca and poppies at their source, the most cost-effective programs, to stop narcotics.

□ 1915

So this is where heroin comes from. This is where the bulk of heroin and

cocaine comes from. And the administration has not acted properly to assist the biggest producer, which is Colombia.

Now, the biggest source of these narcotics coming into the United States in this past 5 or 6 years is Mexico. Mexico has become the major transit center of illegal narcotics, hard narcotics, heroin and cocaine. Not only are they the major transit center, as we can see now from the signature program on heroin, they are also getting into the big league of producing very deadly, very pure heroin in Mexico. And, again, they were a very small player just some short years ago.

What has the administration done to deal with Mexico? Well, repeatedly they have certified Mexico as fully cooperating in the war on drugs. We have on the books, on our Federal legal statutes, a requirement that the President and Department of State every year certify every country that is a drug-producing or drug-transiting country, that the administration must certify that they are cooperating, taking positive steps to stop the production and trafficking of illegal narcotics. It is called drug certification.

What do they get in return? If they cooperate, they are eligible for trade assistance, for foreign aid, for international financial assistance and other resources that we make available as a Congress and also as a government to our allies.

We have had no greater friend or ally or closer neighbor than Mexico. There has been no ally that we have assisted more in trying to maintain their financial stability, treating them as an equal trading partner, granting them NAFTA trade status, assisting them again as a good partner and much to our advantage.

We now have a big trade imbalance. They are shipping more goods, dramatically more, into the United States. And they are also the source of illegal narcotics. This Congress and I were part of that effort several years ago when the administration certified Mexico as fully cooperating. We knew they were not fully cooperating. And we passed about 2 years ago, March 13, 1997, by a vote of 251-175, a resolution that asked that the President be responsible for reviewing the progress of Mexico in helping with some specific items.

First of all was to allow the United States law enforcement agents in Mexico to carry firearms and also to protect themselves in defense and also to increase the numbers in Mexico and the cooperative effort in going after illegal narcotics dealers. Basically, nothing has been done in that regard. Our agents are still at risk. Mexico still refuses to cooperate. And this is a request of the Congress from 2 years ago.

We asked, secondly, that Mexico take concrete measures to find and eliminate corruption in Mexico, particularly among law enforcement and also

among military, and to cooperate fully with the United States law enforcement personnel on narcotics control matters. Now, they have not complied with this second request. Mexico has not complied.

In fact, when we conducted an investigation of money laundering in the hundreds of millions of dollars, the Mexican officials in this operation, called Casablanca, instead of assisting the United States Customs officers who were involved in it, threatened to indict and prosecute and go after our agents. Is this fully cooperating?

So, again, this request of 2 years ago of Mexico still has not been attended to by Mexico. In fact, they slapped us in the face, our enforcement officers in the face, with their actions.

We have asked, thirdly, and we continue to request, we asked 2 years ago that Mexico extradite one major drug trafficker. Have they done that? Not really. We want, again, cooperation in extraditing those identified drug traffickers, major drug traffickers, to the United States for prosecution who are under indictment and under request. Have they complied with that? No, not really. They have actually, just close to the decertification time here, extradited one individual and not a major drug trafficker. They know who they are.

What is even worse is, I accompanied some of my colleagues and met with Mexican officials, the attorney general and others, and we know that the Yucatan Peninsula was completely controlled by drug lords, including the corrupt governor of Quintana Roo, the Yucatan Peninsula state. We know the Baha Peninsula is completely controlled by drug and other narco-traffickers. We know that other states in Mexico are completely overrun by drug dealers and they control the political apparatus, judicial apparatus.

Not only have they not cooperated on extradition, they promised when we were there that they would seek the arrest of the governor of the Yucatan Peninsula, who they knew was involved in drug trafficking, who our agents had the goods on, who internationally is renowned for drug trafficking, who turned the Yucatan Peninsula in a narco-terrorist state.

Unfortunately, in Mexico they have a law that does not allow them to really go after folks in office and it makes it difficult to prosecute. So we were told that as soon as the governor of the Yucatan Peninsula leaves office, he will be arrested and he will be made responsible for his actions, which everyone knew were corrupt.

And what happened 4 or 5 days just before the governor was to leave office? He fled the country, I believe on a banana boat, and is on an island off of Cuba we are told. So again the Mexicans failed to extradite, they failed to keep their commitment to go after corrupt officials.

And what is also a request that has been pending for over 2 years now is

that Mexico sign a maritime agreement with the United States, that it allow us to halt and hold drug traffickers and pursue them into Mexican waters. This request was made several years ago, has been made repeatedly, and still the Mexicans have not complied with the simple request of trying to bring this situation under control.

Now, if this is not bad enough, if all these requests that were made by this House of Representatives and this Congress 2 years ago, a little over 2 years ago, March 13, 1997, are ignored, just toss it, forget about it, if this was not bad enough, listen to what the Mexicans have done in trying to assist us with stopping the huge quantities of illegal narcotics coming into the United States. These are the statistics we have for Mexican drug seizures, opium, heroin.

From 1997, the number of metric tons that have been seized by Mexican officials, heroin, again killing our young people, a 56 percent drop in drug seizures from 1997 to 1998 of heroin by Mexican drug officials. A 56 percent drop. And this stuff is flooding into our communities in unprecedented quantities, in unprecedented levels of purity.

Cocaine. What did they do to stop cocaine coming into the United States? How much cocaine did they seize in 1997 versus 1998? A 35 percent drop in the metric tons of cocaine that was seized in Mexico. Have they been fully cooperating with the United States? I say not.

The vehicles seized by Mexico. These are actually vessels seized by the Mexican Government. The boats, in 1997 they seized 135. In 1998 they seized 96, a 29 drop in the number of vessels seized. My colleagues can see why we want a maritime agreement because they failed to even interdict. These are these folks who are dealing in huge quantities of deadly drugs.

According to again the DEA, 14 percent now of the heroin in the United States is of Mexican origin. That was a very small figure some years ago. So what Mexico is doing rather than being a small producer, is now even a large producer in producing deadly heroin into our communities and across our open commercial borders with Mexico.

So these are some of the things that the administration has done in the past several years in dealing with Colombia, a major producer of death and destruction through cocaine or coca production and poppies and heroin production. This administration failed to respond, failed to aid, failed to stop it.

Mexico, they certified them even though Mexico is kicking dirt in the face of every Member of Congress in the United States of America by their lack of cooperation on the basic items that we have asked for and their lack of effort in trying to seize illegal narcotics, particularly heroin, cocaine, and now the rage is methamphetamines.

I conducted a hearing yesterday on INS and illegal immigration in Atlanta, Georgia; and the district attorney in the Atlanta region told us that methamphetamines are becoming a serious problem in that community. And also in hearings we have heard across the Midwest, places like Minnesota, Iowa, and again the western part of the United States, where endemic levels of meth, which is very deadly, and designer drugs are now making their way from Mexico into these parts of our country.

Now, my colleagues might say, this new majority Chair up here talking, what has he done? What has the new Republican majority done? I might say that under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who is now the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, who had this responsibility for putting back together the last 2 years our drug policy, we have made great progress.

Through his leadership and the work of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and other chairs, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) who has worked on the demand side in the community programs dealing with drug abuse and community efforts in that regard, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), who works on legislative efforts particularly as they deal with the criminal justice system and also helping to restore some of our international efforts, these individuals, part of the new majority, part of the new team, with the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), put nearly a billion dollars into various programs, additional dollars into programs, raising our expenditures on this drug issue to \$17.9 billion.

Now, this administration, ironically, proposed a \$100 million cut in the drug budget and they portrayed that as an increase. I do not know when \$100 million less can be an increase, but somehow they are trying to suggest that to the Congress.

But again, we put money into education, into interdiction, money into stopping drugs at their source, starting with these source countries, getting aid to Colombia, helicopters, equipment, resources, the manpower necessary to support their effort to eradicate the poppy fields, the coca fields, the drugs at their source, which I guarantee is the most cost-effective way.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the full Committee on International Relations, and myself have talked for many days about this situation with Mexico.

The situation with Colombia is a little bit different. We do have the cooperation of the new government, President Pastrana. We are getting aid and assistance there. This Congress has provided that assistance, again, under the new majority leadership.

The situation with Mexico is much more difficult, and we have discussed

this with leadership and with others. We took the unprecedented steps 2 weeks ago, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and myself and other Members of the House, to extend the period of decertification consideration by the House of Representatives indefinitely until we come up with some additional concrete solutions, until we come up with cooperative efforts, until we come up with some concrete cooperative measures that we can take working with Mexico to gain their cooperation, to seek their real actions in stopping illegal narcotics at their source, stopping the tracking through their country, working on a maritime issue, allowing our agents to be armed and to protect themselves when they are working on these problems in their country, working on real extradition, and identifying these individuals that are major drug traffickers that are under indictment from the United States and extraditing them to the United States and seeing that they are prosecuted and serve time and are taken out of the streets, and also enforcing the laws that Mexico has passed.

□ 1930

They have passed some laws, I will give them that credit, but they are not executing those laws.

So we need the cooperation of Mexico. We will find a way, working with Mexican officials and with Members of this Congress, to gain their cooperation because they are an important ally, they are an important trading partner, but we cannot sell our souls and the lives of our young people for the sake of trade, for the sake of dollars, for the sake of doing business with a narcotrafficking state.

And we would hate to see Mexico become a narcotrafficking state, and I am quite concerned, Madam Speaker, that we may be on the verge, after having seen Mexico lose the Yucatan Peninsula, after seeing Mexico lose the Baja Peninsula with hundreds of deaths, narcoterrorist deaths, in that state right across our border, some of them heinous, lining up women and children and machine-gunning them. Again, narcoterrorist drug trafficking that has taken over a great deal of Mexico.

We must work together and find some solutions to stop these hard drugs, heroin, cocaine, methamphetamines, other illegal narcotics coming into the United States and restore the programs that again are cost effective, that have unfortunately been ignored by this administration, but will be passed by this Congress, were passed in the last Congress, to restore effectiveness in dealing with these problems.

Again, the toll is tragic. Over 100,000 Americans have lost their lives in the years since this administration took charge, due to the problem of illegal narcotics, and the problem is growing worse particularly among our young people.

Tonight I did detail one tragic death, a young person who lost his life, whose family now is bravely portraying the horrendous death that he died to set an example for others, particularly young people who may not know that there is not glory, that there is not celebrity status in using narcotics, that the narcotics out there today are very deadly when mixed with other drugs or with alcohol, or sometimes for first-time users with 90 percent purity. These individuals meet very tragic, painful, ugly deaths that are just too horrible to describe in additional detail.

But we want the Members of Congress to know what is taking place across this land, we want the American people to know that there is an effort in Congress to correct this situation and that, although the tragedies, as I said at the opening, that have occurred in Colorado and have taken the lives of numerous young people, although Kosovo is a serious situation and there has been ethnic cleansing, we still have a number one social problem in this country that took 14,000 lives last year, is taking lives as I speak tonight, and will continue to take them until we get this situation under control, until we make a commitment to just say no, until we make a commitment to make certain that our young people are educated about the potential tragedy of using illegal narcotics and until we restore those source-country programs that were cut and get the military and whatever other agencies we need, including resources to law enforcement, and to cooperative countries like Colombia, Bolivia and Peru to stop drugs at their source, again in a cost-effective manner. All of us, particularly those who pay the taxes, their hard-earned tax dollars, want an effective program that deals again with the major social problems.

So tonight, as I conclude, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to correct the problems of the past. Hopefully, we will not make the same mistakes to draw the attention of the Congress to this problem, to draw the attention of the American people and particularly our young people about illegal narcotics and what it can do to their lives. We do not want anyone else to end up like this young person did on this sofa, so badly mangled, his life destroyed, his family's future destroyed in a body bag in central Florida or in any other community.

So that is why we are here, that is why we will be back next week. It may get to be a somewhat repetitive message, and people may get tired of hearing me. But I guarantee for the next number of months that I continue to chair this drug policy subcommittee we will call this to the attention of the Congress. The American people seek our help and support, every Member, until we get this situation under control.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair and not to the television audience.

SHARING THE PROSPERITY OF AMERICA WITH WORKING FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I would like to talk about the need to share the current wealth and prosperity of America with working families.

In 1989, the value of the stock market was \$3 trillion. Ten years later, today in 1999, the value of the stocks in all the exchanges is \$13 trillion. From \$3 trillion to \$13 trillion, that is what the increased value of the stock market has been. That is quite an overwhelming increase in wealth.

Madam Speaker, we enjoy unprecedented prosperity today, so I would like to talk about how this prosperity and wealth should be shared with workers. Instead of attacking working families, we need to find ways to reward working families and to share this wealth.

There are many ways to share the wealth and prosperity of the Nation at this point. Certainly I do not propose that we do what the Roman Empire did. At one point the Roman Empire was so wealthy as a result of its conquests, its taxation policies on its oppressed victims, defeated nations around it, that it had so much money that it decreed that every Roman citizen would be paid each year a certain amount of money out of the Treasury. That was real sharing.

I do not think it succeeded for very long because once the word got out that every Roman citizen could share in the booty and they would pay them part of the accumulated wealth of the Nation, all the people in the surrounding countryside moved into Rome. In large numbers, they filled up Rome, and that policy was brought down by the sheer weight of numbers.

Madam Speaker, I do not think we should ever try to repeat anything of that kind; however, I think that we can share the wealth of the Nation with working families by improving health care and making certain that every American citizen has decent health care. I think we can share the prosperity and the wealth of the Nation by making certain that education is available for every American citizen.

The children of working families, for example, are the children who go to public schools. They have no alternative. So our public system of education which, by the way, has 54 million enrolled pupils, that system should be given as much help as possible by all sectors of our economy, governmental and private as well.

So education, health care, I think if you improve those things, it would be

two ways to share the wealth with working families.

There is another very concrete and direct way to share the wealth with working families, and that is to share the dollars. The best way to help somebody who is poor is to give them money directly. Dollars in the hands of the poor are the most efficient and effective way to deal with poverty. So, instead of attacking the working families, as some of our present Republican legislation is seeking to do, let us have a bipartisan coalition on helping working families by raising the minimum wage. Let us raise the minimum wage and put some dollars in the pockets of working families, and they can put food on the table, better clothes, better housing and take care of themselves.

We do not have that spirit here in this Congress. I appreciate the fact that we do not have a situation similar to the one that existed just a little more than 2 years ago in the 105th Congress. The 105th Congress started out with a set of direct assaults on working families. We had direct assaults, and we came on with the very first bill of the year. The very first bill in the 105th Congress was H.R. 1, which was designed to take away the cash overtime payments from working families.

Madam Speaker, that may seem like ancient history now, but it was on a roller coaster in the first debates of the 105th Congress. It was on a roller coaster because it had support from the White House, it had support from the majority of the Democrats, a bill which said we will not pay workers any more in cash overtime, we will force them to take comp time, and the comp time has to be taken at the discretion of the employer.

I pointed out, in fact, that what the workers needed was the cash, extra cash that the overtime provided, more than anything else. An argument was offered that, well, there are a lot of professionals and middle-class people who would like to have the option of having time off instead of more cash. I pointed out at that time that we in no way, the Fair Labor Standards Act does not really interfere with people having time off instead of cash. There are ways to deal with that if people prefer that voluntarily.

But what they were doing by mandating that the Fair Labor Standards Act be changed was mandating that every worker had to accept the situation where time off would be at the discretion of the employer and no cash. I pointed out at that time that two-thirds of the people in America who worked for a living, wage earners, two-thirds made less than \$10 an hour, less than \$10 an hour, and I said: Let those two-thirds who make less than \$10 an hour be exempted from your proposed legislation which would mandate time off instead of overtime. And it did get a few votes on the floor, my amendment, but it did not pass.

However, thank God, the forces of common sense were at work all the

time, and what seemed like a steam-rolling proposition in the early days of the 105th Congress petered out. The labor unions got moving, the common sense of the average worker out there got moving, public opinion became involved, and the whole concept of forcing a change in the Fair Labor Standards Act to require comp time instead of overtime and cash just disappeared. I am very appreciative of the fact that we do not hear any more about it.

There are some other frontal attacks on working families that we do not hear about this year, and I am glad we do not hear them any more. There were frontal attacks on OSHA to merely wipe out the agency, reduce the budget by two-thirds.

□ 1945

OSHA takes care of the health and safety of workers. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration is there to take care of providing safe workplaces. There were attacks which said that OSHA was threatening American industry, that business could not survive if OSHA continued to exist.

These attacks persisted despite the fact that many of us pointed out the fact that OSHA staff had been so reduced that in my lifetime it was not likely that a business would be visited. It takes a cycle of more than 100 years for the inspectors to get around to visiting those businesses out there to examine the conditions to see if they meet OSHA standards.

So OSHA was not a gestapo like agency with numerous staff members to come down on business. That was not true. That frontal attack has ceased, and we are grateful for that.

There was also an attack on the unions and their ability to use their funds for any political purposes. It was called the Paycheck Protection Act. The Paycheck Protection Act was really going for the jugular vein. Wipe out the ability of unions to speak for their members, cut it off completely and if it could not be won at the Federal level there were also movements in the States fomented and encouraged by the leadership of the Republican majority here in the House.

The Paycheck Protection Act is no longer being discussed this year. We are grateful that working families do not have to worry about losing their voice in the political arena. That is no longer a problem.

Then there were the attacks on Davis-Bacon that came loud and frequently. Davis-Bacon was being attacked relentlessly, although as I often point out Davis and Bacon were two Republicans who devised a system for protecting workers in situations where large Federal contracts were involved. They did not want the wages of the local areas to be eroded by having these large contractors come in and bring outside workers in to do the work at lower wages. So it was common sense built in all the way from the beginning.

These frontal assaults, the constant unrelenting attempt to batter down the protections for working families, are not happening here in the 106th Congress.

I serve as the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee for Workforce Protections of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and I know that at the committee level and the subcommittee level we are getting a guerilla attack. Guerilla ambushes have replaced the frontal assault. Not the same amount of noise is being made. They do not rush these items to the floor and expect immediate endorsements and passage, but there is a slow chipping away at the protections for working families.

Working families are still in danger in this Republican controlled Congress. Working families still have to fear a bush whacking, a quiet assault, an ambush, in a number of areas. I say that I want to call on this 106th Congress, where all of us, most of us, subscribe to the notion that we are more civil and would like to have a bipartisan approach to certain issues, let us have a bipartisan approach to rewarding working families.

Working families make up the majority of America out there. Working families need better health care. They need decent education. They need more help from the Federal Government for education. First of all, working families need dollars in their pockets, and we can do that by increasing the minimum wage.

Increasing the minimum wage is what I want to talk most about. It is all integrally interwoven. We need to increase the minimum wage and the minimum wage is where there are entry level workers who are now making \$5.15 an hour. We have proposed to raise that by fifty cents in one year. That is the President's proposal, fifty cents in one year and then another fifty cents another year, which means a dollar increase over a 2-year period. It will not make anybody rich. People who are making \$10,000 a year would be making a little more than \$12,000 a year after we raise the minimum wage.

A lot of people have a lot of questions about whether the minimum wage really is important because, after all, most Americans are not making minimum wage. I am going to show some statistics, recent statistics, in a few minutes, to let everyone know that quite a number of Americans still make minimum wage and there are a lot who make below minimum wage, that are working every day for wages below minimum wage because minimum wage is not mandated for the smallest business. There are a number of situations where minimum wage does not impact.

So instead of attacks on working families, I propose that we move forward in a bipartisan effort to reward working families by increasing the minimum wage.

At a town meeting that I had just last night, where there were quite a

number of people who came out, people are very concerned about a number of items, a number of Federal actions that are being taken. At the top of the list, of course, is Kosovo and what is going to happen with Kosovo and the intervention of our American forces along with NATO; will we send in ground troops or will they appropriate more money for the effort and in the process of appropriating more money for the war effort will we downgrade the efforts to improve Medicare by having something added to Medicare which will cover prescription drugs; will we downgrade our efforts to improve the education system and say that we have no money because this war effort is going to absorb all the resources? Those are very important questions and people are very concerned about that.

By the way, I asked for a show of hands in an audience of about 200 people as to was there support for the present actions in Kosovo, the bombing of Kosovo, to stop the dictator Milosevic, Slobodan Milosevic, which I call a sovereign predator, responsible for unspeakable horrors in that area of the country, was there support for the present action that the United States was taking along with its NATO allies. Practically every hand in the house went up supporting it. The overwhelming majority, 95 percent of the people, supported taking action.

However, I might point out that when I asked how many would support escalating the combat effort, escalating the effort to the use of ground troops, I had just the opposite reaction. Only about 5 percent raised their hands. I think that is very informative.

To get back to today's subject, their primary concerns, or I might not say primary but equal to Kosovo were concerns about Social Security and concerns about Medicare and concerns about education. These are all things that are very important to working families. When we help to improve education, we are improving a lot of working families.

The public school system that is being attacked by a lot of people in the majority, the Republican majority, they want to replace the public school system with a privatized system. They want vouchers to replace Federal aid to education. They want to give up on the public school system. As I said before, there are 54 million students in the public school system. Fifty-four million students are enrolled.

Only a small percentage of our population of school-age students attend private schools today and if we were to make some kind of effort to greatly increase the funding for private schools, it would still be a very slow process of moving more and more of our youngsters into private schools. So just logistically and statistically, not much help is going to come in the near future from a private school effort or from giving vouchers and sending working family children off to find a private

school. So any attacks on public education are also attacks on working families.

One might want to know that the Federal Government does not do very much for these 54 million children out there in public schools. Our expenditure for elementary and secondary education presently is about \$22 billion a year. The annual expenditure for elementary and secondary education is about \$22 billion. Our current expenditure for highways and transportation is \$51 billion, to let everyone see what the contrast is. We are spending only \$22 billion for education but \$51 billion for highways.

I use that example because a lot of people continue to confront me with the issue of local control and say that it is not the Federal Government's business to worry about education. It is not the Federal Government's business to be involved in education. They ask, why would I want to saddle the Federal Government with responsibilities in the area of education?

Well, let me ask this: Is it the Federal Government's responsibility to be involved in roads and highways? That was always a local responsibility. Highways and roads were for States and local governments to take care of. Nothing in the Constitution gives the Federal Government the responsibility for maintaining the highways and the roads, but now we are at the point where we currently are spending \$51 billion.

Last year we had the biggest expenditure in history for highways and transportation approved. That expenditure will be about \$218 billion over a 6-year period, \$218 billion over a 6-year period. Contrast that with what the President is proposing to spend for school construction. Over a 5-year period he is proposing to spend \$3.7 billion to pay the interest on \$25 billion worth of loans that the local governments and the State governments will have to make for education. So the contrast is overwhelming.

These are children of working families who go to the public schools. School construction would be an initiative to help working family children.

People say that inner cities do not deserve to be given priority for education funding and we should take away the Title I money and put it into ed-flex and let the governors and the local decisionmakers spend the money for anything they want to related to education. Do not concentrate on the original purpose of Title I. The original purpose of the Federal Government's involvement in education was to help the poorer communities. Forget about that. They do not deserve that. There are Democrats who say that we should not have a construction bill, a school construction bill which gives first priority to the cities. Well, we give first priorities to the inner cities because that is where most of the children are. Most of the population of America lives in the big cities.

When it comes time to fight wars, most of the people who go off to die are the young people from big cities. If one goes to the Vietnam Memorial wall they will find that the wall is full of people who come from the big cities and it is full of the children from working families. Children from working families went out to die in World War I and World War II and children from working families died in Vietnam. If we have a war in Kosovo that expands to a ground war, the majority of those who would die in combat will be from working families in big cities.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I wanted to come down here to the Floor of the House to compliment the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), my fine colleague, for his special order this evening.

Madam Speaker, I was listening to the gentleman in my office and I was motivated to come down here when he was talking about the minimum wage and the struggle of people from our country to earn a decent living.

I wanted to engage the gentleman in a colloquy, if I might, based on a speech that was made over the weekend and reported in the gentleman's home city of New York City by none other than the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan.

The story was reported in my local paper back home, the Toledo Blade, because he was talking about workers in our country and saying that, and I quote from the article, "pockets of workers in America sometimes have to suffer for the national economy to get stronger." It was very interesting and, Madam Speaker, I would like to include that article for the RECORD at this point.

Madam Speaker, I ordered a copy of his speech today, and I have read it, because he was speaking to a group in Texas and he was talking about NAFTA. He was talking about how successful it has been.

I was very interested in the gentleman's remarks on minimum wage because Mr. Greenspan, in his speech, argues that international trade has lifted the standard of living of people in this country. I guess I wanted the gentleman to comment whether it is his view that some of the trade arrangements that we have locked ourselves into have been beneficial to the standard of living and to working families' incomes in this Nation. From what the gentleman was saying about the minimum wage, something is not working here.

Obviously, all boats are not being lifted. What was interesting to me about Mr. Greenspan's remarks, in fact, when he said who had to suffer as a result of our trade agreements, he only said workers. He did not say shareholders. He did not say chief executive officers. He did not say executive assistants. He did not say managers.

[From the Toledo Blade, April 17, 1999]

GREENSPAN CONTRADICTS U.S. TRADE VIEW—
COMPETITION IS THE GOAL, HE SAYS

WASHINGTON (NYT).—Alan Greenspan waded into the debate over trade policy yesterday, denouncing protectionist pressures and arguing that pockets of workers sometimes have to suffer for the national economy to get stronger.

The Federal Reserve chairman did not address the biggest question on the trade agenda, the possible entry of China into the World Trade Organization. But he outlined a broad case for eliminating trade barriers and warned that attempts to halt the development of a more global economy are futile and harmful.

Mr. Greenspan's influence could help the Clinton administration as it seeks to complete a deal with China and win congressional approval for the pact.

But Mr. Greenspan criticized the administration for framing the benefits of trade in what he called the wrong way. The point of expanding trade is not to create jobs, Mr. Greenspan said, contradicting the President's main argument for why the United States should open new markets.

Rather, Mr. Greenspan said, trade forces the United States to become more competitive, and to use its resources—people, technology and money—in the most productive way.

The Fed chairman took the administration and Congress to task for taking what he called an overly narrow view of trade relations.

"I am concerned about the recent weakening of support for free trade in this country," Mr. Greenspan said in a speech to business executives and foreign ambassadors in Dallas.

"Should we endeavor to freeze competitive progress in place, we will almost certainly slow economic growth overall and impart substantial harm to those workers who would otherwise seek more effective long-term job opportunities," he said.

Mr. Greenspan spoke after 10 days of debate within the administration and throughout Washington over how hard to push for a deal that would put China under the international rules of trade.

Last week, Mr. Clinton backed away from a deal with China's prime minister, Zhu Rongji, despite sweeping concessions from the Chinese on a variety of trade issues. Mr. Clinton concluded that he would not be able to win approval from Congress because lawmakers are unhappy with China over accusations that it has violated human rights, spread nuclear weapons, and spied on American weapon programs.

But after criticism from business leaders, Mr. Clinton restarted talks with China.

□ 2000

My own view, and perhaps the gentleman would want to comment on this, if we look at our trade deficit with Mexico, now nearly \$16 billion a year, making more down there than we are able to sell. They ship their goods here, we do not get as much down there, their people cannot afford to buy; our people lose jobs.

China, which is an issue we are going to be discussing here, \$50 billion, \$60 billion in trade deficits. The poor workers in China are making 10 cents an hour, and yet we have the downward ratcheting of wages and benefits in this country, which force us to come to the floor here to ask for an increase in the minimum wage.

I just wanted to come down to the floor and to introduce this news article where Mr. Greenspan contradicts U.S. trade views and criticizes Congress. I am mystified why we might be concerned. I thought the gentleman might want to add something to his earlier remarks.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I certainly appreciate the gentlewoman from Ohio joining me because she has studied this situation very closely over a long period of time and has a great deal of knowledge and institutional memory as to how we have progressed to the present situation.

I think the gentlewoman will sympathize with me when I say any country which is earning in its stock markets \$13 trillion in 1999 versus \$3 trillion in 1989, has seen a \$10 trillion increase over a 10-year period, why are they worried about the economy faltering and why must that keep going on the backs of workers? We certainly have no danger; if we raise the minimum wage or if we were to pay workers better and create more jobs, that \$13 trillion cannot be threatened, or if it wavers a bit and goes down to \$12 trillion, what is the difference?

So I had to restrain myself because when I began, our colleagues from the other side had just finished talking about Mexico and the drug trade, and NAFTA came to mind right away. We should have disapproved of NAFTA just for the reason that the Government of Mexico is overwhelmed by the drug trade and that any kinds of laws that we try to enforce there are impossible. We cannot enforce laws that require trade unions to have freedom. We cannot enforce laws on the environment. We cannot enforce laws which would maintain decent minimum wages and working conditions.

Then, when we move to China, China overnight has an overwhelming balance of trade with us, and it is obscene, the amount of the surplus with China in their favor at this point. They not only employ people at low wages, they use prison labor. I heard just this past weekend a manufacturer of toys who openly said that it is manufacturing in the prisons of China. We do not want anything to do with that; do not ask me any questions about it. I do not care what it manufactures, we get a much cheaper price.

So the workers here are directly threatened by that kind of activity in Mexico and in China, and of course the people who benefit are the ones who reap tremendous profits by bringing the very cheap goods in here and selling them at prices that are more consistent with our standard of living and reaping the profit. That is where the \$13 trillion versus \$3 trillion has been accumulated.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would just yield to me for one more minute, I would say that Mr. Greenspan seems to think that all trade raises the standard of living of the American people. It might raise the

standard of living of people who can afford to take him out to lunch or dinner along Wall Street in New York City or K Street here in Washington, D.C., but it has not raised the wages of the people that the gentleman from New York is talking about here, where we in Congress have to forcibly ratchet up the minimum wage because people are being told where they work here in the United States, well, if you want any kind of a small wage increase, or maybe you want better health insurance or health insurance at all, if you do not agree to that, we are going to Mexico. I do not understand why an intelligent person like Mr. Greenspan cannot feel the pain and understand the impact of these trade agreements on the vast majority of the American public that has not benefited from the big bang on Wall Street.

The average wages of people in this country and their real buying power has not been going up. They are working; thank God we have done some things right in this country, but they are not able to meet prices.

The other day I went to get a blouse back home, and I walked up to this one rack and I pulled it off the rack and I looked at it, it was \$129 made in China. And Mr. Greenspan says in his speeches here that this trade is great for America because we get all these cheap goods. Where? Where are the cheap goods? All the garment workers in the gentleman's city who lost their jobs who were making not great wages, but at least they could keep house and home together, when those jobs were wiped out and replaced by Chinese jobs, I really do not see how he can say this helps the standard of living of the ordinary rank and file, the majority of people in this country. It certainly helps those who trade in stocks on Wall Street, would the gentleman not agree?

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, the \$129 blouse probably cost less than \$10 to make.

Ms. KAPTUR. I know.

Mr. OWENS. So large profits are reaped by somebody, and that is where the \$13 trillion has been accumulated, a \$10 trillion increase over the last 10 years. That is obscene when we look at the fact that 40 million people are not covered with any kind of health care and we are nickel and diming our education system in terms of support from the Federal Government, and on and on it goes.

Mr. Greenspan insulted all working people previously by saying that unemployment is good for the economy, and the last thing we wanted was to have full employment. It is ridiculous to allow these icons to go on unchallenged, but as the gentlewoman and I know, we are lucky that lightning has not come down and struck both of us for criticizing Mr. Greenspan. The power structure wants Mr. Greenspan. The President keeps reappointing Mr. Greenspan, the majority of Republicans want Mr. Greenspan. Mr. Greenspan is no friend of working families,

and there is a philosophy, and a lot of people in decision-making positions who are not friends of working families. We are missing a golden opportunity in America to have the working families share the prosperity, and it would be good for the entire country to have them share it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, would the gentleman, who has been such a leader on education, allow me just to say this, because I do not know of any member of the gentleman's committee that has fought as hard for education as the gentleman has in his tenure here in this Congress, and the American people owe you a debt of gratitude for that.

What is very interesting to me in our area of Ohio and around the Midwest, many companies that used to pay taxes for education and used to help schools, got abatement, tax abatement over the last 20 years, and now what is happening is educational systems across this country are faltering at the local level and asking the Congress to appropriate money in order to help for school construction. The President of the United States a couple of months ago was up here asking for money for school construction. This is a shift in priorities of the Federal Government to move into school modernization and construction.

One of the reasons this is happening is that locally, these very same companies that have gotten abatement and are cutting back on their public responsibilities are then shifting that burden up to the Federal Government where we have a lot of other responsibilities, and it is very interesting to me that the gentleman has to fight for dollars for education, dear dollars that we need for curriculum, for instruction, for making up the differential between lower income districts and higher income districts, and yet now we also have to fund buildings. It is amazing to me how much foregone tax revenue there is at the local level. Just another example of corporate America not meeting its public responsibilities.

I would wish for the Federal Reserve to do a study on that.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, as soon as the tax abatement run out for many of these companies, they are going to leave the gentlewoman's State and go to Mexico or somewhere else.

This is a great argument; of course, I do not like to see the Federal Government be forced to assume new responsibilities, but it is a great argument for the Federal Government assuming more responsibilities for school construction, because the wealth is in the country. It is not in the counties, as it was before, but it is somewhere in the country when we see the \$13 trillion stock market value. Let the Federal Government take part of that wealth and use it to build schools across the country. It did not apply 20 years ago; it was not necessary 20 or 25 years ago, but it is necessary now.

What is wrong with safeguarding the national interests by seeing to it that

we have adequate schools and school construction is one of those areas where it is most intense in terms of capital. School systems are struggling for operating budgets to keep the right number of teachers and suppliers and all of the other expenses going. Surely, a one-shot expenditure on a massive scale to deal with the fact that the General Accounting Office says we need about, in 1995, we needed about \$110 billion just to repair schools that needed repair and to build, to keep up with the current enrollment in 1995, and now we need much more.

So we need a massive injection, similar to the highway bill injection. When we need big money for a purpose that people see day-to-day in having some applicability, then let us spend the money there instead of wasting it in other places, and school construction is one of those places where it is needed.

I think the Federal Government expenditure right now for elementary and secondary education is about \$415 per child per year. That is our involvement. Most of the cost of education is still borne by State and local governments. We could afford to have an infusion, a one-shot, one-time set of expenditures for construction and let the Federal Government then get out and leave it to the States on an ongoing basis.

I sympathize when some people say the Federal Government should not interfere with education at the local level. Well, if we build schools, we are not interfering with curriculum and procedures and processes, we are just helping to build schools and then getting out and leaving it to the local government. That is an area where we should be involved. Of course, as I said before, most of those schools are for working families who cannot afford the alternative in terms of private schools. No matter how we play around with that, most working families are going to have to send their children to public schools.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing more light on this subject.

The minimum wage right now is \$5.15 an hour. That comes out to \$10,000, \$10,300 for a worker who works 50 weeks in a year, \$10,300 per year. Let that sink in and let people understand that two-thirds of the workforce makes less than \$20,000 a year. I did this research when I was fighting the bill which required people to take time off instead of receiving overtime. Two-thirds of the workforce is at the level where they are making only \$10 an hour. Two-thirds of the workforce in America are making only \$20,000 a year, twice the minimum wage at this point. That is two-thirds of those who earn a living as wage-earners.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of course was amended, and the minimum wage, on September 30, 1996 it was raised to \$4.75 an hour, and then September 1, 1997 it was raised to \$5.15 an hour. That was when we had the last

increases. Of course at that time we also had to bear an amendment which was called the Opportunity Wage Provision. The Republican majority insisted that workers under age 20 can be paid \$4.25 an hour for the first 90 consecutive calendar days after they are hired. That was a compromise that I did not care for, but we had to make that in order to get the bill passed.

Now, people say that well, most workers are already above the minimum wage; they do not have to worry about that. But 1.6 million workers were paid by the hour at hourly wages of \$5.15 in 1998. Madam Speaker, 2.8 million workers were making less than that. Some workers are paid below the minimum wage because, as I said before, because of the provision for youth workers, and then there are small businesses that are exempted from the minimum wage, very small businesses exempted.

Over the last 30 years, how has the minimum wage kept pace with inflation? I just said before that in 10 years, the stock market value went from \$3 trillion to \$13 trillion. Now, do we have any kind of overwhelming increase like that with the minimum wage? No. From 1961 to 1981, the real value of the minimum wage was above \$6 an hour every year but one. During that period, it fell below \$6 an hour one time in 1973.

□ 2015

Since 1981 the real value of the minimum wage has stayed below \$6 an hour. President Clinton's proposed increase would restore hardworking minimum wage families' purchasing power to the level that it held for almost 6 years, almost 20 years, way back.

It did hold, with the cost of living and inflation, for a 20-year period, but now 20 years has gone by since it was at the level of \$6 an hour. We would be going to that level if we increased the present minimum wage in two stages, \$5.15 and then, 35 cents one year and 50 cents another year up to the point where it would be \$6.15.

People say that most of the minimum wage workers are young people in fast food joints and odd jobs after school, and it does not matter if they make the minimum wage, but the statistics and the studies show that 65 percent of minimum wage workers are adults 20 years or older. Sixty-five percent of the people who earn the minimum wage are adult workers 20 years or older.

Some people say it does not help women and minorities because as we raise the minimum wage, employers lay off people, and a lot of women and minorities who would benefit from more jobs lose jobs as the minimum wage forces employers to cut the number of jobs.

Well, women would be helped by increasing the minimum wage. Most minimum wage workers are women right now. Almost 1 million women are paid \$5.15 an hour. An additional 5.8 are paid wages less than \$6.14 an hour.

Fifty-nine percent of all who would benefit from the increase are women. Nineteen percent of all hourly paid women would benefit from the increase. Seventy four percent of female low-wage workers are adults. Five million of the women are age 20 years or older. They are paid these minimum wages. Raising the minimum wage would provide a modest pay raise to the poorest working women, many of whom are raising children.

Over 15 percent of those who would benefit from an increase are African American women, and 18 percent are Hispanic women. Together they number 3.8 million workers.

The question was asked, is the minimum wage targeted to help poor people? As I said before, the myth is that as we raise the minimum wage, we have decreased the number of jobs because employers lay off people, or they cut the jobs in order to increase their profits.

That is not true. According to a study by the Economic Policy Institute on the impact of the 1996 50-cent increase in the minimum wage, the benefits of the increase went primarily to low-income working families.

The minimum wage can provide a foothold into the middle class. A family with two full-time workers who work all year round would earn \$25,000 a year with a \$6.15 minimum wage. Increasing the minimum wage will help these workers to make up for lost ground due to inflation. It will help make work pay.

Some other facts are, people always argue that the unskilled jobs and the disadvantaged workers are not going to be benefited, again because the number of those jobs will be decreased if we raise the minimum wage.

But between September, 1996, and March of this year, 1999, the unemployment rate for high school dropouts has declined from 8.2 percent to 6.1 percent. The unemployment rate for African Americans has dropped from 10.6 percent to 8.1 percent.

The unemployment rate for Hispanic Americans has dropped from 8.3 percent to 5.8 percent. The unemployment rate for teens has dropped from 15.7 percent to 14.3 percent. The unemployment rate for black teens has dropped from 33 percent to 31 percent.

We would like to see all of these drops be more dramatic, but the fact is that the arguments that we do not help the poorest people or we do not help teenagers or we do not help minorities when we raise the minimum wage are totally discredited. No study has shown that this is true.

When we talk about welfare recipients, a major problem of welfare recipients who entered the labor market so far is not their inability to find a job, but the fact that the earnings are very low. Increasing the minimum wage would increase the earnings of former welfare recipients and make it really worthwhile for them to be working instead of on welfare.

Starting wages of welfare recipients in the job market average about \$6.50 an hour, with significant fractions of recipients earning \$5 and \$6 an hour. Quarterly earnings of welfare recipients tend to be about \$2,000 to \$2,500 per quarter when they work, and just about \$1,500 to \$2,000 for high school dropouts.

These low earning figures reflect the low wages as well as the high turnover rates in these jobs. Two problems, the low wages, and these jobs do not usually last for all year round. They are sporadic. There are periodic layoffs, and people do not earn money 50 weeks in a year.

Virtually all research on minimum wage increases show little or no effects on the employment rates of young people. The vast majority of studies also show that minimum wage increases do reduce poverty rates, and no credible study has shown anything different, as I said before.

Minimum wage workers benefit more and sooner if we raise the wages, as we did before, 50 cents per year. So the present proposals that are being floated by the Republicans, where some call for increases of only 25 cents per year, do not propose to move fast enough with enough money to make it significant. It is not sharing with workers, when we have a \$13 trillion economy, to talk about we will give them a minimum wage increase of only 25 cents per year.

Minimum wage workers benefit more and they benefit sooner under the proposed Kennedy-Bonior proposal than under any of the Republican proposals. The Republican proposals would take money out of the minimum wage pockets.

For example, in the first year of the Quinn bill, a full-time minimum wage worker earns nearly \$200 less than under the Kennedy-Bonior bill. In the second year, the Republican bill gap rises to \$571 less than they would make under the Kennedy-Bonior bill.

There is a Shimkus proposal also, and the wage gap is worse under the Shimkus proposal. If the minimum wage increases by 25 cents in 1999, a full-time minimum wage worker earns \$487 less in real terms than they would earn under the Kennedy-Bonior proposal.

A second 25-cent increase in 2000 leaves workers even further behind, with a \$951 gap between the Kennedy-Bonior proposal and the Shimkus proposal.

In the first 2 years, the Kennedy-Bonior bill would benefit more workers than the Quinn proposal, which is 11.4 million workers compared to 7 million. The Quinn bill does nothing for over 4 million needy workers and their families. The Shimkus proposal helps even fewer low-wage workers.

As I said before, the President's proposal is a simple 50-cent increase on September 1, 1999, and a 50-cent increase on September 1, 2000. As I said before, that would bring the minimum

wage earner from the \$10,000 a year up to \$12,000 a year if they worked 50 weeks in a year, still much too low but an important improvement.

Congress did raise the minimum wage by 50 cents in 1996 and 40 cents on September 1, 1997, and this time we propose to do it, through the President's proposal, a little better than that.

The minimum wage is still low in historical terms. The value of the minimum wage reached its peak in 1968, when the value in real dollar terms was \$7.49 in terms of dollars, dollar values in 1998. We were up that high, \$7.49 in 1968.

During President Reagan's 8 years in office, the real value of the minimum wage went down by about 25 percent. Today, even after the 90-cent increase that President Clinton pushed through Congress, the minimum wage is only \$5.15 an hour, and the new proposal would increase it by another \$1 in two steps. This last increase in percentage terms is in line with previous ones that helped low wage workers without adversely affecting the economy. Both this proposal and the last one increased the minimum wage by about 20 percent.

I could go on and on, but I do not want to talk more about facts related to the minimum wage. I think the point is made, that no studies have been brought forward to show that the economy is in any way harmed by an increase in the minimum wage. Workers certainly are not harmed by losing jobs. Unemployment now is much higher than it was when the minimum wage increase started 2 years ago.

States have minimum wages. A few of them have minimum wages larger than the Federal Government minimum wage, but some States, of course, have no minimum wage, and often do not abide by the Federal minimum wage. They have a lot of jobs that do not pay even the minimum wage.

I think Texas, if we want to look at the largest number of people earning the minimum wage, Texas has 211,000 in its State, and 4.2 percent of the work force is earning minimum wage. They have another 838,000 people who earn between \$5.15 an hour and \$6.14 cents an hour. That comes to 16.6 percent of the work force at very low wage levels.

So we need to share the wealth. If we have \$3 trillion, if we move from \$3 trillion to \$13 trillion on the stock market, there is no sound argument for not raising the minimum wage. Of all the ways to share the wealth, the best and easiest way, the most direct way, is to increase the dollars in the pockets of the workers. Working families need more money.

So I appreciate the fact that we are not openly attacking workers, as we did in the 105th Congress. I appreciate the fact that the first bill on the agenda was not a bill to take away overtime, as we did in the 105th Congress.

I appreciate the fact that we are not any longer waging war on labor unions,

to take away their ability to speak for their workers by having a so-called Paycheck Protection Act, which throtles the voices of unions. I appreciate the fact that there are no loud voices being raised to try to end Davis-Bacon for Federal contract jobs.

But the truth is, in all of these areas there is still a guerilla war going on. The guerilla war is more subtle. The guerilla war is designed to hoodwink working families.

Davis-Bacon is being attacked behind the scenes. Davis-Bacon is being again used as a scapegoat for not approving a massive school construction appropriation. They are saying that Davis-Bacon drives up the cost of school construction, despite the fact that there have been several scientific studies which show that Davis-Bacon does not drive up the cost.

Mr. Peter Phillips has made several studies showing that if we remove Davis-Bacon, the cost may remain the same or go higher, but what happens is that the wages of the workers go down and the profits of the contractors go up. That is the only thing we accomplish when we remove Davis-Bacon from contracts.

State Davis-Bacon laws, similar State Davis-Bacon prevailing wage laws have been changed in certain Midwestern States. They have seen that it does not lower the cost of school construction, it only raises the profits of contractors. So Davis-Bacon should not be an issue.

However, in the circles of Congress there is still talk of blocking any appropriation for school construction because of Davis-Bacon, or holding school construction appropriations hostage by saying that we will do it only if you get rid of Davis-Bacon.

I understand the Committee on Ways and Means has made some steps forward in terms of the Democratic leadership over there. The ranking Democrat on the Committee on Ways and Means recently announced in a session of the Congressional Black Caucus that he would certainly support the continuation of Davis-Bacon on the school construction bill proposed through Committee on Ways and Means.

That is the President's proposal that we borrow \$25 billion, and the States and local governments would be helped by the Federal Government, by the Federal Government paying the interest through a tax credit vehicle on the \$25 billion for school construction.

So I hope that the guerilla warfare will cease. We had some problems recently in the subcommittee on Workforce Protections, my subcommittee where I serve as the ranking Democrat. We had a problem with an attempt to get rid of bonuses as part of the computation of the rate of pay for a worker.

If we remove the bonuses, then the hourly rate of the worker goes down, and we can have the worker work overtime and he gets less money if the bonus is not computed as part of his

hourly pay. That is what we call a bushwacking, an ambush of the working families, to try to take away their overtime through a much less visible approach.

□ 2030

H.R. 1 was a highly visible direct assault by mandating, it called for mandating the use of comp time instead of cash payments for overtime. So we would like to see working families not have to fight so hard to get their share of the wealth.

I would like to even go further and say that the problem of Social Security, problem of health care, we should look at taxing unearned income. Unearned income may be the source of the solution to the Social Security problem. If we would put a Social Security tax, as I am proposing, on unearned income, we would guarantee Social Security for an infinite number of years in the future.

At the same time, we could lift the tax off the backs of the workers. Working families have had the biggest tax increase over the last two decades through the payroll tax. Most people do not realize that because they do not look at taxes in that way. But the payroll tax increase has been not a progressive tax, but a regressive tax, and fallen on the backs of wage earners. At the same time, we have had this tremendous increase in wealth for the people who have unearned income.

I did not invent these two terms. These are economic terms that have been around for a long time. Earned income is the income of working people, the people who earn wages. Those dollars are called earned income. Investments and income from rent and other sources are called unearned income.

I do not know why we discriminate against earned income and all the taxes are just on earned income. Only 11 percent of unearned income is taxed. We ought to take a look at a tax reduction policy for working families. That is another issue that should be considered.

But, first of all and foremost, I think that the current consideration is the need for a bipartisan approach to the passage of a meaningful increase in the minimum wage, a meaningful increase. We do not want a bipartisan increase. The bipartisanship forces us to sacrifice the reality of it.

The reality is that no less than \$1 over a 2-year period is acceptable. We need so much more than that. Consider the \$13 trillion versus the \$3 trillion, and my colleagues will see the kind of magnitude that our wealth has increased by.

No less should happen in terms of the various programs that we, as the policymakers here in Congress, approve for working families. We need to help working families through health care. We need to help working families by providing health care plans and health care systems that take care of everybody.

We need to help working families by increasing Federal aid to education, first of all building more schools and better schools and repairing schools and modernizing schools and equipping schools with the technology that they need.

Finally, we need to help working families first of all, most immediately and most directly, by passing immediately an increase in the minimum wage.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1999 AT PAGE H2135

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 16, 1999.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 16, 1999 at 12:00 noon.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 911.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1376.

That the Senate agreed to the Conference Report on H. Con. Res. 58.

Appointments: Congressional advisers on trade agreements. United States Commission on Civil Rights.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SAXTON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and until 3 p.m., Wednesday, April 21, on account of personal reasons

Mr. NUSSLE (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. OSE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHADEGG, for 5 minutes, today and April 21.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, April 21.

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, today and April 21.

Mr. DEMINT, for 5 minutes, April 21.

Mr. PORTER, for 5 minutes, April 21.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for 5 minutes, April 21.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, April 21.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUTCHINSON, for 5 minutes, April 21.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 60 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 249. An act to provide funding for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

S. 426. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, to provide for a land exchange between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Huna Totem Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 430. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, to provide for a land exchange between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Kake Tribal Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 453. An act to designate the Federal building located at 709 West 9th Street in Juneau, Alaska, as the "Hurff A. Saunders Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 21, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1594. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for livestock price reporting; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1595. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report that the enclosed appropriation to the Department of Agriculture has been apportioned on a basis that indicates the necessity for a supplemental appropriation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1515(b)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1596. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1597. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Bumper Standard [Docket No. NHTSA 99-5458] (RIN: 2127-AH59) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1598. A letter from the Director, Office of Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to section 3349 of the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1599. A letter from the Director, Office of Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to section 3349 of the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1600. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting notification of two vacancies within the Department of Agriculture in positions which require appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1601. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a copy of the Government National Mortgage Association management report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1602. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authorization for Title XI of Public Law 104-333, California Bay Delta Environmental Enhancement Act; to the Committee on Resources.

1603. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company GE90 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-39-AD; Amendment 39-11123; AD 99-08-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1604. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6-80A, CF6-80C2, and CF6-80E1 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-49-AD; Amendment 39-11119; AD 99-08-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1605. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW2000 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-61-AD; Amendment 39-11120; AD 99-08-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1606. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service,