

House Committee on Appropriations pursuant to House Report 106-288 to reflect \$7,200,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$4,817,000,000 in additional outlays for emergencies. This will increase the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations to \$561,834,000,000 in budget authority and \$597,532,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000. This will increase the aggregate total to \$1,452,283,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,434,669,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000.

As reported to the House, H.R. 2561, the conference report accompanying the bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2000, includes \$7,200,000,000 in budget authority and \$4,817,000,000 in outlays for emergencies.

These adjustments shall apply while the legislation is under consideration and shall take effect upon final enactment of the legislation. Questions may be directed to Art Sauer or Jim Bates at x6-7270.

ADDITIONAL REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, PURSUANT TO HOUSE REPORT 106-288, TO REFLECT ADDITIONAL NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS FOR EMERGENCIES

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations pursuant to House Report 106-288 to reflect \$2,310,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$1,591,000,000 in additional outlays for emergencies. The bill also includes \$405,000,000 in additional budget authority and \$352,000,000 in additional outlays in continuing disabilities reviews, as well as \$20,000,000 in additional budget authority and \$12,000,000 in additional outlays for adoption incentive payments. This will increase the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations to \$554,634,000,000 in budget authority and \$592,715,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000. This will increase the aggregate total to \$1,445,083,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,429,852,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000.

As reported to the House, H.R. 3037, the bill making appropriations for Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies for fiscal year 2000, includes \$2,310,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,591,000,000 in outlays for emergencies. The bill also includes \$405,000,000 in budget authority and \$352,000,000 in outlays in continuing disabilities reviews, as well as \$20,000,000 in budget authority and \$12,000,000 in outlays for adoption incentive payments.

These adjustments shall apply while the legislation is under consideration and shall take effect upon final enactment of the legislation. Questions may be directed to Art Sauer or Jim Bates at x6-7270.

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

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE CONTINUING IMPACT OF HURRICANE FLOYD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to remind my colleagues that the impact of Hurricane Floyd continues to affect the people of North Carolina and the people of the eastern shore, from Florida all the way to New York. There have been deaths even up as far as Vermont.

But in North Carolina, that devastation is of untold proportions. There are more than 58,000 people now that have responded to the opportunity to call FEMA's intake line indicating they need assistance through FEMA. They need assistance immediately, and this government and this body needs to act.

I want to say that the people of America have been just tremendously generous in responding and having compassion and showing sensitivity, and by giving of their own personal goods or their organizations or churches or relief organizations.

But that is insufficient to respond to the needs of the 58,000 people who have lost their homes. Some have lost their income, the facilities or the infrastructure that they are accustomed to using, their wastewater system, their water system.

□ 2015

I met today in Greenville with farmers from around four counties. There were approximately 80 or more farmers who had come along with members of the agricultural community to talk about their loss and to recognize that as the relief funds now are constructed they are likely not to be included in that relief. If a farmer has lost his machinery or his livestock or his crops, how do we use that as a way of mitigating his loss? Only through now, as the law is constructed, only through a loan. Many of our small farmers are really on the fringes now of not knowing whether they will stay in business.

I met with the grangers on Friday on the report from the North Carolina Grangers Society. There may be as much as 18 to 20 percent of the farmers going out of business now. I would say that many of the farmers were having problems before now, but if we compound the impact of losing 120,000 hogs, 2.5 million chickens, almost a million turkeys and livestock, we compound that with having low prices and calamities from the drought, one begins to get a sense of the devastation and the suffering and the uncertainty of tomorrow that these farmers are also experiencing.

Not only farmers but small businesses, small businesses in Edgecombe County and Tarboro today said many of them in the downtown area, they were small businesses, they might have had 3 to 5 employees. They are not sure that a loan is what is going to help them. Many of them said when they

look at their creditworthiness, meaning how much debt they have in relation to income, already they are at the margin of not being credit-worthy. So we have to begin to think about new structures to respond to both our farmers and our small businesses.

I know the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) and gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) have begun to work, and I am working with that group, to see how we can ask this Congress to look at maybe a one-time effort to give some relief indeed to both small businesses and farmers. I just want to urge my colleagues to consider that.

Finally, let me just say that we begin to think that this only affects people in North Carolina. Well, on Saturday night, there was a family that had come from this area, had come down to visit their relatives in the home county I live in, in Warren County, a young man who is a young professional, 41 years of age and into computer science, had come to visit his relatives and had gone a familiar road but did not see the sign or the sign was not very well displayed. There was a detour and the waters under that bridge were flooding above the bridge and that family of five in that van ended up in the water and the 8-year-old is dead today and the other four members of that family, from this area, are now in serious and critical condition at Duke University. So the impact is tremendous.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to respond to this tragedy. We have an opportunity to show that this government is responsive as Americans to us, and we will indeed do the right thing. I urge us to do a relief program that is responsive to the needs of all the people who are in the area of Hurricane Floyd.

THERE IS SORROW WHEN ANYONE IS LOST, BUT ESPECIALLY OUR CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD). 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, there are several items that I would like to address this evening. Earlier today in debate, I acknowledged that this past weekend, 6 of our young people in the State of Texas died by way of a tragic automobile accident. I do want to make it clear, as I was speaking at the time of the debate on the Hillory J. Farias date-rape drug, that the incident did not involve drugs, but as someone who advocates for children, along with many of my colleagues in this House, I wanted to be able to offer sympathy to the families of those wonderful young people and as well the institutions of higher learning that all of them were then attending,

and to say that any life is a great loss but certainly when our young people are taken in the prime of their life, these youngsters were 18 and 20, 22, 21, it is a great loss. So I offer my deepest sympathy to those colleges and the families and to the friends and youngsters who have experienced that, and I hope that we can find a solution to some of these tragic accidents and find a way to prevent tragic car accidents like this one, so that we can prevent this loss of life.

Let me also take a special moment to speak again on the Hillory J. Farias bill, because there was an individual that I did not get to thank enough, and that is the Harris County medical examiner, Dr. Joy M. Carter. This has been a long journey in our community and for the Farias family in particular it has been long because the accusations were that the young lady, their niece, their granddaughter, had taken drugs. This was another drug case, and it was only at the persistence of the law enforcement and Dr. Carter to be able to answer the cries of the family to be able to detect, and Dr. Carter, of course, is a woman physician and medical examiner who persisted in detecting or attempting to detect this very difficult drug.

So I want to thank her for her work in this, and I want to read from her testimony dated July 27, 1998.

A common feature of date-rape drugs is their ability to be ingested without knowledge and the inducement of an altered state of consciousness or memory loss. These drugs are not easily detected nor considered regularly as a causative agent in a death or sexual assault so you do not usually look for these drugs. Further, these drugs are not at all categorized as Level I or II under the current Controlled Substances Act.

Today, my colleagues have joined me in directing that, and I applaud them; but I do want to thank Dr. Carter for her extra interest and going the extra mile to give comfort to that family, to know that their young person was not on drugs.

I would also like to just read an excerpt from the letter from the DEA which indicates that the DEA has documented 5,500 cases of overdose, toxicity, dependence and law enforcement encounters as it relates to GHB. The DEA has obtained documentation in the form of toxicology, autopsy and investigative reports from medical examiners on 49 deaths that involve GHB, and they will continue to monitor this and ask that it be in Schedule II if it gets to be determined to be approved for medical use by the FDA.

DEADLY 18-WHEELERS SHOULD BE REGULATED ON OUR HIGHWAYS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn my attention to the discussion that was on the floor of the House today and a discussion that has been going on in the City of Houston very briefly and that is the number of 18-wheeler trucks going

through my community on interstates, of which I recognize the importance of 18-wheelers as transportation in the carry of goods. And I am not here to cast stones, but I am here to say, Mr. Speaker, we need more safety regulation and enforcement as it relates to 18-wheeler trafficking.

I bring to our attention the tragic story that occurred this past summer, a couple of months ago, to the Lutine family, where this widow now tells a story of losing her husband and three babies because of an 18-wheeler at high speed that turned over on them and caused the truck to explode; the vehicle that the family was riding in, the recreational vehicle that the family was riding in, and caused the husband and the children to be burned alive.

If I can quote the comment from the wife, the wife and mother of the three, these victims, witnessed this sickening event and as she testified she stood at the scene screaming, "My life is over. All my children are dead."

I am hoping that we can come together as Members of the United States Congress and ask that we include a data recorder in all trucks, Mr. Speaker, that would provide factual information to determine how these accidents occurred so that we can prevent these accidents. We will have an opportunity as we move toward H.R. 2669, as I conclude, the Motor Carrier Safety Act of 1999, this week and I hope we can work together to ensure that these tragedies do not happen again.

WHEN HISTORY IS LOOKED AT, THERE IS NO CONSTITUTIONAL SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, tonight several of us are again gathered here in the hall of the House in this legislative body that represents the freedom that we know and love in America to discuss what our Founding Fathers believed about the First Amendment, the freedom of religion, the issue of religious liberty, and the intersection of religion and public life.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot said by people of all political ideologies about the role of religion in public life and the extent to which the two should intersect, if at all. Lately we have heard the discussion of issues like charitable choice, graduation prayers, even prayers at football games, opportunity scholarships for children to attend religious schools, government contracting with faith-based institutions, and the posting of the Ten Commandments and other religious symbols on public property.

As we hear this discussion, we often hear the phrase "separation of church and state" time and time again.

Joining me tonight to examine this phrase and this issue and what our First Amendment rights entail are several Members from across this great Nation. I am pleased to be joined by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), each of whom will examine the words and the intent of our Founding Fathers.

I would like to begin by examining some of the words of some of our Founders and Framers of the Constitution as we look at the issue of encouraging religion. In debates in this body in recent weeks, some Members have criticized proposed measures to protect public religious expressions or to allow voluntarily participation in faith-based programs.

They tell us that it is not the purpose of government to encourage religion, even if it shows preference to no particular religious faith or group. Interestingly, we hear no criticism when we encourage or cooperate with private industry or with business or any other group. Only when we cooperate with faith institutions do the critics emerge.

Are the programs and endeavors of people of faith below government encouragement? Or do people of faith have some lethal virus which prohibits the government from partnering with them? Certainly not. What then is the problem? We are told that for us to encourage religion would be unconstitutional, that it would violate the Constitution so wisely devised by our Founding Fathers. This is an argument not founded in history or precedent. It is an argument of recent origin. It does not have its roots in our Constitution but rather in the criticisms of numerous revisionists who wish the Constitution said something other than what it actually does. In fact, those who wrote the Constitution thought it was proper for the government to endorse and encourage religion.

As proof, consider the words of John Jay, one of the three authors of the Federalist Papers, and the original chief justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Chief Justice John Jay declared, and I quote, "It is the duty of all wise, free and virtuous governments to countenance and encourage virtue and religion." Chief Justice John Jay was one of America's leading interpreters of the Constitution, and he declared it is the duty of government to encourage virtue and religion.

Consider next the words of Oliver Ellsworth. He was a member of the convention which framed the Constitution. He was the third chief justice of the United States Supreme Court.

□ 2030

Chief Justice Ellsworth declared, "The primary objects of government