

The Social Security earnings limit penalty is wrong, unfair, and should be scrapped. With the President in agreement, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in full support, let's pass "The Senior Citizens Freedom to Work Act" (H.R. 5), after so many years of inaction.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). All time for debate having expired, pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The Chair announces that the vote on the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered, will immediately follow this vote, and will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—422

Abercrombie	Bryant	DeLay
Ackerman	Burr	DeMint
Aderholt	Burton	Deutscher
Allen	Buyer	Diaz-Balart
Andrews	Callahan	Dickey
Archer	Calvert	Dicks
Armey	Camp	Dingell
Baca	Canady	Dixon
Bachus	Cannon	Doggett
Baird	Capps	Dooley
Baker	Capuano	Doolittle
Baldacci	Cardin	Doyle
Baldwin	Carson	Dreier
Ballenger	Castle	Duncan
Barcia	Chabot	Dunn
Barr	Chambliss	Edwards
Barrett (NE)	Chenoweth-Hage	Ehlers
Barrett (WI)	Clay	Ehrlich
Bartlett	Clayton	Emerson
Barton	Clement	Engel
Bass	Clyburn	English
Bateman	Coble	Eshoo
Becerra	Coburn	Etheridge
Bentsen	Collins	Evans
Bereuter	Combest	Everett
Berkley	Condit	Ewing
Berman	Conyers	Farr
Berry	Cooksey	Fattah
Biggert	Costello	Filner
Bilbray	Cox	Fletcher
Bilirakis	Coyne	Foley
Bishop	Cramer	Forbes
Blagojevich	Crane	Ford
Blumenauer	Crowley	Fossella
Blunt	Cubin	Fowler
Boehlert	Cummings	Frank (MA)
Boehner	Cunningham	Franks (NJ)
Bonilla	Danner	Frelinghuysen
Bonior	Davis (FL)	Frost
Bono	Davis (IL)	Gallegly
Borski	Davis (VA)	Ganske
Boswell	Deal	Gejdenson
Boucher	DeFazio	Gekas
Boyd	DeGette	Gephardt
Brady (PA)	Delahunt	Gibbons
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Gilchrest

Gillmor	Luther	Ryan (WI)	Kilpatrick	Millender-	Spratt
Gilman	Maloney (CT)	Ryun (KS)	Mica	McDonald	Vento
Gonzalez	Maloney (NY)	Sabo		Norwood	Waters
Goode	Manzullo	Salmon			
Goodlatte	Markey	Sanchez			
Goodling	Martinez	Sanders			
Gordon	Mascara	Sandlin			
Goss	Matsui	Sanford			
Graham	McCarthy (MO)	Sawyer			
Granger	McCarthy (NY)	Saxton			
Green (TX)	McCollum	Scarborough			
Green (WI)	McCrery	Schaffer			
Greenwood	McDermott	Schakowsky			
Gutierrez	McGovern	Scott			
Gutknecht	McHugh	Sensenbrenner			
Hall (OH)	McInnis	Serrano			
Hall (TX)	McIntosh	Sessions			
Hansen	McIntyre	Shadegg			
Hastert	McKeon	Shaw			
Hastings (FL)	McKinney	Shays			
Hastings (WA)	McNulty	Sherman			
Hayes	Meehan	Sherwood			
Hayworth	Meek (FL)	Shimkus			
Hefley	Meeks (NY)	Shows			
Herger	Menendez	Shuster			
Hill (IN)	Metcalfe	Simpson			
Hill (MT)	Miller (FL)	Sisisky			
Hilleary	Miller, Gary	Skeen			
Hilliard	Miller, George	Skelton			
Hinchee	Minge	Slaughter			
Hinojosa	Mink	Smith (MI)			
Hobson	Moakley	Smith (NJ)			
Hoeffel	Mollohan	Smith (TX)			
Hoekstra	Moore	Smith (WA)			
Holden	Moran (KS)	Snyder			
Holt	Moran (VA)	Souder			
Hooley	Morella	Spence			
Hostettler	Murtha	Stabenow			
Houghton	Myrick	Stark			
Hoyer	Nadler	Stearns			
Hulshof	Napolitano	Stenholm			
Hunter	Neal	Strickland			
Hutchinson	Nethercutt	Stump			
Hyde	Ney	Stupak			
Inslee	Northup	Sununu			
Isakson	Nussle	Sweeney			
Istook	Oberstar	Talent			
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Tancredo			
Jackson-Lee	Oliver	Tanner			
(TX)	Ortiz	Tauscher			
Jefferson	Ose	Tauzin			
Jenkins	Owens	Taylor (MS)			
John	Oxley	Taylor (NC)			
Johnson (CT)	Packard	Terry			
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Thomas			
Johnson, Sam	Pascrell	Thompson (CA)			
Jones (NC)	Pastor	Thompson (MS)			
Jones (OH)	Paul	Thornberry			
Kanjorski	Payne	Thune			
Kaptur	Pease	Thurman			
Kasich	Pelosi	Tiahrt			
Kelly	Peterson (MN)	Tierney			
Kennedy	Peterson (PA)	Toomey			
Kildee	Petri	Towns			
Kind (WI)	Phelps	Trafficant			
King (NY)	Pickering	Turner			
Kingston	Pickett	Udall (CO)			
Klecza	Pitts	Udall (NM)			
Klink	Pombo	Upton			
Knollenberg	Pomeroy	Velazquez			
Kolbe	Porter	Visclosky			
Kucinich	Portman	Vitter			
Kuykendall	Price (NC)	Walden			
LaFalce	Pryce (OH)	Walsh			
LaHood	Quinn	Wamp			
Lampson	Radanovich	Watkins			
Lantos	Rahall	Watt (NC)			
Largent	Ramstad	Watts (OK)			
Larson	Rangel	Waxman			
Latham	Regula	Weiner			
LaTourette	Reyes	Weldon (FL)			
Lazio	Reynolds	Weldon (PA)			
Leach	Riley	Weller			
Lee	Rivers	Wexler			
Levin	Rodriguez	Weygand			
Lewis (CA)	Roemer	Whitfield			
Lewis (GA)	Rogan	Wicker			
Lewis (KY)	Rogers	Wilson			
Linder	Rohrabacher	Wise			
Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen	Wolf			
LoBiondo	Rothman	Woolsey			
Lofgren	Roukema	Wu			
Lowey	Roybal-Allard	Wynn			
Lucas (KY)	Royce	Young (AK)			
Lucas (OK)	Rush	Young (FL)			

NOT VOTING—13

Brown (OH)	Cook
Campbell	Horn

Kilpatrick	Millender-	Spratt
Mica	McDonald	Vento
	Norwood	Waters

1316

Mr. DIXON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the bells on rollcall 27. I spoke in support of the bill, H.R. 5, and I would have voted in favor of the bill had I been present.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 27, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 27, the Senior Citizens' Freedom to Work Act, on which I addressed the House, I was regretfully delayed on official business with a visiting delegation from the German Bundestag. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 27, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 27, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 27, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Chair's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## IRAN NONPROLIFERATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time today to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 1883, with Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House a motion offered by the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments; that the Senate amendments and the motion be considered as read; that the motion be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, or their designees; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the motion offered by the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous consent request just agreed to, I call up the bill (H.R. 1883) to provide for the application of measures to foreign persons who transfer to Iran certain goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. GILMAN moves to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1883.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate Amendments: Page 2, line 3, strike out "1999" and insert "2000".

Page 5, line 7, strike out all after "Order" down to and including "person." in line 8 and insert "No. 12938."

Page 5, Line 9, strike out all after "prohibition.—" down to and including "terminate" in line 12 and insert "Prohibition on United States Government sales to that foreign person of any item on the United States Munitions List as in effect on August 8, 1995, and termination of".

Page 5, Lines 16 and 17, strike out "The President shall deny licenses and suspend" and insert "Denial of licenses and suspension of".

Page 8, after line 23, insert:

"(b) Opportunity To Provide Information.—Congress urges the President—

"(1) in every appropriate case, to contact in a timely fashion each foreign person identified in each report submitted pursuant to section 2(a), or the government with primary jurisdiction over such person, in order to afford such person, or governments, the opportunity to provide explanatory, exculpatory, or other additional information with respect to the transfer that caused such person to be identified in a report submitted pursuant to section 2(a); and

"(2) to exercise the authority in subsection (a) in all cases where information obtained from a foreign person identified in a report submitted pursuant to section 2(a), or from the government with primary jurisdiction over such person, establishes that the exercise of such authority is warranted."

Page 8, line 24, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)".

Page 9, line 11, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

Page 9, lines 12 and 13, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

Page 10, Lines 11 and 12, strike out "through the implementation of concrete steps".

Page 10, Line 16, strike out all after "systems" down to and including "transfers" in line 18.

Page 10, Line 19, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

Page 10, Line 21, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

Page 11, Line 25, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

Page 12, Line 2, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

Page 13, Line 6, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

Page 13, Line 8, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

Page 13, Line 10, after "Module" insert ", and for the purchase (at a total cost not to exceed \$14,000,000) of the pressure dome for the Interim Control Module and the Androgynous Peripheral Docking Adapter and related hardware for the United States propulsion module,".

Page 13, line 15, after "no" insert "credible".

Page 17, lines 15 and 16, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

Page 17, lines 17 and 18, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

Page 18, lines 1 and 2, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

Page 18, line 6, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

Page 18, line 10, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency".

Page 18, lines 13 and 14, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

Page 18, line 15, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

Page 18, Line 16, strike out "Russian Space Agency" and insert "Russian Aviation and Space Agency or Russian Space Agency".

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) each will control 30 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1883.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have before us H.R. 1883, the Iran Non-proliferation Act of 2000. This measure was introduced by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), and myself on May 20 of last year. There are almost 230 cosponsors on this measure.

When it came to a vote in the House last September, it was approved by a vote of 419 to 0. This vote was even more remarkable when one considers that the administration sent us a letter just before the House voted stating that the President's senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill. Obviously, the administration's plea that we not approve the bill, that we instead allow more time for diplomacy, was rejected unanimously by the House.

Just last week, the measure came up in the Senate, and the Senate brushed aside the administration's objection and approved the bill by a significant vote of 98 to 0.

The unanimity of both chambers of Congress and the strong bipartisan sup-

port for this measure should send a powerful signal to would-be proliferators to Iran. Our Nation will not accept the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and missiles to Iran.

Mr. Speaker, this situation is true today, and it will remain true even if the encouraging political developments we are beginning to observe in Iran lead eventually to major improvements in Iranian foreign policy. The fact is a democratic Iran at peace with itself and with the rest of the world will not need or want weapons of mass destruction, nor will they need any missiles capable of delivering such weapons.

Political change in Iran may ultimately eliminate the need for this kind of legislation. But such change will never make us regret enacting it. Indeed, we fully expect that the leaders of a democratic and a peaceful Iran would have no complaints about this legislation because it would be wholly consistent with the policies that they would pursue.

For now, however, Iran is continuing its programs to develop weapons of mass destruction, and this poses a great threat to our Nation, to our military personnel in the Persian Gulf, and to our friends and allies throughout the region. This legislation states to those nations and entities that are helping Iran's weapons programs that they must stop or face severe consequences.

I am confident that the unanimous vote in both houses of Congress will compel the President to reconsider the administration's threat to veto this legislation.

I want to clarify for the record that no major substantive changes in the legislation were made by the Senate amendment that was adopted last week. Due to the courtesy of the chief sponsors of the Senate companion measure to H.R. 1838, most notably Senators LOTT and LIEBERMAN, I was fully involved in developing the Senate amendment. Indeed, two of the most significant changes it made was suggested by me to the sponsors of the Senate amendment. I can assure our colleagues the changes suggested were intended to strengthen, not weaken, this measure.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment did not convert the bill from a mandatory sanctions bill into a bill merely authorizing the imposition of sanctions, as has been reported by the press. This bill always afforded the President discretion, discretion with regard to the imposition of sanctions, except in the case of the proliferation by entities under the jurisdiction or control of the Russian Aviation and Space Agency. The Senate amendment preserved that structure.

In order to underscore that the Senate amendment was almost entirely cosmetic in nature, I prepared a summary of the changes made by that amendment. This summary makes clear that the bill was not weakened in any way by the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I include the summary for the RECORD as follows:

SUMMARY OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1883, IRAN NONPROLIFERATION ACT OF 2000

During the Senate's consideration of the Iran Nonproliferation Act on February 24, 2000, a manager's amendment was adopted making a number of minor changes in the bill. These changes were largely technical or cosmetic in nature. They include:

The name of the bill was changed from the "Iran Nonproliferation Act of 1999" to the "Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000".

The word "shall" was deleted at several places in the bill dealing with the possible imposition of sanctions on entities that transfer weapons technology to Iran. This was done to emphasize the fact (which is explicit elsewhere in the House-passed bill) that the imposition of such sanctions is discretionary rather than mandatory.

Language was inserted to emphasize that the president may contact entities suspected of transferring weapons technology to Iran in order to afford them an opportunity to demonstrate that they did not make such transfers. Again, this concept was already contained in the House-passed bill.

The name "Russian Space Agency" was changed to "Russian Aviation and Space Agency" most places that it appears in the bill in order to reflect the fact that the name of the agency has been officially changed by the Russian Government.

One element of the certification that the President would have to make in order to provide Russian "extraordinary payments in connection with the International Space Station" was revised to eliminate a requirement that Russia demonstrate its commitment to stop proliferation to Iran by implementing "concrete steps". The key element of this certification was not changed, however. The President would still have to certify that there is no credible information that any entity under the jurisdiction or control of the Russian Aviation and Space Agency has proliferated to Iran during the previous year in order to provide such extraordinary payments to Russia.

The Senate amendment expanded the exception to the bill's restriction on providing Russia "extraordinary payments in connection with the International Space Station". In addition to extraordinary payments related to the Russian Service Module (which were permitted under the House bill), the amendment permits a total of no more than \$14 million in extraordinary payments by the United States in order to buy from Russia two docking adaptors that will facilitate the attachment of two U.S. modules to the International Space Station. The conditions on making extraordinary payments pursuant to the exception (e.g., no credible information that a recipient of such payments has proliferated to Iran) remain unchanged.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I want to elaborate on one point that came up in the Senate debate on the measure. Senators LEVIN, LOTT, and LIEBERMAN agreed that, in deciding whether information is "credible," and I put that in quotes, for purposes of the reporting requirement of this bill, the President is entitled to judge the credibility of information on the basis of all information available to him.

This observation is unassailable so far as it goes. Obviously, one piece of information can be out of sync with all of the other available information that it is not believable. But this does not mean that incriminating information that is novel or surprising must be cor-

roborated before it can be deemed credible.

The Senators certainly did not mean to suggest that the President is entitled to judge one piece of specific information against the absence of other information, and on that basis conclude that one piece of information is not credible. Such will, in my estimation, be the typical case arising under this legislation, a piece of specific incriminating information will be found about a possible transfer, and there will be no other specific information pointing one way or another about that particular transfer. In this context, there really is no other available information against which the incriminating information can be judged. If the incriminating information is, on its face, believable, then the President will be required to report that situation to us pursuant to section 2(a) of the bill.

The real point in here, Mr. Speaker, is the one emphasized in the report of the Committee on International Relations on the bill. The purpose of the credible information standard is to get away from the preponderance of the evidence standard the administration has applied under previous nonproliferation laws.

1330

We do not want there to be any weighing of evidence or any burden of proof under the credible information standard. The test is whether the information is believable, not whether the President thinks it is likely true.

I want to thank my colleagues for the support they provided to H.R. 1883. And I urge them to once, again, cast a favorable vote on this measure.

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

I rise in strong support for this motion. While I have somewhat different interpretations than the chairman of the full committee, on some of the intent, the basic legislation does the job that we all sought to achieve in this nonproliferation act.

What is clear is that the timing is somewhat unfortunate, as I think the chairman referenced so aptly in his remarks, because for the first time in many years, we are seeing within Iran the development of an opposition that seems to want to moderate the policies of that country.

I certainly hope that no one would take that as a signal in this legislation that we have not recognized this great step forward, which is really a function, not of everything we have done or anything else, but a function of what the Iranians want for their country.

No matter what happens around the globe, it is an important goal of this administration, and I think in the interests of the entire world, to restrict access to nuclear weapons, chemical, biological and missile technology. This is clearly a case where the world is not safer by more people having access to this technology.

I think it is critically important for the Congress and the administration to work together to make sure that we do everything in our power, using Nunn-Lugar resources to reduce the availability of fissionable material and the technology expertise in the Soviet Union to further develop nuclear weapons and to proliferate.

There are tremendous pressures in the Soviet Union, former Soviet Union, Russia, both from their own kind of old pride of having once been a major superpower; and I think, additionally, the pressures for economic advancement to sell some of these technologies. But it is not in the Russian's best interests. It is clearly not in the world's best interests. It is not in our best interests.

I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and others who have participated in this legislation. It is an important piece of legislation. I am very excited to have it here on the floor, only somewhat distressed that it comes by accident of the Senate schedule today so close to what was a positive development in Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my time be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE.) Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 2000 and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this important message.

In 1993, the administration invited Russia to join the International Space Station project. At the time the White House made it clear to Congress that Russian participation in the International Space Station was a key component of the administration's efforts to encourage Russia to adhere to a variety of nonproliferation norms and agreements.

Many Members, myself included, expressed concerns about transforming the space station into a foreign policy program, but accepted the administration's argument that Russian involvement was important to halting the spread of ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction.

Since then, we have seen repeated reports in the Western and Russian media that a variety of Russian aerospace enterprises are assisting Iran's efforts to develop weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. The CIA's 721 report of February 2, 2000 confirms these reports.

Russia's aerospace enterprises are not private firms in the way U.S. companies are. In fact, most Russian aerospace enterprises are owned and operated by the Russian government.

In 1998 and 1999, the Russian government clarified its control of its aerospace industry by putting many of these Russian enterprises under the legal and economic jurisdiction of the Russian Aviation and Space Agency.

Having paid the Russians some \$800 million between 1994 and 1998, the administration announced in late 1999 its intention to make additional payments to the Russian Aviation and Space Agency.

The administration's reliance on Russia has put the American taxpayer in the unacceptable position of possibly subsidizing the very Russian aerospace enterprises that are helping Iran develop weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles. The administration's current policy creates an unhealthy situation for both our space program and our nonproliferation efforts. H.R. 1883 addresses these concerns by requiring the President to make a determination about the extent of Russian assistance to Iran before NASA can make additional payments to the Russian aviation and space agency.

Moreover, the bill holds the Russian government accountable by preventing payments to the Russian Aviation and Space Agency if it or any of the entities for which it is legally responsible are involved in inappropriate technical assistance to Iran. Certainly nobody in this body wants to see U.S. tax dollars inadvertently subsidizing the proliferation of ballistic missiles. H.R. 1883 helps prevent just such a prospect.

While helping curb proliferation, the bill does not jeopardize the safety of our astronauts about the ISS or delay the delivery of the Russian hardware that NASA claims it requires in order to reduce U.S. dependence upon Russia in the space station program. Both of these issues are addressed in narrow and specific exceptions to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1883 is a sound step to prevent the spread of ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction. It passed the House by a vote of 419 to 0 and the Senate by a vote of 98 to 0. I am proud to have joined the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) as an original cosponsor of this bill and look forward to the day when the President signs it into law.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to associate myself with the remarks of the previous speakers on this legislation.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 1883. It gives the President authority to impose sanctions on foreign entities that supply Iran with technologies related to nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, and ballistic missiles.

Two weeks ago we saw dramatic evidence of the yearning for change among the Iranian people. Despite ef-

forts by the Council of Guardians to limit the pool of eligible candidates, reformers won an overwhelming majority in the Iranian parliament.

Regrettably, this election landslide will not automatically translate into moderate Iranian policies. Supreme Leader Khomeini and other conservative elements retain control over many institutions, including the security services. And the intentions of President Khatemi and his reformist allies still are not completely clear.

I would welcome an improvement in U.S.-Iranian relations, but a constructive and peaceful bilateral relationship must be based on Iran's willingness to abandon its quest for weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles, to drop its efforts to disrupt the Middle East peace process, and to improve its dismal human rights record. This legislation focuses on the first of these areas of concern. It goes without saying that an Iran armed with these fearsome weapons would be a serious threat to our allies in the Middle East and eventually the United States itself.

Placing additional sanctions on Iran would have little if any effect, given that the U.S. has maintained a trade embargo on the Islamic Republic since the 1979 revolution. This legislation attempts to get at the problem by authorizing sanctions against foreign entities that continue to supply Iran with advanced technologies.

According to a recent unclassified CIA report covering the first half of 1999, Iran remains, "One of the most active countries seeking to acquire WMD technology from abroad. In doing so, Tehran is attempting to develop an indigenous capability to produce various types of weapons, nuclear, chemical and biological, and their delivery systems. Iran focused its efforts to acquire WMD-related equipment, materials and technology primarily on entities in Russia, China, North Korea, and Western Europe."

The report goes on to say that "entities in Russia and China continue to supply a considerable amount and a wide variety of ballistic missile-related goods and technology to Iran. Tehran is using these goods and technologies to support current production programs and to achieve its goal of becoming self-sufficient in the production of ballistic missiles."

It has additional comments on Iran's program with respect to nuclear weapons, which I will assert in my full statement. But, Mr. Speaker, these facts paint a very troubling picture. They reinforced my view that this legislation and other measures are absolutely necessary to prevent or at a minimum slow down Iranian acquisition of WMD and ballistic missiles.

As the CIA report indicates, Russian entities have been among the worst proliferators to Iran. Some steps have been taken to prevent this technology transfer. Last year Russia passed a new export control law and placed monitors in key aerospace entities. Unfortu-

nately, these modest efforts have not stopped the proliferation.

I find it somewhat ironic that Russia objects so strenuously to U.S. deployment of a limited national missile defense system designed specifically to knock down missiles fired by countries like Iran, Iraq, and North Korea, given that the Russian entities are some of the primary suppliers of missile and WMD technology to those very governments and given that Russia may also be a target of those regimes.

I am not under any illusions that this legislation will solve once and for all the problem of proliferation to Iran, but it is a step in the right direction, and more needs to be done. For example, we should initiate an intensive effort with our allies to develop a more effective multilateral export control regime to keep dangerous technologies out of the hands of anti-western regimes. The current Wassenaar arrangement simply is not up to doing the job.

Last year we passed the Iran Nuclear Nonproliferation Act by a vote of 419 to 0, the Senate passed it by 98 to 0. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Senate amendments today and sending the legislation on to the President.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a senior member of our committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his leadership on this important issue.

There is no question the Senate has weakened in effect the strengths of this bill, but it is still very important that we go forward with it. It is still an important piece of legislation.

Here is why. In this legislation we are giving Russia a clear choice. Russia can choose to continue to sell and arm America's deadliest enemies and to sell and arm Israel's deadliest enemies, or they can choose to be a partner in peace and prosperity and democracy with the United States. That is a fair choice for Russia to make.

It is important to make the right decision because we all have a stake in their transition to democracy and to free enterprise as a nation. But it has been disappointing, and I think their conduct has been dangerous for America.

Each year, in effect, Russia erects a tent, and to all within listening distance they proclaim, "Come see the show on improving democracy and freedom in our nation." And each year America is the first in line with billions of dollars to help them make that transition. But each year when we walk inside the tent, it is empty, while out back, behind that tent, Russia is actively and aggressively selling technology and equipment to nations that simply are hateful to the United States and will disrupt the peace process in the Middle East.

I think it is important that no American taxpayer have to finance our deadliest enemies. No veteran ought to be

paying tax dollars so that Russia can arm our enemies. No single mom struggling to make ends meet ought to have her tax dollars going to damage our security. No service members, or members of our military, ought to ever have their dollars be used against them. But, in effect, today they are.

I support this legislation. I support Russia making the right choice, and this choice is long overdue. As a member of the Committee on Science, I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) in adopting an amendment that I offered preserving the existing relationship with Russia on the space station. That was a very key part of this legislation, and overall this bill deserves our support.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for his supportive remarks, and I reserve the balance of my time.

1345

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Chair of the Committee on International Relations for his leadership on this important issue. I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the ranking member, as well, and compliment both gentlemen for working together in a bipartisan fashion on this and so many other issues that bipartisanship serves our committee and this Congress well.

The legislation before us, Mr. Speaker, is an attempt to stem the flow of weapons technology into Iran by authorizing the President to impose sanctions on nations and individuals that provide this weapons technology to Iran.

The sanctions would include the denial of munitions, licenses, arms export, and dual-use licenses, and a halt to any United States foreign assistance.

The bill requires the President to report to Congress when credible information exists of a transfer of dangerous weapons technology to Iran. The President must also report to Congress about whether he has imposed certain penalties on foreign persons as a result of such transfers.

If the penalties are not imposed, the President must expose why those steps were not taken. The bill will also encourage the Russian Space Agency to cooperate with the United States in efforts to halt the proliferation of weapons technology to Iran by cutting off payments to that agency and to the International Space Station if those under its jurisdiction and control engage in such activities.

We are all pleased by the initial reforms that are being made within Iran. Their recent elections give the world some hope that changes are coming. Unfortunately, while there are some encouraging signs, Iran's current policies continue to be a threat to the security of the world.

There are four areas where Iran continues to threaten world peace. In the area of ballistic missiles, with their development of the Shahab missiles, at least one expert has testified to the Senate Armed Services Committee that the Iranians are working on a missile now with a range of 2,600 miles. We know that they have missiles with a range of 1,200 miles and they are pushing ahead with this development.

With nuclear issues, Iran is proceeding with plans to complete the 1,000 megawatt nuclear reactor at Bushehr. While these nuclear plants probably are not able to be used for nuclear weapons purposes, the fear is that Iran will continue to obtain valuable expertise while building these plants that could be transferable to a nuclear weapons program.

In the area of chemical and biological programs, while Iran signed and ratified the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention, the CIA reports that Iran continues to pursue purchasing dual-use biotechnical equipment from Russia and other countries ostensibly for civilian uses. Press reports indicate that they are also hiring Russian scientists.

United States officials have publicly stated that Iran has a large chemical weapons program that has been made possible with the help of China; and Iran and North Korea reportedly have a relationship of exchanging missile technology.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missile delivery systems continues to be one of the most significant threats to American national security.

Rogue states like North Korea and Iran are actively pursuing ambitious ballistic missile programs and the technology needed to threaten our country and our allies. Iran's progress in this effort is being helped by the relationships with North Korea, with China, and with Russia.

This legislation is a good first step that will send a signal to those who are aiding Iran that this aid will not be tolerated.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to emphasize again why we are sending this bill on to the President.

Proliferation to Iran is a very serious threat to our Nation. It is one of the biggest threats we face today. Regrettably, entities in Russia and elsewhere have been actively engaged in this kind of proliferation. The bill sends a message, loud and clear, that our Nation cannot and will not do business as usual with such entities.

We hope this legislation will inspire the governments of Russia, of China, and of other countries to do more to stop proliferation to Iran.

North Korea is also a major concern when it comes to proliferation to the Middle East, and we need to take a

good close look at that situation, as well.

I want to assure my colleagues that our committee is going to remain vigilant.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1883, the Iran Nonproliferation Act. Any transfer of technology to Iran that would allow that country to develop weapons of mass destruction would represent a threat to Israel and other allies in the region.

Passage of this measure sends a strong message to the international community. The United States will not be silent or inactive if any nation decides to aid Iran in production of weapons of mass destruction. By making it clear that we will impose sanctions on any authority that fuels Iran's dangerous motives, I hope we will be more successful in our efforts to prevent Iran's development of nuclear weapons.

While the recent strong showing for reformers in Iran's parliamentary elections is encouraging, we still need to be extremely cautious and firm in our dealings with Iran. We must never allow any nation to develop weapons of mass destruction if we believe they may be targeted on our allies or on Americans. It is important to remember that Iran has been the world's largest exporter of terror for some time now and is an ardent opponent of the Middle East peace process. I am pleased to join my colleagues in supporting H.R. 1883 and sending the right message on behalf of all Americans, that we will not allow back-door maneuvers that aid Iran's dangerous plans for terror and destruction.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I speak today in strong support for the amended version of H.R. 1883, the Iran Nonproliferation Act of 1999.

Everyone in Congress is aware that Iran has continually threatened the peace and security of the Middle East. Iran is still committed to the destruction of Israel, opposes the Middle East peace process and supports terrorist groups such as Hamas. In fact, Iran remains the world's leading sponsor of international terrorism.

Despite these very real security concerns, cash strapped Russia has supported the \$800 million Bushehr project, a 1000-megawatt light-water reactor, in southern Iran. Why Iran needs such a reactor remains an open question because Iran has one of the world's largest oil and natural gas reserves. However, many security experts believe that such projects provide good cover to a nuclear weapons program and provide Iranian technicians with expertise in the development of nuclear weapons.

Iran has successfully tested the Shabab-3 missile, which has a range of 800 miles, and has supplied Fajr rockets to Lebanon. These rockets are capable of hitting Haifa, and other parts of Israel. In fact, Iranian weapons supplied to Hamas are used against the Southern Lebanese Army, the Israeli Defense Forces and severely jeopardize the security of communities in Northern Israel.

Iran's support of international terrorism poses a great risk to the Middle East and shows very clearly that Iran remains a threat to U.S. interests in the region. The results of an Iran armed with nuclear weapons are almost too horrifying to imagine. But, if current trends continue, it may become an all too real

nightmare for the United States and our Middle Eastern allies.

While I welcome the results of the recent parliamentary elections in Iran, I believe that we must wait and see if the victory of the reformists will translate into any real change. Before we start to re-evaluate our policy, Iran needs to drastically change theirs, especially in areas of major concern to the U.S., such as non-conventional weaponry and the support of terrorism. H.R. 1883 reinforces those Congressional concerns and sends a clear message to countries that assist Iran's weapons program.

I was proud to be an original cosponsor of the Iran Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1999, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Iran Nonproliferation Act.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate passed the amended Iran Nonproliferation Act, 98–0, last week and I urge my fellow Members to give this legislation the same overwhelming support on the floor today.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for passage of the Senate amendments to the Iran Nonproliferation Act. Last week, this important legislation was approved by the Senate by 98 to 0. H.R. 1883 was originally approved by the House in September 1999.

This important legislation gives the President the authority to impose sanctions against Russia or any other nation for supplying Iran with the technology to build missiles and chemical and biological weapons. The Iran Nonproliferation Act also provides for biannual reports on who around the world is transferring prohibited technology or information to Iran, and allows the President to take action against persons or entities found to be engaged in such activity.

This bill also includes new steps to ensure the Russian Space Agency, which is a partner with NASA in the International Space Station project, is complying with Russia's official Iran anti-proliferation policy. If needed, the President is granted the authority to cut-off funds for the remaining payment of \$590 million to the Russian Space Agency for helping the U.S. build the International Space Station. As much as we want to continue to work with Russia on joint efforts in space, we will not do so if they are contributing to this grave threat to our security. That said, the language as amended is much more workable in ensuring that the ISS moves forward.

The threat is a very real and serious security concern for the United States and Israel, our nation's most-trusted ally in the Middle East. The CIA has reported Iran has the capability to launch a missile that will reach Israel, and it is well known that Iran is pursuing development of nuclear, chemical and biological weaponry. This legislation provides the Administration with useful tools to combat the spread of dangerous weapons technology and to discourage nuclear proliferation. H.R. 1883 also demonstrates our commitment to prevent the proliferation of dangerous nuclear weapons to countries that threaten our national security as well as the security of allies—such as Israel and Europe.

The U.S. support for Israel must go beyond economic and military aid to Israel—it must meet the very real challenges that will face Israel and the United States in this new century, such as limiting the threats of weapons of mass destruction. It is well documented that

technology provided to Iran increases its ability to develop its own intermediate range ballistic missile that is capable of reaching Israel as well as our European allies. By limiting Iran's access to such technology we can better protect these countries as well as our own troops in the Middle East and Europe.

The people of Iran demonstrated in their recent elections an overriding desire to move toward reform and moderation in the future—but it is too early to tell what this change will mean in practice. I hope that it is a sign that Iran will end its missile program and its support for international terrorism. This legislation also sends a strong message to Russia that U.S. aid and scientific collaboration will be limited if Russia doesn't stop missile proliferation to Iran. U.S. funding will be substantially limited unless the President certifies that the Russian Space Agency is not transferring technology to Iran. Acting Russian President Vladimir Putin has been receptive to restricting companies that sell missile technology and equipment to Iran. I hope his intentions are translated into action. Otherwise, our cooperation with Russia—both in space and elsewhere—may end.

We live in a dangerous world—where terrorists and rogue nations are developing deadly weapons of mass destruction. Our action today will send a clear message to our allies and to our adversaries. By supporting this bipartisan legislation, we will demonstrate our commitment to limit nuclear proliferation and to create a safer, more stable world.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to the order of the House today, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Andrews  
Archer  
Army  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)

Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Billakis  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Bliley  
Blumenauer  
Blunt

Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (FL)  
Bryant  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert

Camp  
Canady  
Cannon  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth-Hage  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (VA)  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fossella  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht

Hall (OH)  
Hansen  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill (IN)  
Hill (MT)  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Isakson  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, E.B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kind (WI)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Klink  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
Kuykendall  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan

Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Metcalfe  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Ose  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pease  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pickett  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaffer  
Schakowsky  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Shuster  
Simpson

Sisisky	Tauscher	Walsh
Skeen	Tauzin	Wamp
Skelton	Taylor (MS)	Watkins
Slaughter	Taylor (NC)	Watt (NC)
Smith (MI)	Terry	Watts (OK)
Smith (NJ)	Thomas	Waxman
Smith (TX)	Thompson (CA)	Weiner
Smith (WA)	Thompson (MS)	Weldon (FL)
Snyder	Thornberry	Weldon (PA)
Souder	Thune	Weller
Spence	Thurman	Wexler
Spratt	Tiahrt	Weygand
Stabenow	Tierney	Whitfield
Stark	Toomey	Wicker
Stearns	Towns	Wilson
Stenholm	Traficant	Wise
Strickland	Turner	Wolf
Stump	Udall (CO)	Woolsey
Stupak	Udall (NM)	Wu
Sununu	Upton	Wynn
Sweeney	Velazquez	Young (AK)
Talent	Visclosky	Young (FL)
Tancredo	Vitter	
Tanner	Walden	

## NOT VOTING—14

Brown (OH)	Kilpatrick	Paul
Campbell	Klecicka	Vento
Cook	Larson	Waters
Dingell	Millender-	
Fowler	McDonald	
Hall (TX)	Norwood	

1413

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 28, I was unavoidably detained and, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present for rollcall votes No. 27 and No. 28 because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on both counts.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1304

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1304.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

1415

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MOAKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to inquire about the next week's schedule.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I am pleased to announce that we have completed legislative business for the week. There will be no recorded votes on Thursday or Friday of this week.

The House will next meet for legislative business on Wednesday, March 8, at 10 a.m. We will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices later this week.

The House will also consider H.R. 1827, the Government Waste Corrections Act, under an open rule. On Wednesday we do not expect recorded votes until 2 o'clock p.m.

On Thursday, March 9, and Friday, March 10, the House will consider the following measures, all of which will be subject to a rule: The Small Business Tax Fairness and Minimum Wage Legislation; and H.R. 1695, the Ivanpah Valley Airport Public Lands Transfer Act.

Mr. Speaker, conferees report they are making progress on the conference report accompanying S. 376, the Communications Satellite Competition and Privatization Act. I am hopeful that it will be ready for consideration in the House at some point next week.

Mr. Speaker, I wish all of my colleagues safe travel back to their districts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, does the gentleman expect the minimum wage legislation to be completed on Thursday next?

Mr. COX. We do expect it, certainly, to come up; and we hope to be completed on Thursday.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Also, I thank the gentleman for saying there will not be any votes until 2 o'clock on Wednesday, but Members in your part of the country would really appreciate it if you could hold back those votes until at least 5 or 6 o'clock on Wednesday next.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, Tuesday is the only day we have not had votes on a primary day, and that is an important accommodation that as a California Member I am pleased is being made. We, of course, have our primary on Tuesday. I am in a position of traveling back that day myself, on Wednesday. So I know that every accommodation that can be made will be made for Members on the West Coast. Two o'clock is currently the schedule; but of course I understand the pressures that puts on travel, because I myself will not be able to be back here until 5 o'clock.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Further, Mr. Speaker, that minimum wage legislation, is that going to be contained within one piece of legislation, or will it be two bills?

Mr. COX. There will be two separate bills, which it is my understanding will be enrolled together if both are successful.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Will the Democrats have a substitute on both of these bills?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has yet to meet on that point.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I understand that. Is the gentleman's leadership allowing the substitute on each of these bills?

Mr. COX. The Committee on Rules is going to be meeting on Wednesday for that purpose, and I am sure that is the very topic they will consider.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 425 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 425

*Resolved*, That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Wednesday, March 8, 2000, for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order at any time on Wednesday, March 8, 2000, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend rules. The rule further requires the Speaker or his designee to consult with the minority leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to the rule.

As my colleagues are aware, clause 1 of House rule XXVII allows the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules on Mondays and Tuesdays. Since the House will not conduct legislative business on either of those days, this will allow us to begin the legislative workweek in normal fashion.

This is a non-controversial rule. There are no surprises, and it requires consultation with the minority, so I hope we can move expeditiously to pass this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not object to this rule making next Wednesday a suspension day. Normally, the House takes up suspension bills on Mondays and Tuesdays; but next Tuesday is Super Tuesday, which pushes the House schedule back. So, Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from New York has explained, this rule will make next Wednesday a suspension day as well. That way we can quickly debate and vote out relatively non-controversial bills.

As long as my Republican colleagues hold the proper consultations on the