

requirements of section 13 of the Federal Power Act.

These types of bills have not been controversial in the past. The bill does not change the license requirements in any way and does not change environmental standards but merely extends the construction deadline. The construction deadline for the project expired in March 1999; and, unless Congress acts, FERC will terminate the license, the project owner will lose its investment, and the local community will lose jobs and revenues.

I note this project already received a legislative extension in 1992. For that reason, the committee expects that FERC will vigorously apply the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of the Federal Power Act. If FERC determines that the owner is no longer pursuing project construction in good faith and with due diligence, the agency should refuse to issue further extensions in the construction deadline.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of S. 1236.

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

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

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

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today of S. 1236 as reported by the Committee on Commerce. In its original form, this legislation would have authorized the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to extend for 6 more years the deadline for commencing construction of the Arrowrock Dam Project in the State of Idaho.

In his testimony before the subcommittee on the legislation, the chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission stated his opposition to the bill in the form in which it was then pending before the committee because it would have extended the construction deadline on the Arrowrock Project for a total of up to 16 years.

Traditionally, Congress extends these licenses for a total of only 10 years; and in those instances in which FERC does not object, licenses have been extended for up to that period. I am only aware of one instance in recent memory in which a license has been extended for as much as 16 years.

When an entity holds a license but fails to develop a project, it is potentially preventing others from developing and exploiting that site for hydropower or for other uses. Sometimes a licensee who is not developing a site may be purposefully using license extensions for the very purpose of preventing other potential applicants from developing the site, and that is a process that is known as site banking.

When those rare instances occur in which we extend the license beyond the traditional period of 10 years, it is crucial that we ensure that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has the authority and the direction from Congress to prevent site banking.

The reported legislation of the Committee on Commerce, which was drafted with the full participation of the minority, ensures that the FERC has the authority to guard against site banking in this instance. The report is well drafted, and I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), for ensuring that the committee report on the measure provides clear direction to FERC to be vigilant in this area. I had requested that treatment during subcommittee consideration; and, in fact, it was provided.

The report clearly states that if the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission determines that the licensee is not pursuing construction in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements that are contained in section 13 of the Federal Power Act, then the committee expects the agency to refuse to grant a request for an additional license extension, and in that instance to terminate the license.

The subcommittee also corrects an oversight by the other body which failed to provide for the reinstatement of the license in the event that it lapses. And I would note that in this case the license has in fact lapsed and that correction is contained in the substitute that we are considering today.

Mr. Speaker, I support this measure as reported from the committee; and I am pleased to urge our colleagues to approve it this afternoon.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1236, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□

MUHAMMAD ALI BOXING REFORM ACT

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1832) to reform unfair and anti-competitive practices in the professional boxing industry.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 6, after line 17, insert:

“(c) PROTECTION FROM COERCIVE CONTRACTS WITH BROADCASTERS.—Subsection (a) of this section applies to any contract between a commercial broadcaster and a boxer, or granting

any rights with respect to that boxer, involving a broadcast in or affecting interstate commerce, regardless of the broadcast medium. For the purpose of this subsection, any reference in subsection (a)(1)(B) to ‘promoter’ shall be considered a reference to ‘commercial broadcaster’.

Page 17, after line 24, insert:

“(1) in paragraph (9) by inserting after ‘match.’ the following: ‘The term ‘promoter’ does not include a hotel, casino, resort, or other commercial establishment hosting or sponsoring a professional boxing match unless—

“(A) the hotel, casino, resort, or other commercial establishment is primarily responsible for organizing, promoting, and producing the match; and

“(B) there is no other person primarily responsible for organizing, promoting, and producing the match.”;

Page 18, line 1, strike out “(1)” and insert “(2)”

Page 18, line 4, strike out “(2)” and insert “(3)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to sponsor H.R. 1832, the Muhammad Ali Act, to enact anti-bribery safeguards for the sport of boxing.

Four years ago, I sponsored another piece of legislation, the Professional Boxing Safety Act of 1996. This act established the first-ever uniform licensing and health and safety system to protect professional boxers, and prohibited conflicts of interest by boxing's State regulatory commissions. This legislation was a great success, but the State boxing commissions and attorneys general have now asked us to go the next step to clean up the corruption among boxing's promoters, managers, and sanctioning bodies.

Ironically, the Professional Boxing Safety Act took effect on the same weekend as the now infamous fight between Mike Tyson and Evander Holyfield, where Tyson bit off a piece of Holyfield's ear. Before this act took effect, there was no uniform safety laws governing boxers, and States were unable to effectively regulate the sport. Because of the Professional Boxing Safety Act, the suspension of Mike Tyson by the Nevada Boxing Commission was recognized nationwide, preventing Tyson from fighting again until his suspension was completed.

The Muhammad Ali Boxing Reform Act, which we consider today, amends the Professional Boxing Safety Act to expand the consumer protections and anti-bribery provisions. It prevents

promoters, sanctioning bodies, and networks from forcing boxers into coercive contracts as a condition of participating in a mandatory bout. No longer will promoters be able to abuse boxers and monopolize the sport by requiring boxers to sign away all their rights in order to get a big break or keep their ranking.

The bill also cleans up the arbitrary ranking systems of sanctioning bodies. In the past, promoters and sanctioning bodies have been able to rig the sport by placing favored boxers who have signed away promotional rights in the top rankings. Boxers who do not grant appropriate favors are arbitrarily dropped from the ranking or prevented from moving up. This bill requires the sanctioning bodies to publish written criteria for ranking boxers and requires sanctioning bodies and promoters to disclose all revenues and other compensation received in connection with the boxers to minimize the opportunities for bribery and back-room dealing.

This new system will force sanctioning bodies to rank boxers based on merit not subservience. It will mean new opportunities for honest boxers who are trying to fight their way up the rankings and more integrity and respect for the sport since boxing fans will know that championship matches are being fought by true champions.

□ 1445

Judges and referees are also required to clean up their act under this legislation. They must be certified and approved by a State boxing commission, and they are required to disclose their sources of compensation in order to prevent any impropriety. No longer will sanctioning bodies and promoters be able to influence judges or hire uncertified referees.

The State boxing commissions are directed to develop and approve guidelines for uniform rating criteria for boxers. Boxing has long suffered from the lack of standardized rankings. This legislation maintains flexibility but directs the establishment of uniform guidelines to increase public confidence in the sport.

H.R. 1832 finishes the job started several years ago by weeding out corruption from boxing. It passed the House last November by voice vote. The only change today is the addition by the Senate of a provision stating that commercial broadcasters cannot coerce boxers into coercive contracts, parallel to the same restrictions already in the bill for promoters.

I do not believe that broadcasters have any interest in forcing boxers into exclusive long-term contracts as a condition of being able to fight in a broadcast event, so I view the amendment as a supplemental safeguard.

This legislation is good for boxing and good for the fans. It has been endorsed by almost every major boxing magazine, numerous high-profile boxers, promoters, managers, and almost half of the U.S. State attorneys general.

In the words of one of boxing's greatest, Muhammad Ali, "The day this bill is signed into law cannot come soon enough. I pray justice will be done and somehow, along the way, honor can be restored to this sport."

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

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

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

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin this afternoon by commending our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), for his truly excellent work in bringing this measure forward. I think he has performed an important public service. I am pleased to lend my support to the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Muhammad Ali Boxing Reform Act is cosponsored by 11 Democratic Members, including three Democratic members of the Committee on Commerce: the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce and was passed by the full House by voice vote. It also was approved by the Senate with an amendment by unanimous consent. And today we consider that Senate amendment, which I am pleased to endorse and with regard to which I am pleased to urge approval.

In 1996, the Committee on Commerce reported legislation which became law establishing minimum health and safety standards for professional boxing. The bill that we are considering today addresses abuses that occur on the business side of boxing. The bill contains protections for professional boxers against coercive contracts they may be pressured to sign by nonscrupulous promoters. The amendment to the bill added by the other body applies this same protection against coercive contracts that may be presented by broadcasters.

In addition, the bill requires sanctioning organizations and promoters to disclose to the State boxing commissions any agreement that they may have with the boxer and any fees they charge the boxer in the case of a fight of 10 rounds or more. These, I think, are helpful provisions.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has enjoyed broad support throughout the entire process, and I am pleased today to urge our colleagues to adopt the Senate amendment and give approval to this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman OXLEY) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) for their hard work on this bill.

My colleagues may wonder why this feminist Member is coming to the floor on this bill to strongly support it. I note that my name was not read off as a cosponsor. I have to ask my staff, in light of a bill I introduced, H.R. 2354, how they missed this one.

After the heavyweight match between Mike Tyson and Evander Holyfield in Las Vegas, I was so stunned and shamed by the incident that I decided to learn a little bit about this sport, which, I confess, I do not favor but accept as a reality will be with us for some time, and discovered the loophole that is closed by this bill today.

I introduced the State Reciprocity and Professional Boxing Act of 1997 since I saw I had no assurance that Mike Tyson could not, when suspended in Nevada, go off and fight in some other State. That seemed to me to be unprofessional and not what either the Congress intended in the Professional Boxing Safety Act of 1996 or, for that matter, anybody who watched that disgraceful performance would have wanted.

Now this bill has come forward to do precisely what my bill would have done and to go somewhat further in adopting the Senate amendments to ensure that no boxer is permitted to box while under suspension by any other State.

Wherever one stands on whether or not grown men should get in a ring and go at one another, we certainly know that they ought to do so governed by sportsman-like conduct.

I think it is most appropriate that this bill is named for Muhammad Ali. I am sure that if he were inclined to speak, as he often spoke out as a young man, he would find that this bill does the sport proud and helps elevate the sport once again.

I believe that the House, in making sure that it is vigilant whenever it sees amendments that should be made to the Professional Boxing Safety Act of 1996, does a great service to the sport, to reclaiming its good name, and especially to those honorable men and women, the great majority of them who continue to exercise this sport.

In light of my own concern and my own bill right after the Tyson-Holyfield fight, I wanted to be sure to come forward to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their diligence in seeing to it that this loophole is closed.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for her words and for her support of this legislation, as well as my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER).

I would be remiss, also, without mentioning our good friend, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, who had been a real leader on this issue, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce in the Senate and the driving force behind this bill and the one we previously passed 2 years

ago. So we want to thank him for his leadership.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1832, the Muhammad Ali Boxing Reform Act.

I grew up as a young boy living in south Louisiana. The first television set in our community came to my grandfather's house, and some of my earliest bonding memories with my dad and grandfather were when we got together with our friends from the whole community and gathered around that only television set in our area to watch the great boxing fights of our day.

Perhaps the greatest fighter in all of boxing history is Muhammad Ali. Muhammad Ali gave his name to this legislation because he believes it is absolutely critical to help protect boxers and clean up the sport from the occasional unscrupulous individuals who have recently given it a bad name.

Last June, my Commerce Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection held a hearing on this legislation to get input from various State boxing commissioners, promoters, managers, boxing fans, and boxers. Coincidentally, the hearing took place just after an extremely controversial decision in a fight between Evander Holyfield and Lennox Lewis, in which an International Boxing Federation judge awarded the title to Mr. Holyfield, the IBF champion, instead of to Mr. Lewis, the World Boxing Council champion and clear apparent winner according to most boxing commentators. At our hearing, one witness said the decision by the IBF judge was dishonest, two said it was incompetent, the third called it "highly influenced", and Middleweight Boxer Alfonso Daniels simply replied, "Lewis was robbed".

We are all robbed when this kind of corruption and incompetence touches on this great sport. Since that time there have continued to be indictments and allegations of corruption in the sport. The Miami Herald reported that over 30 prize fights have been fixed or tainted with fraud in the last dozen years. A Los Angeles Times investigation found that boxing ranking were sometimes sold by sanctioning bodies and that boxing promoters and managers make thinly disguised bribes to improve their boxers' standings and to get them more lucrative fights.

In fact, the week before the House passed an earlier version of this legislation last November, a Federal grand jury issued a 32-count indictment against the President and three officials of the International Boxing Federation on charges of taking bribes from promoters and managers to manipulate rankings, as well as racketeering and money laundering. According to the Federal prosecutor, "In the IBF, ranking were bought, not earned . . . completely corrupt[ing] the . . . ranking system."

This legislation will remove the few rotten actors that have been giving a bad name to the numerous honest and hardworking individuals that have made this sport so great. It is good for boxing and good for boxing fans. We will now all be able to trust in the integrity of the sport, and enjoy without suspicion boxing's championship fights, just like I did with my father and grandfather many years ago.

In conclusion, I would like to thank some of the people who have worked so hard on this legislation to make it a reality, including ABC President Greg Sirb, promoter Tony Holden,

Senate Commerce Committee staff Paul Feeney, George Otto with the Quarry Foundation, and of course the Great One, Muhammad Ali, without whose persistence and support we would not be able to achieve what we are about to accomplish here today.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 1832.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

NATIONAL MOMENT OF REMEMBRANCE TO HONOR MEN AND WOMEN WHO DIED IN PURSUIT OF FREEDOM AND PEACE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 302) calling on the people of the United States to observe a National Moment of Remembrance to honor the men and women of the United States who died in the pursuit of freedom and peace.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 302

Whereas the preservation of basic freedoms and world peace has always been a valued objective of this nation;

Whereas thousands of American men and women have selflessly given their lives in service as peacemakers and peacekeepers;

Whereas greater strides should be made to demonstrate appreciation for these loyal Americans and the ultimate sacrifice they each made;

Whereas Memorial Day is an appropriate day to remember American heroes by inviting the people of the United States to honor these heroes at a designated time;

Whereas Memorial Day needs to be made relevant to both present and future generations of Americans; and

Whereas a National Moment of Remembrance each Memorial Day at 3:00 p.m., local time, would provide the people of the United States an opportunity to participate in a symbolic act of American unity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) calls on the people of the United States to observe a National Moment of Remembrance to honor the men and women of the United States who died in the pursuit of freedom and peace; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such a National Moment of Remembrance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 302.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, President Calvin Coolidge once said, "The nation which forgets its defenders will be itself forgotten."

President Coolidge's words highlight the reason we must never forget those who have sacrificed everything for the defense of this country. They are also one of the main reasons why I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 302, sponsored by our colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

This bipartisan resolution calls upon the American people this Memorial Day to join together and observe a National Moment of Remembrance to honor the men and women who died in the pursuit of freedom and peace. The resolution also asks the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe at 3 p.m. local time a National Moment of Remembrance for all those who fought for our country.

To put it succinctly, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to put the "memorial" back in "Memorial Day." It is intended to serve as a reminder that a day has been set aside for us to formally recognize and give thanks for the efforts of those who have served in uniform.

Unfortunately, the meaning of this special day is slowly fading from our national conscience. In May 1996, children touring Lafayette Park here in our Nation's capital were asked about the meaning of Memorial Day. Their answer was "That's the day the pools open."

That exchange, which occurred right across the street from the White House, sparked the idea of a Moment of Remembrance to remind us all why we celebrate Memorial Day. This movement has been led by one of America's premier humanitarian organizations, No Greater Love.

Thanks to the efforts of this dedicated organization, 1997 was the first day in our history that "Taps" was played at 3 p.m. on Memorial Day in locations throughout the country. This simple but meaningful remembrance continued in 1998 and 1999. And how appropriate that dignified ceremony is.

No one can hear that solitary bugle's music without reflecting on the many fallen heroes at whose funerals it has been played over the years. These heroes were men and women who, in this century alone, saw us through two world wars, conflicts in Korea and