

Maloney (NY)	Peterson (PA)	Souder
Markey	Petri	Spence
Martinez	Phelps	Stabenow
Mascara	Pickering	Stark
Matsui	Pickett	Stearns
McCarthy (MO)	Pitts	Stenholm
McCarthy (NY)	Pombo	Strickland
McCollum	Pomeroy	Stump
McDermott	Portman	Stupak
McGovern	Price (NC)	Sununu
McHugh	Quinn	Sweeney
McInnis	Radanovich	Talent
McIntosh	Rahall	Tancredo
McIntyre	Ramstad	Tanner
McKeon	Rangel	Tauscher
McKinney	Regula	Tauzin
McNulty	Reyes	Taylor (MS)
Meek (FL)	Reynolds	Terry
Meeks (NY)	Riley	Thomas
Menendez	Rivers	Thompson (CA)
Metcalfe	Rodriguez	Thompson (MS)
Mica	Roemer	Thornberry
Millender-	Rogers	Thune
McDonald	Rohrabacher	Thurman
Miller (FL)	Rothman	Tiahrt
Miller, Gary	Royce	Tierney
Miller, George	Rush	Toomey
Minge	Ryan (WI)	Towns
Mink	Ryun (KS)	Trafigant
Mollohan	Sabo	Turner
Moore	Salmon	Udall (CO)
Moran (KS)	Sanchez	Udall (NM)
Moran (VA)	Sanders	Upton
Morella	Sandlin	Velazquez
Murtha	Sanford	Vento
Myrick	Sawyer	Visclosky
Nadler	Saxton	Vitter
Napolitano	Schaffer	Walden
Nethercutt	Schakowsky	Walsh
Ney	Scott	Wamp
Northup	Sensenbrenner	Waters
Norwood	Sessions	Watkins
Nussle	Shadeegg	Watt (NC)
Oberstar	Shays	Watts (OK)
Obey	Sherman	Waxman
Olver	Sherwood	Weldon (FL)
Ose	Shimkus	Weldon (PA)
Owens	Shows	Weller
Oxley	Simpson	Wexler
Packard	Sisisky	Weygand
Pallone	Skeen	Whitfield
Pascarell	Skelton	Wilson
Pastor	Slaughter	Wise
Paul	Smith (MI)	Wolf
Payne	Smith (NJ)	Woolsey
Pease	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Pelosi	Smith (WA)	Young (FL)
Peterson (MN)	Snyder	

## NOT VOTING—37

Barcia	Lantos	Roybal-Allard
Bliley	Largent	Scarborough
Brown (FL)	Manzullo	Serrano
Carson	McCrery	Shaw
Clay	Meehan	Shuster
Dooley	Moakley	Spratt
Gephardt	Neal	Taylor (NC)
Hansen	Ortiz	Weiner
Hastings (FL)	Porter	Wicker
Hulshof	Pryce (OH)	Wu
Jefferson	Rogan	Wynn
Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen	
Kingston	Roukema	

## □ 1856

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, due to the threat of Hurricane Floyd to South Florida I found it necessary to stay in my district to attend to the needs of my constituents. However, I wish to be recorded as a "yes" vote on the motion to close the conference on H.R. 2561, the Fiscal Year 2000 Defense Appropriations bill due to national security reasons.

I also wish to be recorded as a "yes" vote on H. Con. Res. 184 and H.R. 658.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

## ENHANCING INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, citizens chronically complain about the state of America's public capital, about dilapidated school buildings, condemned highway bridges, contaminated water supplies, and other shortcomings of the public infrastructure.

In addition to inflicting inconvenience and endangering health, the inadequacy of public infrastructure adversely affects productivity and the growth of our economy. Public investment, private investment, and productivity are intimately linked.

For more than two decades, Washington has retreated from public investment as the costs of entitlements and of the interest payable on rapidly rising debt have mounted.

State and local governments, albeit to a lesser extent, have also slowed investments. Their taxpayers were frequently reluctant to approve bond issues to finance the infrastructure.

Whereas, in the early 1970s, non-defense public investment accounted for 3.2 percent of GDP, it now accounts for only 2.5 percent. That is a huge loss. Widespread neglect of maintenance has contributed substantially to the failure of the stock of public capital assets to keep pace with the Nation's needs.

## □ 1900

For instance, the real nondefense public capital stock expanded in the past two decades at a pace only half that set earlier in the post-World War II period.

Evidence of failures to maintain and improve infrastructure is seen every day in such problems as unsafe bridges, urban decay, dilapidated and overcrowded schools, and inadequate airports. A General Accounting Office study finds that education is seriously handicapped by deteriorating school buildings and that an investment of \$110 billion is needed to bring them up to minimally acceptable.

The problems take a toll in less visible and perhaps even more important ways, in unsatisfactory gains in private sector productivity and a diminished rise in real income for the Nation at large. Seemingly endless traffic jams, disruptions to commuter service and backed-up airport runways, everyday experiences for Americans, spell waste and inefficiency for the economy at large. Congestion on the Nation's

highways alone costs the Nation over \$100 billion a year according to the Competitiveness Policy Council estimate. That estimate does not include the cost of added pollution and the wear and tear on vehicles.

This legislation is designed to help the Nation take a significant step both toward overcoming its infrastructure debt and promoting the productivity needed to meet the competitive challenges of the 21st century.

The plan is fiscally sound. It follows the best accounting procedures of the private sector and is designed to recognize the statutes that mandate a balanced Federal budget. In salient ways, it advances sound fiscal operation. The plan would provide \$50 billion a year for mortgage loans to State and local governments for capital investment in types of projects specified by Congress and the President. These mortgage loans would be at zero interest. They would thereby cut the overall cost of projects about in half, depending on the prevailing interest rates, for State and local taxpayers.

We have a plan, the opportunity to rebuild and maintain our infrastructure for the 21st century. By using an innovative and logical approach to sound public financing without debt and without huge interest payments.

## IMMIGRATION RESTRUCTURING AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about the Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act of 1999 that I have offered along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and others.

Partly this discussion this evening is prompted by a very effective hearing, field hearing, that was held today that I just came from in Chicago, Illinois, called by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and attended by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and myself, the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

What I was most struck by is the consensus of all those who had gathered that this is a Nation of laws but it is also a Nation of immigrants. We all have come from somewhere. And we all stand willing and waiting, if you will, to be patriotic and to love this country if given the opportunity. In fact, one of the statements made by the witnesses was that many immigrants and most of them come to this land for a better way of life. We heard testimony from

very outstanding members of the Illinois delegation, Democrats and Republicans, we heard testimony from district constituency workers of Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, and we heard testimony from the INS regional director. Sadly, however, much of the commentary was about the ills of the INS, the difficulties in getting service, the difficulties in getting the right answers, the difficulties in the timeliness of the responses, the long lines. I was very gratified to hear by the INS regional director, however, that he was struck by these complaints, and of course, had been working over the last couple of months to remedy the concerns that had been expressed. He offered on behalf of his staff a genuine interest to work with congressional offices but most importantly to do the taxpayers' business, and, that is, to do the very best task that he might be able to do.

I believe, however, that he needs additional assistance. And one of the points that was made is that we should not throw money, good money, if you will, after bad. We should not throw money at a problem and yet not be able to fix its very infrastructure. And so the Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act of 1999, I believe, offers real reform.

Americans, I think, in their heart of hearts appreciate the fact that this is a Nation that welcomes immigrants in order to have a better way of life. We realize that we support and our Constitution and our laws support legal immigration, not illegal immigration. In order to do that, we must encourage those who seek to go through the processes, the legal processes, we must expedite that process, we must not penalize and be punitive, we must not be negative, we must not characterize immigrants as people who are taking and not giving, deadbeats who are not willing to contribute to this society. I could list a whole litany of contributions that immigrants throughout the years and ages have given to this Nation. And all of us stand in a position that we can claim some contribution to this Nation.

The Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act of 1999 does several things. We restructure and reorganize the immigration function within the Department of Justice through the creation of a fair, effective and efficient National Immigration Bureau, the NIB. Such a bureau is urgently needed, given both the importance of this entity's mission, the hundreds of thousands of people, of family members who are already citizens within this country and in the international community and the size of the agency which is larger than five current Cabinet agencies. We need to establish the INS not as an agency but as a bureau to separate the enforcement and adjudication functions of the Federal immigration function. The goal of such separation is to lead to more clarity of mission and greater accountability which in turn

will lead to more efficient adjudications and more accountable, consistent, effective and professional enforcement to create strong centralized leadership for integrated policymaking and implementation.

Coordination is a key. In order to fulfill this new agency's important responsibilities, a single voice is needed at the top to coordinate policy matters and interpret complex laws in both enforcement and adjudications. We must also emphasize that the INS, now named INS, I hope the NIB, key goal is service. There is an enforcement responsibility and we all know the tragedy of the Resendez-Ramirez case, the alleged serial killer, we want to end that as well by giving the enforcement aspect the tools that it needs to ensure that illegal and also criminal aliens do not make it into the United States, and if they do so that they are caught immediately.

To coordinate policymaking and planning between the National Immigration Bureau offices so as to ensure efficiencies and effectiveness that result from shared infrastructure and unified implementation of the law among the office of immigration, adjudication, enforcement, prehearing services and detention and shared services. Those are the subsets of what I think we need to fully fund the adjudication function. Many, many people are in the process, are in the works, if you will, yet they wait 3 and 4 and 5 years in order to be adjudicated to become a naturalized citizen. This keeps them from employment. This keeps them from planning for their future. This disallows young people to get scholarships. It prevents young people from getting into college.

We are a Nation, Mr. Speaker, of laws, but we are also a Nation of immigrants. I would ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the Immigration Restructuring and Accounting Act of 1999 for real INS reform.

#### WELCOME BACK TO THE CLEVELAND BROWNS

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about something close to my heart, the Cleveland Browns football team. As many of my colleagues may know, Sunday marked the beginning of a new season for us, an important one, a historic day in Cleveland because this is the first season, since the departure of the original Browns for Baltimore, Cleveland has its own NFL franchise.

Though the result of the game was decidedly not what the fans assembled were hoping for, seeing our Browns take the field in a regular season NFL contest was extremely satisfying. We were welcomed back to the Dawg Pound, the brown and orange colors of the Browns, and the familiar uniforms

of the team. Just being able to host the game was exciting for those of us from Cleveland.

Hats off to Al Lerner, the owner, and Carmen Policy, its manager. Thank you. Cleveland Browns, we are going to win the rest of the season.

#### CRISIS IN EAST TIMOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the House Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on Asia-Pacific Affairs, of which I am a member, held a joint hearing with the Senate Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs to review the current crisis in East Timor and the implications on the overall future of Indonesia. I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) for jointly addressing this compelling crisis now confronting the international community.

Mr. Speaker, I recall some 38 years ago right outside this Chamber at his inaugural address, I believe it was in 1961, that President John F. Kennedy made this profound statement to the world, and I quote: "Let every Nation know that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I am greatly disturbed and saddened by the brutal, violent response of the pro-Jakarta militia and Indonesian military to the overwhelming vote for independence demonstrated by the courageous people of East Timor. However, I am not at all surprised at the rampant killings, Mr. Speaker, as the Indonesian military has routinely used violence as a tool of repression as it is doing now and for the past 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, although the Timorese struggle for self-determination has received much publicity, scant attention has been paid to the people of West Papua New Guinea who have similarly struggled in Irian Jaya to throw off the yoke of Indonesian colonialism. Mr. Speaker, one cannot talk about the crisis in East Timor and ignore the same crisis in West Papua New Guinea or it is now known as Irian Jaya. As in East Timor, Indonesia took West Papua New Guinea by military force in 1963 in a pathetic episode, Mr. Speaker, that the United Nations in 1969 sanctioned a fraudulent referendum, where only 1,025 delegates were hand-picked and paid off by the Indonesian government, permitted to participate in a so-called plebiscite, and at the point of guns on their heads and with threats on their lives, these 1,025 individuals voted obviously for Indonesian rule. At the same