

(B) information relating to trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(C) personnel or medical data or similar data the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy;

unless the portions containing such matters, information, or data have been excised.

Upon request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of that department or agency shall furnish that information to the Commission.

(d) **MAILS.**—The Commission may use the United States mail in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(e) **ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.**—Upon the request of the Commission, the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, the administrative support services necessary for the Commission to carry out its duties under this title.

(f) **CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—The Commission may, subject to appropriations, contract with and compensate government and private agencies or persons for property and services used to carry out its duties under this title.

SEC. 106. TERMINATION.

The Commission shall terminate 90 days after submitting its final report pursuant to section 102(d).

SEC. 107. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Commission \$1,000,000 to carry out this title.

SEC. 108. DEFINITION.

As used in this title, the term "Federal mandate" means any provision in statute or regulation or any Federal court ruling that imposes an enforceable duty upon States, local governments, or tribal governments including a condition of Federal assistance or a duty arising from participation in a voluntary Federal program.

SEC. 109. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall take effect 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. **POMBO.** Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see that the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act we are debating today is moving steadily toward passage in the House of Representatives. This measure, H.R. 5, is long overdue. For too many years, the Federal Government has been forcing regulations down the throats of State and local government officials without providing them with the necessary resources to pay for them.

To give an idea of how outrageous this practice has become, the Environmental Protection Agency's own figures state that its rules and regulations cost this Nation \$140 billion last year—that is 2.2 percent of our entire gross domestic product. Let me remind my colleagues that this represents the cost of mandates from just one single agency of the Federal Government. The successful passage of H.R. 5 will once-and-for-all end this outrageous, and arrogant, Federal Government practice.

While I am disappointed that some in this House have tried to slow down the progress of H.R. 5, I am confident that the overwhelming bipartisan support it enjoys will enable us to make good on our promise with the American

people. H.R. 5 is a top priority for those of us who have signed the Contract With America—and we intend to deliver.

Mr. Chairman, we are not the only ones who have been eagerly waiting for this legislation. State and local officials around the country are so disgusted with the Federal Government's penchant for establishing new programs without paying for them, they established an official Unfunded Mandates Day to make their concerns felt here in Washington. They have done this because it is the simple fact that the burden of paying for unfunded mandates is minimizing the effectiveness of State and local governments to provide even the most basic local services. Let me make one thing clear—we have heard their voices, and are dedicated to making a real difference.

What good do unfunded mandates serve if they require city officials to seriously consider buying and passing out bottled water to residents rather than comply with the strict Federal water testing requirements set forth in the Safe Drinking Water Act? How effective is requiring a city to spend over \$250,000 over 3 years to remove petroleum-contaminated soil so that an asphalt parking lot could be put on top of it—when asphalt is a petroleum-based product? Mandates like these serve no one—except the Federal bureaucrats, of course.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my strong support for the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act and urge its passage in the House of Representatives as well as the other body. We owe the American people nothing less.

Mr. **MCKEON.** Mr. Chairman, legislative mandates made by the Federal Government have placed a significant financial burden on communities in California. The city of Los Angeles estimates that Federal mandates will cost approximately \$2.2 billion over 5 years (1993–94 through 1997–98). In recent years, many Federal mandates have been placed on cities like Los Angeles without Federal funding required for implementing and enforcing these mandates.

Despite the attention to this issue, these Federal mandates have not subsided. The National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices is currently in the process of recommending improvements in traffic-control devices, including street signs, to the Federal Highway Administration. In its present form, the National Committee's proposal recommends new Federal guidelines that would require communities to:

First, increase the size of the street sign lettering from 4 inches to 6 inches high; and second, modify street name signs to be reflective or illuminated.

The proposed guidelines do not contain any provisions for cities to fund these changes.

The city's department of transportation has reviewed this proposal and believes that the suggested requirements are extreme and unnecessary. The cost to change the more than 150,000 street name signs in the city would be approximately \$10 to \$15 million.

Without financial assistance, the city of Los Angeles is not in a position to comply with the proposed new guidelines for street signs. Furthermore, in an urban area such as Los Angeles, many intersections are sufficiently illuminated and often feature additional identifying signs for drivers of motor vehicles.

While this is one small example of a much larger problem, it is indicative of the costly

Federal mandates imposed on local governments. With this in mind, I respectfully urge House Members to support H.R. 5, the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995.

Mr. **CLINGER.** Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. **EHLERS**) having assumed the chair, Mr. **EMERSON**, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5) to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments, to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and to provide information on the cost of Federal mandates on the private sector, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 607

Mr. **RAMSTAD.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 607.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. **FIELDS** of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, last week I missed a series of votes because, on January 22, at 7:14 p.m., my wife gave birth to our first child, Cleo Brandon Fields, who weighed 7 lbs., 1 oz. and was 20 inches long.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall votes 25 through 28, 32 and 33, 35, 36, 40, 43 through 48, and 50 through 55. I would have voted "no" on rollcall votes 29, 30, 37, 38, 39, 41, 49, and 51.

□ 0010

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE FAMILY OF CLEO FIELDS OF LOUISIANA ON THE BIRTH OF THEIR FIRST CHILD

(Mr. **ARMEY** asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. **ARMEY.** Mr. Speaker, let me preface my comments by offering my congratulations to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. **FIELDS**] and his wife on the birth of their first child. I hope it is every bit as much a joy in their life as mine was and is in my life.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. **ARMEY.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following

committees, and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: The Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on National Security, the Committee on Science, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on International Relations, and the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

Mr. BONIOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I will not object. I rise to suggest that this is a reasonable request that my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], has made this evening. We were given adequate time to consult with the ranking members of each of the various committees he has just read off to the body.

Mr. Chairman, the ranking members of those committees have no objection to the request, and the request does not contain a blanket waiver of the rule, but it specifies the particular committees that would be affected, and it is only for one day. We want to reassure the majority that we want to work with their leadership to make this institution work better, and as long as we are notified in advance so we can check with our appropriate people, and they think it is a request that will move this institution forward, we will not object.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection./

REPORT ON DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO LIBYA DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 12543 OF JANUARY 7, 1986—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. Doc. No. 104-24)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of July 18, 1994, concerning the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order No. 12543 of January 7, 1986. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); and section 505(c) of the International

Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c).

1. On December 22, 1994, I renewed for another year the national emergency with respect to Libya pursuant to IEEPA. This renewal extended the current comprehensive financial and trade embargo against Libya in effect since 1986. Under these sanctions, all trade with Libya is prohibited, and all assets owned or controlled by the Libyan government in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons are blocked.

2. There has been one amendment to the Libyan Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 550 (the "Regulations"), administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) of the Department of the Treasury, since my last report on July 18, 1994. The amendment (59 *Fed. Reg.* 51106, October 7, 1994) identified Arab Hellenic Bank (AHB), an Athens-based financial institution, 4 other entities, and 10 individuals as Specially Designated Nationals (SDNs) of Libya. (In addition to the recent SDN action against AHB, the Greek central bank has recently announced that AHB's banking license has been revoked.) Included among the individuals are three Italian shareholders in Oilinvest (Netherlands) B.V., who increased their positions in the Libyan government-controlled firm shortly before United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 883 directed a freeze on certain Libyan assets owned or controlled by the Government or public authorities of Libya.

Pursuant to section 550.304(a) of the Regulations, FAC has determined that these entities and individuals designated as SDNs are owned or controlled by, or acting or purporting to act directly or indirectly on behalf of, the Government of Libya, or are agencies, instrumentalities, or entities of that government. By virtue of this determination, all property and interests in property of these entities or persons that are in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons are blocked. Further, U.S. persons are prohibited from engaging in transactions with these individuals or entities unless the transactions are licensed by FAC. The designations were made in consultation with the Department of State and announced by FAC in notices issued on June 17 and July 22 and 25, 1994. A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

3. During the current 6-month period, FAC made numerous decisions with respect to applications for licenses to engage in transactions under the Regulations, issuing 136 licensing determinations—both approvals and denials. Consistent with FAC's ongoing scrutiny of banking transactions, the largest category of license approvals (73) concerned requests by non-Libyan persons or entities to unblock bank accounts initially blocked because of an apparent Government of Libya interest. The largest category of denials (41) was for banking transactions in which FAC

found a Government of Libya interest. Three licenses were issued authorizing intellectual property protection in Libya.

In addition, FAC issued eight determinations with respect to applications from attorneys to receive fees and reimbursement of expenses for provision of legal services to the Government of Libya in connection with wrongful death civil actions arising from the Pan Am 103 bombing. Civil suits have been filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and in the Southern District of New York. Representation of the Government of Libya when named as a defendant in or otherwise made a party to domestic U.S. legal proceedings is authorized by section 550.517(b)(2) of the Regulations under certain conditions.

4. During the current 6-month period, FAC continued to emphasize to the international banking community in the United States the importance of identifying and blocking payments made by or on behalf of Libya. The FAC worked closely with the banks to implement new interdiction software systems to identify such payments. As a result, during the reporting period, more than 210 transactions involving Libya, totaling more than \$14.8 million, were blocked. As of December 9, 1994, 13 of these transactions had been licensed to be released, leaving a net amount of more than \$14.5 million blocked.

Since my last report, FAC collected 15 civil monetary penalties totaling more than \$76,000 for violations of the U.S. sanctions against Libya. Nine of the violations involved the failure of banks to block funds transfers to Libyan-owned or -controlled banks. Two other penalties were received for corporate export violations. Four additional penalties were paid by U.S. citizens engaging in Libyan oilfield-related transactions while another 76 cases of similar violations are in active penalty processing.

In October 1994, two U.S. businessmen, two U.S. corporations, and several foreign corporations were indicted by a Federal grand jury in Connecticut on three counts of violating the Regulations and IEEPA for their roles in the illegal exportation of U.S. origin fuel pumps to Libya. Various enforcement actions carried over from previous reporting periods have continued to be aggressively pursued. The FAC has continued its efforts under the Operation Roadblock initiative. This ongoing program seeks to identify U.S. persons who travel to and/or work in Libya in violation of U.S. law.

Several new investigations of potentially significant violations of the Libyan sanctions have been initiated by FAC and cooperating U.S. law enforcement agencies, primarily the U.S. Customs Service. Many of these cases are believed to involve complex conspiracies to circumvent the various prohibitions of the Libyan sanctions, as well