United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 24, 1996 No. 94

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FUNDERBURK].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 24, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable DAVID FUNDERBURK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

As we come before You this day, O gracious God, to offer our prayers and supplications, we remember with affection the life of our colleague and friend, BILL EMERSON. We are grateful for his concern for the issues of great importance to our Nation and for his abiding service to the people of Missouri. We ask, O God, that Your blessings of mercy and peace, of remembrance and recollection, be with his family and with all who knew and loved him. We are grateful that he has now received the fullness of Your promises and he abides with You and all those who sought to serve You by serving people in their need. May Your peace, O God, that passes all human understanding, be with each person now and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MONTGOMERY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

GRANTING MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS TO CHINA

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon vote on most-favored-nation status with China. That means should we have a trading relationship with this Communist dictatorship that violates the rights of its people, is belligerent against its neighbors, is helping in the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and a country that is now run by a group so hostile to the United States that it could well become our enemy in the future and possibly an enemy at war with the United States of America unless we do something?

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to grant that type of trading status, that grants this dictatorial regime the same status as we grant England and France and other democratic countries. We should put our foot down and say until we see changes in human rights and in their aggressive policies toward their neighbors and the stealing of American technology, we will not grant them this right. And if we do that, we will be protecting the interests of the people of the United States of America and we will be securing our future, because tyrants understand action. They do not understand platitudes, and up to this point they have only heard platitudes about human rights from the United States of America.

MESSAGE CONCERNING THE DEATH OF CONGRESSMAN EMERSON

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, as Chaplain Ford mentioned this afternoon about the death of our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, Congressman BILL EMERSON, was one of the most popular Members in the Congress. He even came as a page many, many years ago. He loved this House. He died at the age of 58 at Bethesda Naval Hospital. He served eight terms in the Congress. His funeral will be this Thursday out in his State of Missouri. So I bring this message to the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure tomorrow the Missouri delegation will take more time to talk about this wonderful man, BILL EMERSON.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

HOW NOT TO HANDLE A SEX DISCRIMINATION CASE IS DEMONSTRATED BY MITSUBISHI AUTO COMPANY

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am positively amazed by the executives at Mitsubishi Auto Co. They seem to be destined to go in the textbook as the classic textbook case on how not to handle a sex discrimination case. Over the weekend, they decided that they would now try and get out from under the EEOC charges that have been filed against them. This case has been one that has been documented in newspapers all over the place, and they constantly continue to spend all of their money trying to do legal maneuvers, find fancy high-priced people that they can hide behind to say that they are coming clean.

I guess the bottom line is ''denial is not a river in Egypt.'' It seems to be something that is flowing right through the executive offices of Mitsubishi Auto Co., and it is a shame they do not just settle this case and get on with it. I think everybody would have a whole lot more respect for all of them.

THE FAMILY LEAVE ACT LAID A FOUNDATION FOR THE FAMILY INVOLVEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for recognizing me, and I first of all take the floor and say how very, very sad I am by the passing of our colleague, BILL EMERSON. This is a man who cared very much about hunger issues and nutrition issues, and he will be sadly missed because those are not great power issues. You can imagine, hungry people do not have political action committees and they are not really involved in the great power process. So they have lost a friend, and we have lost a friend, and my deepest sympathy goes to their family.

Now, I wanted to talk a bit today about what is going on in Tennessee, which I think is very exciting. Vice President GORE and his wife Tipper, and the President and Mrs. Clinton, are all in Tennessee doing a family reunion. They are doing a family reunion where they are calling families together and continuing the dialog of what can Government do to make family life a little less stressful. A lot of people say we do not have the values anymore for families. We have those values. We have those values. The problem is the whole society is pressing down on families so hard that it is very hard for a family to sustain itself. So the question is, Is there anything that can be done for a little relief?

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I am doing with the gentleman from Connecticut, Senator DODD, and that they will be talking about today in Tennessee is to extend the family medical leave concept that we passed 2 years ago. The family medical leave that we passed 2 years ago gave families for the first time the right in the workplace to have unpaid leave upon the birth or adoption of a child or a critical chronic illness of a member of the family. Because the President and Vice President listened so well and many others have been listening so well to what families have said, they have said this family leave has really been a salvation for them in many cases.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are introducing a bill to lower the covered companies down to 25. If you have 25 or more employees, we think you should be covered by family leave. Right now, it is up at 50. We think that experiment worked so well, and we had a whole year of hearings all around America so that we are now ready to make the next step and lower it. That will be a very, very exciting thing and we hope that we can get that passed.

Now, the next part, now we are talking about parental involvement leave, because what so many parents tell us is that they want to be more involved in the child's education, but where they work they cannot take the time off. So this would give each parent a couple of days of unpaid leave a year where they could participate in the child's educational advancement. You know, all sorts of corporations give schools machinery, equipment, computers, and that is all wonderful. But they will tell you they are so understaffed that unless they have people who know how to use them and can help them, they do not do much good.

So we are saying let us work together with corporate America to find a way where we also allow employees who are in the work force to be able to take a couple unpaid days of leave and invest it in their child's education. We have study after study showing that any child does much better in school if the parents are interested, if the parents are involved, and if the parents are tracking along. We desperately need to allow people that option. One of the things that has troubled me, imagine, project yourself 100 years into the future and suppose we are going through some of the surveys we now see in this country. We see survey after survey showing that the average American will tell you if they get up in the morning and their child care has fallen apart or their spouse is chronically ill that they feel much safer calling their employer and lying about that. They feel much safer if they call their employer and tell them that the car broke down, rather than the truth. Now, 100 years from now, they are going to dig us up and say, ''What did they do, worship these cars? I mean, they care more about their cars than children, spouses, family members.'' I do not think so.

But the same thing also goes with what we see these surveys talking about what a person says if they want to go to the child's school to participate. How many will tell their employer that? Very few. Most people will say they feel much more comfortable saying they are going to play golf. Now, going to play golf is more important than going to participate in your child's school? I do not think most Americans think it is more important, but they think that their employer will not be as apt to dock them if they say they are going to play golf or they are going to play tennis or they are going hunting, rather than they are going to the school.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of craziness has happened that the values that we all feel in our home, in our kitchen, around the kitchen table, the things that pull us into our family and pull us into the institutions they want us to participate in, that somehow we do not feel that we are able to talk about those out in the work world without being condemned, without being punished or without having our career on the line? Something is really wrong.

So family leave began to work on that and now we are going to have a parental involvement act that really is just like family leave. It is not paid, so you are taking a penalty to do it. Very few people can have very many unpaid days. But at least a couple times a year you could do this if you wanted to do this and not worry about having to use sick days and not having to make something up or whatever.

□ 1415

I think we need to continue this dialog with America's families to find everything we can find to see what other kinds of things like this we could do just to give them a few tools to lift some of the pressure they are feeling up off their shoulders.

When I talk to the average American family they tell me they feel like one of those hamsters in a wheel. My kids used to have hamsters when they were growing up, and in the cage there was a little wheel and the hamsters would run and run and run and run, and they never got out of the wheel, obviously. I think families feel that way. They run faster every year, they are more exhausted every year, and they are still at the bottom of the wheel. I think it is because families still have the same values their families had but they feel they are in a society where they will be penalized for expressing those values or trying to act on those values.

Well, if that is true, we are in real bad shape and the No. 1 goal of this Government should be to try and make sure that you will not be penalized for expressing and acting on those values. Anyone who thinks a car is more important than a child, I want to talk to them.

Now, the other thing that just came out, too, was the fact of child support enforcement. We are hearing all this stuff about welfare reform, welfare reform, welfare reform. Very important. But when we still only see about 18 percent of child support enforcement, as that report showed last week, we are still not making much of a commitment. For the parents that are supporting their children, obviously, they get very angry with the other parents who cast their children off like they are a used up can of pop and refuse to pay. Obviously, they do not want to have to pay for their kids and someone else's kids that they walked away from.

On the other hand, we have to be very concerned about those young people because they are our country's future. Are we afraid to talk about the common good anymore? And the common good is certainly that all young people get all the education their ability and desire drives them to want, because they are certainly going to be better citizens and then our country is going to be a better place.

So I think making parents more reponsible, and I think the parents that have taken responsibility ought to be very angry with the parents who will not take responsibility. Now, we cannot force them to live together but we can certainly force them to pay and make that family as economically whole as possible. It is startling to me that we force children to have that welfare stamp stamped on them because some adults do not want to take economic responsibility for children that they participated in bringing into this world.

One of the prime values that we should talk about here is the fact that we have not done a good job doing that because they do not want to make adults mad. The kids do not vote but the adults do vote, and they are afraid they will make the adults mad if they make those adults become responsible parents and pay their child support.

So I would hope that families would also be talking about that today at the family reunion, because I think an awful lot of us, again, are very concerned about what that survey will look like 100 years from now when somebody recognizes that 97 percent of the payments get made and only 18 percent of child support payments were made.

Again, do we care more about cars than our children? If we do, we really are lost souls, and if we really do, then we may as well forget it for the 21st century because those children are the primary stockholders in this next century, and if they are not ready and if they are not prepared and if we are not getting them ready and prepared, then we have really given up on the future.

So those are all the things going on down in Tennessee, and there is another little piece that I would like to talk about, the other little piece about what happens with Medicare, what happens with Medicaid, the raging debate that has been going on in this body about Medicare and Medicaid. What does it mean; where are we going; how come it is so partisan; can we not get some kind of consensus?

I have thought and thought and thought about what could I say, what could I say that would try to bring it down and then all of a sudden, voila, I came across Little Red Riding Hood. Little Red Riding Hood, I think, tells us more about what is going on in the Medicare-Medicaid debate than anything I can think of.

Let me go back and start so I can try to make some sense out of this. We all know that we have to make adjustments to Medicare and we have to make adjustments in Medicaid because no one ever guesses exactly what kind of premiums should be paid, how many people are going to be sick. Our best guess is sometimes off, so we tinker here and we tinker there. That has been going on since they created the system, that is what should go on, and that is what should continue to go on. But some people use those reports to say, OK, this is it, it is going off the cliff, kill it. Well, I do not think we should kill it. Other people say, oh, we did not mean kill it, we are just trying to fix it, trust us.

That is where Little Red Riding Hood comes in, because if you remember Little Red Riding Hood, the great pictures are of grandma dressing up like the wolf, or the wolf dressing up like grandma. I got that wrong, did I not? We have the wolf, who sneaks into grandma's bed clothes, climbs in the bed, and then what happens when Little Red Riding Hood comes in? Well, it is not too surprising; the wolf jumps out and she sees who it really is.

My question about Medicare and Medicaid is when the Republicans have voted against Medicare when it was started, said they did not like it, said they would like to have it wither on the vine, and I could give you hundreds of quotes, do you then trust them to fix it? Is that not the equivalent of the wolf putting on grandma's clothes and getting in bed? That is certainly how I see it. If for years they have railed against it, not thought it was a good idea, and now they say, trust us, we want to fix it, that is no different than the wolf putting on the little hat, crawling under the bed covers and getting ready to jump out at Little Red Riding Hood.

So we must make sure we do not become Little Red Riding Hood. This all sounds so esoteric, and I hope none of you ever have to go through what I have gone through to really feel it, but a couple of weeks ago my mother fell and broke her hip. Now, my mother has never used Medicare. She has been under Medicare, she is in her eighties, but she has never had to use it, she has been very healthy, nor has my father, but all of a sudden she broke her hip. When a woman in her eighties breaks her hip, we are talking about expensive procedures. We are talking about long-term rehabilitation. Never have I been so happy there has been something such as Medicare, because I think my very proud mother would be absolutely devastated if she had to go through the breaking of the hip and then also the asking of her children for money to help her recover. This is devastating enough to her to have to be on her back for a while, but this is going to cost a lot of money. I think since she has been paying in for tens of years or decades, probably she will just be gradually getting it all back, but, nevertheless, in prior times, before we had Medicare, the family would have been in crisis trying to figure out where to get the money so she could get the proper care, and that is just to something that we want to enter the equation at such a traumatic time.

Now, there is no question my brother and I would do everything we can to try and protect our parents, who have been so wonderful to us, but we are not rich, and the way medical bills run, I will tell you, luckily my mother is not in that bad a shape, but all of a sudden I can visualize how somebody could have something happen where very rapidly my brother and I could have been out of all of our resources within 6 months to a year. That is not at all impossible under the system and the costs of our wonderful medical care that we have.

So people need to think about that. And as we talk about Medicare and Medicaid, let me constantly stipulate, of course we have to constantly work to fix it, but we also have to make sure that it is still there, that fixing it does not mean killing it. That, I think, is very critical.

When we look at the other health care issues that we are talking about, this bill that we are hoping to get through that Senator KASSEBAUM had introduced, which is very important, it says that you and I, this is not Medicare, this is not Medicaid, you and I can transport our insurance with us; we can be guaranteed that we can get it no matter what our physical state is, and so forth. That is very important. But one of the things that they are trying to do to ruin that, the reason we have not been able to take it up, is another variable.

Imagine a pool of water. That is how we want health care to be, a pool that we are all in, just like my mother and father were in a Medicare pool for years and years and years and never drew a dime. It is a pool where everybody is paying in and, hopefully, no one gets sick. But if they do, you are sharing the cost in the pool and that is how you hope to keep the premiums down.

Well, what the Republicans want to do is lower a ladder into that pool so the healthiest people and the wealthiest people can climb out. Normally in a swimming pool if you are climbing out, the water goes down. But let me tell you in an insurance pool, if you let the

healthiest people climb out of that pool and get a special deal and you let the wealthiest people climb out of that pool and get a special deal, then the water; that is, the insurance premiums, they are not going to go down, they are going to go up.

So if we allow the MSA's to go through, which is the equivalent of the ladder letting the healthy-wealthy people escape from the pool, we will have some guarantees that do not mean anything. If you have a guarantee that they have to sell you an insurance policy, that sounds wonderful until you find out that they can also charge you $3,000 a month and you do not have the money. You have a guarantee that does not mean anything.

I have a guarantee I can buy a Rolls Royce. The only problem is I do not have the money so it does not do me any good. So we do not want the pool to be decimated of the healthiest and wealthiest or we will end up with something that does not work. So think all of the health care issues have to be kept in that context or we get very lost.

There is another issue that a lot of us would like to talk about, too, and that is what will happen in this campaign year. I guess it is no secret, most people know that I will be leaving after 24 years at the end of this year, and I am very saddened about what I have seen happening in campaigns. I think they have gotten so much worse than when I first ran.

When I first ran they were so much more issue based. They were fun. They were not the big sleazy fights that we see. And the money, the money is unbelievable. When I first ran, my average campaign contribution was $7.50. Hello. Do you think anybody running for Congress has an average campaign contribution anywhere close to that? Of course, after my 24 years I am now up to about 50 bucks, PAC's and all, so I have not evolved very far. But let me say the big money that is swirling around out there, I think, tends to taint the whole thing. Anybody who believes someone gives you thousands of dollars because they believe in good government, it really does not pass the straight face test. I think they want access, and I think they probably want something more than good government, probably something that affects them very directly.

So when I see the big bucks going into it, that have really skewed it, when I see it has moved from an issue base to a very personal type of base when you try to destroy people one-on-one, and when I now see more and more people trying to do independent expenditures and the candidate says these independent expenditures are whirling around out there running TV ads and they can savage anybody, the candidate can always say, well, gee, I do not know, they are just spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in my name, but I have no control over them. Gosh, I am so sorry they are so savage and awful, but I have no control at all.

Now, are we in this democracy just going to surrender to that or are we going to do something about that? Is there anything we can do about it? I am so tired of Americans throwing up their hands and saying nothing we can do. It just gets worse and worse every year, and so more and more Americans say, well, I am not even going to vote.

□ 1430

First of all, this House hopefully is going to have reform week, and I do not think we can call it a reform week unless we do something about the big bucks in campaigns, about the soft money, about independent expenditures. If we do not deal with that, we may as well forget it. That is because I feel so strongly that money is tainting this process and makes it look more and more like it is nothing but a coin operated legislative machine. If you do not have the coins to put in, you do not get the legislation out. Period.

So the average American feels very sold out. I feel so strongly about that one day we went to the top of this dome and had a sold sign that we walked around with, because even I feel like we are getting sold out on our priorities and what we should be doing. Hopefully that reform week that is coming up will deal with that issue. That is the key issue, that is the core issue, and that absolutely must be dealt with.

There is something else that every American can do. I was in Minnesota this weekend and ran into a person campaigning for their statehouse who put out a very simple, fair campaign code. If people all over America did this, we could really change our democratic process to be something we are proud of again. Is it not kind of embarrassing, the whole world is now saying, we like your possess, we want to be a democratic process. We are saying that is fine, but do not come see ours because it kind of stinks. We do not like it anyone. It does not pass the smell test.

So this wonderful young woman out in Minnesota had come up with just simple four little points. Her first point was, I will take full responsibility for all brochures, advertisements, and press releases done by my campaign. That is fairly simple, is it not? The candidate takes responsibility for anything their campaign does. So they cannot stand there and say: My press secretary did it; my campaign manager did it; my counselor did it. No, no, no, no, no. You take responsibility. And if you take responsibility, this means that, if something goes out from your campaign, you bloody well better have seen it and, if you did not see it, you still take responsibility.

It is the captain of the ship principle, simple, easy, and very important. She also says that the second point should be people talking about they should tell the truth. They should not distort or misrepresent votes taken by either side. I think that is terribly critical and very simple, again, to enforce.

She also thinks that it is very important that each candidate do the following: No. 3, ask groups that support you to follow the same rules and take responsibility for what they say. For example, if I were a candidate and someone came to me and said, we really like you, PAT SCHROEDER, we are going to go out and spend $200,000 in advertising in your name, I would say to them, you can do that, that is wonderful, but you only do it on these rules. I must sign off on what you say. There will be no misrepresenting of votes. It must be truthful. And I am going to take responsibility for what you do. If you do something that is out of line, I am pulling the plug.

How simple is that? Imagine what could happen. This woman is amazing. She is handing it out all over Minnesota and asking people to sign it. I just picked it up. I thought, what a great idea. It is Yankee ingenuity at work. Everybody sits around bemoaning the fact that campaigns get worse and worse, and here is someone who has done something about it. Yankee ingenuity is back.

So I hope every American starts redefining Yankee ingenuity campaign by campaign by campaign across this great country. Because heaven only knows, I know very few people who will stand up anywhere and say, we are so proud of our democratic process and the level of civic debate going on among the candidates. Let me tell you, it is so helpful, you go to see civic debates, you go to these community debates and you come out and really understand the issues. They are great forums.

Do you know anybody like that? If you do, I want to know where they are. I travel around this country a lot, and I found people saddened, their heart is broken by what has happened, by the civil discourse, by the constant lowering down and dumbing down of the whole political process.

I think we have a change to take it back. It is only going to happen if we do it campaign by campaign individual by individual. The act of omission is as bad as the act of not doing it. So you really have to get out and do something. You cannot just sit back on the bench and be a backbencher.

I just wanted to share that, too. If there is anyone frustrated, and I know there are a lot because I hear from them all the time, this is a great chance to move out, start putting down those principles, saying to candidates, please, you should sign these agreements. You could even have some political science groups or whatever oversee them, police them or whatever. But if we do not reclaim this process, we are in trouble. I think everybody knows that.

Now, one of the other things that I wanted to talk a bit about today, too, is what has been happening with women. I was very excited to see what

is happening in the Olympics. We are seeing young woman from America move out in astronomical numbers. They are really looking like they are going to do very well for this great country, that there are going to be a lot more medals not just by our young men, who have always been there, but the women are claiming more and more and more every single year. So we are very proud of them.

I am particularly in awe because, being 55 years old, when I grew up, there was no such thing as title 9, which comes from this great Federal Government. There was no such thing as title IX. So we had no gym, really. We had a few gym classes, yes, but I mean they were nothing. The biggest thing was you were afraid that they would have a fire drill in the middle of your gym class and somebody would see you in your stupid gym suit and you would die of embarrassment. As a consequence, I really have no sports at all.

When we played basketball, they thought women were so frail that we could only dribble twice and we could not cross the center line. You can imagine what exciting games those were. If you can only dribble twice and could not cross the center line, it was like boring. But that is where we were. It was always interesting they never thought women were too frail to scrub floors, but they thought we were too frail for sports. You could scrub floors somehow but, if we stood up and engaged in sports, I guest they thought we would faint.

So title IX said that all the educational institutions that receive any kind of public money had to provide the same sports and educational opportunity for women that they did for men. As a consequence, many of our young women in the schools participated in sports and found they had all sorts of talent. This country has gone on to develop that talent. We are going to see them showing those talents that we will all be cheering on in the Olympics.

So why am I saying this? What is the big deal?

Well, the big deal is we have an affirmative action bill in front of this Congress that can undo title IX, that could roll it all back, that could put the women back out of the gyms and the sports programs and push them back out of a lot of the educational programs they have been able to involve themselves in. That I think we want to think about a very long time. There are any number of other things that that affirmative action bill would do. It just kind of guts everything that was done from the 1960's on.

It is done in the name of things that we all want to agree with. It says, well, you know, we really should be a color-blind society. And they are right, we really should be a color-blind society. But let me ask you, Americans, when we have got this terrible rash of church burnings going on and black churches, how can we say we are there yet? How can we say we are a color-blind society? I do not think we can, when this awful act is going on that we are all trying to end.

I could give example after example after example. So people say what we want ourselves to be but we have all sorts of empirical evidence that we are not there yet. What these programs were about was to try and open doors for people and help get them over some of the barriers that have been artificially put up in front of different groups because of their gender, their religion, their race, their ethnic background, whatever it was.

If America is going to really allow everybody to develop to their full potential, then you cannot allow artificial barriers to be put up in front of people all over the place so that you prevent them from being able to develop. That is just about how simple it is.

So I am hoping very much that we do not see this bill come to the floor, but we are very apt do see it come to the floor and in the heat and passion of the moment, with all the current flowing the other way, I am afraid we will have all sorts of folks run to pass this bill. And once it gets implemented about 5 years from now we will suddenly realize we overreacted.

The problem with politics right now is to stand up and talk about reforming something is not an applause line. If you stand up and say, we are going to blow it up, hey, there is an applause line. You find that over and over and over again. We are tired of affirmative action, we do not like it, blow it up. Well, everybody would say, hey, the world has changed since it went into effect.

There should be some changes and modifications, let us talk about those. And let us bring it into the 1990's. But let us not blow it up because we are not there yet. We have moved from point zero to maybe 50 percent, maybe 60 percent. We could have a debate about where it is, so let us fine tune it and figure out where we go; but let us not blow it up, and see if we cannot go back to where we were when we began the whole process.

I think almost every single thing you think of that we have been dealing with in this last year and a half fits under that same category. You may think people have gone too far with environmental regulations. But if you say, then let us talk about that and let us figure out where they went too far and let us figure out what we do about that instead, nobody wants to hear that. They want to hear just blow it up. Let us do away with them. We do not want them. I think that goes way too far.

So I guess my plea is for how do we lower the level of the discourse and how do we roll up our shirt sleeves and get on with the hard work of trying to reform things, to fix things, and to put them back together again rather than to just continue this inflammatory rhetoric about how I hate government more than you hate government. No, you do not, I am going to go out there and blow it up even harder than you are going to blow it up.

When you get all done, what are you going to replace it with? I used to chair the Civil Service Subcommittee, and I would constantly find myself in that position where you knew what the applause line was but you knew it was wrong. You knew you could get great applause from audiences if you went out and said the Federal Government is fat, and it is lazy, and it is terrible, and blow it up. And everybody said yes, yes, yes, that is wonderful.

And then you would say to people, OK, now what do you want to blow up? Do you want to blow up the Park Service? No. We like the parks. What about the immigration service? No, we need the immigration service. What about drug enforcement? We need them. What about the FBI? No, we need them.

You go through the whole thing. The only thing they really wanted to blow up was the IRS. They hated the IRS. They did not want the IRS, but they wanted all those things that came out of it.

So I guess what all of us have to do as citizens, as we start talking, and I hope we do in this political year, start talking about what is our responsibility as citizens, is we have to stop wringing our hands and shouting loudly, instead of rolling our shirt sleeves, lower our voices and start figuring out how we come together around a table to fix things. That is what you do in a family.

There is nothing in my house that is ever perfect. My house is constant maintenance. My cars are constant maintenance. I am middle-aged. I am constant maintenance. I do not blow myself up or burn my house down or decide I am not going to drive my car because the wheel bearings fell out last week or whatever happened this week. No, we keep fixing it and moving on. Government is that way, too. So how that factors in, how we bring campaigns around, how we continue on with saying we cannot just promise people that this is the great American dream.

They have also got to see the reality that they can get there. It is not just a dream that can be translated into reality by having such things as affirmative action and title IX and many of the other programs that a lot of us have benefited from.

□ 1445

And how we fine-tune those, make them work better, make them fit better; all of that is terribly important. So those are all things that I think this body and this Nation needs to reflect upon.

When you see what I see, I see people becoming more and more cynical every single day, and I remind people of what the word ''cynic'' came from. It came

from the Greek word for yapping dog, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap. If you go back and you look at Greece, the democracy that they were so proud of in Athens that we all talked about and learned about in school, it fell because of cynics. They just all were so angry with everything. No one fixed anything, and suddenly it all fell from within.

And it is very ironic, as you look at history, to see so many civilizations could come together and work so hard to make sure nobody overcame them from the outside, but suddenly, when they started to come apart on the inside, they could not handle it. Is that not interesting?

You read over and over in history books different variations of people coming together and saying, ''Well, it's not that we don't know what is wrong. We know what's wrong. We can all give speeches on what's wrong.'' And I bet every one of us will give a very similar speech about what is wrong: about the pressures of families, the pressures on the workplace, the pressures on what is going on with children, all of those pressures. We all can state what is wrong. The problem is we are not willing to work together to fix it. We are not willing to work together to fix it, and we want to go out and attack in full force all of the institutions that are there to fix it, and nobody has got some kind of debate about what replaces those institutions.

If you truly believe this Government can run without a government or this country can run without a government, then OK, but if it does, it will be the first. No one has—you have got to have some kind of functioning government around which you are organized; something has to be there.

So should it not be something that we are proud of? Should it not be something that we all are invested in? And should it not be something that relates to us and we relate to it?

I constantly think about the excitement of the American revolution and how did we lost it. Think about revolutions. We were not the first country that had a revolution. Almost every country in the world has had a revolution at one time or another. But so often what happens in a revolution is the guys on the outside are yelling at the people who are in power, and they say they are autocratic, they are repressive, they are all those things, and they probably are, but then the minute they take over, they become more autocratic, more repressive, more, more, more, and so it really becomes a fight over power, who has power over the people, rather than a real revolution which changes.

But the American Revolution was different because the people who beat the king did not insist on having power over. Remember, remember, there were colonists who went to George Washington after the Revolution and said to him:

''Listen, George, Forget this democracy stuff. Why do you not just be king? We really just didn't want a king sitting on the other side of the Atlantic, but having a king here, that will be fine. Why don't you be king.''

Is there a politician you would make that offer to in America today? I doubt it. But that offer was made to George, and he said, ''You forgot why we fought this revolution. We fought this revolution about a democracy where everybody is going to have a chance to participate and have their voice heard.'' So he had an idea of what it was about, and somehow we have lost the feeling for what it is all about.

It is about civics, it is about community, it is about common good, and why we are so afraid to say those words anymore I do not know, and it is about trying to bring them around.

And so as I mention that, let me come to my final thing. I have been on the Committee on Armed Services for 24 years, and I have been very honored to sit there. The end of last week I was very troubled to realize that there were articles in the paper talking about the fact that there is a whole new tradition apparently being developed; I never heard of this before, and that is that the armed services are now putting four officers in the Speaker's office. I am not quite sure why we are putting people in uniform in congressional offices to help them with their work. Does that mean all of us are now to get four officers in our office or, because we are lower down, maybe we only get two. And what are they supposed to do? Drill the staff?

I mean I do not get this at all. If we have got all these extra people, maybe we should downsize and save some tax money.

I have written to Secretary Bill Perry asking about this and asking why these officers had been assigned to be workers in political offices. One of the great things about our military is it has not been politicized, and it has not been involved in partisan politics, and I find it very hard to put military officers in offices of congressmen and women and not have them get politicized in this body. Heaven forbid. It has been more politicized than anything I have ever seen. How you would put them in this body and have them be neutral and nonpartisan I do not know, but I just really cannot figure this out, and I wonder what it means in all of this discourse we have been having about civics and community and all of that.

The initial response we heard from the military is that they put these officers in the Speaker's office because many Members of Congress had not had experience in uniform and they thought that this would be helpful, and I mean I cannot figure that one out either. That one did not print with me. So I want a better excuse. We added up the salaries. It comes to about a quarter of a million dollars a year. That is a lot of money to be donating.

So what are they doing? Why are they doing it? How are they responsible to citizens in America? And is this something we want our tax money doing? I certainly do not think I do, but I will wait until we hear from the Defense Department and get a much more detailed response than anything we have gotten so far. But that is troubling.

So let me finish at this point to say I hope that this Nation really finds its passion and fire for democracy.

I think democracy is a faith. All of our Forefathers said it was a faith, and it is a faith. You have to really believe it is going to work because the only way it is going to work is if people really get involved, and it is not like consumerism where you can say I do not like those burgers so I will not buy those burgers. That works for being a consumer, but in civics if you say I do not like politics so I will not get involved in politics, the difference is the people who do get involved are going to pick the leaders and the leaders are going to make the decision for you, so you just gave up your place at the table.

So democracy is a faith because we hope all citizens will stay involved, they will stay at the table, they work hard to become informed with those rights. To elect and participate comes the responsibility to know something when you do it. But how exciting. How many people gave their lives for that great, great privilege? And how many people on this planet go to bed every night wishing they had that great privilege? And we have absolutely, as a nation, got to shake off this attitude that we are in because we have a terrible attitude right now out there about democracy and a terrible attitude about our process.

You may have a better idea than democracy; I do not know. If you have got one, bring it forward. But if you do not have one, get involved and make democracy work better. Do not just sit there and holler.

I really wish that we could give people a little card every time they voted, and you could only complain if you had the current little card because I cannot tell you how many people come at me at a hundred miles per hour with their mouth going and their finger going and you know their nostrils are getting wider and they are screaming and yelling and jumping up and down and you say:

''Well, now, did you vote?''

''No.''

And you really wonder, do you not, how could they give up that phenomenal privilege? They want to be heard, but they do not want to take the time to vote.

So let us think about civics, let us think about inclusiveness, let us think about common good, let us think about families, let us think about all the people gathered today at the table in Tennessee talking about what could be done to help make the pressure a little less on their family. I hope all of you think about what could make the pressure a little less on your family, and

let us all put those thoughts to work, stop shouting at each other and get on with making this great country what it should be and giving it the legacy it should have in the 21st century. We should be leading the world showing people how democracy works. We should be holding our head high.

TRIBUTE TO BILL EMERSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FUNDERBURK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to make some personal comments about our colleague, BILL EMERSON, who died Saturday night. BILL was a very honest, very decent, very ethical, very moral individual. As everyone knows, he had friends on both sides of the aisle. Republican and Democratic Members were very close to BILL personally.

I was in a small group with BILL that met in the House chapel every week. In the group are Republicans and Democrats, both backgrounds. We would pray for each other in the group, we would pray with each other in the group. BILL was an inspiration all the years together and was an inspiration during the very difficult time when he found out about his illness.

BILL EMERSON had a very strong faith, a very strong Christian faith. He loved the Lord very deeply, and his faith was very, very strong. As the other people know and the Washington Post points out today, BILL and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HALL worked together on the issue of hunger. The fact is BILL EMERSON went to many places with Congressman HALL, from Sudan to Ethiopia, to Somalia and similar places. I can safely say there are many people, hundreds of thousands or even millions of people that are alive today on the continent of Africa and other places that would not be alive had it not been for the work of BILL EMERSON working with Congressman HALL. BILL was totally committed to dealing with the issue of hunger and working together with TONY they did so much good that saved so many lives.

The fact is the people whose lives were saved do not even know how they were saved or why they were saved, but I want the record to show there are millions who are alive today because of the work of BILL EMERSON working with TONY HALL.

BILL loved his wife and loved his family, his four daughters, his wife Jo Ann. He would often talk about them. They were the center of his life, and he loved his family very, very much. Many times that we would meet he would talk about his wife and about his family, and we would exchange those things, and I just want that to be on the record.

□ 1500

BILL loved this institution. That should be on the record. He was a page in this House. I believe he was a page in the House during the time that there was an assassination attempt in the House of Representatives. I remember seeing the picture of the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. BILL EMERSON, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. KANJORSKI, who were both pages. That is how long BILL EMERSON goes back as being identified with this body.

He loved history. I think he read every book about Winston Churchill. He probably knew more about Winston Churchill than any person I knew. He knew more about Abraham Lincoln than anyone I knew. He loved this institution. He loved the Congress and he loved the House and he loved history.

Last, Mr. Speaker, I know he loved the Lord and he loved Christ. I know in his death he has gone to be with Jesus Christ. I include for the RECORD an obituary in the Washington Post.

The material referred to is as follows:

EIGHT-TERM REP. BILL EMERSON OF MISSOURI DIES

(By Martin Weil)

Rep. Bill Emerson (R-Mo.), who was found to have inoperable lung cancer last year while serving his eighth term in Congress, died June 22 at the Bethesda Naval Medical Center. He was 58.

Despite his illness, which sometimes led him to carry a portable oxygen canister to the floor of the House, Rep. Emerson was running for reelection. Agriculture dominated his district's economy, and he was in line to become chairman of the Agriculture Committee next year if he won and his party kept control of the House.

''He was a fighter,'' an aide said last night. Rep. Emerson believed ''that he was going to beat this thing, and he fought it all the way.''

Sometimes, in response to medical advice, he used a motorized scooter to help him get around Capitol Hill, aides said, but he was proud that he did not miss a vote this year until the week before he entered the hospital.

Rep. Emerson was admitted to Bethesda last Monday with a respiratory infection, and he issued a statement Thursday saying he was ''resting comfortably and following doctors' orders.''

Aides said he was a lifelong smoker who gave up cigarettes after his cancer was diagnosed last fall.

''All of Congress will feel the loss of Bill Emerson,'' said House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.). ''He was a leader on nutrition programs and a man who was admired on both sides of the aisle.''

''Politics in America,'' a reference work on members of Congress, described Rep. Emerson as a man whose votes and speeches demonstrated ''a streak of ideological conservatism'' but whose legislative career bore the stamp of pragmatism.

He was named in another reference work as being one of two key Republicans on the Agriculture Committee who early last year persuaded Gingrich to drop from the Republican ''Contract With America'' a proposal to put food stamps into block grants to the states. The food stamp program is a major part of federal spending on agriculture.

Rep. Emerson, a member of the House Select Committee on Hunger, traveled to starvation-stricken Somalia in 1992 to spotlight conditions there. When the committee was abolished, its chairman, Rep. Tony P. Hall (D-Ohio), fasted 22 days; according to ''Politics in America,'' Rep. Emerson fasted every Monday in sympathy.

Rep. Emerson, a native of Hillsboro, Mo., largely was raised by a grandfather who was a county judge, and he acquired early what was to be a lifelong interest in politics and government.

As a teenager eager to become a congressional page, he came to Washington in the 1950s without the promise of a job. But repeated knocking on the doors of members of his state's delegation won him admiration for his initiative and resulted soon in the post he sought.

Aides said he regarded the assignment as a dream come true. After receiving a bachelor's degree in political science from Westminster College in Fulton, Mo., he returned to Washington to work for Rep. Robert Ellsworth (R-Kan.). Subsequent jobs included stints as a lobbyist and as a staff member for Sen. Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.). In the meantime, he received a law degree from the University of Baltimore.

In 1980, he went back to Missouri to defeat a Democratic incumbent and become the first Republican to win the 8th District seat in 52 years.

Aides said Rep. Emerson's mother, Marie Hahn, his wife, Jo Ann, and his daughters, Elizabeth, Abigail, Victoria and Katharine, were at his bedside when he died.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS WITH CHINA, AND INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO PROTECT AMERICAN PATENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FUNDERBURK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE BILL EMERSON

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in remembering the gentleman from Missouri, BILL EMERSON, a decent, hardworking man who made great contributions not only to this body, not only to our country, but to the cause of a humane and decent world. We will remember him. He made major contributions to this legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, today I will be discussing something that goes to the heart and soul of a moral society, a decision that we will soon make about most-favored-nation status with China. Then, after a brief discussion on most-favored-nation status with China, in which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will participate, I will give a longer presentation on a bill that will be introduced shortly on the floor of the House dealing with the American patent system and major changes that are being made in our patent system.

First, Mr. Speaker, let me say that as we move forward to the day when Congress will be considering most-favored-nation status for China, we must recall that this happens every year. Every year we are told that we must grant most-favored-nation status for the Communist Chinese because it will help them evolve.

The justification for not treating the Communist dictatorship like any other democratic nation, for example, like

Canada, the evidence for not doing this is overwhelming. Unfortunately, it is not strong enough to overwhelm the dreams of prophets, the glimmer in the eyes of American capitalists and international corporate elites. Up until now they have been able to win the day by claiming that our economic interaction with this brutal, genocidal dictatorship on the mainland of China will help it evolve into a freer, less repressive society. But by now it should be clear to everyone that China is not becoming a freer, less repressive society.

We keep granting most-favored-nation status, we keep having more international and economic interaction. Yet the Red Chinese regime, the last major Communist regime in the world, is becoming more belligerent, more repressive, and more contrary. It is becoming more contrary to the economic and moral interests of our people to continue this trading relationship that we have developed that is, as I say, the same as a trading relationship we would have with Canada or a democratic country.

The gentleman from Texas, DICK ARMEY, said something that I have heard him say many times, and there really is some truth in it. I like to steal phrases from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], which he knows. Plagiarism in this case is a form of flattery. Mr. ARMEY said insanity is doing more of the same but expecting to get different results.

Mr. Speaker, if we use this as our guide to our relations to most-favored-nation status relations with China, our policy is insane, because we continue to have the same policy of granting favorable economic status, as favorable as any other country in the world, but yet the situation continues to get worse. Economically, just economically, if we just judge it on that basis alone, they are the most protectionist regime of any that we are trading with.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are permitted to flood our markets with their goods, putting millions upon millions of U.S. citizens out of work, while they protect their own domestic markets with huge tariffs, tariffs that can be 40 percent and 50 percent tariffs.

What does that do? That means that in traditional economic terms, and those of us who do believe in free trade, and I happen to believe in free trade between free people, but when we take the equation the way the Chinese are having trade, they fought flood our market, and when economics would mandate, then those people laid off in our country would go to work for those factories that are now producing goods to sell in China, and what do we find out? We cannot sell our goods in China because they will not let our people go over and sell the washing machines and appliances because they have a protective tariff. They are protecting their own domestic industry.

If America wants to invest in creating new factories over there so that our laid-off workers or unemployed citizens continue to be laid off and continue to be unemployed, that is okay with them. In other words, the Red Chinese are manupulating the system, and we have permitted them to do so, knowingly permitted them to do so, and that puts millions of our own people out of work, and benefits them to the tune of tens of billions of dollars of hard currency every year.

There are a few companies here that benefit from the trading relationship. Do not get me wrong. Aerospace, which is a very big industry in my own area, in my own congressional district, does benefit. So do those who are selling raw materials and food. It is just that everybody else except those in aerospace or those selling raw materials and food, not everybody else but large numbers of people in our society, are actually being hurt dramatically and losing jobs. I happen to believe there are more jobs being lost in our economic relationship with China than there are being created.

Who is losing? Regular working people. Who are really the main people who gain? A lot o people in the international financial community and the corporate elite. Basically, the Chinese continue economically in this relationship to basically serve themselves, but our government is not protecting the interests of our people while they potect the interests of theirs.

The Chinese blatantly steal American technology, and over and over again what do we do? We accept their word. They sign a little piece of paper with a bunch of scribbling on it, and then we accept their word, OK, we will not bring down sanctions on you this year because you have signed this piece of paper. Then we act surprised again as it becomes close to the time to debate most-favored-nation status to find that there has been a wholesale violation of all the agreements they have made.

We have had negotiating in the interests of the American people by people who are not committed to the welfare and best interests of the American people. Instead, we have had people who seem to be interested in a global concept of trade and commerce, and China has to be part of this. With that excuse we find Americans being thrown out of work, and our standard of living is slowly but surely edging down. At the same time, they steal our technology, they steal our intellectual property rights and use it against us.

Of course, what are they doing with these tens of billions of dollars in hard currency that we permit them to make every year? That is a conscious decision that we are making, to permit them to make every year? That is a conscious decision that we are making, to permit the rules of the game to be that they are going to have all of these extra tens of billions of dollars. What are they doing? They are building up a powerful military that is currently being used to threaten their neighbors. And someday, if the United States gets in the way, those weapons will kill American citizens, America's defenders. What will they be killed with? With technology they have stolen from us, and billions of dollars of hard currency that we have permitted them to make as profit in an unfair trading relationship between our two countires.

One last economic issue. Why do people want to have most-favored-nation status? Why do big businesses want to have most-favored-nation status? They could still officially sell their products over in China and other countries that do not have most-favored-nation status. The real reason behind this, the underlying reason, if you have most-favored-nation status with China, companies can get, how about it, government guarantees of their investments in this dictatorship. You can have the Export-Import Bank and OPIC and the World Bank and all of these financial institutions, which actually get their money from good old U.S. tazpayers, those taxpayers end up subsidizing, let us say guaranteeing, the loan for somebody who is going to do business in China.

I will give Members one big example. This is mind-boggling. There is a $30 billion public works program that they want to build in China to provide electricity, called the Three Gorges Dam project. We have people in here who said we have to support the Three Gorges Dam project because that means jobs in the United States. The Chinese want us, the Western bankers and American taxpayers, to guarantee these loans to provide the $30 billion to build this big dam project.

What are they going to do with their own $30 billion? The Chinese want to use their own $30 billion to build weapons so that someday, if the United States ever gets in their way, they can take care of our military. They want to spend their money on weapons to destroy people and to bully their neighbors, but they want us to provide the loans and the guarantees for those loans so they can build their great public works project. And what are we getting in return? Caterpillar is going to be able to sell their bulldozers, rather than having Japanese bulldozers down there.

Let me just say this, Mr. Speaker. For those people who think that is a good way to create jobs, would it not be better for us to spend $30 billion and rebuild our own infrastructure and use those bulldozers, those caterpillars, here across the United States to rebuild our drainage systems and our sewer systems that are going kaput, the bridges that are about to fall down? That makes a lot more sense than spending $30 billion to bolster a Communist regime in hopes that they may evolve into more liberal, wonderful, beautiful people, just like the elite that runs our country.

No, we should be thinking about the interests of the American people. That should be the basis of our negotiations. One of our problems is we have been sending the likes of Peewee Herman

over to do our negotiations when we should be using Arnold Schwarzenegger.

One last area in terms of most-favored-nation status. That is the following. It is not just an economic decision. It is not just a strategic decision for the United States in terms of the military. It is also a moral decision that goes to the heart of the United States of America: What do we stand for?

Next week we will recess in order to celebrate the Fourth of July, when our Founding Fathers proclaimed that every individual has certain rights and those rights are granted by God. The Declaration of Independence was not just a declaration that we were no longer going to be under British tyranny, and it was not just a declaration that we would have democracy here. It was a declaration of the rights of the individual, and that no government has legitimate rights unless they receive them from the consent of the governed. It was a proclamation saying America will be a different kind of land, a different kind of country, and we would be a shining beacon of hope to the world and to the oppressed. Wherever they are, they can see there will be hope as long as the United States stands true to its principles.

In this case, that is what we will be discussing, most-favored-nation status, right after we celebrate the Fourth of July. But the human rights violations and the tyranny on mainland China would tell us our Founding Fathers would roll over in their grave if they thought that we would have the same type of relations with this type of vicious dictatorship as we do with other democracies in the world.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], who has been stalwart in the battle for human rights, has cataloged many of the abuses that the people of China have had to endure. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia so he can share with us some of the things that are going in China today.

Mr. WOLF. I will, and I appreciate the gentleman taking out this special order, Mr. Speaker. I think he is absolutely right. This is, whether we like it or not, a fundamental moral issue, perhaps the overriding one internationally that this Congress will have to address.

As the gentleman said with regard to human rights, as we vote on this issue, we should think of several things: There are more slave labor camps in China today than there were in the Soviet Union, and we all remember Solzhenitzen's book, Gulag Archipelago. I was in one of those camps, Perm Camp 35, with the gentleman from New Jersey, CHRIS SMITH. They are very grim places. And yet Members should know, the world and the body should know, that there are more slave labor camps in China than there were in the Soviet Union during the heyday of the Soviet Union.

Second, there are more individuals in those gulags, slave labor camps, logi camps, than there were in the Soviet Union. Also, they make goods, they make supplies, they make socks; they make different items like that for export to the United States, in competition with American workers. As the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] has said many times, we lose more jobs than we gain.

The gentleman from New Jersey and I were in Beijing Prison No. 1, where we saw a number of Tiananmen Square demonstrators working on socks and plastic jelly shoes for export to the United States. They had little golfer insignias on the side of the socks. What the gentleman from California said is true. This is driving American jobs, and it is also, I think, fundamentally a major moral issue: Do we want to purchase the goods made with slave labor out of a gulag camp so we can get a better buy? I think the American people are saying no.

Second, I think there is major fundamental religious persecution going on in China, perhaps more than any other place in the world.

□ 1515

Everyone should know, no one should say I did not know, that is why I voted for MFN. Today, there are Catholic priests and Catholic bishops in jail for worshipping and practicing their religious faith. Some have been in jail for years, not 6 months, not 9 months, but for years. There are also evangelicals who are in jail.

Almost every week Protestant house churches are raided and many times the people are picked up, arrested and sent into the logais and the slave labor camps and the gulags or in prison. so we have numerous, both Catholic priests, Catholic bishops, and Protestant pastors arrested and sent to jail.

We also know, and the gentleman I think mentioned it and knows as well as anyone, Tibet has been plundered by the Communists in China. They have abused and imprisoned and tortured Buddhist monks. They have also done horrendous, horrible things to Buddhist nuns. They have plundered Tibet, so we know what they have done. They are also now in the process of persecuting those of the Moslem faith in certain provinces in China.

So they have gone after the Catholic priests and bishops, they have gone after the Protestant pastors, they have gone after the Buddhist nuns and priests, and now they are going after the Moslems. So from a religious persecution issue, this country is number one in persecuting people.

Third, we know that they sell body parts. When they kill people in their prisons, they line them up, and we have this on film if any Member wants to see it, they line them up, they invite crowds to come in to watch, they put pistols at the back of their heads, and they shoot them, they fall to the ground.

Trucks and ambulances come and take them away. They take them to hospitals and they take their kidneys out and their corneas out for transplantation, for sale to people in the West, $35,000 per kidney. So they have a major business of executing people, taking their corneas out, taking their kidneys out for transplantation.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, are any of these people who are being shot, is there any evidence that they could be just people who are advocating democracy?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I do not know if they are or not. We have pictures of them. It is hard to say why.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. But we do know that people have been executed in China only for opposing the regime?

Mr. WOLF. Yes, we do know that.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. So we know that the Chinese dictatorship is willing to execute someone simply for exercising what we consider to be our rights as citizens and the rights of free people; we know that, and we also know that they are engaged in a ghoulish enterprise of after executing some prisoners, or executing prisoners in general, taking from them their body parts and selling them on the world market?

Mr. WOLF. We know that for a fact, and we have pictures of it, taking place as late as February of this year.

Last, before I get to the last one I would mention, we also know that they were so barbaric that they were trying to sell AK–47's and shoulder missiles to street gangs in L.A., near your area, which would have been used to kill innocent people, and we also know that the People's Liberation Army was behind this and the top leadership of those companies are people who are connected to the leaders in Beijing. I mean they were selling AK–47 weapons, assault weapons and also shoulder missiles that could take a 747 aircraft down coming in at any airport.

Last, let me cover something with regard to human rights. In the 1980's, and I know the gentleman was in the Reagan White House in those days, writing speeches for President Reagan. In the 1980's, the gentleman knows that no Member of Congress would have ever come to the floor of the House, no person in the Reagan administration would have ever gotten up and said that we should have granted MFN to the Soviet Union when Sakharov was under house arrest in Gorky and Scharansky was in perm camp 35. No member of the administration, no Member of Congress on either side would have ever been in support of granting MFN for Russia, and now we see the granting of it for China.

My closing comment is, I would like to read to you a statement by Elena Bonner, who was the wife of Sakharov on the MFN status in China. Her marriage to Sakharov changed Elena's life. She took early retirement as a disabled war veteran to devote herself to Sakharov. She was Sakharov's ambassador to the world at large. She represented him at the 1975 Nobel Peace

ceremony in Oslo. She reported on her visits into Italy and America, was exiled in January 1980. She served as a sole link with Moscow and the West until 1984, when she too was barred from leaving Gorky. In August of 1994 she was tried by a Gorky court, found guilty of anti-Soviet agitation and sentenced to exile. So I will submit her entire bio for the RECORD at this point.

ELENA BONNER—BIOGRAPHY

Elena Bonner was born on February 15, 1923, in Merv, Tadjikistan. She grew up in the restless, cosmopolitan atmosphere of the Hotel Luxe on Gorky Street, which lodged important foreign Communists working in Moscow. Her father, Gevork Alikhanov, was a prominent Armenian Communist and a secretary of the Comintern, the ''general staff of the world revolution.'' Her mother, Ruth Bonner, was born in Siberia in 1900, joined the Communist Party in 1924, and was dedicated to bringing culture to the masses. Elena's childhood sweetheart, Vsevolod Bagritsky, lived only a couple of blocks away. (He was killed at the front in 1942, shortly before his twentieth birthday.)

Elena's life as a Moscow schoolgirl ended abruptly when her father was arrested in May 1937. Ruth moved with her two children to her mother's apartment in Leningrad but did not escape her fate. She was arrested later that year and sentenced to hard labor as the wife of a traitor.

Elena became a proficient survivor. She finished high school in Leningrad, volunteered as a nurse when war broke out, was wounded twice, and was honorably discharged in 1945 as a lieutenant and a disabled veteran. After two years of intensive treatment, the loss of vision caused by her wartime injury was brought under control, and she enrolled in the First Leningrad Medical Institute. After graduation, she worked as a pediatrician, a district doctor, and a freelance author and editor. She married Ivan Semyonov, a classmate from the medical school, and, ignoring warnings that childbearing could endanger her life, gave birth to a daughter, Tatiana, in 1950, and a son, Alexei, in 1956. (Elena and Ivan separated in 1965).

She succeeded in reestablishing contact with her mother as the war was drawing to a close. It was only in 1954, however, that Ruth was exonerated, granted a special pension, and informed that her husband died in confinement sometime in 1939. (It took another 52 years for the truth to be revealed—four years after Ruth passed away, Elena gained access to the KGB files and learned that her father was executed in 1938.) Ruth was also assigned an apartment on Chkalov Street, comfortable by Soviet standards. This apartment became Elena's home and in 1971 it was here that Andrei Sakharov moved in.

Elena paid her respect to the memory of Vsevolod Bagritsky by putting together a book of his diaries, letters, and poems, which was published in 1964. She mingled with the generation of writers and artists who has been inspired by the post-Stalin thaw, but she also helped prisoners and their families. Elena met Andrei Sakharov in October 1970 when both were attending the trial of human rights activities in Kaluga. They got to know each other better in December while defending Jews sentenced to death for attempting an escape from the USSR in a hijacked plane. By August 1971 friendship turned into love, and in January 1972 they formally registered their marriage. The unlikely match between a reserved Russian physicist and a scrappy, streetwise Armenian-Jewish physician endured.

Her marriage to Sakharov changed Elena's life. She took early retirement as a disabled war veteran and devoted herself to Sakharov, serving as his chief of staff and secretary as well as cook and bottle washer. She also became Sakharov's ambassador to the world at large. She represented him at the 1975 Nobel Peace Prize ceremony in Oslo; reported on her visits to Italy, France, and America; and after his January 1980 exile, served as his sole link with Moscow and the West until May 1984, when she too was barred from leaving Gorky. In August 1984, she was tried by a Gorky court, found guilty of ''anti-soviet agitation'' and sentenced to exile. By then she already had a serious heart condition and was in urgent need of surgery.

In 1981 Elena and Andrei went on a successful hungerstrike to secure the right for their daughter-in-law to join her husband, their son Alexei, in the United States. But it took three hungerstrikes by Sakharov, totalling almost 200 days, for Elena to gain permission to travel to US in December 1985 for open heart surgery. She returned to Gorky in June 1986 with six bypasses, to Andrei and to indefinite exile. But a love story deserves a happy ending—on December 15, 1986, a telephone was installed in their Gorky apartment. The next day it rang for the first time, and Mikhail Gorbachev personally asked the Sakharovs to return to Moscow. They arrived at the Chkalov Street apartment on December 23, 1986. The curtain was raised for the next act.

Since Andrei Sakharov's death in December 1989, Elena Bonner has continued the campaign for democracy and human rights in Russia. She joined the defenders of the Russian parliament during the attempted coup of August 1991, and lent her support to Yeltsin during the constitutional crisis of 1993. She writes frequently for the Russian and American press. She has campaigned tirelessly in defense of self-determination for the disputed region of Nagorno-Karabakh and for all the peoples of the former Soviet Union.

Dr. Bonner has published a number of books in the United States and in Russia.

Dr. Bonner has two children and five grandchildren, all of whom live in the United States and whom she comes to visit from Moscow.

But this is what Dr. Bonner said in a letter to me the other day. She said:

JUNE 17, 1996.

I believe it is dangerous to grant the most favored nation status to China, while mass-scale violations of human rights are taking place there, confirmed by many authoritative international human rights organizations.

The United States possesses only one real mechanism for protection of human rights in other countries—granting or not granting such status. There should be no double standards in this issue and there should be no double standards for protection of human rights no matter in which part of the world.

More than 20 years ago Andrei Sakharov has addressed the U.S. Congress with appeal to introduce the Jackson-Vanik amendment and by doing this to confirm commitment of your country to the human rights cause. Today, I dare to warn American legislators against hasty refusal from the Jackson-Vanik amendment. By giving up this amendment, the U.S. Congress, in my mind, is going to lose completely its influence on human rights situations in any part of the world and will practically admit that protection of human rights is no longer a matter of priority and a long-term goal of the Congress and the U.S. people.

ELENA BONNER.

So I think Doctor Elena Bonner has said it and said it well. I will tell the gentleman too, if he looks at the surveys, the American people are overwhelmingly against granting MFN to China. So while it may be a close issue in the Congress and certainly gone, lost in the administration, the American people agree with the position of the gentleman.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. When the American people see their Congressmen over the Fourth of July holiday, it would be actually a good moment to remind the Member of Congress that we should be standing up for what our forefathers believed in, these principles of freedom and individual rights, that this country was going to be better than just some conglomeration of people seeking profit and seeking monetary reward, that we do indeed stand for freedom.

Before the gentleman leaves, I would like to mention one last story on this particular issue. I agree with him wholeheartedly when he says that no one could ever have gotten away during the cold war with suggesting we will make Russia better, this dictatorship in Russia better, by granting most-favored-nation status and transferring all of our technology to Russia. No one would have ever dreamed of that.

Instead, we were strong and we were tough and when Ronald Reagan came in, his tough stand helped end the cold war and bring a greater potential for freedom and peace in the world than anyone had ever dreamed. Well, during that time period, there was a hero of freedom named Natan Scharansky. He was a Jewish man, a dissident in Russia who was a champion of liberty, and he was arrested and thrown into the gulag, and when we say the gulag, we are talking about the harshest of prison conditions that Americans cannot even imagine. There he was, struggling to survive in the gulag and his Communist captors said, all he needed to do is sign this document admitting that you were lying about the repression in the Soviet Union and admitting that you are some kind of a spy or something, and we will let you go, and he refused to do it. All he had to do was sign a piece of paper.

Eventually, his fame spread throughout the world. Here was indeed a man, a lone individual, a champion of freedom standing up against a totalitarian power, and all he had to do to end his suffering was to sign his signature.

Well, eventually we traded him for a Russian spy. We actually sent a Russian spy across a bridge and he went back another way, and when Natan Scharansky came to the United States, he made his way to Washington and to the White House where he met with President Reagan.

As a speech writer for President Reagan, I will never forget that day because when he left the Oval Office, he met with the press corps and the reporters asked him, ''What did you tell President Reagan?'' And Natan Scharansky, this heroic individual,

said, ''I told him not to tone down his speeches,'' not to tone down his speeches. He said, they were the only things. He said, I described for them in the gulag, and he was describing for these reporters how in the gulag, somebody smuggled in little pieces of paper that had Ronald Reagan's words of one of his speeches on it, and he said, as long as I knew that the President of the United States believed in these principles, there was hope, and it gave me the hope to struggle on.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, this is such an important point. Congressman CHRIS SMITH and I visited the gulag that Natan Scharansky was in. The fact is we hollered out that we were Congressmen from the United States and we met with 21 of the men. In fact, we interviewed, on camera, an interview with Natan Scharansky's cell mate and that night, late into the night in the Ural Mountains in this gulag, the men said, and I had forgotten it, but you triggered it, the men said precisely what you said.

We gave the men Bibles and we started to ask them questions. All of the men said they knew of the statements that Ronald Reagan had made, and I do not understand how they got it in there, and it gave them hope and encouragement and by us speaking out, by Ronald Reagan speaking out, they were bold and solid.

The gentleman said to Natan Scharansky, when Natan Scharansky was exchanged, Natan Scharansky was to walk across the Glienicke Bridge in Berlin and the Communists told Natan Scharansky to walk straight. What Scharansky did is he walked zigzag. He walked this way on the bridge and that way on the bridge and that way on the bridge and that way on the bridge, and he denied the Communists for the very reason that you said, because we gave Scharansky and we gave his cell mate and we gave those people hope.

The gentleman is exactly right. If we had the same type of rhetoric coming out of the White House, the language that Ronald Reagan used, we would solve this problem. The Chinese would stop persecuting Christians, stop persecuting priests and ministers and Buddhist monks, and you are exactly right.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. The gentleman would probably be interested in knowing that the day after Scharansky met with Ronald Reagan, I was in the Israeli Embassy at a reception honoring Scharansky, and through the crowed, he was the honored guest, he walked straight toward me and he came up to me and he said, I understand that you write Ronald Reagan's speeches and I said yes, that is true, and he said, I have often wondered who you are.

Well, he knew that some people were behind Ronald Reagan and working with him to try to make sure that we took these bold stands and beat back the bureaucracy and the elitists in every country that would say, oh, do not make moral stands, do not make a stand of morality and a stand for freedom because it will rock the boat. But he knew, ever as a prisoner in the gulag, that I was there and other people were there.

Today it is the same thing. Although they do not know us by name, they know that there are American people everywhere throughout our country who believe in the cause that George Washington talked about on the 4th of July, believe in what Thomas Jefferson was talking about and James Madison and our Founding Fathers when they started a country on a Declaration of Independence and a declaration that talked about the individual rights that are a gift of God to all people.

Mr. WOLF. Can the gentleman imagine the feeling that would roll through China if they found out that the United States House of Representatives, the people's body, voted to deny them MFN? Can you imagine how the dissidents would feel? Can you imagine how the prisoners in the gulags in China would feel?

The gentleman is exactly right. I hope that we defeat MFN when it comes here. I know they are going to get MFN because President Clinton is going to give it to them, but if we defeat it, the gentleman is right, the message that we will send through China to the dissidents will be the same message of the 1980s.

Do you remember the rally that was held on the lawn from the Capitol down to the Washington Monument on that Sunday for those of the Jewish faith who had been persecuted? Do you remember the hundreds of thousands that came? If we could not that for those who are suffering in China, can you imagine the difference that it would make?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If we had made that stand a few years ago instead of heeding those naysayers who said, do not let the moral stand, we are going to evolve China away, rather than making a tough stand, we would probably right now be voting to grant most-favored-nation status to a new and more democratic China.

Mr. WOLF. And I would be voting for it and the gentleman would be voting for it and we would be pushing trade.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. That is correct. I thank the gentleman very much, and I appreciate his jointing me.

The second issue that I would like to discuss today is also an issue that deals with trade, interestingly enough, and the well-being of the American people and the relationship with others, because I believe what is pushing our most-favored-nation status with China at the expense of the American people is the same thing that is motivating us to destroy the American patent system.

I would like to ask a question. What was one of the first things that Bill Clinton did after becoming elected President? The answer is, he appointed Bruce Lehman as Commissioner of the Patent and Trademark Office.

□ 1530

What was one of the first things that Bruce Lehman did when he became head of that office? He hightailed it to Japan and met and reached an agreement with—this is an agreement that almost nobody knows about outside a few people in Congress—Mr. Wataru Asou, the commissioner of the Japanese patent office. They had a meeting with Mr. Lehman.

That is right. These two unelected officials entered into an agreement which, if it holds, could change the face of the American economy as we know it. It could effectively remove America, and I predict will effectively remove America, from our economic predominance in the world.

What is the intent of this agreement that I am talking about? Who knows about this hushed-up agreement between the head of the patent office in Japan and the Patent Office in the United States?

The purpose of this agreement is to harmonize the American patent system to the Japanese system. Their intent is to take the best patent system in the world, that of the United States of America, the patent system that has offered the strongest patent protection of any country in the world, and in the name of global and Japanese harmonization of law, convert it into a mirror image of a system in Japan that has stifled innovation and creativity and kept the Japanese people under the heel of their economic elite.

The Japanese system benefits large conglomerates. They crush any creative attempts by individual inventors. The Japanese system, which they are now trying—and, remember this, they want our law to be exactly like the Japanese law, and they are moving to change it, to superimpose that law on us—the Japanese system is so slow that it takes many years to grant a patent at great expense of the applicant.

Turning abuse into injury, the Japanese publish every patent application in 18 months. By the time the patent is issued, years later, a phenomenon known as patent flooding has already occurred.

What is patent flooding? We are going to know all about that, because we are changing our law to be exactly like their law. That is when patents very similar to the original idea flood the patent office, slowing the whole process and rendering the original application almost valueless, unless of course it is a huge corporation or a fabulously wealthy inventor who can defend himself. Even then it makes the process much more expensive.

Where did the patent flooders get the information, in Japan to flood the patent office? The information, by the way, was just in the inventor's original patent application that had to be published after 18 months.

By the way, under our system traditionally when you file for a patent, until you are granted that patent, it is

a secret. Nobody knows. Thus an inventor has the incentive to invent things and to make an application for a patent and it is protected.

Americans have always been the innovators of the world because we have had this system. Our patent system supports innovation. The Japanese, however, have been copiers and their patent system supports copying. The proof of this, and it is glaring, the United States has 175 of the world's Nobel laureates in science and technology. Japan has just five.

Why would we want to change our system to make it more like their system? Global harmonization is the answer. That is what we are being told, although there are other excuses, but that is the main one, that we need to globalize all the rules of the game so we can have a global economy, and gutting the American patent system is the first step towards globalizing us with the rest of the world.

Does it makes sense to everyone that we should just globalize our economy, even if it means gutting rights that have been inbred into our system for 200 years, that our Founding Fathers thought were sacrosanct? First let us recognize that the strongest advocates of a global market are not the advocates of free markets at home. Once the authority to regulate a global market is empowered, it will be too late.

We do not appreciate most of the important things in our lives until we are on the verge of losing them. Americans will find that freedom in the economic arena has everything to do with controlling one's own destiny and determining one's own life. But the regulators of this global market on a worldwide scale will have little or no regard for the desires of ordinary Americans.

The global market will be regulated by a new set of managers. It will be the arrogance of officialdom times 10. Huge multinational corporations may be able to thrive in such an environment, but individual citizens and small business will not. They will see what they have considered their rights as an American evaporate.

There are those who believe that globalizing is good for America, and we understand that participation in the world trading system is essential for our economic well-being. I certainly believe in trade. As I say, I believe in free trade between free people. But we cannot sacrifice the rights of our people or especially destroy our innovative process to achieve this goal.

What has been the factor that has given America the strength in the economic marketplace to maintain a high standard of living for our people even though many people overseas receive much less money in pay? It has been our technological genius and our innovation. That is what has permitted us to succeed and our people to prosper. What is being proposed is the sacrifice of the rights of Americans, the sacrifice of our future, of the standard of living of our people, all in the name of globalism and harmonization.

Megabusiness, however, has a different approach. The cartels have no loyalty to the American people, and that is us. We are talking about us here. Those huge multinational conglomerates are profitmotivated and that is it. They now have a dream that they can maximize profits throughout the world and help trade flow through a global economy. The first step, however, in achieving that is putting the American people in their place. That means a lower standard of living, that means fewer rights, that means the individual no longer has the protections that the individual has had in the past. Phase one of this assault on America is the assault on America's technological rights because that is what has given us as Americans our leverage, our ability to ensure our freedom and to build a high standard of living for our people. The first step in this organized strategy to destroy our patent system was snuck into the GATT implementation legislation we passed about a year and a half ago. We accepted a fast-track system to pass the GATT implementation legislation because we were promised that nothing would be put into this legislation except that which was mandated by the GATT agreement itself. However, dramatic changes in the patent term were snuck into that legislation even though the position on patents in GATT just simply suggested that the patent term should be no less than 20 years from date of filing, which means, if one reads that, that we need not change America's current patent system. But they put the massive change—that may seem hard to understand but it will have incredible results—into the GATT implementation legislation. What did it do? Basically it eliminated the 17-year guaranteed patent term.

A patent term, let me note, has been a right. A guaranteed number of years as a patent term has been the right of Americans since 1790, since the establishment of our Constitution. A patent office is actually in our Constitution. The implementing legislation created an uncertain patent term. We then took a guaranteed patent term and exchanged it in that implementation legislation for an uncertain patent term which dates 20 years from the date of application. That means, in the new system, and, by the way, the new system is nothing more than the Japanese system superimposed on us. It is much different than our past system and it is hard to understand but under the new code, the day the inventor files for a patent, 20 years later, his time is up. He has no more rights, he or she has no more rights to ownership of that patent. If it took 10 years for a patent to be issued in the past, the inventor still had a guaranteed term of 17 years. Under the new system, however, if it takes 10 years for a patent to issue, half of the inventor's patent term has been eaten up, it is gone, he or she will never get it back, and the clock continues to tick against the inventor, not against the bureaucracy. Every second that ticks is against the inventor. Anyone who has studied the process knows that it is not unusual for a breakthrough technology, and these are the innovations that changed the world, innovations like the airplane and the microprocessor and many others. I will explain a couple of those in a moment.

Polyurethane plastic, by the way, which has changed our life, it took 33 years for the inventor to receive his patent. It took 17 years for the microprocessor and 21 years for the laser to receive their patent. These patents will determine the flow of tens of billions, if not hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of wealth. By making sure that they now receive almost no protection, because the new system would offer them almost no protection, it has changed the flow of wealth in the world.

What does it mean when the clock is ticking against the inventor? It means the bureaucracy and special interests have leverage on the inventor, because he wants some reward for his creative invention.

During the negotiations which are part of the patent granting process, the inventor, just like in Japan, will end up being ground down because now he or she is vulnerable. If a patent can be delayed, what does it mean? If they can delay the patent or shorten the time when the patent is actually in effect because he now only has half of his patent term because the rest has been eaten away, it means that those royalties that were once going into the bank accounts of American inventors, royalties from basically technologies that were created by Americans, those royalties will now be in the bank accounts of huge domestic and multinational corporations. These people will not be able to control their technology. To claim stolen royalties or to reclaim control over one's technology after these huge corporate and multinational interests have taken the technology, the individual American will have to pay lawyers and legal specialists to go to court.

Have you got that? That is the little inventor in the United States versus Toshiba. Where do you think we are going to get on that? The little guy gets ground down, just like the Japanese people have been ground down over the years, now those same corporate interests will be here in our country grinding down our people. The Wright Brothers will be smashed by the Toshibas and the Sonys of the world and the aerospace workers that should be producing the aerospace technologies of the future may well not be American aerospace workers. Our people will be impoverished.

This system, which our Patent Commissioner Bruce Lehman wants American law to emulate, has ill-served the Japanese people. Little, if any, innovation is born in Japan and few, if any, inventions start there. The Japanese, as I say, are rightfully known as copiers and improvers, and that is fine,

they do a good job at that, but they are not innovators and inventors. Their laws, which Bruce Lehman wants America to emulate, have permitted powerful business conglomerates to run roughshod over their people. Their people have been beaten down. Anyone who raises their head gets beaten down over there. Now those same interests will have that same kind of leverage over American inventors. After successfully beginning this harmonization through the legislative maneuver which, as I said, went through the GATT implementation legislation, basically they got step No. 1, which is eliminating the guaranteed patent term for American inventors.

But, now, we see step No. 2. Step No. 2 happens to be authored, it is H.R. 3460, the Moorhead-Schroeder Patent Act which I call the Steal American Technologies Act. What this legislation does is finish the job of harmonizing our law like that of Japan's. In our country, the rights of the individual are paramount and these patent laws were meant to protect individual property rights. Basically, these individual property rights would be respected by our Government just as other property rights, of small farmers and businessmen and others who own property in our country, and this system of private property for the individual has worked well. We believe it is through individual endeavor and personal responsibility that someone prospers and when individuals as a whole population act in that way, the whole society prospers. Lehman's approach treats individuals as secondary, sort of as ants in a collective hole who, if they insist on rights for themselves, will be crushed.

□ 1545

Of course, those trying to challenge our system will never admit this. The change is coming not as part of a major debate in our democratic process, but I believe these changes are coming, they are trying to sneak these changes through, hoping that none of us will never understand the complexities of patent law. Well, when one can force the advocates of these patent changes to engage, they claim their goal is not destroying the American traditional patent system, but instead they are going to solve a problem which they call, well, it is called the submarine patent problem. What is that? They believe some inventors, certainly a few self-serving inventors, may have been able to elongate the process in which their patent application was being considered; thus, if they put off the issuing date of their patent, they will have a guaranteed 17 years of patent. That means that some inventors will enjoy some royalty benefits in the outyears when, you know, if they had not gamed the system, they would have been receiving those royalties in the outyears. They would be receiving them in the in-years and perhaps after a length of time, certain technologies are more valuable.

Well, making things worse, according to the other side, let us say someone games the system for 10 years. Some other companies may have decided to use that technology, which they have discovered independently, in some of their own products and then when the submariner finally allows his patent to be issued, well, then those other companies have to pay that submarine patenter a certain royalty.

Now, this is all very confusing. But the fact is we are talking about less than 1 percent of all patents where people are actually able just to prevent their patent, through gaming the process, from being issued right away. And I agree, that is not something we should tolerate, but it is not something that will in any way justify, basically, the elimination of the guaranteed patent term and the obliteration of the patent system in the United States and replacing it with a Japanese system.

The vast majority of all patent applicants, more than 99 percent, are doing everything in their power to get their patent issued. They are not submariners. They beg, they plead, please issue my patent, because that is when they know they can start earning their rewards. And if they delay, what is going to happen? They know if they delay their patent being issued, new technologies might come up and make their patent worthless. But there are a few submarine patenters, and they are a minuscule part of the system, and this problem can and will be dealt with and should be dealt with by patent examiners and by using the patent system as it is today, rather than eliminating the patent system and eliminating the guaranteed rights of Americans.

My bill, in fact, includes a provision that we publish the application of any inventor who uses a continuance to intentionally delay the process. Over and over again in the year and a half that I have pushed this issue, I have offered to put many changes into law that will curb submarine patents as long as those changes did not eliminate the guaranteed patent term. But the other side never would come up with a suggestion except, oh, I am sorry, this is the problem, so we have to eliminate the guaranteed patent term. I was willing to compromise in any way just so long as you get those submarine patenters. There are a few of them out there.

You know, sometimes when someone is unwilling to compromise and make a change like that, you maybe get the feeling that perhaps his real target was eliminating the guaranteed patent term and not correcting some minor problem, the submarine patent. Well, interestingly enough, there is a system in place in the Patent Office called the patent application and monitoring system, the P-A-L-M, the PALM system, which can and does print out the status of all pending applications in the Patent Office monthly, and if a patent has an unusual term of waiting, if an application is judged to be special by the Commissioner, he has the right to publish the application at any time. And this is in existing law. Thus it is already possible to solve the submarine patent. It is already solved. But this is being used as an excuse to destroy the guaranteed patent term in the United States of America.

Well, history will judge their motives, but those claiming to end the submarine patent as their goal have refused every other method except eliminating the guaranteed patent term.

By the way, this move to harmonize our laws with Japan happened long before anyone had ever heard of the word ''submarine'' patent and this whole idea of eliminating the guaranteed patent was part of that harmonization process.

During the debate, Mr. Lehman has used the bogeyman of the submarine patents, and when we have checked his figures, we have found that many of the patents he claimed to be submarine patents, again, this is the excuse they are using to destroy our patent system, when we checked out the submarine patents, we found many of them had not been issued because the Defense Department had said this is a security risk, we have to keep these particular technologies secret.

You can imagine what secrets will be made available to America's enemies if we just publish all of our patent applications after 18 months.

My bill, H.R. 359, would restore the guaranteed patent term of 17 years and facilitate the action against those who are trying to manipulate the system and delay the issuance of their patent. I am offering this as a substitute to H.R. 3460, a bill which, as I say, is the next step in totally harmonizing our law with Japan. H.R. 3460, which I call the Steal American Technologies Act, better than anything else demonstrates what really is going on because it is understandable and its goals are easy for regular working people to understant what is happening.

One of the provisions was introduced last year under a bill entitled the ''Patent Application Publication Act.'' This bill is now part of H.R. 3460 and is titled ''Early Publication of Patent Applications.'' The title is self-explanatory. That provision in this bill—hold on to your hats—mandates that after 18 months every American patent application, just like in Japan, whether it has been issued or not, will be published for the entire world to see. Every thief, every brigand, every pirate, every multinational corporation, every Asian copycat will be handed the details of every patent application. Our newest and most creative ideas will be outlined for them, for the thieves of the world, even before the patent has been issued to the American citizen.

It is an invitation for every thief in the world to steal American technology. Lines will form at the copy machines and the fax machines to get this information out to America's worst enemies and our fiercest competitors.

H.R. 3460 is entitled as I say, the ''Moorhead-Schroeder Patent Act.'' The author of the bill suggests that we need not worry about an abrupt early publication of patent applications if domestic or foreign or multinational corporations steal the ideas; the patent applicants, once he or she gets the patent issued, can sue the pirates. Like I say, it is Toshiba versus John Q. American citizen. The price tag on this simple infringement suit, by the way, is a quarter of a million dollars, a quarter of a million dollars for just an uncomplicated suit. Our citizens who will be up against Toshiba, Sony, and even the Chinese People's Liberation Army, which is engaged in stealing our technology.

As this bill was being passed through subcommittee, I was in my office with the president of a medium-sized solar energy corporation. When I asked what would happen if this provision became law, he clenched his fist and angrily predicted his Asian competitors would be manufacturing his new technology before his patent was issued, and they would use the profit from selling his new technology to defeat any court challenge that they had and destroy his company. On top of that, his overseas competitors would have a further advantage in the fact that they would never have had to invest in research and development to get the new technology they were benefiting from.

This is a nightmare that faces every small- and medium-sized company. Anyone who cannot afford a stable of expensive lawyers is at the mercy of the worst thieves of the world. The big guys have the contacts overseas and the money to divert and deter such thievery, but it is open season on the little guys, on the average Americans. Of course, we will do everything we can to prevent this bill, but what is their goal?

They say we have to do everything, we have to go, we have to destroy the American patent system, we have to make all of our technological secrets known to the world in order to protect us from submarine patents. Because a few people want to elongate the system on their patent and they will get 5 or 10 years more protection here, a few Americans, so we have to open up our system to this type of massive theft. I would suggest that maybe we should think about the arguments about the submarine patent argument.

What they are telling us, it is sort of like you are going in to your doctor and saying, doctor, I got a hang nail here on this toe and it is really hurting me. The doctor says, I really am opposed to hang nails. Those hang nails are terrible and we are going to solve your problem. We are going to cut your leg off, we are going to amputate your leg.

No, no, doctor, please. I just got this little hang nail down here. He says, I bleed for you, and he goes into a big lecture on hang nails, and at the end of it he says, well, we are going to cut your leg off. Well, if your doctor is telling you that to cure a hang nail, that he is going to amputate your leg, I think you better question your doctor's motives or maybe your doctor's sanity if he is trying to do that on you.

Another major provision in H.R. 3460, it is the abolition of the Patent Office. That is right, H.R. 3460, the Steal American Technologies Act, will abolish America's Patent Office. Now, it is in our Constitution. Ben Franklin saw to that. Thomas Jefferson saw to that. It has played a vital role in protecting our property rights ever since then, yet now H.R. 3460 will separate the Patent Office from our Government, limiting congressional oversight. That means those of us who have been elected to represent the interest of the people will not have the same oversight after the Moorhead-Schroeder Act passes. It will remake the Patent Office into sort of a corporate-like private corporation-government corporation, sort of like the post office.

Now, I am in favor of privatizing services when government does not have to do that, but this is a core function of our Federal Government. Protecting the rights of our people as we head into an era of technology, that is even more important. But we need the government to make sure of that. Who is there to determine and protect the intellectual property rights of our people? That is their core function all the way back since 1784.

Well, along with corporatizing and taking away our congressional oversight, the civil service protection for our patent examiners will be stripped from them. It is like stripping the judge's robes off of him, and basically the patent examiners make judicial decisions that will affect billions of dollars worth of ownership in our society. It is the quasi-judicial decisions, and under this bill, they are not going to have any more civil service protection. It opens up our system to outside influences and to corruption that we have never had before. Taking away the civil service protection is a travesty, and these people who work at the Patent Office try their best, and even when they are protected, it is a hard job.

If our Patent Office is corporatized, the head of the Patent Office, Bruce Lehman, Mr. Harmonize Our Laws With Japan, can make the changes he and his board of directors want with limited congressional scrutiny and recourse. Thus, in the coming era of technology and creativity, we basically will be decoupling the protection of patent rights from our Government, cutting off this congressional oversight, and leaving it in the hands of an autonomous board of unelected officials.

Mr. Speaker, who is going to be on that board? Whose special interests will be represented on that board overseeing the decisions as to who owns what technology in the future? Maybe they won't even be people who have allegiance to the United States, who knows. But they will be making the decisions, and we do not know who they are.

H.R. 3460, the Steal American Technologies Act, must be defeated. My bill, H.R. 359, the Patent Rights Restoration Act, can be substituted in its place when it comes to the floor of Congress for a vote. The choice is our choice as the American people, as Members of Congress. It is H.R. 3460, the Moorhead-Schroeder Patent Act or the Rohrabacher substitute. One might ask why has a bill that is so obviously detrimental to America's interests, why has it gone this far? First and foremost, and this is a problem we talked about earlier, our big businesses have bought off on the idea of a world economy, and if harmonizing our patent rights is part of that deal with a global economy and even if our foreign competitors renege later, we must change our laws now as a sign of good faith to get everybody working together. This mindset is a great threat to the well-being of the American people.

Second, let me say these huge corporations have enormous influence on Members of Congress. Your biggest corporation in your district comes to see you, the president of that corporation, you listen to that head of that corporation. But these corporate leaders are not representing the interests of their own working people, much less the greater constituency of the people of the United States. These corporate leaders may have good hearts and may be well intended, but they are wrong headed when it comes to globalization. Their loyalty should be in the long term with the people of the United States. Instead, what we find here are people who basically bought into an idea, we are going to create a whole new world, and it is going to be a more perfect world where commerce is flowing.

Watch out, Mr. and Mrs. America, when you run into somebody who is going to change the whole world and make it so much better, even at the expense of the American people and our rights. That is the threat we face today, and right after the Fourth of July when this bill comes to the floor, H.R. 3460, the Steal American Technologies Act, has to be defeated and the Rohrabacher substitute should take its place.

□ 1600

ECO-SANITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FUNDERBURK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well of the House here to talk about the environment. I think as the election process starts this year, we are going to hear many elected officials talk about the environment and they will say one party is destroying

the environment and the other party will say we are not destroying the environment. One party will talk about its record and the other party will talk about its record. So I thought it would be good to put in perspective some of the recent literature on eco-sanity, is what I call it, the ability to talk about the environment in terms of common sense.

Most of what I will be talking about today, Mr. Speaker, comes from a book by that exact title, ''Eco-Sanity: A Common-Sense Guide to Environmentalism,'' published by the Heartland Institute. The authors are Joseph Bast, Peter Hill, and Richard Rue.

Now, one of the questions a lot of people ask, particularly back in the district, is can we not spend more Government money to solve this problem? Why can the Government not protect the environment and why can the Government not be the sole provider of this protection?

Well, as many of you know, in 1962 there was a book published called ''The Silent Spring.'' That is roughly 34 years ago, and that started the environmental movement. Until that point we have always relied upon the Government to stop pollution, to safeguard human health, and to protect the wildlife, and we have always thought, well, why can we not just spend more money so that we can protect the environment?

Well, if we go about giving immunizations, as we generally do; if we look at the cost per deaths averted because of this, it might be for diphtheria, $87, cost per death avoided. But, when we start to move up the chain here, for example, improving traffic signs, that is roughly $21,000 cost per death averted. Let us move a little higher up and go to breast cancer screening. That is $160,000 cost per death averted. But then if we go to the hazardous waste land disposal ban, that is roughly $4.2 billion. Now, that is pretty expensive for the cost per one death.

Now, we can move even further up and we go to hazardous waste listing for wood preserving chemicals. Do you know what that cost, Mr. Speaker, to avert one death. That would cost $5.7 trillion. So you can see the Government cannot be expected to stop all environmental problems. So we must come up with a solution, and that is what Republicans try to do.

So heavy is this reliance that many environmentalists measure the movement's progress by the strictness of Government-enforced air and water pollution standards, the amount of land placed under Government control, and the number of plants and animals given protected status under the Government-enforced Endangered Species Act. Is that the criteria we want to use, particularly in light of some of these astronomical figures that we see now in this book to try to prevent one death and how much cost the Government will have to spend?

Remember, Mr. Speaker, when we do that we have to go out and tax the American public to do this. So is there another way? Is there another sound, commonsense approach here that we can get to solve this problem? I think there is and this is what brought me to the House floor today. I believe that there is a way to protect the environment and to do it without huge enormous litigation costs, without a huge amount of Government-run breaucracies.

In fact, I do not think we have to solve the problem by another bureaucratic Government agency. It is unlikely, for example, that reduction in air and water pollution would have occurred as quickly in the absence of Government regulations, and I think that is true, to a certain extent Government is required, or for landfill safety. But these victories often came at much too high a price.

As I mentioned earlier, billions were spent on litigation, footdragging, focusing on the wrong problem. Behind these victories, too, were conspicuous failures. Let us not forget this. Below-cost logging sales, farm and ranching subsidies, Superfund.

How many of us have not been on the House floor to talk about the huge amount of litigation involved with Superfund, and yet we have still so many sites around the United States that are still clogged with these toxic chemicals. I have one in my district. We spent so much money and put up a huge trust fund and most of the money has gone for litigation.

Many feel that the Endangered Species Act has not worked to the benefit of all of us. In fact, when you lay off 30,000 people for one endangered species, you have to question is there some way to solve this problem without more Government bureaucracy. And that is what I am here to say; that we can offer a way. Through the markets, through incentives, through property owner rights enforcement, and by making choices, we can move forward through the channel of politics to results where environmental protection is provided for all our citizens.

This leads me to really the main reason I came on the House floor, is to talk about the rules for eco-sanity. The biggest barrier to further improvements in the environment quality is not a lack of money, even though you hear many people on this side of the aisle saying we need to spend more and more money. In fact, the President of the United States has said we need to spend vast amounts, more money to improve the environment.

Spending on environmental protection in the United States is greater both in dollar terms and as a percentage of gross domestic product than it has ever been before, also considerably higher than spending in many other countries. Our biggest problem is that it is in the politics. We think we have good men in the White House, both Republicans and Democrats. We have good people on the House floor. So we really cannot say that it is any one individual or perhaps any one type of committee or subcommittee or administration.

What then is the biggest barrier to improving environmental protection? Mr. Speaker, I think it is the environmental movement itself. More specifically, I believe that the lack of understanding and critical thinking on the part of most environmentalists has compromised the movement's ability to be an effective force for real true environmental protection.

Many environmentalists do not think clearly about the issues, relying instead on environmental organizations to do their thinking for them. This trust has been rewarded with campaigns against crises that do not exist and supporting policies that are clumsy, expensive, and sometimes counterproductive.

Similarly, environmentalists have said let the Government do it, and then they fail to pay attention to what the Government actually does. A closer look reveals the Government's record on the environment is a poor one, and that Government often suffers from perverse incentive structures and information blackouts that render it unreliably an ally of the movement.

So I wish to put into the RECORD some of these rules for eco-sanity, which I think is a little bit beyond the popular wisdom on some of the issues, and I think there has been a disconnect by the movement on some of these things that Republicans have done in Congress, and particularly when we try to relax some of the rules and regulations that cities and small towns have so that they can actually inspect for the toxic waste materials that are in their water instead of doing the entire EPA list. This list is so extensive that they have very little money left to really try to identify the toxic waste that is in that particular community, which is indigenous to that community.

So we need to look at some way to equip ourselves to understand if we have a problem here and rules of critical thinking. So with the help of this book I will put into the RECORD the first rule of critical thinking in the eco-sanity debate.

The first one, Mr. Speaker, is correlation is not causation. Now, this sounds a little complicated, but let us take it a little further. Correlation means that two things tend to happen at the same time. Causation means one thing is known to cause another thing. Just because two things happen at the same time does not mean one is causing the other. We need proof, including a reasonable theory, showing the path by which one thing causes another to occur.

Mr. Speaker, these are many environmental scares, including global warming. Remember now last winter we had the most severe winter we have had in Washington, DC, in many years. There

has been so much talk about electromagnetic fields and dioxin. They resulted in the correlation of two things which are mistaken. To avoid future errors we need to challenge people who rely on correlations to prove that one thing is actually causing another thing to happen.

The second rule of critical thinking for eco-sanity is not everything can be explained. The truth is in 1994 that the causes of most specific cases of cancer, miscarriage, and child deformity in the United States are unexplained. We have no idea why it occurs. We simply do not know whether a specific case of brain cancer, for example, is due to a genetic condition, nutrition, alcohol, or drug abuse, and we can go round and round in circles and pointing the blame and asking for more Government regulations and more spending, but not everything can be explained. We have to recognize that fact.

While we should sympathize with the victims of these afflictions, we should not confuse them with experts on the cause of these illnesses. A victim's guess is no more reliable and maybe less reliable than the guesses of many other nonexperts. Someday the work of all these professionals and other scientists may produce the answers we seek, but, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that day has yet arrived. So the second rule of critical thinking is not everything can be explained.

No. 3, trends cannot predict the future. What I as an individual do today, lots of times the environmentalists will project that out and that might not be right. During the 1970's global temperatures fell several years in a row, and, remember, experts like Dr. Steven Schneider predicted a new ice age. Well, during the 1980's temperatures rose several years in a row and the experts, including Mr. Schneider, predicted catastrophic global warming.

So, first of all, we had the ice age that was predicted in the 1970's, and then we had this global warming where we are going to have the polar caps melt, and, of course, half of North America would be under the water. And they predicted this based upon predicting the future and certain trends. The cold winter of this year, and, of course, the cold winter of 1993–94 prompted Time Magazine, think about this, Time Magazine and some scientists warned of an approaching ice age.

These predictions, along with the prediction of a population explosion and eventual resource depletion, were wrong because they were based upon projection of past trends. And, in fact, the population in the United States has more or less normalized. It is not going up at the projection many people said. So at this point trends cannot necessarily predict the future.

The fourth rule of critical thinking and rules for eco-sanity are facts count for more than opinions. Now that might sound a little strange but it is the truth. A person with the loudest voice sometimes is heard above everybody else, or he or she might have the most controversial opinion. That person gets the attention on the 6 o'clock news. This is certainly true in the environmentalist movement where there are claims of impending environmental issues.

A few numbers tell us more than 1,000 pictures. For example, the destruction of the world's rain forests changed from a crisis to a manageable problem once we recognized that rain forests are being diminished at a rate of well under 1 percent a year. Similarly, plastic containers moved to the bottom of our agenda when we learned they constitute less than 1.5 percent of the solid waste in a typical landfill. Yes, we all have heard about the plastic containers.

No. 5 rule for eco-sanity is do not forget the past. All common sense things here, Mr. Speaker. During the 1970's many prominent environmentalists predicted an energy crisis, energy crisis in the 1980's and energy crisis in the 1990's and this huge population explosion. Well, some 25 years later oil reserves have grown and population growth is slowing.

Ronald Bailey, a scientist commenting on Paul Erlich and Lester Brown, the environmentalists, say quote,

> One reason such apocalyptic abuses thrive is that the public has no longer-term memory. People are unlikely to remember that a doomster made a dire prediction 20 years ago that has since proved absolutely false.

Bailey is right. We need to remember yesterday's false alarms and who sounded them if we are to respond correctly to future calls to action. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, here in Congress we should start keeping track of all these doomsters and all these predictions from the people who say we will have an energy crisis or a population explosion, to all these different problems that they talk about.

No. 6 in the rule of eco-sanity: We can never avoid risk completely. And this is one of the things that Republicans are trying to say, is we have choices. There can never be an absolutely pure, theoretically, absolutely safe situation. Everything we do carriers with it a risk. When I came up to Washington on the airplane it carried a risk. When I drove over here or when I walk on the curb there is a risk; even common activities such as a bath, you can drown; crossing a street, being hit by a car. Seemingly harmless things like balloons and toothpicks sometimes can kill people.

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as a product, decision, or action that carries no risk whatsoever. So when someone tells us hold on, there may be a risk that a chemical, nuclear plant, or landfill will endanger our health, we should not be frightened. Instead we should calmly ask, how much risk is there? If the risk is unknown, we should wait until reliable evidence is available for us to estimate the risk. If the risk is 1 in a million, the level of risk often found for things like incinerator fumes and pesticides, it may not be worth attempting to reduce it or spending enormous amounts of government money or setting up another government bureaucracy to do so. It may be a case to study and maybe we can find other ways, but in the end it may not be worth the cost to attempt to stop it any further.

Keep in mind, that is one in a million risk. Keep in mind that the risk of drowning is 16 in a million. So you have a chance or, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the risk of drowning is 16 in a million whereas the risk from pesticide is 1 in a million.

How about dying in an accident in the home; that is 90 in a million or dying in an automobile accident is 192 in a million, greatly exceeds the alleged environmental risk being decried by some organizations. So if you keep those statistics in mind, you realize that we do not have to set up another government bureaucracy just to handle some of these things because 1 in a million can be a very low risk.

The last rule for ecosanity is rule No. 7, we have to make choices. We cannot buy two items in the grocery store with the same amount of money. We have to choose one or the other. The same, Mr. Speaker, is true of how we clean the environment. We have to choose among many different ways to do it. We cannot do everything at once, because trying to do so would be extremely wasteful, unnecessarily injure many people, and probably produce unintended consequences that harm the environment.

Instead we must apply the same prudence that we apply to other parts of our lives, because the law of diminishing returns, a zero discharge policy would cost huge, huge sums of money and produce very little benefit. That, on this side of the aisle, we are trying to do, to understand the zero discharge, to understand what amount of moneys are required, what is at risk, and what benefit will be produced.

We must, and here is the key word, Mr. Speaker, we must prioritize threats to the environment and find efficient ways to address these threats. The more carefully we do these, the more threats we will be able to successfully address.

The importance of environmental issues does not somehow exempt them from this discipline. In fact, their importance makes careful planning and efficiency all the more necessary.

I would conclude by saying, we on this side of the aisle are trying to bring a new idea to the environmental movement. We have had 36 years of more Government spending, more Government bureaucracies and at this point we realize there is a way to solve this without taxing the American people. That way is, of course, to bring some semblance to this environmental debate with ecosanity. Ecosanity is basically going to help us understand how

to attack these problems and what in the end would be the best thing, best way to solve the problem.

I would conclude by pointing out that if people own a property, that leads to better stewardship. We tend to take better care of things we own than things we rent or borrow. And if the Government and local community would enforce some of the already existing laws on the books, we should be able to bring the ownership and better stewardship and government compliance all together. Because in the end, incentives are better than commands. People are more apt to do things if you give them incentives rather than commands out of Washington. We think that through ownership and incentives, pollution problems can be reduced and we should clearly define the rights of property owners, clearly define what the Government is supposed to enforce and not have this vague set of books where the rules and enforcement are so vague that the actual citizen has no idea how to comply with the rules.

I think the rules to air, water, and wildlife can be defined and I think they can be enforced so when you bring in the clear definition of these rules, you bring in the idea of ownership being better stewardship; incentives are better than command, I think pollution can, in the end, be diminished.

Also we need to understand that when you set up government programs, they suffer in themselves. They are like a black hole. They require more money and sometimes the Government will act with improper knowledge. If we abide by a set of rules for ecosanity, I think we can prevent that.

Also I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes Government subsidies cause waste. When you have the Government involved spending this money, it sometimes creates less efficiency and leads to greater pollution because in the end if you do not have the efficiency, you cannot have less pollution. Of course, I would conclude by saying the media gives false alarms by extensive publicity, as I point out. A good example is in the area of the energy crisis as well as talking about overpopulation. So all of us need to be aware of stories that come out of the media when, in fact, if we obey these seven rules of ecosanity, we can have a better understanding how to cope. We need to understand and not react out of fear. Mr. Speaker here is a commonsense agenda for further protecting and improving the environment.

TERMINATION OF SUSPENSIONS UNDER FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT WITH RESPECT TO ISSUANCE OF LICENSES TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–236)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FUNDERBURK) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by Section 902(b)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (P.L. 101–246) (''the Act''), and as President of the United States, I hereby report to Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States to terminate the suspensions under section 902(a) of the Act with respect to the issuance of licenses for defense article exports to the People's Republic of China and the export of U.S.-origin satellites, insofar as such restrictions pertain to the Hughes Asia Pacific Mobile Telecommunications project. License requirements remain in place for these exports and require review and approval on a case-by-case basis by the United States Government.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 23, 1996.*

REPORT ON REVISED DEFERRAL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–237)

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 Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral of budgetary resources, totaling $7.4 million. The deferral affects the Social Security Administration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 24, 1996.*

Contents of Special Message

[In thousands of dollars]

Deferral No. and Item	*Budgetary resources*
D96–2A—Social Security Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses	7,365
Total, deferral	7,365

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT—REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 1014(c) OF PUBLIC LAW 93–344

This report updates Deferral No. D96–2, which was transmitted to Congress on October 19, 1995.

This revision increases by $44,285 the previous deferral of $7,320,543 in the Limitation on administrative expenses, Social Security Administration, resulting in a total deferral of $7,364,828. This increase results from the deferral of additional carryover of funds from FY 1995 that cannot be used in FY 1996.

DEFERRAL OF BUDGET AUTHORITY

REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 1013 OF P.L. 93–344

Agency: Department of Health and Human Services.

Bureau: Social Security Administration.

Appropriation title and symbol: Limitation on administrative expenses [1] 75X8704.

OMB identification code: 20–8007–0–7–651.

Grant program: No.

Type of account or fund: No-Year.

New budget authority	[2] 167,000,000
Other budgetary resources	[2] 261,623,563
Total budgetary resources	[2] 428,623,563
Amount to be deferred: Entire year	[2] 7,364,828

Legal authority (in addition to sec. 1013): Antideficiency Act.

Type of budget authority: Appropriation.

Justification: This account includes funding for construction, renovation, and expansion of Social Security Trust Fund-owned headquarters and field office buildings. In addition, funds remain available for costs associated with acquisition of land in Colonial Park Estates adjacent to the Social Security Administration complex in Baltimore, Maryland. The Social Security Administration has received an approved FY 1996 apportionment for $50,000 to cover potential upward adjustments of prior-year costs related to field office roof repair and replacement projects. The remaining funds will not be needed for obligation in FY 1996. This deferral reflects the actual amount available for construction in FY 1996, less than $50,000 apportioned for potential upward adjustments in FY 1996. This action is taken pursuant to the Antideficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1512).

Estimated program effect: None.

Outlay effect: None.

[1] This account was the subject of a similar deferral in FY 1995 (D95–6A).

[2] Revised from previous report.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 21, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Friday, June 21, 1996 at 10:30 a.m.: That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2803.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE, *Clerk.*

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROHRABACHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HASTERT, for 5 minutes each day, on today and June 25, 26, 27, and 28.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes each day, on June 25, 26, and 27.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes each day, on June 25, 26, and 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. WARD.

Mr. FAZIO of California.

Mr. BARCIA.

Ms. NORTON.

Ms. FURSE in two instances.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ROHRABACHER) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. FORBES in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STEARNS) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn in memory of the late Honorable BILL EMERSON.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 25, 1996, at 10:30 a.m., in memory of the late Honorable BILL EMERSON.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3762. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—1996 Amendment to Cotton Board Rules and Regulations Adjusting Supplemental Assessment on Imports—Final Rule [Docket No. CN–96–002] received June 21, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3763. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's report entitled ''Expanding Housing Choices for HUD-Assisted Families,'' pursuant to Public Law 102–550, section 152(d)(1) (106 Stat. 3716); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

3764. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Controls Applicable to Gasoline Retailers and Wholesale Purchaser-Consumers; 10 Gallons Per Minute Fuel Dispensing Limit Requirement Implementation (FRL–5522–3) (RIN: 2060–AG43) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3765. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: State of Georgia; Approval of Revisions to the State Implementation Plan (FRL–5519–2) [GA–30–3–9615a] received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3766. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of New Jersey; Revised Policy Regarding Applicability of Oxygenated Fuels Requirements (FRL–5524–4) [Region II Docket No. 146, NJ23–1–7243(c)] received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3767. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Kentucky: Approval of Revisions to the Kentucky State Implementation Plan (FRL–5456–4) [KY–86–2–6933a] received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3768. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Final Interim Approval of Operating Permits Program; the State of Texas (FRL–5526–4) (40 CFR Part 70) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3769. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program: Nebraska (FRL–5524–9) (40 CFR Part 271) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3770. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Attainment Extension for the Municipality of Anchorage Area Carbon Monoxide Nonattainment Area: Alaska (FRL–5523–7) [AK–13–7101a] received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3771. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Honor, Michigan) [MM Docket No. 95–135]; received June 21, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3772. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Denison-Sherman, Paris, Jacksboro, Texas, and Madill, Oklahoma) [MM Docket No. 95–126] received June 21, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3773. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Milton, West Virginia and Flemingsburg, Kentucky) [MM Docket No. 95–137] received June 21, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3774. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Ingalls, Kansas) [MM Docket No. 95–180] received June 21, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3775. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period January 1, 1996, through March 31, 1996, as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 104a (H. Doc. No. 104–235); to the Committee on House Oversight and ordered to be printed.

3776. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Priority Dates for Employment-Based Petitions Docket No. INS–1647–95] (RIN: 1115–AE24) received June 21, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3777. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations: Newport—Bermuda Regatta, Narragansett Bay, Newport, RI (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD01–96–025] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3778. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations: Fireworks Display within the First Coast Guard District (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD01–96–011] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3779. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations: Suncoast Kilo Run; Suncoast Offshore Challenge; Suncoast Grand Prix; Sarasota, FL (U.S. Coast Guard) [CGD07–96–008] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3780. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revocation of Class E Airspace; Johnson City, TX—Docket No. 96–ASW–14 (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0068) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3781. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Alice, TX—Docket No. 95–ASW–35 (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0071) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3782. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Burns Flat, OK—Docket No. 95–ASW–36 (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0069) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3783. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Zuni, NM—Docket No. 95–ASW–01 (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0066) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3784. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Tucumcari, NM—Docket No. 95–ASW–33 (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0065) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3785. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Portales, NM—Docket No. 95–ASW–02 (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0064) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3786. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Truth or Consequences, NM—Docket No. 95–ASW–34 (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0063) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3787. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Arkadelphia, AR—Docket No. 96–ASW–03 (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1966–0067) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3788. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Mitchellville, MD—Docket No. 96–AEA–04 (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1966–0075) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3789. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Alteration of Class E Airspace; Nome and Unalakleet, AK—Docket No. 95–AAL–3 (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AA66) (1966–0057) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3790. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (22) [Amendment Number 1736] (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AA65) (1966–0018) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3791. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (47) [Amendment Number 1735] (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AA65) (1966–0019) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3792. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (19) [Amendment Number 1734] (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AA65) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3793. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Alteration of V–268—Docket No. 95–ANE–22 (Federal Aviation Administration) RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0070) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3794. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Subdivision of Restricted Areas R–2104A and R–2104C, Huntsville, AL—Docket No. 96–ASO–4 (Federal Aviation Administration) RIN: 2120–AA66) (1996–0072) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3795. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Using Agency for Restricted Area R–2905A and R–2905B, Tyndall AFB, FL—Docket No. 96–ASO–8 (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AA66) 1996–0073) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3796. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Grade Crossing Signal System Safety (Federal Railroad Administration) [FRA Docket No. RSGC–5; Notice No. 81] (RIN: 2130–AA97) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3797. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Policy Regarding Airport Rates and Charges (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120–AF90) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3798. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F28 Series Airplanes (Excluding Fokker Model F28 Mark 0100 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 95–NM–151–AD; Amendment 39–9674; AD 196–13–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3799. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F28 Series Airplanes (Excluding Fokker Model F28 Mark 0100 Series Airplanes) (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 95–NM–170–AD; Amendment 39–9673; AD 96–13–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3800. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; AlliedSignal Inc. (formerly Textron Lycoming) LTS 101 Series Turboshaft and LTP 101 Series Turboprop Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 93–ANE–64; Amendment 39–9668; AD 96–12–27] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3801. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9 and C–9 (Military) Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 94–NM–195–AD; Amendment 39–9671; AD 96–13–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3802. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Jetstream Aircraft Limited (formerly British Aerospace, Regional Airlines Limited) Jetstream Model 3201 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 93–CE–34–AD; Amendment 39–9670; AD 96–13–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3803. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; MDB Flugtechnik AG Model MD3–160 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96–CE–18–AD; Amendment 39–9669; AD 96–13–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 20, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3804. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—The Municipality of Anchorage, AK—Notices for Rate Increase for Alaska Intermodal Motor/Water Traffic—Petition for Rulemaking (STB Ex Parte No. MC–220) received June 18, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Science. H.R. 3604. A bill to amend title XIV of the Public Health Service Act (the ''Safe Drinking Water Act''), and for other purposes; with amendments; referred to the Committee on Science for a period ending not later than July 24, 1996, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(n), rule X (Rept. 104–632, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGED FROM CORRECTIONS CALENDAR

Under clause 5 of Rule X, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2531. Discharged from the Corrections Calender.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

[The following action occurred on June 21, 1996]

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1734. Referral to the Committee on House Oversight extended for a period ending not later than June 28, 1996.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3702. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of certain factors with respect to any aspect of a surety bond transaction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 3703. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the same insurance reserve treatment to financial guaranty insurance as applies to mortgage guaranty insurance, lease guaranty insurance, and tax-exempt bond insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

H.R. 3704. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to apply the act to a greater percentage of the U.S. workforce and to allow employees to take parental involvement leave to participate in or attend their children's educational and extracurricular activities, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, and House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 3705. A bill to provide for the liquidation or reliquidation of certain frozen concentrated orange juice entries to correct an error that was made in connection with the original liquidation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3706. A bill to designate the Mollie Beattie Alaska Wilderness Area in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 324: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 773: Mr. HORN and Ms. PRYCE.

H.R. 2209: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Ms. FURSE, Mr. SABO, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 2270: Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 2727: Mr. WAMP and Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 3067: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3119: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 3195: Mr. FUNDERBURK.

H.R. 3213: Mr. LAZIO of New York and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3328: Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 3401: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. QUINN, Mr. ZIMMER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. HORN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3604: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FARR, Mr. LINDER, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 3642: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 173: Mr. BROWNBACK and Mr. FLANAGAN.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3604

OFFERED BY: MR. BLILEY

AMENDMENT NO. 60: At the end of the bill, add the following new titles and conform the table of contents:

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR WATER INFRASTRUCTURE AND WATERSHEDS

SEC. 501. GENERAL PROGRAM.

(a) TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator may provide technical and financial assistance in the form of grants to States (1) for the construction, rehabilitation, and improvement of water supply systems, and (2) consistent with nonpoint source management programs established under section 319 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, for source water quality protection programs to address pollutants in navigable waters for the purpose of making such waters usable by water supply systems.

(b) LIMITATION.—Not more than 30 percent of the amounts appropriated to carry out this section in a fiscal year may be used for source water quality protection programs described in subsection (a)(2).

(c) CONDITION.—As a condition to receiving assistance under this section, a State shall ensure that such assistance is carried out in the most cost-effective manner, as determined by the State.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2003. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 502. NEW YORK CITY WATERSHED, NEW YORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The administrator may provide technical and financial assistance in the form of grants for a source water quality protection program described in section 501 for the New York City Watershed in the State of New York.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $8,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2003. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 503. RURAL AND NATIVE VILLAGES, ALASKA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may provide technical and financial assistance in the form of grants to the State of Alaska for the benefit of rural and Alaska Native villages for the development and construction of water systems to improve conditions in such villages and to provide technical assistance relating to construction and operation of such systems.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Administrator shall consult the State of Alaska on methods of prioritizing the allocation of grants made to such State under this section.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The State of Alaska may use not to exceed 4 percent of the amount granted to such State under this section for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the activities for which the grant is made.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $25,000,000. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 504. ACQUISITION OF LANDS.

Assistance provided with funds made available under this title may be used for the acquisition of lands and other interests in lands; however, nothing in this title authorizes the acquisition of lands or other interests in lands from other than willing sellers.

SEC. 505. FEDERAL SHARE.

The Federal share of the cost of activities for which grants are made under this title be 50 percent.

SEC. 506. CONDITION ON AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

An authorization of appropriations under this title shall be in effect for a fiscal year only if at least 75 percent of the total amount of funds authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year by section 308 are appropriated.

SEC. 507. DEFINITIONS.

In this title, the following definitions apply:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) STATE.—The term ''State'' means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(3) WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM.—The term ''water supply system'' means a system for the provision to the public of piped water for human consumption if such system has at least 15 service connections or regularly serves at least 25 individuals and a draw and fill system for the provision to the public of water for human consumption. Such term does not include a for-profit system that has fewer than 15 service connections used by year-round residents of the area served by the system or a for-profit system that regularly serves fewer than 25 year-round residents and does not include a system owned by a Federal agency. Such term includes (A) any collection, treatment, storage, and distribution facilities under control of the operator of such system and used primarily in connection with such system, and (B) any collection or pretreatment facilities not under such control that are used primarily in connection with such system.

TITLE VI—DRINKING WATER RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 601. DRINKING WATER RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in addition to—

(1) amounts authorized for research under section 1412(b)(13) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (title XIV of the Public Health Service Act);

(2) amounts authorized for research under section 409 of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996; and

(3) $10,000,000 from funds appropriated pursuant to this section 1452(n) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (title XIV of the Public Health Service Act).

such sums as may be necessary for drinking water research for fiscal years 1997 through 2003. The annual total of the sums referred in this section not exceed $26,693,000.

SEC. 602. SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall assign to the Assistant Administrator for Research and Development (in this section referred to as the ''Assistant Administrator'') the duties of—

(1) developing a strategic plan for drinking water research activities throughout the Environmental Protection Agency (in this section referred to as the ''Agency'');

(2) integrating that strategic plan into ongoing Agency planning activities; and

(3) reviewing all Agency drinking water research to ensure the research—

(A) is of high quality; and

(B) does not duplicate any other research being conducted by the Agency.

(b) REPORT.—The Assistant Administrator shall transmit annually to the Administrator and to the Committees on Commerce and Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report detailing—

(1) all Agency drinking water research the Assistant Administrator finds is not of sufficiently high quality; and

(2) all Agency drinking water research the Assistant Administrator finds duplicates other Agency research.

In section 403 of the reported bill, relating to New York City watershed protection program, in paragraph (4), strike ''$15,000,000'' and insert ''$8,000,000''.

H.R. 3666

OFFERED BY: MR. FIELDS OF LOUISIANA

AMENDMENT NO. 61: Page 61, line 14, after each of the two dollar amounts, insert the following: (''increased by $3,500,000)''.

Page 61, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $178,500,000)''.

Page 61, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $89,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $60,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $4,500,000)''.

Page 62, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $11,500,000)''.

Page 63, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $7,000,000)''.

Page 63, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 74, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $178,500,000)''.

H.R. 3666

OFFERED BY: MR. GEJDENSON

AMENDMENT NO. 62: Page 87, after line 17, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Consumer Affairs, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $1,811,000, to be derived from amounts provided in this Act for ''National Aeronautics And Space Administration—Human space flight'': *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that Office may accept and deposit to this account, during fiscal year 1997, gifts for the purpose of defraying its costs of printing, publishing, and distributing consumer information and educational materials; may expend up to $1,110,000 of those gifts for those purposes, in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated; and the balance shall remain available for expenditure for such purposes to the extent authorized in subsequent appropriations Acts: *Provided further,* That none of the funds provided under this heading may be made available for any other activities within the Department of Health and Human Services.

H.R. 3666

OFFERED BY: MR. HEFNER

AMENDMENT NO. 63: Page 10, line 10, strike ''; *Provided,* That'' and all that follows through ''Secretary'' on line 15.

H.R. 3666

OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMENDMENT NO. 64: Page 66, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 3666

OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMENDMENT NO. 65: Page 66, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 82, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 3666

OFFERED BY MR. KINGSTON

AMENDMENT NO. 66: Page 95, after line 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. 422. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by any officer or employee of the Environmental Protection Agency to organize, plan, or disseminate information regarding any activity if it is made known to such officer or employee that such activity is not directly related to governmental functions that such officer or employee is authorized or directed to perform.