



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 102<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 26, 1991

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Kirk D. Monroe, Sr., pastor, Mount Zion United Methodist Church, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Good morning God; we come to You seeking harmony and peace. We ask for Your sovereign protection over the limits and boundaries of our Nation. As You have called us to mark the paths of history we ask for Your wisdom and Your goodness to intern us toward mercy.

We pray for America, for all of her children. Please help us to let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like an everflowing stream. Please guide us and kindle us for fine heroic living; please humble us when the ordinary is transformed into some mountaintop experience for Your people.

So as the rose tells its secret in its perfume, so as the Sun tells its secret in light and heat, may we who serve America tell of its secret in our benevolence and our compassion.

Hear our prayer O God. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY] will please come forward and lead the Members in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HENRY 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. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without

amendment a bill and concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 749. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation of land for addition to the Ocmulgee National Monument in the State of Georgia; and

H. Con. Res. 173. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 904. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a national historic landmark theme study on African-American history; and

H.R. 1143. An act to authorize a study of nationally significant places in American labor history.

The message also announced that pursuant to Senate Resolution 143, 102d Congress, first session, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader and the Republican leader, announces the appointment of Mr. WIRTH and Mr. GORE, as cochairmen; Mr. CHAFEE and Mr. NICKLES, as vice chairmen; Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. WALLOP, as members of the World Climate Convention Observer Group.

### THE REVEREND KIRK MONROE

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a personal pleasure to welcome Rev. Kirk Monroe, pastor of Mount Zion United Methodist Church, at 175 years old this year, the oldest black congregation in Washington. Located in Georgetown, Mount Zion United Methodist Church is among a treasure of historic churches located in the Nation's Capital.

It is only fitting that one of our most distinguished and historic churches would have as its minister a distinguished and able young man, a graduate of Howard University Divinity School, who has been cited in the Afro-

American newspaper as one of the District's top 25 preachers.

Mr. Speaker, we in the District are grateful for Mount Zion's spiritual and civic influence and for the energetic and excellent contributions of Rev. Kirk Monroe.

### AMERICA 2000: MEETING THE PRESIDENT'S CHALLENGE

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

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, for the past 25 years the Federal Government has been a significant leader in the education of American students. Head Start, chapter 1, Education of the Handicapped Act, Pell grants, and adult education—all programs created by the Federal Government and targeted at populations with specific unmet needs.

The President has raised a new challenge to the Congress, the Governors, the private sector, and the American people. He has asked us all to start a second track of change, without turning back from the goal of equal opportunity. This new challenge is no less than the transformation of the American educational system so that all students will have an opportunity for a quality education. That is what school reform is all about—quality. Rather than looking at inputs and numbers of this, that, or the other thing, school reform is about making sure every student receives a world class education.

To accomplish this, some feathers are going to be ruffled. No doubt about it. Things are going to be done differently, in some cases by different persons trained differently. Choice, national tests, merit schools, national education standards—new and, some would say, scary stuff. But if we learned anything from the last 10 years of school reform it's that incremental, marginal changes in our schools are not enough.

The President has given us the lead. He has challenged Congress, the pri-

□ 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.

vate sector, Governors, parents, and communities in this charge to give our children the education they deserve and America the schools it needs.

Let's join him.

#### H.R. 5, THE GOLDEN RULE VERSUS THE RULE OF THE JUNGLE

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, most Americans treat others the way they want to be treated. But during the 1980's, many companies chucked the Golden Rule for the rule of the jungle. They permanently replaced workers to loot their pensions or dissolve worker and retiree health plans.

Often, this attack against organized workers came from businesses brokered in a merger or buyout. These firms prolonged job actions as a pretense for hiring permanent replacements, and then they cracked down on wages, health benefits, and pensions to service their debts. Unwise mergers led to unfair actions by corporations, injuring and humbling workers and communities, just to make a buck.

H.R. 5, the workplace fairness law, will make it unlawful to permanently replace workers engaged in a job action. This bill would not apply to non-union establishments. And it mirrors the laws of our major trading partners.

Mr. Speaker, the practice of hiring permanent replacements is unjust and a threat to the health care and retirement security of working American families. We should be on their side and strongly supporting H.R. 5.

#### H.R. 5: STILL CREATES UNBALANCED RISKS

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of H.R. 5 claim that giving unionized employees the right to not be replaced, balances the scales in the labor-management relationship, and preserves their right to strike.

However, under H.R. 5 unionized employees can't be replaced, even if the labor dispute is illegal, or if the strikers engage in violence.

Employees must assume some risk when they strike, however, H.R. 5 provides job guarantees for unionized employees. An April 8, 1991, editorial by the Omaha World Herald, stated:

What is so wrong with a worker being forced to consider whether he will be able to return to his job if he strikes? Workers want guarantees, but life holds few guarantees. An employee who tries to bring down his employer by withholding his services, should understand that he is taking a risk. He should understand that the company might

have to hire replacements to stay in business.

Mr. Speaker, if we truly want balance, then perhaps we should investigate reforming the problem resolution process. The National Labor Relations Board [NLRB] has had outlandish delays in issuing decisions—on one occasion it took 7 years.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5, and to start work on meaningful labor law reform.

□ 1000

#### LEGISLATION TO GIVE U.S. PROCESSORS FIRST CRACK AT WESTERN RED CEDAR ON NATIONAL FOREST LANDS IN ALASKA

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

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, our Northwest timber communities are facing a problem as gut wrenching as any I've seen. Reduced harvests, partly due to protection for the northern spotted owl, are triggering an economic disaster every bit as serious as that of the Great Depression.

We need to be creative and fight for ways to help our timber mills and communities survive economic chaos—and the bill I am introducing today is one way to do that. It would ensure that our own U.S. processors get first crack at national forest western red cedar in Alaska—potentially saving hundreds of jobs for processors in Washington State and the Northwest.

Right now, processors in Alaska are deciding they do not need this cedar—so they are shipping it to Japan. That is not fair—especially when our U.S. processors do need that red cedar.

My bill makes a simple statement, but one this Government all too often forgets: America first.

#### FIND A SOLUTION TO STRIKER REPLACEMENT PROBLEM

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Madam Speaker, if you have been listening to the 1 minutes thus far today, you get a pretty clear impression of the challenge we face in this House. We can either have a solution, or we can have a political issue.

Contrast the two issues that have been discussed. On the one hand, we have had H.R. 5 discussed, striker replacement. Unfortunately, there is a problem, but people do not want a solution.

Yes, there are some companies, a very few companies, who have not bargained in good faith. The solution to that is to clean up and expedite the

process at the National Labor Relations Board.

However, people are suggesting that we ought to totally reverse all labor-management law and labor-management relations in this country, because they would rather have an issue than a solution.

Now, contrast that on the other side with the discussions you have heard this morning regarding educational reform. In that case, this Congress has withstood the test of bipartisan cooperation to do what is in the interest of America now and in the future. We did a bipartisan effort on testing. Today, in the Labor-HHS appropriation bill, we are setting aside the money, and we will be able to, between now and October 1, enact a solution, rather than simply create an issue.

#### WORKPLACE FAIRNESS ACT COVERAGE

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Speaker, with regard to Workplace Fairness Act coverage, Members need to understand that from the beginning there was no intention that H.R. 5 cover workplaces in which there was no union. Because concerns were raised that the bill could be clearer about expressing this intention, the committee approved an amendment I offered making it absolutely clear that H.R. 5 does not apply in a workplace where there is no union. The language is now explicit on this point.

We adopted my amendment in committee specifically in response to concerns raised by several members, constituents, and business groups. They were concerned about the bill's coverage of employees who were not involved in a bona fide collective bargaining dispute but merely walked off the job and then claimed protection under the bill when they chose to return to work. The bill does not cover such employees. Such spontaneous, undisciplined, and unpredictable economic work stoppages in the unorganized sector are not covered by this bill.

#### STRIKER REPLACEMENT BILL IS BAD FOR SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. IRELAND. Madam Speaker, proponents of H.R. 5, the striker replacement bill, claim that it would not affect most small businesses because the vast majority of them are not unionized.

In fact, this bill would have Congress grant unions both the incentive and

the power to launch a huge organizing campaign aimed at small, nonunion businesses.

"Join the union and your job will be permanently protected. Don't join and you can be permanently replaced." This is the message that proponents of H.R. 5 want the U.S. Congress to send to American workers.

If H.R. 5 becomes law, the union bosses' gain will be the country's loss—in terms of higher labor costs, more frequent strikes, and the devastating ripple effect on suppliers, customers, subcontractors, and related businesses.

My colleagues, I urge you to vote against H.R. 5. It's easy to say that you're for small business. But it's how you vote that really counts.

**MR. PRESIDENT: KEEP YOUR PROMISE AND RESPECT WORKER RIGHTS**

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

Mr. NAGLE. Madam Speaker, during his 1988 campaign, President Bush promised to respect collective bargaining agreements between workers and their companies. Yesterday, that promise was broken. Just as this administration broke its promise against raising taxes on working Americans, the White House announced Mr. Bush would veto H.R. 5. I urge the President to reconsider.

Major corporations are making war against white- and blue-collar workers, their families, and the communities where they live. Just as they take advantage of tax loopholes, there is a loophole in labor law that permits firms to permanently replace workers who are on strike.

Companies can refuse to bargain in good faith. And when workers take a job action, firms can seize their pensions, cut their health benefits, and hire unqualified replacements to permanently fill their jobs.

Legislation awaiting House action would change all that. It would prevent workers from being permanently replaced, balance the rights of workers and management, and restore respect to the collective bargaining process.

Mr. President, don't break another promise to America's working families. Support H.R. 5, the workplace fairness law.

**HORTON BAY, MI: 51ST STATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

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

Mr. DAVIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation designating Horton Bay, MI, as the 51st State of the United States of America.

Now, Madam Speaker, you might ask why a village of 49 people should be granted statehood. If you know these 49 people, you would not have to ask.

This year thousands of people will make the trek to Horton Bay for a Fourth of July parade based on the premise that laughter is the best medicine. Here people pride themselves on not taking themselves too seriously. Where else can you see the world's only pizza eating goat? Where else can you see 49 people trying to earn statehood with the motto, "if Texas can do it, why can't we!"

Madam Speaker, the world needs more Horton Bays. July 4 is a day of good, clean fun in this unique little village on Lake Charlevoix. The least we could do is honor them by giving them a State of their own.

**TIME FOR TAX FAIRNESS: STOP DROWNING THE MIDDLE CLASS**

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Speaker, few principles are more important to our Nation than the concept of fairness. It is concept embodied in the very foundation of our democracy, the belief and conviction that all men and women are created equal.

Yet today we find ourselves in a time when children more and more are living in poverty. We find ourselves in a time when middle class families are not able to give their children the opportunity to reach their highest potential. We find the doors of our colleges and universities being shut to the middle class.

Madam Speaker, it is time for tax fairness. We do not ask that we soak the rich, but we demand that we stop drowning the middle class. It is time for fairness. It is time for recommitment to the ideals on which this country was founded.

**GOVERNMENT SHOULD SERVE, NOT RULE**

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, the week before last Edward Rendell, the Democratic nominee for mayor of Philadelphia, said it is time to change some basic assumptions about the public sector. In a hearing in New York City, Mr. Rendell said:

Government does not work because it is not designed to. There is no incentive for employees to do their best, so many do not. There is no incentive to save money, so it is squandered.

This is a liberal Democrat talking, not a conservative Republican. Yet he has put his finger on something that

many people are feeling today. People are becoming angry with elitists in government who act like our rulers, instead of our servants. People are becoming sick of hearing governments who have doubled or tripled spending in a short time crying about budget shortfalls.

□ 1020

People are fed up with the civil service system that does nothing for good, dedicated employees but serves to protect lazy incompetent ones. There is a resentment in the land today toward government, particularly at the Federal level, and some Federal employees are going to have to soon stop demanding so much while giving so little in return.

**WE NEED TAX FAIRNESS**

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, tax fairness, yes, it is a big problem. It is such a big problem that everyone on both the right and left, as they have looked at it, realize that what we did during the Reagan era of the 1980's was to shift more and more and more taxes on the middle class. They are carrying the heaviest percentage burden they have ever carried in the history of America.

When President Bush campaigned in 1988, he campaigned on relieving some of this tax pressure for the middle class. But somehow he has forgotten that. It seems his entire domestic agenda is nothing but more highways and more executions. Maybe we could bind them and make a drive-in execution.

I think what we desperately need is tax fairness. If America's families could get a little more money, they would certainly be under a lot less stress. And a whole nation of dysfunctional families can soon become a dysfunctional nation.

I think we must work on tax fairness, and the Democratic Party must make that its No. 1 priority to make that Tax Code family friendly once again.

**DEMOCRATS WANT TO INCREASE YOUR TAXES**

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, we hear attacks on Ronald Reagan and tax fairness all the time. Who controls the tax bills anyway? Who controlled the House of Representatives during the entire Reagan administration?

Some people would have Members believe that it was the Republicans, but I

can tell my colleagues that tax bills originate in the House of Representatives. And the House of Representatives, during the entire Reagan administration, was controlled not by the Republicans. The House of Representatives, where all tax revenue bills originate, was controlled by the Democrats.

So if we hear anything about a lack of tax fairness, let us face it. It was not the Republicans who were at fault for lack of tax fairness. It was the Members who control the House of Representatives, the House in which all tax bills originate.

So come on, let us not cry some crocodile tears. Let us get serious. Every time the Democrats talk about tax fairness, what they are really talking about is raising taxes on the middle class. Those are the people who end up paying the taxes. They know it and we know it.

#### OUR TAX SYSTEM NEEDS REFORM

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, yesterday we read all about the National Commission on Children's proposal for a \$1,000 tax credit for each child in this country. This bipartisan commission spent 2½ years studying the problems that affect so many of our Nation's children, and they came to the conclusion that we need to reform our tax system. This news is hardly startling.

The tax system is unfair. My constituents tell me this every day. It is time to offer tax relief to working middle class American families. There are already three or four thoughtful proposals on this issue.

I propose the Middle Class Tax Relief Act which increases the personal exemption and even comes up with a workable revenue plan to pay for it.

Whether it is increased exemptions or tax credits, the message is clear. We cannot continue to neglect the needs of middle income families, the hard-working taxpayers who make up the heart and soul of our country and the children who represent our future.

The commission stressed the importance of strong families for the stability and healthy development of our children. This conclusion underscores our need to promote policies that bolster families.

It is time to enact tax reform that leaves families with more of their hard-earned dollars intact to make ends meet. We do not suffer from a lack of ideas or how to accomplish this. We suffer from a lack of vision and leadership in the White House.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the reports and seen the evidence. The verdict is clear. It is time to stop neglecting those who are calling out for our help.

It is time to bring tax relief to middle class families in this country.

#### INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION CONCERNING UNITED STATES POSITION ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AT 1992 U.N. CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT IN BRAZIL

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, international economic integration is proceeding at a rapid pace. With the consequent economic development that accompanies such a process it is imperative that we also examine the unintended results of such growth. That is why I welcome the 1992 U.N. Conference on Environment and Development in Brazil.

This conference will examine the delicate balance between economic and environmental stability throughout the world.

The United States, as a leader in the environmental movement and as a leading economic power, must set an example for other nations to follow in determining the nature of the balance between growth and environmental stability. That is why Mr. HYDE, Mr. RITTER and I are today introducing a resolution which if adopted would urge the United States delegates to the Brazilian conference to weigh these factors in such a way as not to competitively disadvantage the United States while at the same time improving overall environmental quality.

I hope that the appropriate committees and the whole House will view this resolution with favor and will act on its adoption expeditiously.

#### H.R. 5 PROTECTS RIGHTS OF STRIKING EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, shortly after the July 4 recess the House will consider, H.R. 5, the bill protecting the jobs of employees who exercise their right to strike.

Soon we will be hearing great cries of anguish from the other side of the aisle about this bill. Before the cries begin, let's be very clear about what this legislation does and what it doesn't do. It simply gives workers who go out on strike the right to have their job back when the strike is over and not be permanently replaced by workers hired during the strike.

A revolutionary concept? Hardly.

All we have to do is think back to the 1987 National Football League season. The NFL season opened without a player contract, and the first few games were played by—you guessed

it—replacement players. My team the Dallas Cowboys, even won a few of these replacement games. The dispute was settled and, overnight, the replacement players were gone and the NFL regulars were back in uniform.

Now, there are people who would tell us that this very concept shouldn't be applied to other American workers.

Madam Speaker, why should assembly line workers have less rights than a linebacker for the Washington Redskins or the Dallas Cowboys. They shouldn't. It is that simple.

#### INFANT MORTALITY

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I believe that it's time for the Congress to help raise awareness of our Nation's infant mortality statistics. Since 1989, I have served as the cochairman of the Congressional Sunbelt Caucus Task Force on Infant Mortality with my good friend Dr. ROY ROWLAND. My involvement with this task force stems from my personal commitment to lowering our Nation's dismal infant mortality statistics.

In my home State of Florida, the infant mortality rate is disturbingly high—during 1987, almost 11 infants died before their first birthday out of every 1,000 babies born. In fact, the Sunbelt region has the highest infant mortality rate in the Nation. I feel it is the duty of Congress to raise public awareness and encourage solutions at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local.

If we could encourage all pregnant women to seek prenatal care, not only will we have healthier babies but we will also have healthier mothers. Hopefully, these comments this morning will send a message to all Americans on the importance of this issue to them and to Members of Congress.

#### MEDICAL INSURANCE SHOULD ENCOURAGE PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. WISE. Madam Speaker, as part of my program to introduce you to West Virginians, who are being denied access to adequate health care, I want you to meet Cecilia Wood, who lives in Ireland in Lewis County, WV. Her husband is a salesman and she used to teach school until she left teaching to take care of her children. She was covered by a private insurance policy.

In June 1990, she had precancerous cells burned off of her cervix. When the doctor contacted her insurance company about this, they dropped her cov-

erage and refused to cover the procedure because she had cancer. Now she lives every day without insurance.

Her insurance company will not cover her for a period of 2 years during which she must have clean Pap smears every 4 months.

People should be encouraged, not discouraged, to take preventative steps in their health care. She might have been hospitalized for major surgery with major medical bills, had she not taken these steps.

Cecilia Wood asked when the Congress and the administration are finally going to enact a medical policy that says that you are encouraged, not discouraged, from doing those things that are necessary to have adequate access to health care.

The Congress and the President must act now.

□ 1030

#### PROTECT AMERICAN JOBS: VOTE NO ON H.R. 5

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, proponents of H.R. 5, the strike breeder bill, argue that companies use permanent replacement workers to bust unions. This claim is not only misleading, but it is entirely false.

Under the Federal Labor Relations Act, it is an unfair labor practice if employers commit any of the following activities: discriminate against union employees, refusing to bargain in good faith, and pretending to bargain in good faith. If employers commit any of these acts during a strike, workers must be reinstated to their old jobs. In addition, companies can be forced to pay fines for engaging in unfair labor practices. So if it were the intention of a company to break a union by hiring replacement workers, this would constitute an unfair labor practice and those who were replaced would be entitled to their jobs at the end of the strike.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues not to be taken by the false claims made by proponents of H.R. 5. If this bill were to become law, it would promote strikes, cause disruption within our economy, and hurt our Nation's ability to compete against our trading partners. If our Nation's businesses are faced with negotiating labor contracts under this law, many will simply close up shop and head overseas. If you want to protect American jobs and the economy, you will vote no on H.R. 5.

#### NATIONAL RECYCLING MARKETS ACT

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, all across the United States, we are running out of places to put our trash. In recent years, 83 percent of our Nation's annual 160 million tons of municipal solid waste has been stuffed in landfills, half of which are expected to be closed by mid-decade.

Recycling, after waste minimization, offers a way out of this crisis and has great untapped potential. Recycling provides a cheap source of quality feedstock materials and is an efficient use of natural resources. Recycling can save money, while reducing pollution, pollution control costs, and energy consumption. Recycling can also create competitive opportunities in the international marketplace.

Unfortunately, obstacles remain. Manufacturers claim that they would use more recovered materials if only reliable supplies of high-quality materials could be found. Waste managers, meanwhile, claim that they would institute more programs to recover recyclable materials if only they could find regular buyers for them.

Although many collection programs have been started and more manufacturers are using recovered materials, recycling is still only crawling forward. I believe the keys to improving recycling are to stimulate demand for recovered materials and to bolster and stabilize recycling markets.

That is why yesterday I introduced the National Recycling Markets Act which aims to accomplish precisely those objectives. I believe that we can no longer sit back and wait for progress to just happen. We must make it happen.

I encourage my colleagues to support the bill and join me in attempting to bring America a new era in recycling.

#### WHAT IS NEXT, CONGRESS?

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, fat cats are buying savings-and-loan property from the RTC for pennies and selling them for millions, making a killing. Meanwhile, the working poor who desperately need homes cannot get a loan. Does that sound familiar?

But through all this, it is consistent, the taxpayer continues to get screwed by the lawyers, by the investors, and, in my opinion, the RTC.

I say it is time to call the RTC the Rectal Trespass Corporation of America. They earned it.

Let me say one thing: What is next, Congress? Interstate banking?

#### IN SUPPORT OF TARGETED INFANT MORTALITY INITIATIVES

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

Mr. ERDREICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the targeted infant mortality initiatives contained in the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriation bill for fiscal year 1992.

The committee bill contains several provisions for making the battle against infant mortality a national health care priority. Today's bill calls for a coordinated approach among various agencies charged with carrying out these initiatives, something we spotlighted in a congressional hearing I held in Birmingham 3 years ago.

In addition to increasing resources to fight infant mortality, the committee has rightfully emphasized that any program must be part of a community-wide, comprehensive initiative. We know that early, regular, high-quality prenatal care reduces low birthweight babies. Our challenge now is to make sure that every mother at risk learns about these programs and has access to them.

Efforts to reduce infant mortality are vital to my State because Alabama has one of the highest infant mortality rates in the Nation. Likewise, the United States ranks 20th among developed countries in the number of infant deaths.

The committee's bill will help reverse this trend. I urge by colleagues to join me in support of the targeted infant mortality initiatives contained in this appropriation bill.

#### IN CELEBRATION OF THIS COUNTRY COMING TOGETHER

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

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Speaker, as we approach July 4 and the many parades that will take place across our great country to celebrate the homecoming of our Desert Storm troops, I want to tell this body about an experience that happened to me recently in my hometown of Mishawaka, IN.

Going to a homecoming ceremony for a homecoming troop, a Dave Barrett, the family presented him with a plaque that read, "We admire your courage, devotion, and patriotism to country." They then turned around to their Uncle Bob, who had served in the Vietnam war, unveiled a package, and presented a plaque that read, "We admire your patriotism, your courage, and your devotion to country."

Madam Speaker, we need the vets of not only the Persian Gulf war but the Vietnam war to join arms and march down our streets in celebration of this

country coming together not just in a victory in the Middle East but with this can-do spirit that we today in the 1990's are ready to take on the challenges that face our great Nation in education, in rebuilding our infrastructure, and in guiding this country to be the economic power with the Japanese and the Germans and ahead of them in the next century.

#### TRIBUTE TO HON. WILLIAM NATCHER

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Madam Speaker, later today, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the dean of the Kentucky delegation, will assume his spot just to my right, and with his customary aplomb and courtesy and courtliness steer through to passage the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriation bill.

It has been my great fortune to serve with BILL for these past 20 years, and I would like to call to the attention of the Members in the body, the few of whom may not know it, that last week on June 20, Chairman NATCHER cast his 17,000th consecutive vote.

He came into this Chamber in January 1954. It happened to be, parenthetically, my senior year at Notre Dame. BILL came in here, and he has never failed to cast a vote on every issue since then.

I would say from the clarity of his eye and from the spring in his step and from the steel in his spine he will be here to cast 17,000 more votes.

#### SUPPORT APPROPRIATION FOR INFANT MORTALITY INITIATIVES

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

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Sun Belt Caucus on Infant Mortality, I am very concerned with the infant mortality rate in this country.

The United States ranks near the bottom of all industrialized nations with a rate of 10 deaths per 1,000 births.

This is not only a problem in urban areas.

This is a problem in rural America as well. The Fifth District of Virginia that I represent has one of the highest infant mortality rates in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

There is a model volunteer organization in my district whose goal is to develop child and maternal health programs that address the problems of infant mortality, low birth rate babies, and teenage pregnancy in southside Virginia.

The Save Our Children Coalition is headed by Dr. Marie Hooper, a gynecologist who came to Farmville, VA, through the National Health Services Corps.

Dr. Hooper has remained in Farmville and continues to serve poor, low-income women.

I commend Dr. Hooper on the progress she has made. I believe that the save our children coalition can serve as a model for other efforts around the country.

Later today we will vote on H.R. 2707, Chairman NATCHER's fiscal year 1992 appropriations for Labor, HHS, and Education.

For important infant mortality initiatives such as Save Our Children Coalition, \$114 million has been appropriated.

I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

□ 1040

#### UNEMPLOYED DESERVE TAX EXEMPTION

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

Mr. APPELLEGGATE. Madam Speaker, we send billions of dollars overseas to help other countries with their problems. The Reagan and Bush administration gave big tax breaks to the rich in 1981. The Reagan and Bush administration had terrible trade policies which produced a trade deficit. We are running \$300 billion a year in deficit. We owe \$3.5 trillion in total deficit, and we are paying \$200 billion in interest on that deficit. The consequences are that millions of Americans are unemployed and more people overseas are becoming employed.

Now, who do Members think that we are asking to pay for this fiscal irresponsibility and this nonsense? It is the unemployed. The people who are getting unemployment compensation, are being asked to cough up enough money to make up for the deficit.

I think these people need a boost to help give them the quality of life that has been taken away from them by the administration of this country. I am asking Members to cosponsor House Resolution 2492 that will correct this thing. Give a tax exemption to the millions of unemployed Americans in this country who are getting unemployment compensation.

#### SUPPORT FOR PROGRAMS TO COMBAT INFANT MORTALITY

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

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate Chairman BILL NATCHER on a job well done. Today, we will be

considering the appropriations bill for Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Of particular interest to me is the funding contained in the bill to combat the problem of infant mortality. I believe that the funding for the maternal and child health block grants and the community and migrant health centers will certainly help rural Alabamians. I am especially pleased that Federal dollars will be targeted to areas with high infant mortality rates.

Earlier this year, I was the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 194, to designate May 12, 1991 as Infant Mortality Awareness Day. This commemorative legislation became Public Law 102-43 in May. This is the second year I have sponsored this educational effort. I believe that as more Americans are made aware of our infant mortality rates, they will work harder to ensure that healthy babies are born. Every death of a child represents a tragedy for both the parents as well as the loss of the child's potential for our society. I would encourage all pregnant women to seek early prenatal care to ensure the birth of healthy infants.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1991

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2699) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1044

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2699, with Mrs. KENNELLY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, June 25, 1991, all time for general debate had expired.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment and points of order at any point.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON]?

There was no objection.

The text of H.R. 2699 is as follows:

## H.R. 2699

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, namely:

## TITLE I

## FISCAL YEAR 1992 APPROPRIATIONS

## FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For payment to the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, \$630,500,000.

## FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO RETIREMENT FUNDS

For the Federal contribution to the Police Officers and Fire Fighters', Teachers', and Judges' Retirement Funds, as authorized by the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act, approved November 17, 1979 (93 Stat. 866; Public Law 96-122), \$52,070,000.

## OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

For a Federal contribution to the District of Columbia for the Office of the Mayor, \$52,000.

## METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

For a Federal contribution to the District of Columbia for the Metropolitan Police Department, \$75,000, of which \$25,000 shall be for an accreditation study by a recognized law enforcement accrediting organization and \$50,000 shall be for community empowerment policing programs.

## BOARD OF EDUCATION

For a Federal contribution to the District of Columbia, \$1,100,000, of which \$600,000 shall be for renovations to public school athletic and recreational grounds and facilities and \$500,000 shall be for maintenance, improvements, and repairs to public school facilities under the Direct Activity Purchase System (DAPS): *Provided*, That the \$500,000 provided for DAPS shall be returned to the United States Treasury on October 1, 1992, if the amount spent by the District of Columbia out of its own funds under DAPS and for maintenance, improvements, and repairs to public school facilities in fiscal year 1992 is less than the amount spent by the District out of its own funds for such purposes in fiscal year 1991.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GENERAL HOSPITAL

For a Federal contribution to the District of Columbia General Hospital, \$12,000,000, of which \$10,000,000 shall not be available for obligation until September 30, 1992 and shall not be expended prior to October 1, 1992.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INSTITUTE FOR MENTAL HEALTH

For a Federal contribution to the District of Columbia Institute for Mental Health to provide professional mental health care to low-income, underinsured, and indigent children, adults, and families in the District of Columbia, \$1,000,000.

## CHILDREN'S NATIONAL MEDICAL CENTER

For a Federal contribution to the Children's National Medical Center for a cost-shared National Child Protection Center, \$3,000,000.

## DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The following amounts are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the current fiscal year out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, except as otherwise specifically provided.

## GOVERNMENTAL DIRECTION AND SUPPORT

Governmental direction and support, \$111,973,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,500 for the Mayor, \$2,500 for the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, and \$2,500 for the City Administrator shall be available from this appropriation for expenditures for official purposes: *Provided further*, That any program fees collected from the issuance of debt shall be available for the payment of expenses of the debt management program of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, there is hereby appropriated \$8,326,000 to pay legal, management, investment, and other fees and administrative expenses of the District of Columbia Retirement Board, of which \$1,000,000 shall be derived from the general fund and not to exceed \$7,326,000 shall be derived from the earnings of the applicable retirement funds: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia Retirement Board shall provide to the Congress and to the Council of the District of Columbia a quarterly report of the allocations of charges by fund and of expenditures of all funds: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia Retirement Board shall provide the Mayor, for transmittal to the Council of the District of Columbia, an item accounting of the planned use of appropriated funds in time for each annual budget submission and the actual use of such funds in time for each annual audited financial report: *Provided further*, That the Mayor shall submit to the Council of the District of Columbia by October 1, 1991, a reorganization plan for the Department of Finance and Revenue that shall follow the directives and initiatives contained in the Report of the Committee of the Whole on Bill 9-151, the Fiscal Year 1991 Supplemental Budget and Rescissions of Authority Request Act of 1991, at 8-20 (March 25, 1991).

## ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION

Economic development and regulation, \$106,430,000: *Provided*, That the District of Columbia Housing Finance Agency, established by section 201 of the District of Columbia Housing Finance Agency Act, effective March 3, 1979 (D.C. Law 2-135; D.C. Code, sec. 45-2111), based upon its capability of repayments as determined each year by the Council of District of Columbia from the Finance Agency's annual audited financial statements to the Council of the District of Columbia, shall repay to the general fund an amount equal to the appropriated administrative costs plus interest at a rate of four percent per annum for a term of 15 years, with a deferral of payments for the first three years: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the foregoing provision, the obligation to repay all or part of the amounts due shall be subject to the rights of the owners of any bonds or notes issued by the Finance Agency and shall be repaid to the District of Columbia government only from available operating revenues of the Finance Agency that are in excess of the amounts required for debt service, reserve funds, and operating expenses: *Provided further*, That upon commencement of the debt service payments, such payments shall be deposited into the general fund of the District of Columbia.

## PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE

Public safety and justice, including purchase of 135 passenger-carrying vehicles for replacement only, including 130 for police-type use and five for fire-type use, without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, \$930,836,000: *Provided*, That the Metropolitan Police De-

partment is authorized to replace not to exceed 25 passenger-carrying vehicles and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia is authorized to replace not to exceed five passenger-carrying vehicles annually whenever the cost of repair to any damaged vehicle exceeds three-fourths of the cost of the replacement: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500,000 shall be available from this appropriation for the Chief of Police for the prevention and detection of crime: *Provided further*, That \$50,000 of this appropriation shall be available at the discretion of the Chief of Police for community empowerment policing programs: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$25,000 of this appropriation shall be available solely for an accreditation study of the Metropolitan Police Department by a recognized law enforcement accrediting organization: *Provided further*, That the Metropolitan Police Department shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate on efforts to increase efficiency and improve the professionalism in the department: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, or Mayor's Order 86-45, issued March 18, 1986, the Metropolitan Police Department's delegated small purchase authority shall be \$500,000: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for expenses under the District of Columbia Criminal Justice Act, approved September 3, 1974 (88 Stat. 1090; Public Law 93-412; D.C. Code, sec. 11-2601 et seq.), for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, shall be available for obligations incurred under the Act in each fiscal year since inception in fiscal year 1975: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for expenses under the District of Columbia Neglect Representation Equity Act of 1984, effective March 13, 1985 (D.C. Law 5-129; D.C. Code, sec. 16-2304), for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, shall be available for obligations incurred under the Act in each fiscal year since inception in fiscal year 1985: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for expenses under the District of Columbia Guardianship, Protective Proceedings, and Durable Power of Attorney Act of 1986, effective September 30, 1989 (D.C. Law 6-204; D.C. Code, sec. 21-2060), for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, shall be available for obligations incurred under the Act in each fiscal year since inception in fiscal year 1989: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,500 for the Chief Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, \$1,500 for the Chief Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, and \$1,500 for the Executive Officer of the District of Columbia Courts shall be available from this appropriation for official purposes: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall operate and maintain a free, 24-hour telephone information service whereby residents of the area surrounding Lorton prison in Fairfax County, Virginia, can promptly obtain information from District of Columbia government officials on all disturbances at the prison, including escapes, fires, riots, and similar incidents: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia government shall also take steps to publicize the availability of the 24-hour telephone information service among the residents of the area surrounding the Lorton prison: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$100,000 of this appropriation shall be used to reimburse Fairfax County, Virginia, and Prince William County, Virginia, for expenses incurred by the counties during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, in relation to the Lorton prison complex: *Provided further*, That such reimbursements shall be paid in all instances

in which the District requests the counties to provide police, fire, rescue, and related services to help deal with escapes, riots, and similar disturbances involving the prison: *Provided further*, That the staffing levels of each engine company within the Fire Department shall be maintained in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Department Rules and Regulations, if any: *Provided further*, That the reduction in the staffing levels of each two-piece engine company shall not take effect until such time as the Fire Chief certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate that the Department is taking all reasonable steps to reduce the expenses of the Department, including steps to reduce overtime, filling eligible vacancies, returning detailees to their intended positions, and other measures deemed appropriate by the Fire Department: *Provided further*, That when staffing levels are reduced, the pay and salary levels of fire fighter technicians shall be held harmless during the term of the collective bargaining agreement in effect on the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used to implement any staffing plan for the District of Columbia Fire Department that includes the elimination of any positions for Administrative Assistants to the Battalion Fire Chiefs of the Firefighting Division of the Department: *Provided further*, That the Mayor shall reimburse the District of Columbia National Guard for expenses incurred in connection with services that are performed in emergencies by the National Guard in a militia status and are requested by the Mayor, in amounts that shall be jointly determined and certified as due and payable for these services by the Mayor and the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be necessary for reimbursement to the District of Columbia National Guard under the preceding proviso shall be available from this appropriation, and the availability of the sums shall be deemed as constituting payment in advance for the emergency services involved.

#### PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM

Public education system, including the development of national defense education programs, \$706,431,000, to be allocated as follows: \$518,764,000 for the public schools of the District of Columbia; \$1,100,000 for pay-as-you-go capital projects for public schools, of which \$600,000 shall be for renovations to public school athletic and recreational grounds and facilities and \$500,000 shall be for maintenance, improvements, and repairs to public school facilities under the Direct Activity Purchase System (DAPS): *Provided*, That the \$500,000 provided for DAPS shall be returned to the United States Treasury on October 1, 1992, if the amount spent by the District of Columbia out of its own funds under DAPS and for maintenance, improvements, and repairs to public school facilities in fiscal year 1992 is less than the amount spent by the District out of its own funds for such purposes in fiscal year 1991; \$84,200,000 for the District of Columbia Teachers' Retirement Fund; \$73,495,000 for the University of the District of Columbia; \$20,578,000 for the Public Library, of which \$200,000 is to be transferred to the Children's Museum; \$3,527,000 for the Commission on the Arts and Humanities; \$4,290,000 for the District of Columbia School of Law; and \$477,000 for the Education Licensure Commission: *Provided*, That the public schools of the District of Columbia are authorized to accept not to exceed 31 motor vehicles for exclusive use in

the driver education program: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,500 for the Superintendent of Schools, \$2,500 for the President of the University of the District of Columbia, and \$2,000 for the Public Librarian shall be available from this appropriation for expenditures for official purposes: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be available to subsidize the education of non-residents of the District of Columbia at the University of the District of Columbia, unless the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia adopts, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, a tuition rate schedule that will establish the tuition rate for nonresident students at a level no lower than the nonresident tuition rate charged at comparable public institutions of higher education in the metropolitan area.

#### HUMAN SUPPORT SERVICES

Human support services, \$877,033,000: *Provided*, That \$20,848,000 of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, shall be available solely for District of Columbia employees' disability compensation: *Provided further*, That \$10,000,000 of this appropriation for the District of Columbia General Hospital shall not be available for obligation until September 30, 1992 and shall not be expended prior to October 1, 1992: *Provided further*, That the District shall not provide free government services such as water, sewer, solid waste disposal or collection, utilities, maintenance, repairs, or similar services to any legally constituted private nonprofit organization (as defined in section 411(5) of Public Law 100-77, approved July 22, 1987) providing emergency shelter services in the District, if the District would not be qualified to receive reimbursement pursuant to the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Act, approved July 22, 1987 (101 Stat. 485; Public Law 100-77; 42 U.S.C. 11301 et. seq).

#### PUBLIC WORKS

Public Works, including rental of one passenger-carrying vehicle for use by the Mayor and three passenger-carrying vehicles for use by the Council of the District of Columbia and purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles for replacement only, \$234,390,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for collecting ashes or miscellaneous refuse from hotels and places of business.

#### WASHINGTON CONVENTION CENTER FUND

For the Washington Convention Center Fund, \$13,110,000.

#### REPAYMENT OF LOANS AND INTEREST

For reimbursement to the United States of funds loaned in compliance with An Act to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896; Public Law 79-648); section 1 of An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs and to amend provisions of law relating to Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City, approved June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183; Public Law 85-451; D.C. Code, sec. 9-219); section 4 of An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer to connect the Dulles International Airport with the District of Columbia system, approved June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 211; Public Law 86-515); section 723 of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act of 1973, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 821; Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 47-321, note); and section 743(f) of the District of Co-

lumbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act Amendments, approved October 13, 1977 (91 Stat. 1156; Public Law 95-131; D.C. Code, sec. 9-219, note), including interest as required thereby, \$277,577,000.

#### REPAYMENT OF GENERAL FUND DEFICIT

For the purpose of eliminating the \$331,589,000 general fund accumulated deficit as of September 30, 1990, \$41,170,000.

#### OPTICAL AND DENTAL BENEFITS

For optical and dental costs for nonunion employees, \$3,423,000.

#### PERSONAL SERVICES AND NONPERSONAL SERVICES ADJUSTMENT

The Mayor shall reduce authorized appropriations and expenditures for personal services and related nonpersonal services in the amount of \$1,000,000 within one or several of the various appropriation headings in this Act.

#### CAPITAL OUTLAY

For construction projects, \$310,928,946, as authorized by an Act authorizing the laying of water mains and service sewers in the District of Columbia, the levying of assessments therefor, and for other purposes, approved April 22, 1904 (33 Stat. 244; Public Law 58-140; D.C. Code, secs. 43-1512 through 43-1519); the District of Columbia Public Works Act of 1954, approved May 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 101; Public Law 83-364); An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs and to amend provisions of law relating to Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City, approved June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183; Public Law 85-451; D.C. Code, secs. 9-219 and 47-3402); section 3(g) of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 686; Public Law 85-692; D.C. Code, sec. 40-805(7)); and the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969, approved December 9, 1969 (83 Stat. 320; Public Law 91-143; D.C. Code, secs. 1-2451, 1-2452, 1-2454, 1-2456, and 1-2457); including acquisition of sites, preparation of plans and specifications, conducting preliminary surveys, erection of structures, including building improvement and alteration and treatment of grounds, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$17,707,000 shall be available for project management and \$10,273,000 for design by the Director of the Department of Public Works or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Mayor: *Provided further*, That funds for use of each capital project implementing agency shall be managed and controlled in accordance with all procedures and limitations established under the Financial Management System: *Provided further*, That \$1,100,000 for the public school system for pay-as-you-go capital projects shall be financed from general fund operating revenues: *Provided further*, That all funds provided by this appropriation title shall be available only for the specific projects and purposes intended: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the foregoing, all authorizations for capital outlay projects, except those projects covered by the first sentence of section 23(a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, approved August 23, 1968 (82 Stat. 827; Public Law 90-495; D.C. Code, sec. 7-134, note), for which funds are provided by this appropriation title, shall expire on September 30, 1993, except authorizations for projects as to which funds have been obligated in whole or in part prior to September 30, 1993: *Provided further*, That upon expiration of any such project authorization the

funds provided herein for the project shall lapse.

#### WATER AND SEWER ENTERPRISE FUND

For the Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund, \$219,752,000, of which \$38,006,000 shall be apportioned and payable to the debt service fund for repayment of loans and interest incurred for capital improvement projects.

For construction projects, \$51,690,000, as authorized by an Act authorizing the laying of water mains and service sewers in the District of Columbia, the levying of assessments therefor, and for other purposes, approved April 22, 1904 (33 Stat. 244; Public Law 58-140; D.C. Code, sec. 43-1512 et seq.): *Provided*, That the requirements and restrictions that are applicable to general fund capital improvement projects and set forth in this Act under the Capital Outlay appropriation title shall apply to projects approved under this appropriation title: *Provided further*, That \$25,608,000 in water and sewer enterprise fund operating revenues shall be available for pay-as-you-go capital projects.

#### LOTTERY AND CHARITABLE GAMES ENTERPRISE FUND

For the Lottery and Charitable Games Enterprise Fund, established by the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, approved December 4, 1981 (95 Stat. 1174, 1175; Public Law 97-91), as amended, for the purpose of implementing the Law to Legalize Lotteries, Daily Numbers Games, and Bingo and Raffles for Charitable Purposes in the District of Columbia, effective March 10, 1981 (D.C. Law 3-172; D.C. Code, secs. 2-2501 et seq. and 22-1516 et seq.), \$8,450,000, to be derived from non-Federal District of Columbia revenues: *Provided*, That the District of Columbia shall identify the sources of funding for this appropriation title from the District's own locally-generated revenues: *Provided further*, That no revenues from Federal sources shall be used to support the operations or activities of the Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board.

#### CABLE TELEVISION ENTERPRISE FUND

For the Cable Television Enterprise Fund, established by the Cable Television Communications Act of 1981, effective October 22, 1983 (D.C. Law 5-36; D.C. Code, sec. 43-1801 et seq.), \$2,000,000.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 102. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, all vouchers covering expenditures of appropriations contained in this Act shall be audited before payment by the designated certifying official and the vouchers as approved shall be paid by checks issued by the designated disbursing official.

SEC. 103. Whenever in this Act, an amount is specified within an appropriation for particular purposes or objects of expenditure, such amount, unless otherwise specified, shall be considered as the maximum amount that may be expended for said purpose or object rather than an amount set apart exclusively therefor.

SEC. 104. Appropriations in this Act shall be available, when authorized by the Mayor, for allowances for privately owned auto-

mobiles and motorcycles used for the performance of official duties at rates established by the Mayor: *Provided*, That such rates shall not exceed the maximum prevailing rates for such vehicles as prescribed in the Federal Property Management Regulations 101-7 (Federal Travel Regulations).

SEC. 105. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for expenses of travel and for the payment of dues of organizations concerned with the work of the District of Columbia government, when authorized by the Mayor: *Provided*, That the Council of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Courts may expend such funds without authorization by the Mayor.

SEC. 106. There are appropriated from the applicable funds of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary for making refunds and for the payment of judgments that have been entered against the District of Columbia government: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as modifying or affecting the provisions of section 11(c)(3) of title XII of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, approved March 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 78; Public Law 84-460; D.C. Code, sec. 47-1812.11(c)(3)).

SEC. 107. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for the payment of public assistance without reference to the requirement of section 544 of the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1982, effective April 6, 1982 (D.C. Law 4-101; D.C. Code, sec. 3-205.44), and for the non-Federal share of funds necessary to qualify for Federal assistance under the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968, approved July 31, 1968 (82 Stat. 462; Public Law 90-445; 42 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.).

SEC. 108. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 109. No funds appropriated in this Act for the District of Columbia government for the operation of educational institutions, the compensation of personnel, or for other educational purposes may be used to permit, encourage, facilitate, or further partisan political activities. Nothing herein is intended to prohibit the availability of school buildings for the use of any community or partisan political group during non-school hours.

SEC. 110. The annual budget for the District of Columbia government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, shall be transmitted to the Congress no later than April 15, 1992.

SEC. 111. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be made available to pay the salary of any employee of the District of Columbia government whose name, title, grade, salary, past work experience, and salary history are not available for inspection by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on the District of Columbia, the Subcommittee on General Services, Federalism, and the District of Columbia of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, and the Council of the District of Columbia, or their duly authorized representative: *Provided*, That none of the funds contained in this Act shall be made available to pay the salary of any employee of the District of Columbia government whose name and salary are not available for public inspection.

SEC. 112. There are appropriated from the applicable funds of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary for making payments authorized by the District of Co-

lumbia Revenue Recovery Act of 1977, effective September 23, 1977 (D.C. Law 2-20; D.C. Code, sec. 47-421 et seq.).

SEC. 113. No part of this appropriation shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes or implementation of any policy including boycott designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress or any State legislature.

SEC. 114. None of the Federal funds contained in this Act shall be used to perform abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term.

SEC. 115. At the start of the fiscal year, the Mayor shall develop an annual plan, by quarter and by project, for capital outlay borrowings: *Provided*, That within a reasonable time after the close of each quarter, the Mayor shall report to the Council of the District of Columbia and the Congress the actual borrowing and spending progress compared with projections.

SEC. 116. The Mayor shall not borrow any funds for capital projects unless the Mayor has obtained prior approval from the Council of the District of Columbia, by resolution, identifying the projects and amounts to be financed with such borrowings.

SEC. 117. The Mayor shall not expend any moneys borrowed for capital projects for the operating expenses of the District of Columbia government.

SEC. 118. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended by reprogramming except pursuant to advance approval of the reprogramming granted according to the procedure set forth in the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference (House Report No. 96-443), which accompanied the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1980, approved October 30, 1979 (93 Stat. 713; Public Law 96-93), as modified in House Report No. 98-265, and in accordance with the Reprogramming Policy Act of 1980, effective September 16, 1980 (D.C. Law 3-100; D.C. Code, sec. 47-361 et seq.).

SEC. 119. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 120. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act shall be obligated or expended to procure passenger automobiles as defined in the Automobile Fuel Efficiency Act of 1980, approved October 10, 1980 (94 Stat. 1824; Public Law 96-425; 15 U.S.C. 2001(2)), with an Environmental Protection Agency estimated miles per gallon average of less than 22 miles per gallon: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to security, emergency rescue, or armored vehicles.

SEC. 121. (a) Notwithstanding section 422(7) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act of 1973, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 790; Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 1-242(7)), the City Administrator shall be paid, during any fiscal year, a salary at a rate established by the Mayor, not to exceed the rate established for level IV of the Executive Schedule under 5 U.S.C. 5315.

(b) For purposes of applying any provision of law limiting the availability of funds for payment of salary or pay in any fiscal year, the highest rate of pay established by the Mayor under subsection (a) of this section for any position for any period during the last quarter of calendar year 1991 shall be deemed to be the rate of pay payable for that position for September 30, 1991.

(c) Notwithstanding section 4(a) of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945,

approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 793; Public Law 79-592; D.C. Code, sec. 5-803(a)), the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency shall be paid, during any fiscal year, a per diem compensation at a rate established by the Mayor.

SEC. 122. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the provisions of the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978, effective March 3, 1979 (D.C. Law 2-139; D.C. Code, sec. 1-601.1 et seq.), enacted pursuant to section 422(3) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act of 1973, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 790; Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 1-242(3)), shall apply with respect to the compensation of District of Columbia employees: *Provided*, That for pay purposes, employees of the District of Columbia government shall not be subject to the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code.

SEC. 123. The Director of the Department of Administrative Services may pay rentals and repair, alter, and improve rented premises, without regard to the provisions of section 322 of the Economy Act of 1932 (Public Law 72-212; 40 U.S.C. 278a), upon a determination by the Director, that by reason of circumstances set forth in such determination, the payment of these rents and the execution of this work, without reference to the limitations of section 322, is advantageous to the District in terms of economy, efficiency, and the District's best interest.

SEC. 124. No later than 30 days after the end of the first quarter of the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall submit to the Council of the District of Columbia the new fiscal year 1992 revenue estimates as of the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1992. These estimates shall be used in the budget request for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993. The officially revised estimates at midyear shall be used for the midyear report.

SEC. 125. Section 466(b) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act of 1973, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 806; Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 47-326), as amended, is amended by striking "sold before October 1, 1991" and inserting "sold before October 1, 1992".

SEC. 126. No sole source contract with the District of Columbia government or any agency thereof may be renewed or extended without opening that contract to the competitive bidding process as set forth in section 303 of the District of Columbia Procurement Practices Act of 1985, effective February 21, 1986 (D.C. Law 6-85; D.C. Code, sec. 1-1183.3), except that the District of Columbia Public Schools may renew or extend sole source contracts for which competition is not feasible or practical, provided that the determination as to whether to invoke the competitive bidding process has been made in accordance with duly promulgated Board of Education rules and procedures.

SEC. 127. For purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, approved December 12, 1985 (99 Stat. 1037; Public Law 99-177), as amended, the term "program, project, and activity" shall be synonymous with and refer specifically to each account appropriating Federal funds in this Act, and any sequestration order shall be applied to each of the accounts rather than to the aggregate total of those accounts: *Provided*, That sequestration orders shall not be applied to any account that is specifically exempted from sequestration by

the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (99 Stat. 1037; Public Law 99-177), as amended.

SEC. 128. In the event a sequestration order is issued pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (99 Stat. 1037; Public Law 99-177), as amended, after the amounts appropriated to the District of Columbia for the fiscal year involved have been paid to the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury, within 15 days after receipt of a request therefor from the Secretary of the Treasury, such amounts as are sequestered by the order: *Provided*, That the sequestration percentage specified in the order shall be applied proportionately to each of the Federal appropriation accounts in this Act that are not specifically exempted from sequestration by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (99 Stat. 1037; Public Law 99-177), as amended.

SEC. 129. Sec. 133(e) of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1990, as amended, is amended by striking "December 31, 1991" and inserting "December 31, 1992".

SEC. 130. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1992 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 131. For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, the District of Columbia shall pay interest on its quarterly payments to the United States that are made more than 60 days from the date of receipt of an itemized statement from the Federal Bureau of Prisons of amounts due for housing District of Columbia convicts in Federal penitentiaries for the preceding quarter.

SEC. 132. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used by the District of Columbia to provide for the salaries, expenses, or other costs associated with the offices of United States Senator or United States Representative under section 4(d) of the District of Columbia Statehood Constitutional Convention Initiative of 1979, effective March 10, 1981 (D.C. Law 3-171; D.C. Code, sec. 1-113(d)).

SEC. 133. (a) Up to 75 officers or members of the Metropolitan Police Department who were hired before February 14, 1980, and who retire on disability before the end of calendar year 1991 shall be excluded from the computation of the rate of disability retirement under subsection 145(a) of the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act, as amended, approved September 30, 1983 (97 Stat. 727; D.C. Code, sec. 1-725(a)), for purposes of reducing the authorized Federal payment to the District of Columbia Police Officers and Fire Fighters' Retirement Fund pursuant to subsection 145(c) of the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act.

(b) The Mayor, within 30 days after the enactment of this Act, shall engage an enrolled actuary, to be paid by the District of Columbia Retirement Board, and shall comply with the requirements of sections 142(d) and 144(d) of the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act of 1979, approved November 17, 1979 (93 Stat. 866; Public Law 96-122; D.C. Code, secs. 1-722(d) and 1-724(d)).

(c) If any of the 75 light duty positions that may become vacant under subsection (a) of this section are filled, a civilian employee shall be hired to fill that position or it shall be filled by an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department for a temporary period of time.

(d) The limited duty policy of the Metropolitan Police Department shall be that in effect prior to July 8, 1990, unless ordered by the relevant court.

SEC. 134. (a) An entity of the District of Columbia government may accept and use a gift or donation during fiscal year 1992 if—

(1) the Mayor approves the acceptance and use of the gift or donation; and

(2) the entity uses the gift or donation to carry out its authorized functions or duties.

(b) Each entity of the District of Columbia government shall keep accurate and detailed records of the acceptance and use of any gift or donation under subsection (a), and shall make such records available for audit and public inspection.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "entity of the District of Columbia government" includes an independent agency of the District of Columbia.

This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1992".

## TITLE II

### FISCAL YEAR 1991 SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

#### GOVERNMENTAL DIRECTION AND SUPPORT

##### (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Governmental direction and support", \$257,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2226 to 2227), \$5,650,000 are rescinded for a net decrease of \$5,393,000: *Provided further*, That of the \$9,077,000 appropriated under this heading for fiscal year 1991 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2226), to pay legal, management, investment, and other fees and administrative expenses of the District of Columbia Retirement Board, none shall be derived from the general fund and not to exceed \$9,077,000 shall be derived from the earnings of the applicable retirement funds: *Provided further*, That within fifteen days of the date of enactment of this Act the District of Columbia Retirement Board shall reimburse the general fund of the District by an amount not to exceed \$818,000 for any expenses of the Board paid with general fund revenues in fiscal year 1991: *Provided further*, That the Mayor shall submit to the Council of the District of Columbia by October 1, 1991, a reorganization plan for the Department of Finance and Revenue that shall follow the directives and initiatives contained in the Report of the Committee of the Whole on Bill 9-151, the Fiscal Year 1991 Supplemental Budget and Rescissions of Authority Request Act of 1991, at 8-20 (March 25, 1991).

#### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION

##### (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Economic development and regulation", \$37,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2227), \$29,525,000 are rescinded for a net decrease of \$29,488,000.

#### PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE

##### (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Public safety and justice", \$10,774,000, of which an additional \$3,600,000 shall be allocated to the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department; an additional \$84,000 shall be allocated to the Civilian Complaint Review Board; and notwithstanding any other law, an additional \$7,090,000 shall be allocated for the

District of Columbia Police Officers and Fire Fighters' Retirement Fund: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2227 to 2229), \$20,711,000 are rescinded for a net decrease of \$9,937,000: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, of the funds available for fiscal year 1991, \$225,000 of the amount allocated to the District of Columbia Judge's Retirement Fund are rescinded.

The following provision under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2228), is repealed: "*Provided further*, That at least 21 ambulances shall be maintained on duty 24 hours per day, 365 days a year."

#### PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Public education system", \$200,000 for the Public Library to be transferred to the Children's Museum.

Of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2229), \$11,123,000 for the D.C. Public Schools; \$10,000,000 for pay-as-you-go capital projects for public schools; \$3,418,000 for the University of the District of Columbia; \$41,000 for the Education Licensure Commission; \$327,000 for the Commission on Arts and Humanities; and notwithstanding any other provisions of law, \$23,650,000 for the District of Columbia Teachers' Retirement Fund are rescinded for a net decrease of \$48,359,000.

The following provision under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2229), is repealed: "*Provided further*, That the amount allocated under this title for the public schools shall be increased, dollar for dollar up to \$36,400,000, by the amount the annual Federal payment for fiscal year 1991 is increased above the current \$430,500,000 Federal payment in fiscal year 1990."

#### HUMAN SUPPORT SERVICES (RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2229 to 2230), \$11,227,000 are rescinded.

#### PUBLIC WORKS (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Public works", \$2,965,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2230), \$2,949,000 are rescinded for a net increase of \$16,000.

#### WASHINGTON CONVENTION CENTER FUND

For an additional amount for "Washington Convention Center Fund", \$2,756,000.

#### REPAYMENT OF LOANS AND INTEREST

For an additional amount for "Repayment of loans and interest", \$8,577,000.

#### REPAYMENT OF GENERAL FUND DEFICIT

The paragraph under the heading "Repayment of General Fund Deficit", in the Dis-

trict of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2231), is repealed.

#### SHORT-TERM BORROWINGS

For an additional amount for "Short-term borrowings", \$8,142,000.

#### OPTICAL AND DENTAL BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Optical and dental benefits", \$311,000.

#### SUPPLY, ENERGY, AND EQUIPMENT ADJUSTMENT

The paragraph under the heading "Supply, energy, and equipment adjustment", in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2231), is repealed.

#### PERSONAL SERVICES ADJUSTMENT

The paragraph under the heading "Personal services adjustment", in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2231), is repealed.

#### CAPITAL OUTLAY

For an additional amount for "Capital outlay", \$73,570,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading in prior fiscal years for the Mount Vernon Square Campus project of the University of the District of Columbia, \$39,134,000 are rescinded for a net increase of \$34,436,000: *Provided further*, That \$2,644,000 shall be available for project management and \$3,212,000 for design by the Director of the Department of Public Works or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Mayor.

#### WATER AND SEWER ENTERPRISE FUND (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund", \$23,633,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2232), \$35,880,000 are rescinded for a net decrease of \$12,247,000: *Provided further*, That \$35,852,000 of the amounts available for fiscal year 1991 shall be apportioned and payable to the debt service fund for repayment of loans and interest incurred for capital improvement projects instead of \$36,608,000 as provided under this heading in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2232): *Provided further*, That \$15,477,000 in water and sewer enterprise fund operating revenues shall be available for pay-as-you-go capital projects instead of \$39,609,000 as provided under this heading in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2232).

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. Sec. 112 of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1991, approved November 5, 1990 (Public Law 101-518; 104 Stat. 2234), is amended by striking "April 15, 1991" and inserting "May 17, 1991".

SEC. 102. (a) An entity of the District of Columbia government may accept and use a gift or donation during fiscal year 1991 if—

(1) the Mayor approves the acceptance and use of the gift or donation; and

(2) the entity uses the gift or donation to carry out its authorized functions or duties.

(b) Each entity of the District of Columbia government shall keep accurate and detailed records of the acceptance and use of any gift or donation under subsection (a), and shall

make such records available for audit and public inspection.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "entity of the District of Columbia government" includes an independent agency of the District of Columbia.

This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act, 1991".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order?

Are there any amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, insert after line 20 the following new section:

SEC. 135. (a) The Mayor shall ensure that the requirements of the Buy American Act apply to all procurements made with any funds provided under this Act.

(b)(1) If the Mayor, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an agreement by discriminating against certain types of products produced in the United States that are covered by the agreement, the United States Trade Representative shall rescind the waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to the procurement of such types of products produced in that foreign country with funds provided under this Act.

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is any agreement between the United States and a foreign country pursuant to which the head of an agency of the United States Government has waived the requirements of the Buy American Act with respect to certain products produced in the foreign country.

(c) The Mayor shall submit to Congress a report on the amount of procurements from foreign entities made in fiscal years 1992 and 1993 with funds provided under this Act. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items procured with such funds for which the Buy American Act was waived pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (b)(2), the Trade Agreements Act of 1979, or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(d) No contract or subcontract made with funds provided under this Act may be awarded for the procurement of an article, material, or supply produced or manufactured in a foreign country whose government unfairly maintains in government procurement a significant and persistent pattern or practice of discrimination against United States products or services which results in identifiable harm to United States businesses, as identified by the President pursuant to section 305(g)(1)(A) of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979.

(e) If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, that person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided under this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

(f) For purposes of this section, the term "Buy American Act" means title III of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Depart-

ments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.).

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, this is an agreement that was reached with the authorizing committee and the Committee on Appropriations on Buy American language.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment because I do not understand its total implications and how it would affect the District government. I have indicated to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] that I would not ask for a roll-call vote. Also, his amendment is subject to a point of order, but I will not make that point of order.

Mr. GALLO. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GALLO. Madam Chairman, we have no objections on this side.

The Chairman. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRBACHER

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROHRBACHER: Page 2, line 7, strike "\$630,500,000" and insert "\$611,268,000".

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Chairman, this amendment, together with the next amendment I will offer, is another in the ongoing series of appropriations amendments aimed at holding spending to a 2.4-percent increase over the current level. If we could hold spending increases to 2.4 percent for the next 4 fiscal years, growth in revenues, with no tax increases, we would be able to catch up with growth in spending, and we would achieve a balanced budget.

Let me repeat that: If we can just hold spending growth to 2.4 percent, we are going to get control of the Federal deficit that threatens everything that we have in this country today.

Madam Chairman, I am pleased to be given the honor of offering this particular 2.4 percent amendment, because it is even more justified than any of the others.

It is true, Madam Chairman, that the District of Columbia government has taken a great turn for the better in the past year with the elections of Mayor

Dixon, Chairman Wilson, and our own colleague, Mrs. NORTON. No one could be happier about the new, more realistic attitude in the District building than I. But, as a member of the D.C. Committee and Republican chairman of its Fiscal Affairs and Health Subcommittee, I have to note that this Congress has already been extremely generous with the District of Columbia and will still be very generous if my amendment passes.

Last week, the House passed the authorization bill for the Federal payment, setting the Federal payment level for fiscal year 1992 at \$630 million. This in itself represented a 32-percent increase over the level of fiscal year 1990.

The Appropriations Committee has decided even this is not enough. Not only did they nudge up the regular Federal payment to \$630.5 million, they added four extra Federal payments, making the total Federal payment, not including the pension fund contributions, to \$643.7 million, or 35 percent above the fiscal year 1990 level.

I am offering two amendments to get us to a reasonable level of spending. The first reduces the regular Federal payment from \$630.5 million to \$611.3 million. The second amendment takes out all the additional Federal payments that take this bill beyond the level of the authorization bill we just passed here on this floor last week.

Madam Chairman, Congress is facing a budget deficit of over \$400 billion. That is over a billion dollars a day in the red that we are spending. With this massive deficit, we cannot give even the most beloved and deserving Federal agencies as much as we might like them to have. Neither can we do that for the D.C. government.

It is time to say, "Enough is enough." And locking in a 25-percent increase over 2 years, plus 2.4 percent more is going to have to be enough. I ask my colleagues to support this small step toward fiscal sanity and ask them to vote for my amendments.

Madam Chairman, if we are going to have a viable government, if we are going to have the resources we need to do what is necessary for the well-being of our citizens across the United States of America, we have to be responsible.

□ 1050

We have to come to grips with this deficit and holding the spending level at 2.4-percent increase across the line is a very responsible and a very effective way of getting control of the deficit without causing the maximum degree of pain. If we do not get control of the deficit now with these very reasonable approaches of keeping growth to 2.4 percent, in the future we are going to face, and it is in the near future, a mammoth crisis that will overwhelm this body and overwhelm the well-being of the American people.

The young people who watch this debate in the galleries are going to be strapped with a debt that is going to knock the legs out from the economy in which they will live. They will not have jobs. This body will not be able to allocate money for the projects that they think are necessary because this body will be overwhelmed with red ink.

It is unfair. It is absolutely irresponsible for us to go on with this unrestricted spending. My proposal is a modest proposal keeping the growth of spending to 2.4 percent, and this can be done in the District of Columbia as well as other spending bills.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment for several reasons.

First of all, let me point out that this bill is within the 602(b) allocation. Second, the House authorizing committee on which this Member from California sits, passed out an authorization for \$630 million 2 weeks ago.

Third, the Federal payment, in my opinion, has been long overdue for an increase. As the delegate from the District of Columbia pointed out yesterday, the last time the Federal payment was increased was in 1984. At that time it was set at \$425 million and it has been held at \$425 million since that time.

Fourth, it is important that since the District of Columbia has new leadership and they have really taken extreme measures to provide for not only a balanced budget, but curtailing their programs, they need every dollar in this bill.

The Federal payment is not a gift to the District of Columbia. It is in lieu of property taxes. We have cut them over the last 7 years and I think it is inappropriate to cut them now.

The second amendment that the gentleman from California recommends is cutting \$12 million from the D.C. General Hospital. Public health is a serious issue in this community. It not only affects the citizens of this community, it can ultimately affect the tourists who come to visit.

There are 120,000 uninsured people that receive medical services here in the District of Columbia. Why the gentleman would select cutting health programs for people who are poor and uninsured, I do not understand.

Further, we all have a concern with the D.C. Board of Education and with the public school system. The gentleman's amendment would cut \$1.1 million from renovations to public schools. We have all seen the rundown conditions of some of the public schools. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO] and I have been working on this project for the last 2 years. Why the gentleman has selected to cut \$1.1 million from renovations and maintenance of public schools, I cannot imagine.

All in all, Madam Chairman, it seems very clear that the District government's new leadership is performing well. They are taking extraordinary measures to cut employment and to reduce their accumulated general fund deficit. And the projects that are funded in this bill involve health and education and are well supported by the testimony we received. And they are certainly supported by the authorizing committee.

Madam Chairman, I would ask Members to vote against this amendment.

Mr. GALLO. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the Rohrabacher amendment.

Madam Chairman, this amendment would reduce the Federal payment from \$630.5 million to \$611 million.

Our bill as it currently stands is consistent with the authorization bill that only recently passed this House by unanimous voice vote.

It is also in compliance with the budget resolution and within our 602(b) allocation.

The House approved the higher Federal payment because of its faith in the new leadership of the District, its understanding about the current financial crisis in our Nation's Capital and because it is our best opportunity in years to help put an end to the problems in the District and put this city back on the right track.

Let's not waste this opportunity.

It may be an easy budget vote to vote in favor of this cut, but I urge my colleagues to reject this cut and support our efforts to restore pride in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. AUCOIN. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this piece of legislation.

The District of Columbia has impressive new leadership in city hall, and I think this bill reflects the confidence of Members of Congress in that new leadership; so at a time when we all have very, very high hopes for a new era in this Nation's Capital city and in the District government, I find it surprising and I find it deplorable that the President is once again threatening to veto this piece of legislation, this bill that provides pass-through funding and funding for the District of Columbia.

Why is the President willing to veto money for such things as the Children's Hospital, for education, for public safety here in the Nation's Capital? Well, it is because the bill allows the District the same degree of local control over abortion funding, with local taxpayers' dollars for poor women that is currently enjoyed in every other city in every other State in the land. That is the reason.

I find that an incredible statement, an incredible fact; nevertheless, it is true.

I guess I only have one message for the President, and it is this: "Mr. President, you have already paid your debt to the antichoice extremists several times over. I urge you to sign this piece of legislation and get on with the Nation's business."

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from California.

This is the balanced budget amendment, and the gentleman from California has described it very adequately and accurately; but I would remind the Members that really the question here is one of priorities, because what the gentleman from California is attempting to do is assure that as we consider spending in the House, we consider the option of ultimately balancing the Federal budget.

Now, I realize that is a difficult thing, but there are an awful lot of Members of this House, in fact I would say the vast majority, in fact I would say three-quarters of the Members of this House have gone on record at some point in their districts saying they favor a balanced budget.

Now, a lot of those Members of Congress who say that they voted against the constitutional amendment to balance the budget because they said, "Well, we ought not burden the Constitution. We ought to have the guts to stand up and do what is right and cut the spending."

Well, that seemed to me and to others to be a challenge. If in fact we are going to stand up and cut the spending, then what you have to do as spending bills come through, you have to have some standard that assures that the end product is a balanced budget.

In this particular instance, the gentleman from California has described accurately how we would achieve that. If you can hold for 4 fiscal years a spending level at 2.4 percent above the 1991 levels, in other words, 2.4 percent each year, you can get to a balanced budget by the fiscal year 1995.

A lot of the American people would like to see us get to a balanced budget by 1995. The reason why they would like to see us get there is they are disturbed by the increasing problem of massive Federal debt and the interest payments that go with it. We could very well by 1995, as we proceed down the route we are going, end up paying more interest each year than we pay for national defense, and then the burden of that ongoing for the next generation of Americans is just absolutely unbelievable.

So some of us have determined that regardless of the consequences that are involved in some of the decisions that are being made, we think that the highest priority ought to be a balanced budget and we ought to hold the line to that balanced budget.

□ 1100

Now, believe me, this does not bring about any great sacrifice. We take all of the priorities that the committees have determined and simply put a spending cap on these priorities so that the spending cap reflects a 2.4-percent increase. So no priorities are going to be eliminated.

This is simply going to be trimmed down to fit within a balanced budget. In this particular case I think the committee accurately described what would happen: The Federal payment would be trimmed back.

I realize in the District of Columbia that will not be popular. I would say to the Members of this body, think about the priority. Are you more in favor of the Federal payment to the District or are you more in favor of doing something that will ultimately help us—just help us, this does not do it all by itself—help us to get to a balanced budget?

Later on today I will be offering a similar amendment to the HHS bill. There it is a much tougher decision, I would say, for the Members. There are a lot of hard-nut programs that you have to trim back a little in order to get to a balanced budget.

But the fact is we ought to be willing to do that too if we are going to achieve a balanced budget at some point for our society.

So that is the real issue here. It is a matter of priorities. Some people are going to decide to them increasing the Federal payment to the District is more important than a balanced budget. Fine, go ahead and vote that way if that is your sense of priorities. I am sure your constituents will understand.

To me, the balanced budget is such that I think that that is what is important to do.

Yesterday we had a couple of Members come to the floor, and their attempt to cut Federal spending was to take \$42,000 away from the protection of the Vice President's children. I would say that saving several million dollars in this amendment might get us closer to a balanced budget over the long term than the kinds of games that we play on the floor with a few thousand dollars here and there.

So, I would ask the Members to support the Rohrabacher amendment. The Rohrabacher amendment does do the job in this particular bill of moving us closer to a balanced budget, something that I think a majority of the American people would like to do.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. DIXON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I think the last speaker, the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania, points out quite clearly the problem with the D.C. budget. In essence, what he says is you can vote for a cut in this bill for political purposes. He says the next bill, the Labor-Health and Human Services Appropriations bill, is going to be harder to cut. He is exactly right.

This bill has no constituency. So what he says to you is that it is going to be harder to cut the next bill, but you can show the folks back home that you are for cuts by cutting the Federal payment, the money that is owed the District of Columbia in lieu of property taxes.

There have been a half dozen bills on this floor, and none of them has been able to take a 2.4 percent cut. Why? Because there are important programs in those bills that affect their constituents. And, yes, it is much more difficult to make a cut in Mr. NATCHER's bill, the Labor-Health and Human Services and Education bill, and very easy on this one.

But what is fair for some should be fair for all. You cannot balance the budget of the United States by constantly cutting the Federal payment to the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because I just want to point out to the gentleman that there have been a number of bills on the floor where the 2.4 percent amendment has not been offered because the bill itself was below the 2.4 percent limit. So, in fact, the committee itself in several instances has determined a sense of priorities where the priorities in the bill are below the 2.4 percent.

Mr. DIXON. On those bills that a cut has not been offered, it was because they were within their 602(b) allocation. Our bill is also within our 602(b) allocation, but it is easy to offer an amendment to cut it for political reasons to show that you are for budget cuts.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield further, all I would say to the gentleman is there are no politics involved here. We are offering this amendment to every one of the bills that come out here which is more than 2.4 percent above last year's spending. We are offering it to every bill which is more than that above 1991 spending.

So the issue is perfectly clear.

Mr. DIXON. The gentleman makes my point. On all of those bills where he has offered his amendment, the amendment has not passed.

Mr. WALKER. That is right.

Mr. DIXON. This bill is within the 602(b) allocation. What the gentleman suggested was this was an easy one to cut because there is no program here that affects any Member of Congress except the Delegate from the District

of Columbia. That is clearly what he suggested when he said it would be much more difficult to cut Mr. NATCHER's bill that funds Labor, Health and Human Services and Education programs all across this country.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Madam Chairman, I want to point out to the gentleman I hope that was not my remark. What I said to Members was that this was a question of priorities, and I still believe it is a question of priorities and Members can make their own judgment as to whether it is an easy priority or a hard one.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Well, I am glad the gentleman took the time, and I am glad that I yielded to him in the last few seconds, because I think that makes the chairman's point even more clear. This is a matter of priorities, and the reality is that those who keep insisting on these amendments are drawing priorities against people.

This is another one of those votes we are being asked to take against people, against American citizens who somehow become, for at least some Members on the other side, the lowest priority in this country.

This is not for projects, it is not for programs, it is not for a space station; it is not for anything but people.

And, Madam Chairman, this is to run the District of Columbia, the Federal share of what it costs to run the District of Columbia, for the loss that they sustain by virtue of having no tax revenues from the property which we have usurped to run this country, to put our Federal buildings on, et cetera.

This is what we are now talking about.

This amendment, as the chairman characterizes it, is easy because there is no constituency to fight against it. The trouble is it is not fair.

It may be easy, but there is no fairness here at all. This is not where you should draw the line on priorities.

People on the other side were willing to vote 2 weeks ago to spend a quarter of a billion dollars out of the HUD programs to put that into a space station. That is what the vision of their priority is. But that is not what most Americans really see as priorities. They want to see Americans as a priority, the people themselves as a priority.

I would urge all of the Members of this body to reject this type of prioritization, notwithstanding it is done in the name of deficit budget cutting.

Madam Chairman, I would urge people to remember what the chairman said.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Madam Chairman, this is indeed a matter of principle. This is the Nation's Capital. All of us have a constituency here, all of us have visitors who come here every year, 18 million of them a year.

Fifty-five percent of the property in this District is tax exempt. I dare say there is hardly another community in America with such a high percentage. We have height limitations on the District so that they cannot increase the height of their buildings and there by increase their tax base.

There are countless numbers of demonstrations every year for which the District has to supply police and other safety personnel.

We have heads of state who come and require police escorts, special protection, all of which underscores the responsibility that we have.

Yes, we have to be mindful of the budget, and the authorizing committee was mindful. The Mayor had originally requested 30 percent of local revenues as a Federal payment and had requested it for 5 years in the authorization. Realizing the budget problems that we have, the committee cut back the authorization to 24 percent, and we also limited it to 3 years.

We are not just talking about \$20 million here, we are talking about restoring dignity, restoring relations between the District Building and indeed this House of Representatives.

□ 1110

If we vote for this amendment, we are inviting a failure of the Mayor and the Council to be able to come to grips with the massive problems they face. They do not have an easy task now, and we will surely see, in my opinion, the Mayor coming back to this body next spring for another supplemental. We do not want that.

I would remind my colleagues that Federal outlays based on constant 1982 dollars have risen 7 percent between 1977 and 1991. Yet the Federal payment measured in constant 1982 dollars has fallen by 5 percent. We cannot expect the District of Columbia to balance the Federal budget alone. All of us have a responsibility, and I would hope that the Members would reject this amendment.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chairman. I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I appreciate the kind remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], who offered this amendment. I appreciate his thoughtful study of the problems of the District of Columbia and his support for the concept of the Federal payment, but I want to associate myself with the remarks of the chairs on both sides of the aisle, with the remarks of the distinguished chair of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appro-

riations, the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON], the ranking member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO], and the ranking member of the authorization committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

Madam Chairman, I would note that I associate myself with the remarks from both sides of the aisle because this measure has come to this body with most unusual support, not only with a 10-to-2 vote out of the authorization committee, but in the Appropriations Committee and the subcommittee it had unanimous support.

I remind this body, Madam Chairman, that this bill broke precedent in another way. The Speaker of this body, Mr. FOLEY, and the minority leader, Mr. MICHEL, both sent letters to Members of this body supporting the bill containing this appropriation. Mr. MICHEL came to the well to speak for the Federal payment formula.

Madam Chairman, the District of Columbia lost close to \$1 billion during more than 5 years of no increases. We have not tried to recover that amount. We recognize that we will never recover that amount. We remind this body that we did not stop delivering services to the Federal Government during this period of extreme drought in our Federal payment. What did we do instead?

Madam Chairman, what we did was to increase our own taxes by 50 percent in 5 short years. I submit that the residents of the District of Columbia, Madam Chairman, have made their contribution to balancing the budget by 1995 because we have taxed ourselves and absorbed expenses properly charged to the Federal Government during the last 5 years.

Madam Chairman, our residents are at this moment absorbing \$200 million in cuts this fiscal year, and in the next fiscal year we will absorb another \$200 million in cuts, for a cumulative \$400 million in cuts. We come to this body not with our hands held out but with very clean hands, having dug even deeper into our own pockets. We, who are second per capita in taxes paid in the United States, say to the Members that this is the posture in which we come to this body, Madam Chairman, and our Mayor needs support, no lip service, as she now embarks on yet another and more difficult mission to downsize the District, which is what this body has asked her to do. She is attempting what very few Mayors have attempted successfully. She needs the support of this body now more than ever.

Mayor Sharon Pratt Dixon has won great support and respect in this body from her first day in office. She announced that there would be cuts by the District government before she came to this body, and that is one of the primary reasons she has won such respect in this body. Her respect is not

without reason, and the way to respond or to show our respect to her is not simply by compliments but by voting this measure which she has requested. And we should understand that she requested less than she knows she needs. She has gone back to the businesses of the District already for increased taxes.

Madam Chairman, the reform that is underway is not free. It cannot be accomplished without the strong support of this body. This body will send a very negative signal to the residents of the District who thus far have supported the Mayor when she has asked them to do very, very difficult things—we will send a very negative signal if we vote to weaken the appropriation. The responsible thing is not always to cut; the responsible thing to do with this measure is to follow the Appropriation Committee's lead.

Ms. MOLINARI. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Chairman, first of all, we have several issues we have to examine when we are talking about this amendment, and it is important for everyone to understand that no one is asking for us to cut the amount of money that is going to the District of Columbia, just as the other proposals at 2.4 percent are not asking for cuts in the level of Federal spending on the various spending bills that are coming before this body.

What we are talking about is limiting the growth in Federal spending. That means there are no cuts taking place in Federal spending, but Federal spending is being brought under control, and the increase in Federal spending is being kept to 2.4 percent. This idea that we are cutting spending in any way is just giving a false impression of what the central issue is.

The central issue is that either we are going to control deficit spending or in a very short period of time deficit spending is going to control us. We must get Federal deficit spending under control or it is going to overwhelm this body. There are people who are crying, "Whoa," and that is true. We are saying, "Watch out, something is coming." There is a wave of deficit red ink that is headed in our direction and that is going to drown our society.

That is what this debate is about. It affects not just the District of Columbia payment, the money that we are giving to the District of Columbia. We are saying that we have to control the amount of increase in Federal spending, that we must keep it within 2.4 percent on the spending bills that come before this body. If we do that, future generations, those young people who watch us on C-SPAN, who watch us in the halls here, and who watch us debate, can be assured that their futures will be brighter because we are not

spending the money that should be available to them and their representatives 10 years down the line. If we do not get Federal spending under control, what will happen is that their elected representatives will never have this option because they will be spending all the money on interest payments. Is that the legacy of democracy we want to leave the young people of this country? I say that holding down spending to 2.4 percent is a very reasonable and responsible approach. We are not calling for spending cuts. Let us note that if my proposal is accepted, spending for the District of Columbia would still be 28-percent higher than it was for fiscal year 1990. So what is all this about cutting spending?

□ 1120

I am saying that we can still have spending that is still 28-percent higher than it was 2 years ago. This is a tremendous increase in spending. But we have got to get control of it. One way to do it is to set this overall limit.

One of the side benefits of this is that local government in the District of Columbia will have to set priorities. We applaud the new mayor, Sharon Pratt Dixon, for the fact that she has taken some strong leadership positions and made some tough decisions. But let us note that the District of Columbia, before she came in to make these reforms, and we want to encourage her to make more reforms, that it was the most bloated local government in the entire United States of America. That is why these reforms were absolutely justified.

Madam Chairman, we have to have that same sort of decisionmaking that Mayor Sharon Pratt Dixon is making here in the District of Columbia. We have to have that same courage at the Federal level. We have to be able to prioritize. If we just keep passing more and more spending, saying that we are not even going to set a limit on how high that spending can go, we are asking on one to make the responsible decisions of what should and what should not be increased.

Let me note that we are not talking about spending for hospitals being cut, nor all of the other things one hears that touches one's heartstrings. We are not talking about cutting spending to those. We are talking about keeping control on the growth in spending of those institutions, not actually cutting the amount of money that they will have when the whole process is over.

Madam Chairman, is it wrong to say let us try to make our hospitals and our institutions more effective by making sure that we just do not pour more money on more money, and that we will actually limit the growth, thus ensuring the quality of life of the young people who will follow us and generations of Americans to come? This is a very responsible approach,

and I would ask Members to support my amendment, which is part of an overall program to try to get control of the Federal deficit.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I fall in line with many of the Members who want to see a balanced budget come about. I have strenuously supported all measures up to now throughout the entire incumbency that I have enjoyed in attempting to reach that hallowed place of the balanced budget, and I will continue to do so. But for the moment, I will lapse from that ecstasy of reaching the balanced budget, for an important reason.

Madam Chairman, I believe that the entire country was looking with disgust and dismay at the leadership of the District of Columbia for the last several years, and that that seeped over into a disgust that the Congress of the United States felt about what was happening in its neighborhood in the District of Columbia. But it is new day, and the new breath of fresh air that the new Mayor has brought in has restored a sense of confidence in the citizens themselves of Washington, DC.

Madam Chairman, more importantly, for our purposes, it has given the Members of Congress and the people across the land a new vision of possibilities for self-government at the highest level here in Washington, DC.

Madam Chairman, we cannot at this moment feel great about the new Mayor and the new breath of fresh air, and then rip away from her the modest tools that we are providing with these appropriations. Even though I feel they may be budget busters under the terminology that we use, this is an emergency situation. It is just as much an emergency situation as those kinds of emergencies which would compel the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from California, my fellow colleagues, that kind of emergency which would make even them bander away for a while from an effort to reach a balanced budget. That is how strong I feel about it.

Madam Chairman, I want to see this Mayor succeed. I want to see the neighborhoods brought back to a sense of order. I want the partnership and neighborhoodship between the Congress of the United States and the District of Columbia to flourish. This is an excellent time to do so.

I was in a taxicab this morning with a taxi driver who lives in the District of Columbia, who said he did not vote for Dixon; he voted for one of the other candidates that were on the ticket at that time. But he is so glad, even though he made a mistake, that the populace did not make a mistake, and that it is a change for the better.

Madam Chairman, we have to endorse that change for the better and support the District. This is part of our

domain. This is our neighborhood. This is part of the future of our country, from the standpoint of the search for better government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 153, noes 270, not voting 9, as follows:

## [Roll No. 197]

## AYES—153

Allard	Hammerschmidt	Petri
Andrews (TX)	Hancock	Porter
Applegate	Hansen	Pursell
Archer	Hastert	Quillen
Armey	Hayes (LA)	Ramstad
Baker	Hefley	Ravenel
Ballenger	Henry	Riggs
Barrett	Herger	Rinaldo
Barton	Holloway	Ritter
Bennett	Huckaby	Roberts
Bentley	Hughes	Roemer
Bereuter	Hunter	Rogers
Bilirakis	Hutto	Rohrabacher
Boehner	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks	Inhofe	Roth
Broomfield	Ireland	Roukema
Burton	James	Santorum
Byron	Johnson (SD)	Sarpalius
Camp	Johnson (TX)	Saxton
Campbell (CA)	Kasich	Schaefer
Campbell (CO)	Kolbe	Schulze
Clement	Kyl	Sensenbrenner
Clinger	Lagomarsino	Shaw
Coble	LaRocco	Shuster
Coleman (MO)	Laughlin	Skelton
Combest	Leach	Smith (OR)
Cox (CA)	Lent	Smith (TX)
Crane	Lewis (FL)	Snowe
Cunningham	Lightfoot	Solomon
Dannemeyer	Lipinski	Spence
DeLay	Livingston	Stearns
Dickinson	Luken	Stump
Doollittle	Machtley	Swett
Dorgan (ND)	Marlenee	Tauzin
Dornan (CA)	McCandless	Taylor (MS)
Dreier	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	McCrery	Thomas (CA)
Edwards (OK)	McEwen	Thomas (WY)
Edwards (TX)	Miller (OH)	Upton
English	Moorhead	Valentine
Fawell	Murphy	Vander Jagt
Fields	Neal (NC)	Volkmer
Galleghy	Nichols	Vucanovich
Geren	Nussle	Walker
Glickman	Orton	Walsh
Goss	Packard	Weber
Grandy	Pallone	Weldon
Gunderson	Patterson	Wilson
Hall (OH)	Paxon	Wylie
Hall (TX)	Penny	Zeliff
	Peterson (MN)	Zimmer

## NOES—270

Abercrombie	Bilbray	Chandler
Alexander	Bliley	Chapman
Anderson	Boehlert	Clay
Andrews (ME)	Bonior	Coleman (TX)
Andrews (NJ)	Borski	Collins (IL)
Annunzio	Boucher	Collins (MI)
Anthony	Boxer	Condit
Aspin	Brewster	Conyers
Atkins	Browder	Cooper
AuCoin	Brown	Costello
Bacchus	Bruce	Coughlin
Barnard	Bryant	Cox (IL)
Bateman	Bustamante	Coyne
Bellenson	Cardin	Cramer
Berman	Carper	Darden
Bevill	Carr	Davis

de la Garza	Kildee	Poshard
DeFazio	Kliczka	Price
DeLauro	Klug	Rahall
Dellums	Kolter	Rangel
Derrick	Kopetski	Ray
Dicks	Kostmayer	Reed
Dingell	LaFalce	Regula
Dixon	Lancaster	Richardson
Donnelly	Lantos	Ridge
Dooley	Lehman (CA)	Roe
Downey	Lehman (FL)	Rose
Durbin	Levin (MI)	Rostenkowski
Dwyer	Levine (CA)	Rowland
Dymally	Lewis (CA)	Roybal
Eckart	Lewis (GA)	Russo
Edwards (CA)	Lloyd	Sabo
Emerson	Long	Sanders
Engel	Lowery (CA)	Sangmeister
Erdreich	Lowey (NY)	Savage
Espy	Manton	Sawyer
Evans	Markey	Schauer
Fascell	Martinez	Schiff
Fazio	Matsui	Schroeder
Feighan	Mavroules	Schumer
Fish	Mazzoli	Serrano
Flake	McCloskey	Sharp
Foglietta	McDurdy	Shays
Ford (MI)	McDade	Sikorski
Ford (TN)	McDermott	Slasky
Frank (MA)	McGrath	Skaggs
Franks (CT)	McHugh	Skeen
Frost	McMillan (NC)	Slattery
Gallo	McMillen (MD)	Slaughter (NY)
Gaydos	McNulty	Slaughter (VA)
Gejdenson	Meyers	Smith (FL)
Gekas	Mfume	Smith (IA)
Gephardt	Miller (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Gibbons	Miller (WA)	Solarz
Gilchrest	Mineta	Spratt
Gillmor	Mink	Staggers
Gilman	Moakley	Stallings
Gingrich	Molinaro	Stark
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Stenholm
Goodling	Montgomery	Stokes
Gordon	Moody	Studds
Gradison	Moran	Swift
Gray	Morella	Synar
Green	Morrison	Tallon
Guarini	Mrazek	Tanner
Hamilton	Murtha	Thomas (GA)
Hatcher	Myers	Thornton
Hayes (IL)	Nagle	Torres
Hefner	Natcher	Torricelli
Hertel	Neal (MA)	Towns
Hoagland	Nowak	Traficant
Hobson	Oakar	Traxler
Hochbrueckner	Oberstar	Unsold
Horn	Obey	Vento
Horton	Olin	Visclosky
Houghton	Oliver	Washington
Hoyer	Ortiz	Waters
Hubbard	Owens (NY)	Waxman
Jacobs	Owens (UT)	Weiss
Jefferson	Oxley	Wheat
Jenkins	Panetta	Whitten
Johnson (CT)	Parker	Williams
Johnston	Payne (NJ)	Wise
Jones (GA)	Payne (VA)	Wolf
Jones (NC)	Pease	Wolpe
Jontz	Pelosi	Wyden
Kanjorski	Perkins	Yates
Kaptur	Peterson (FL)	Yatron
Kennedy	Pickett	Young (AK)
Kennelly	Pickle	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—9

Ackerman	Harris	Michel
Callahan	Hopkins	Rhodes
Early	Martin	Sundquist

## □ 1146

Mr. OXLEY and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mr. HYDE and Mr. GUNDERSON changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROHRABACHER: Beginning with page 2, line 14, strike out all through page 3, line 19.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Chairman, my second amendment should be less controversial and easier for my colleagues to accept. It merely removes the additional special Federal payments that the committee has added that go beyond the level of the authorization bill we just adopted on the floor last week.

The provisions struck by this amendment add additional special Federal payments totaling \$13.2 million for agencies of the District government that can be funded perfectly well under the regular Federal payment. If there is any fiscal discipline in this House at all, surely we can draw the line here. Let us at least say that we are not going to pile money on top of more money, ignoring even our own authorization ceilings.

If the House adopts this amendment, the bill will still contain a Federal payment for fiscal year 1992 of \$630.5 million, still slightly above the authorized level of \$630 million. For that reason, I understand that my colleague, the ranking member of the District of Columbia Committee, will not be opposing this amendment. I ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment to simply reiterate what this House did last week.

□ 1150

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, this is the last amendment I know of, and we will be moving to final passage after this amendment.

I rise in opposition to this amendment, Madam Chairman. This is really a mean amendment. It goes further than the 2.4 percent across-the-board cut, in my opinion.

The gentleman from California reaches in and he pulls \$75,000 from the police department. On what basis? I do not know. He reaches in and he pulls \$1.1 million from the Board of Education. On what basis? I do not know.

There is a health crisis in this city in the sense of health service delivery. The D.C. General Hospital is the only public hospital in this city and it serves the indigent and the underinsured people of the district. In a bipartisan manner, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO] and I thought that they needed an additional \$12 million to keep that hospital operating effectively. The gentleman from California, just arbitrarily reaches in and pulls that out. He says that, in fact, they can do without this money. The committee on which he serves has had no hearings on this subject.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If the gentleman will yield, he did attribute something to me that I did not say.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, I will be glad to yield when I complete my remarks. Let me make my statement first.

The gentleman reaches in and he pulls \$12 million from the D.C. General Hospital. That hospital serves a constituency of at least 120,000 people, mostly uninsured, but certainly underinsured people.

There has been testimony that that hospital is about to burst at the seams. Certainly, our committee took hours of testimony on the state of health here, and I think this \$12 million is not only richly deserved but desperately needed. I ask all Members to oppose this cutting amendment.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Chairman, my position was not that the hospital did not need the money, but that that money could be available from the Federal payment, from the rest of the Federal payment, rather than breaking the ceilings that we had set. I am not at all suggesting that the hospital does not need the money. I am suggesting if it does need the money that there are ways to get that money from the Federal allocation that we have already set, rather than breaking our own limits.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, I can only speak for myself, but the ranking member and I have gone over the details of this budget with the rest of the committee. We are satisfied that the District needs every dollar in this budget. And this bill is within the 602(b) budget resolution allocation.

I ask for a "no" vote.

Mr. BLILEY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Madam Chairman, I will not take the entire 5 minutes. I had not planned to speak, but I must speak.

I agree with the gentleman from California that these appropriations should have been authorized. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking member that, in the future, that these requests, since we now have a fixed formula payment, be referred to the Authorizing Committee.

However, my colleagues, I beg all Members, do not throw the baby out the bathwater, literally. Twelve million for D.C. General Hospital, which has an emergency room which treats thousands of patients every year that have no insurance. We have closed one hospital on Capitol Hill. We cannot afford to have another one closed.

For my Republican colleagues, I beg those Members not to throw out this \$12 million on a technicality.

We send money to Bangladesh. We send money to Ethiopia. We send money to a lot of place. It is right that we do so. Let Members not forget the uninsured people here at home, and take care of D.C. General Hospital.

In the future, let Members make sure that these come through the authoriz-

ing process. I urge a rejection of the amendment.

Mr. GALLO. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I, too, rise against this amendment.

Some of the areas that we are talking about were outlined by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON], and are very important to the District itself. There are other areas that are also very important.

We are talking about additional foot patrol in the District of Columbia. I do not think there is a person on this floor that does not want to see that, in an effort to bring about more in the way of law and order.

There is an amendment set aside, only \$25,000, to have the District police department accredited, making outside individuals coming in for an accreditation process, not only for the police, but also for the training center. This is an important part of the overall bill.

I would like to stress to my colleagues, that it is very important that we defeat this amendment.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, I simply want to make one final plea on behalf of the residents of the District. It is very hard to reform a government when we are in the midst of a fiscal crisis. The District is trying to do that at this time. This body has been very kind over the past 6 months to the Mayor of our city and to the residents of our city. We ask you to continue to help our city reform itself.

Members of this body have had wonderful things to say about the reform that is under way in the District of Columbia, and about the actions of our new Mayor, Sharon Pratt Dixon. Our new Mayor is very appreciative. Our residents are very appreciative for the response of this body to our concerns.

I ask Members to continue to support the District of Columbia as we dig into our own pockets, deeper than we are asking Members to dig, to support ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. INHOFE

Mr. INHOFE. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. INHOFE: Page 31, insert after line 20 the following new section:

SEC. 135. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used for the renovation of the property located at 227 7th Street Southeast (commonly known as Eastern Market), except that funds provided in this Act may be used for the regular maintenance and upkeep of the current structure and grounds located at such property.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. INHOFE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, I have no objection to this amendment and am happy to accept it.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam Chairman, just a brief explanation of the amendment. This does not call for any cuts. For those Members who are aware, this merely precludes the use of Federal funds for a massive reconstruction at the Eastern Market.

□ 1200

The current Mayor of the District of Columbia is not planning to do anything with this for some time. I do not know of any large group that is opposed to this, but at least it gets it on the table and precludes these funds from being used.

These are funds, however, that can be used for bringing it up to code and doing things that actually become necessary.

Madam Chairman, I think the committee chairman is in support of this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2699, the District of Columbia appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. This is the 10th of the 13 annual appropriations bills to be considered by the House.

The bill provides \$700 million in discretionary budget authority and \$690 million in estimated discretionary outlays, which is identical to both the level of domestic discretionary budget authority and outlays as set by the 602(b) spending subdivision for this subcommittee.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I will continue to inform the House of the status of all spending legislation, and will be issuing a "Dear Colleague" on how each appropriations measure compares to the 602(b) subdivisions.

I look forward to working with the Appropriations Committee on its three remaining regular bills.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, June 24, 1991.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Attached is a fact sheet on H.R. 2699, the District of Columbia Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1992, scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, June 25, subject to a rule being adopted.

This is the tenth regular Fiscal Year 1992 appropriations bill to be considered. The bill is equal to the discretionary budget authority and outlay 602(b) spending subdivision.

I hope this information will be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,  
Chairman.

[Fact Sheet]

H.R. 2699, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1992 (H. REPT. 102-120)

The House Appropriations Committee reported the District of Columbia Appropria-

tions bill for Fiscal Year 1992 on Thursday, June 20, 1991. Floor consideration of this bill is scheduled for Tuesday, June 25, 1991, subject to a rule being adopted.

COMPARISON TO THE 602(b) SUBDIVISION

The bill, as reported, provides \$700 million of discretionary budget authority and \$690 million in estimated discretionary outlays, the same as the Appropriations 602(b) subdivision for this subcommittee. A comparison of the bill with the funding subdivisions follows:

COMPARISON TO DOMESTIC SPENDING ALLOCATION

(In millions of dollars)

	District of Columbia Appropriations Bill		Approp. Committee 602(b) Subdivision		Bill Over (+) / Under (-) Committee 602(b) Subdivision	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Discretionary .....	700	690	700	690		
Mandatory <sup>1</sup> .....						
Total .....	700	690	700	690		

<sup>1</sup> Conforms to the budget resolution estimates for existing law.

Note: BA—New budget authority; O—Estimated outlays.

Following are major program highlights for the District of Columbia Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1992, as reported:

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	New outlays
Federal payment to the District of Columbia .....	630	630
Federal contribution to retirement funds .....	52	52
D.C. General Hospital .....	12	2

The House Appropriations Committee reported the Committee's subdivision of budget authority and outlays in House Report 102-81. These subdivisions are consistent with the allocation of spending responsibility to House committees contained in House Report 102-69, the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 121, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1992, as adopted by the Congress on May 22, 1991.

Mr. DIXON. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEILENSON) have assumed the chair, Mrs. KENNELLY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2699) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, had directed her to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 300, nays 123, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

YEAS—300

Abercrombie	Dorgan (ND)	Jefferson
Alexander	Downey	Jenkins
Anderson	Durbin	Johnson (CT)
Andrews (ME)	Dwyer	Johnson (SD)
Andrews (NJ)	Dymally	Johnston
Andrews (TX)	Eckart	Jones (GA)
Annunzio	Edwards (CA)	Jones (NC)
Anthony	Edwards (TX)	Jontz
Applegate	Engel	Kanjorski
Aspin	Erdreich	Kaptur
Atkins	Espy	Kennedy
AuCoin	Evans	Kennelly
Bacchus	Fascell	Kildee
Ballenger	Fazio	Kleczka
Barnard	Feighan	Klug
Bateman	Fish	Kolbe
Bellenson	Flake	Kolter
Bennett	Foglietta	Kopetski
Berman	Ford (MI)	Kostmayer
Bevill	Ford (TN)	Lancaster
Bilbray	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Bliley	Franks (CT)	LaRocco
Boehlert	Frost	Lehman (CA)
Bonior	Gallo	Lehman (FL)
Borski	Gaydos	Lent
Boucher	Gejdenson	Levin (MI)
Boxer	Gekas	Levine (CA)
Brewster	Gephardt	Lewis (CA)
Brooks	Geren	Lewis (GA)
Browder	Gibbons	Lipinski
Brown	Gilchrest	Lloyd
Bruce	Gillmor	Long
Bryant	Gilman	Lowery (CA)
Bustamante	Gingrich	Lowery (NY)
Byron	Glickman	Machtley
Campbell (CA)	Gonzalez	Manton
Cardin	Gooding	Markey
Carper	Gordon	Martin
Carr	Gradison	Martinez
Chandler	Gray	Matsui
Chapman	Green	Mavroules
Clay	Guarini	Mazzoli
Coleman (TX)	Gunderson	McCloskey
Collins (IL)	Hall (OH)	McCurdy
Collins (MI)	Hall (TX)	McDade
Conyers	Hamilton	McDermott
Cooper	Hammerschmidt	McHugh
Costello	Harris	McMillan (NC)
Coughlin	Hatcher	McMillan (MD)
Cox (IL)	Hayes (IL)	McNulty
Coyne	Hefner	Meyers
Cramer	Hertel	Mfume
Darden	Hoagland	Miller (CA)
de la Garza	Hobson	Miller (WA)
DeFazio	Hochbrueckner	Mineta
DeLauro	Horn	Mink
Dellums	Horton	Moakley
Derrick	Houghton	Mollinari
Dicks	Hoyer	Mollohan
Dingell	Hubbard	Montgomery
Dixon	Hughes	Moody
Donnelly	Inhofe	Moran
Dooley	Jacobs	Morella

Morrison	Reed	Stenholm
Mrazek	Regula	Stokes
Murtha	Richardson	Studds
Nagle	Ridge	Swett
Natcher	Riggs	Synar
Neal (MA)	Roe	Tallon
Neal (NC)	Roemer	Tanner
Nowak	Rose	Tauzin
Oakar	Rostenkowski	Thomas (CA)
Oberstar	Rowland	Thomas (GA)
Obey	Roybal	Thornton
Olin	Russo	Torres
Olver	Sabo	Torricelli
Ortiz	Sanders	Towns
Orton	Sangmeister	Trafficant
Owens (NY)	Savage	Traxler
Owens (UT)	Sawyer	Unsoeld
Oxley	Scheuer	Valentine
Panetta	Schiff	Vento
Parker	Schroeder	Visclosky
Payne (NJ)	Schumer	Walsh
Payne (VA)	Serrano	Washington
Pease	Sharp	Waters
Pelosi	Shays	Waxman
Penny	Sikorski	Weiss
Perkins	Siskisky	Weldon
Peterson (FL)	Skaggs	Wheat
Peterson (MN)	Skeen	Whitten
Pickett	Slattery	Williams
Pickle	Slaughter (NY)	Wilson
Poshard	Smith (FL)	Wise
Price	Smith (IA)	Wolf
Pursell	Snowe	Wolpe
Rahall	Solarz	Wyden
Rangel	Spratt	Yates
Ravenel	Staggers	Yatron
Ray	Stark	Young (FL)

NAYS—123

Allard	Hansen	Quillen
Archer	Hastert	Ramstad
Arney	Hayes (LA)	Rinaldo
Barrett	Hefley	Ritter
Barton	Henry	Roberts
Bentley	Herber	Rogers
Bereuter	Holloway	Rohrabacher
Bilirakis	Huckaby	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Hunter	Roth
Broomfield	Hutto	Roukema
Bunning	Hyde	Santorum
Burton	Ireland	Sarpalius
Callahan	James	Saxton
Camp	Johnson (TX)	Schaefer
Campbell (CO)	Kasich	Schulze
Clement	Kyl	Sensenbrenner
Clinger	LaFalce	Shaw
Coble	Lagomarsino	Shuster
Coleman (MO)	Laughlin	Skelton
Combest	Leach	Slaughter (VA)
Condit	Lewis (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Cox (CA)	Lightfoot	Smith (OR)
Crane	Livingston	Smith (TX)
Cunningham	Luken	Solomon
Dannemeyer	Marlenee	Spence
Davis	McCandless	Stallings
DeLay	McCullum	Stearns
Dickinson	McEwen	Stump
Doolittle	McGrath	Taylor (MS)
Dornan (CA)	Miller (OH)	Taylor (NC)
Dreier	Moorhead	Thomas (WY)
Duncan	Murphy	Upton
Edwards (OK)	Myers	Vander Jagt
Emerson	Nichols	Volkmer
English	Nussle	Vucanovich
Fawell	Packard	Walker
Fields	Pallone	Weber
Galleghy	Patterson	Wylie
Goss	Paxon	Young (AK)
Grandy	Petri	Zeliff
Hancock	Porter	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—9

Ackerman	Hopkins	Rhodes
Baker	McCrery	Sundquist
Early	Michel	Swift

□ 1232

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Ackerman for, with Mr. Baker against.

Messrs. HYDE, LIVINGSTON, and SLAUGHTER of Virginia changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DIXON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material, on H.R. 2699, a bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. NATCHER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2707) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] and myself.

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this is just for the general debate?

Mr. NATCHER. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, yes, it is for general debate only.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1235

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2707, with Mr. SHARP in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased today to bring before the House the bill H.R. 2707, which appropriates funds for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year 1992. This bill appropriates \$203,219 million for the 3 cabinet Departments and the 17 independent agencies which come under its jurisdiction. This includes \$10,874 million for the Department of Labor, \$162,865 million for the Department of Health and Human Services, and \$31,342 million for the Department of Education. These amounts are described in detail in House Report 102-121 which was filed in the House last Thursday.

Mr. Chairman, I will highlight these amounts for the House in a minute but first I want to say that it is an honor and a privilege for me to chair the subcommittee which develops the bill we bring before you today. It deals with the issues which are so important to our country—health, education, job training, and safety, to name a few. You have heard me say many times that when you take care of the health of your people and educate your children, you continue living in the strongest country in the world. I will tell Members honestly, however, that this is the most difficult bill which I have worked on since I became chairman 12 years ago. The limitations imposed by last year's budget summit agreement have meant that there is not enough money to do the things which the committee believes are necessary. We have been able to provide many of the increases which we believe the House supports but there are also many areas where the amounts in the bill are not adequate. We know that; but the additional amounts are just not available for 1992.

I also want to say at this point that it is an honor and privilege for me to serve on the Appropriations Committee with my big chairman, JAMIE WHITTEN. As a member of the subcommittee, he has helped us down through the years on this bill, and we appreciate his support. As you know, this is the first time in many years that we will be presenting this bill to the House without Silvio Conte. We all miss Silvio; he was one of the ablest Members of the House, and no one was more concerned

about the programs in this bill than he was. We are pleased to have CARL PURSELL as our new ranking member, and I want to thank him for the support he has given us throughout the hearings and the markup. I also want to thank each of the other members of the subcommittee who worked many days putting together this difficult bill.

Mr. Chairman, despite the limitations imposed on the committee by the budget summit agreement, we believe that the bill we bring before you today is a good one. We have tried to strike a careful balance among many important program needs and the concerns of the Members. We have had 13 weeks of hearings, which included testimony from 478 public witnesses and 127 Members of Congress. We have received 1,455 written requests from Members. In trying to accommodate all these concerns, we have faced difficult choices. As many of you have heard me say, we were short by about \$1.7 billion compared to the amount we believe could have been fully justified. The President's budget proposed some good increases, such as the \$498 million increase for biomedical research, but he financed them with program cuts that Congress has traditionally rejected—areas like health professions training, community services, libraries, low income home energy assistance, impact aid category B, State legalization assistance grants, and Medicare user fees. This year we did not have the funds to restore all the cuts and also provide all the increases we would have liked.

We had to set priorities for our scarce dollars, and our highest priorities went to the areas our committee feels are investments in the future of this country: elementary and secondary education and biomedical research. I am pleased to report that our bill provides a \$2,458 million increase over 1991 for education, including a \$250 million increase for Head Start. The National Institutes of Health receives a \$548 million increase over 1991—enough funding to support approximately 6,000 new research grants.

This year, we heard persuasive testimony from Members of the House, particularly our women Members, about the need for increased research into conditions that affect women. Within the funding provided for NIH, we have made research into women's issues our highest priority. We have provided \$25 million to start a multiyear women's health clinical trial, \$30 million is added to the Cancer Institute for breast and ovarian cancer research, and more than \$15 million is added in other Institutes for research in areas such as reproductive health, osteoporosis, and infertility. We also provide \$50 million for the new breast and cervical cancer screening program, an increase of \$21 million over last year.

I am also proud to tell Members that, for the third year in a row, the committee has provided \$1 billion increase for chapter 1, for a total of over \$7 billion for this vital program. With these additional funds, the program will serve about 70 percent of eligible students. The bill also includes substantial increases for vocational education, historically black colleges, math/science education, bilingual education, and the TRIO program. Of interest to the 55 Members who testified before our Subcommittee on Impact Aid, and the many others in the House who care about this program, we have restored category B payments to the 1991 level of \$137 million.

Despite the constraints of our 602(b) allocation, we have been able to support increases for other programs of concern to the Members. The bill includes \$1.88 billion for AIDS research, prevention, and treatment, which is \$63 million above last year and \$7 million above the President's request. Within this total, the Ryan White programs receive an increase of \$26 million. Enough funding is provided to support the two cities that are newly eligible for assistance. Funding for childhood immunizations increases by \$80 million over last year's level, to a total of \$298 million. Additional funding of \$20 million is provided for the Stewart McKinney homeless programs over the 1991 level, including a total of \$37 million for the education for homeless children program. The bill includes \$139 million for the infant mortality initiative proposed by the President, up from the \$25 million allocated in 1991.

There are two areas, in particular, however, where the committee was not able to provide funding in the amounts which we would have liked. These are low-income home-energy assistance and State immigration grants. In the case of low-income energy assistance, the bill includes \$1,600 million, which is \$575 million more than requested by the President; \$600 million of this amount, however, is in an emergency fund to be available if released by the President under the provisions of the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act. We would have liked to restore this cut completely but the outlays were just not available. In the case of immigration assistance, the President proposed to rescind the full \$1,123 million currently available for 1992. The committee did not approve this, but we did delay the payment of these funds for 5 months until October 15, 1992. This gave the committee an outlay savings of \$359 million which was used to fund increases throughout the bill.

In addition to highlighting the major funding issues in the bill, I also want to make Members aware that the bill includes two new general provisions, one requiring parental notification in family planning programs and the second prohibiting the Department of

Health and Human Services from implementing the family planning regulations upheld in the recent Rust versus Sullivan Supreme Court decision, the so-called gag rule. I am deeply concerned that these provisions will trigger a veto from President Bush, but they represent the will of the majority of the committee.

In closing, I commend this bill to my colleagues. We have fully utilized, but not exceeded, our 602(b) outlay ceiling. We have done our best to meet the needs of the country with the resources we were allocated. We ask for your support.

H.R. 2707, the fiscal year 1992 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and 17 related agencies, includes appropriations totaling \$203,219 million, which is \$2,563 million over the amounts requested by the President, and \$18,494 million over the comparable amounts available for 1991.

Entitlement programs, whose funding levels are determined by authorizing legislation, comprise more than 71 percent of the bill's total appropriations. The bill includes \$144,708 million for these entitlements, an increase of \$117 million above the amount requested by the President and \$16,177 million above the amounts available for these programs in fiscal year 1991.

For discretionary programs, whose spending is controlled through the annual appropriations process, the bill includes \$58,510 million for fiscal year 1992, which is an increase of \$2,446 million over the President's budget and \$2,317 million above the amount available for fiscal year 1991. The committee has provided funding for currently unauthorized, ongoing programs at levels not in excess of fiscal year 1991 totals.

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The bill provides a total of \$10,874 million for the Department of Labor, including \$9,301 million for discretionary programs and \$1,573 million for entitlements. The bill exceeds the President's request for discretionary programs at Labor by \$213 million and the 1991 level by \$322 million.

The bill includes \$4,130 million for programs under the Job Training Partnership Act, an increase of \$64 million over the 1991 level. This total includes \$898 million for the Job Corps, which is \$31 million over last year's level. This amount is sufficient to maintain the current centers and 41,338 training slots. The Dislocated Workers Program receives \$577 million, which represents a \$50 million increase over last year's rate. Community services employment for older Americans is supported at \$390 million, an increase of \$48 million over the request. Trust funds and general funds for State unemployment insurance and employment service operations total \$3,157 million, \$156 million above the 1991 level.

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

The bill includes \$162,865 million for activities administered by the Department of Health and Human Services. For discretionary activities, the bill includes \$24,553 million, which is an increase of \$556 million over the amount requested by the President and \$517 million below the comparable amount available for these programs in 1991.

## HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The bill provides \$139 million for the infant mortality initiative proposed by the President, of which half is targeted to community and migrant health centers. This is an increase of \$114 million over the funding provided in 1991. The bill restores the President's proposed reductions in health professions training, providing a total of \$302 million for these activities. The bill also provides \$74 million for minority health initiatives, compared to a 1991 funding level of \$31 million. AIDS programs are funded at \$283 million, of which \$247 million is appropriated for the three titles of the Ryan White Act—an increase of \$26 million over last year's funding.

## CENTER FOR DISEASE CONTROL

The bill includes \$1,391 million for the Centers for Disease Control, which is \$79 million above the 1991 level. Major funding increases include: \$80 million above 1991 for childhood immunizations to ensure that all children under the age of 2 can be vaccinated, and \$21 million above last year for the new breast and cervical cancer screening program.

## NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The bill includes \$8,825 million for the 20 appropriations which together fund the programs of the National Institutes of Health [NIH], including funding for AIDS research. The total for NIH is \$548 million above the amount available in 1991 and \$50 million above the administration request. Funds provided will be sufficient to support approximately 6,000 new research grants, consistent with the 4-year financial management plan established by Congress last year. The committee identified \$146 million that could be reallocated within the President's request, principally from savings associated with recent revisions to the indirect cost circular and the blocking of the transfer of funds to the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research. These funds, along with \$50 million in additional funding, were provided to the Institutes consistent with high priority needs identified during committee hearings. These areas include: funding for research into the special health problems of minorities and women, especially breast and ovarian cancer; prostate cancer; cystic fibrosis; pediatric AIDS; conditions of aging, especially Alzheimer's disease; kidney disease; and lupus. The committee provides almost \$15 million to continue

the Shannon grant program begun in 1991.

## ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

The bill includes \$2,918 million for these activities, of which \$1,657 million is for currently unauthorized, ongoing programs. This is \$11 million below the 1991 funding level and \$131 million below the President's request. For currently authorized substance abuse activities, the bill provides \$1 million above the administration request. Mental health research funding increases by \$36 million over 1991, or 8 percent.

## AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH

The bill includes \$115 million in general funds and Medicare trust funds, a decrease of \$7 million below the President's request and the same as the 1991 level. The committee has included a limitation of \$13 million on transfers from the other Public Health Service agencies, including NIH, CDC, ADAMHA, and HRSA, compared to the \$50 million transfer requested by the President.

## HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION

The bill includes \$59,899 million for the 1992 program level for the Medicaid program, which is \$92 million above the administration request and \$8,344 million higher than the 1991 level. For Medicare contractors \$1,714 million is provided, including \$257 million in a contingency for possible shortfalls in funding for beneficiary and provider inquiries and appeals. Also, provided is \$21 million to continue the rural hospital transition demonstrations and \$10 million is included for the essential access community hospital program. The bill includes \$195 million for facility survey and certification activities which was not requested, in order to meet current law requirements.

## SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The committee recommends that \$4,582 million be expended from the Social Security trust funds for administrative costs of the Social Security retirement, survivors, and disability program. This is \$375 million more than the comparable 1991 operating level. Also \$100 million is provided in a contingency fund to support the costs of unexpected workloads.

## ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

The administration announced the creation of this new agency in April 1991. It will eventually consolidate what was formerly the Family Support Administration, the Office of Human Development Services, and the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant Program in the Health Resources and Services Administration.

The bill includes \$15,162 million for the 1992 program level for family support payments to States, which is \$1,167 million above the 1991 level and the same as the administration request; \$1,000 million is provided for the

Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program; \$1,600 million is provided for low income energy assistance programs, of which \$1,000 million is allocated for the regular low income home energy assistance block grant program, and \$600 million is provided in an emergency fund, to be made available upon submission of a request by the President designating it as an emergency; \$294 million is provided for the refugee and entrant assistance program, which is \$117 million below both the 1991 level and the President's request. The amount provided assumes that the cash and medical assistance program will be phased out after March 31, 1992. The committee delays the availability of \$1,123 million in State legalization assistance grants until October 15, 1992. The President proposed to permanently rescind these funds. The committee restores the community services block grant to a level of \$421 million. The President has proposed to terminate most of these activities. The bill provides \$850 million for the child care and development block grant and child care licensing improvement grants, an increase of \$105 million over the budget request and \$250 million over the revised 1991 level of \$600 million. The 1992 amount is partially funded through a reduction in the 1991 grants.

Within the Office of Human Development Services, the Head Start Program receives \$2,202 million, an increase of \$250 million over the 1991 level and \$150 million over the President's request. An increase of \$21 million is provided for comprehensive child development centers.

## DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

For the Department as a whole, the bill includes \$28,266 million, an increase of \$5,383 million over the 1991 level and \$1,685 million over the President's request. The amount for discretionary programs is \$23,444 million, which is \$2,458 million, or 11.7 percent, above the 1991 level, and \$1,690 million over the President's request.

## COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

The bill includes \$7,065 million for chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is \$999 million above the 1991 level and \$851 million above the administration request. The amount provided includes \$5,805 million for basic grants to local school districts and \$645 million for concentration grants. Also included is \$100 million for the Even Start Program, and \$38 million for capital expenses for private school students.

## IMPACT AID

The committee bill provides \$765 million for impact aid, \$16 million below the 1991 level and \$145 million over the budget request. This amount includes \$586 million for category A and \$137 million for category B payments, which are the same as the 1991 levels.

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

The bill includes \$1,578 million for the 21 activities which together comprise the school improvement account. This total is \$93 million above the 1991 level and \$77 million above the President's request; \$607 million is provided for drug-free schools. Funding for math and science programs increases by \$38 million over 1991 to a total of \$240 million.

## EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE

The bill provides \$500 million for educational excellence activities and permits the Secretary to allocate up to \$250 million to new education initiatives if they are authorized by December 31, 1991. The bill provides that not less than \$250 million of the increase is for the Head Start Program. This is \$190 million less than the President's request for a new education package which must be considered by the authorizing committees.

## BILINGUAL AND IMMIGRANT EDUCATION

The bill provides \$249 million for these activities, which is \$51 million above the 1991 level and \$48 million above the request.

## SPECIAL EDUCATION/REHABILITATION SERVICES

The bill provides \$2,823 million for special education, which is \$206 million above the 1991 level and \$93 million above the President's request. The rehabilitation services and disability research account is funded at \$1,999 million, which exceeds the 1991 appropriation by \$109 million.

## VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

The bill appropriates \$1,371 million for the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, an increase of \$367 million over both the 1991 level and the President's request. Included within this total is \$1,077 million for basic grants, an increase of \$220 million over 1991; \$100 million for tech prep, an increase of \$37 million over 1991; and \$100 million for new supplemental grants for the acquisition of vocational education equipment and related program improvements. The bill also provides \$280 million for adult education, an increase of \$41 million over 1991.

## STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The bill provides \$6,853 million for student financial assistance, which is an increase of \$139 million over both the 1991 level and the President's request. This amount restores \$156 million to Perkins loans and \$64 million to State student scholarships, both of which the President proposed to eliminate. The committee bill maintains the maximum Pell grant at \$2,400. Supplemental educational opportunity grants are funded at \$570 million, an increase of \$50 million over 1991 and \$223 million over the President.

## GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS

The bill includes \$3,106 million for the guaranteed student loan liquidating account, which is the current estimate of the funding that will be re-

quired to meet program obligations associated with loans borrowed prior to fiscal year 1992. This amount is \$2,276 million below the 1991 appropriation for guaranteed student loans and the same as the budget request under current law; \$2,867 million is also available under permanent law for loan subsidies and related administrative expenses for new loans made in 1992.

## HIGHER EDUCATION

There is \$120 million provided for historically black colleges and universities, an increase of \$12 million over the request and \$2 million over the 1991 level. Special programs for the disadvantaged [TRIO] receive \$395 million, an increase of \$51 million over 1991 and the same as the President's request.

## LIBRARIES

The bill restores the funding for the library programs to the 1991 level \$143 million. The President had proposed to reduce funding to \$35 million. The bill includes \$5 million for training.

## RELATED AGENCIES

The bill includes \$1,213 million for 17 related agencies. This amount is \$12 million below the request and \$54 million above the 1991 funding level. The total includes \$253 million for 1994 funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Full funding of \$315 million is provided for railroad retirement dual benefits.

□ 1240

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman NATCHER for yielding the customary allotment of time. I also want to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman on his completion of this year's bill and thank him for the outstanding leadership he has provided.

Last week our chairman was honored for casting his 17,000th consecutive vote in this House. At that time, the gentleman from Kentucky rose to say he counts it a distinct privilege to serve with his fellow Members of Congress. I wish to pause for a moment to comment on what a privilege it is for me to serve on this subcommittee with Mr. NATCHER.

As our chairman, Mr. NATCHER has earned the respect of Members from both sides of the aisle. His bipartisan style of leadership and evenhanded approach are appreciated. The genuine respect of his colleagues continues to be the hallmark of Mr. NATCHER's very distinguished career.

I also wish to congratulate the members of the Labor, Health, and Human Services, Education Subcommittee staff—Mike Stephens, Mark Mioduski, Bob Knisely, and Susan Quantius.

Likewise, I wish to thank and congratulate the Republican members of the subcommittee for their work and support—Mr. PORTER, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. WEBER.

I also must acknowledge Education Secretary Alexander, Labor Secretary

Martin, and Health and Human Services Secretary Sullivan for their testimony, support, and input throughout our process.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this appropriations bill. Although this is not a perfect bill, and there are places where it can be improved, I still believe, overall, it is a good bill.

This is a bill which outlines the priorities and programs of importance to the vast majority of Americans—programs which provide needed health care to the elderly, programs which provide access to medical treatment for the sick, programs which bring hot meals to the homes of our older population, programs which support our schools and institutions as they teach our young, programs which equip our workers with new skills and knowledge, programs which, in total, serve the people of this Nation.

As one of the Members of this body who remains concerned about the budget deficit and the level of government spending, I must point out that the increase in discretionary spending, in terms of budget authority, has been held to inflation—\$53.6 billion, which is up only 4.1 percent. In terms of outlays, discretionary spending is set at \$58.1 billion, representing an increase of 8.4 percent.

As the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, I would like to make some personal comments regarding three important areas.

First, I continue to be concerned about the accountability of our departments, agencies and their contractors. I believe there have been some celebrated examples of the misuse of funds which happens when we fail to hold funding recipients accountable. Providing better management of Government resources must remain a top priority within all of the departments and agencies included in this appropriations bill.

Second, I would like to draw attention to the need for field visits. Since becoming ranking minority member, I personally have placed an emphasis on conducting field visits to gain a better understanding of the programs we fund.

My visits have included Job Corps Centers in New York and Detroit, AIDS Health Centers, visits to the National Institutes of Health campus in Maryland, the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, hospitals, the Office of Education Research and Improvement [OERI], an OERI lab in Illinois, and many schools. Through these field visits, I have gained valuable knowledge and insight into a number of areas. I have seen firsthand the types of work going on, I have observed the levels of staffing, and I have had the opportunity to discuss the impact of Federal programs with those on the front lines.

These types of visits also demonstrate the interest of Members of

Congress, as well as our resolve to truly oversee the operations we fund. I will continue to emphasize field visits as a means of providing better leadership and management at the congressional level.

And third, I wish to comment on the construction of two NIH buildings named for two individuals who have played a very major role in our nation's health care policy.

One of the buildings, now under construction, will bear the name of my predecessor on the subcommittee, Silvio Conte. I would be remiss in not making mention of the loss we all have felt by the passing of the gentleman from Massachusetts. For many years, Silvio Conte served as the ranking minority member on the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee. He was dedicated to providing leadership in the critical areas encompassed in this bill, and his tireless efforts still serve as an example.

The Conte Building, which will be used for child health, is scheduled for completion in the fall of 1992. This building now has added significance as a tribute to our departed friend.

The other building, now in the planning stages, will bear the name of our chairman, who I referenced at the onset. The Natcher Building will be a fitting tribute to one of the leaders in our Nation's health care community.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. NATCHER has done an excellent job already in describing many of the components of our bill. And, rather than repeating this information, I would like to draw attention to two areas I deem of the utmost importance—prevention and education.

This bill provides funding for a number of very important programs which promote prevention in health care. Throughout the course of our many hours of testimony, we again heard of the important role of prevention in health care. Nowhere does the old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure better apply than in health care. In these days of skyrocketing health treatment costs, we are finding that prevention can save tremendous amounts of pain, suffering, and dollars. To that end, I wish to cite a number of programs:

**Immunization**—we have increased the funding for immunization programs by \$80 to \$300 million. Through grants to the States and localities, these funds support immunization programs against measles, mumps, rubella, poliomyelitis, diphtheria, pertussis, tetanus, and influenza.

**Infant mortality**—the subcommittee has provided \$140 million for Secretary Sullivan's infant mortality initiative. Through this initiative funds are made available for the improvement of health care access for high-risk, low-income pregnant women and children.

**Biomedical research**—we have set matching funding at \$8.8 billion, up

more than \$500 million from last year. This provides operational and research funding for the entire National Institutes of Health. Included in this amount, we have designated \$15 million for the Shannon Grants Program which will be used to encourage the Nobel Laureates of tomorrow. In this endeavor, I must thank Mr. EARLY and Mr. PORTER for their invaluable assistance and support.

**Women's health initiatives**—the subcommittee has provided \$100 million for research and implementation of important women's initiatives. This includes quite a variety of programs, such as \$25 million for women's health trials, \$30 million to continue breast and ovarian cancer research, \$10 million to the Office of Research on Women's Health, and \$50 million for the CDC to carry out its program of breast and cervical cancer screening.

**Minority health**—the subcommittee, with the encouragement of Mr. STOKES, has provided significant funding throughout the bill for minority health incentives. This includes \$23 million for the Disadvantaged Minority Health Improvement Program in the Health Research Service Agency, and \$10 million for research grants in the Office of Minority Health Research at NIH. During the course of our hearings, we learned of the continuing disparity between the health status of white and minority populations. Also, at my urging, this funding includes \$3 million for the study of Lupus, a disease which primarily affects black women.

**Bone marrow registry**—at the urging of Mr. YOUNG we included \$16.3 million for the national bone marrow registry. The establishment of the National Bone Marrow Donor Program has provided a national resource for the treatment of diseases of the blood and cancer. I might also mention that Mr. YOUNG continues to be our national leader in this area, having worked on the bone marrow registry for 6 years.

**Rural health**—thanks, in part to the help of Mr. WEBER, the subcommittee has designated \$101 million for the National Health Service Corp. The NHSC Program provides health manpower resources to areas, populations, and facilities which find it difficult to recruit health care providers.

Today, there is much discussion about the financial problems being faced in the delivery of health care in this Nation. And, while this remains an area for further investigation and debate, I believe we all could agree upon the value of prevention. This bill provides the funding for research programs which, in turn, provide the types of biomedical knowledge needed for prevention. As we learn more about diseases and illnesses, we learn more about the means of preventing these diseases and illnesses.

Mr. Chairman, this bill also includes funding for our Nation's education pro-

grams. Education provides us with a challenge of a different nature than health care. Education in the 1990s will be the key to our competitiveness in a world economy and marketplace.

Toward that end, our subcommittee has included funding for several initiatives which I wish to mention:

**Head Start**—we have increased the funding for Head Start by \$250 million, to \$2.2 billion. As you know, the Head Start Program provides comprehensive support and development services to children from low-income families.

**Even Start**—the subcommittee has increased this funding by \$40 million to \$100 million. Targeted for disadvantaged children between the ages of 1 and 7, and their parents, Even Start will provide State block grants for model joint-education programs.

**America 2000**—if authorized, this bill would provide \$250 million for the innovative America 2000 initiative. The America 2000 plan represents a dramatic shift the funding of new and innovative approaches to education.

**Higher education**—an increase of \$139 million for Student Financial Aid, to a total of \$6.8 billion.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I believe this appropriations bill includes many of the priorities of our Nation. These programs are of critical importance to the everyday lives of millions of Americans. I support this bill and ask my colleagues to join with me in voting for it.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the chairman of the full committee, one of the able Members of the House. Mr. Chairman, all down through the years, the gentleman from Mississippi has helped us with this bill, and we appreciate it.

□ 1250

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to say a word about our chairman of this subcommittee, the vice chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

As my colleagues know, he has a wonderful record of attendance, at voting, but really it is not how long one serves, it is how well one serves. I do not believe in the history of this Nation we have had anyone who could equal the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], my friend, in his service to the people of his district, State, and Nation. Truly he has done and does a great job. In the process, he has earned the respect and admiration of all Members of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be a member of this subcommittee. All members of this subcommittee do a fine job especially the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] the new ranking minority member taking over for our dear departed colleague Silvio Conte, who served so well for so many years.

I say to my colleagues, whatever your age may be, if you look around and remember how conditions were that you first remember and see the progress that we've made, you can realize just how sound a job we have done.

It is encouraging to see our subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] give attention to Americans and America. We have got to give our country that attention, because our country is what all of our money is based on. An educated, healthy population, with adequate housing, food, and nutrition from a strong agricultural base, provides the foundation for our national strength and future.

Mr. Chairman, this bill includes funds for all phases of education, both higher and secondary, including universities, colleges and community colleges, vocational education, disadvantaged education, adult education, and historically black colleges, including Mississippi Valley State University at Itta Bena, MS.

It is directed to meeting the health and other needs of our people, all of which is spelled out in the report accompanying this appropriations bill—H.R. 2707—which I shall not list here. This bill looks after our people and our country. We must look after the people's health and education, but in the same breath we must look after the physical health of our own country because it is our country to which we have to look to take care of all the needs that we have.

Mr. Chairman ours is a great country. We need to take care of all of it in order to maintain a strong, healthy nation. Strength and health that can come only from protection and developing the Nation's resources—our real wealth.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to being a member of this subcommittee, I am serving my 13th year as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and I assure you no chairman and no subcommittee, does a better job than BILL NATCHER and the members of this subcommittee.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], a great Congressman who has been an outstanding leader on bone marrow transplants.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, most of our constituents know that most Members of Congress are pretty powerful and pretty influential, but I doubt that very many of our constituents know that Members of Congress on occasion have an opportunity to play a role in a miracle.

In the 2 minutes that I have today I am going to talk about just one of the many good features of this bill, and that is the miracle of one human being being able to give life to another human being through a bone marrow transplant.

It is such a dramatic weapon in the fight against leukemia, other types of blood cancers and, in fact, some 60 other types of fatal blood diseases.

I have a chart that I am going to show that says it much better than I can. Since the Members of Congress became involved in the National Marrow Donor Program, look at the chart. Look at how just in the last year the number of donors in the registry has grown, really a dramatic story, and each and every Member of this House of Representatives deserves tremendous credit for having played a role.

This second chart relates to the first chart. They look almost identical. This second chart shows the number of people who had no chance for life, but who have now had a bone marrow transplant through the registry that we created. And look at the numbers, how they have gone up so dramatically again in the last year.

This is a relatively new program. Its seed was planted right here in the U.S. House of Representatives. We could not find a sponsor. So we went to the U.S. Navy; the Navy agreed to be our original sponsor. And they are still very much involved in this program through research and recruiting; and both the research and recruiting has been tremendously successful.

Now the National Institutes of Health is also involved as the official sponsor, and is doing a tremendous job.

Finally, I am going to hold up a chart here for all Members to see. This is an 800 number, 1-800-654-1247. Members can call this number if they would like to be a volunteer donor. If anyone happens to see that number and would like to call, they are open 24 hours a day.

A major recruiting effort was conducted last year right here in the House by Members of Congress, and if my colleagues will recall, we had a recruiting day when some 50 of our colleagues came in, signed up, and took a simple blood test to be a donor.

The gentleman from New Jersey, JIM SAXTON, was one of the heroes who was tested that day. Later on this summer when we have more time in a special order, I am going to list all of the heroes who have played a major role here. Our colleague from New Jersey, however, JIM SAXTON, is just about to become a donor and there are two other Members in the House who also are just on the verge of being donors.

The simple blood test required to become a part of this program does not hurt. It enables people to join a program that saves lives, and each one of my colleagues can feel really good because they have all played a major role in getting this program to the point that it is today.

It is a miracle saving lives.

The National Marrow Donor Registry now includes 362,613 volunteers who have indicated their willingness to give the living gift of

life to a matched, unrelated patient in need of a life saving marrow transplant. In the past month alone, 31,000 volunteers have joined the registry and since this time last year the size of the registry has more than doubled.

This dramatic growth in the registry has enabled the program to identify an increasing number of matched donors with the end result being a life saving marrow transplant. In just 3½ years, the national registry has provided a second chance at life for 741 patients suffering from leukemia and 60 otherwise fatal blood disorders. More than 40 unrelated marrow transplants now take place every month and in the past 12 months there has been a 100-percent increase in the number of transplants.

The secret to the success of this program is people—people who are willing to help a complete stranger in need. And the secret to encouraging people to volunteer to become potential marrow donors has been a nationwide effort to educate and recruit marrow donors. That has been accomplished with funds appropriated by this Congress over the past 5 years.

My colleague from Kentucky, BILL NATCHER, the chairman of our Appropriations Subcommittee which funds the National Institutes of Health, and CARL PURSELL, our ranking member, and all the members of our subcommittee have been true heroes in this effort by supporting my request for funds to administer the growing national registry, to defray the cost of laboratory tests for tissue typing volunteers, and for research to perfect the marrow transplantation technique.

The largest share of the Federal support for this program actually has come from the Navy, where we originally established the program in 1987. My colleague from Pennsylvania, JACK MURTHA, the chairman of our Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, our ranking member JOE MCDADE, and all the members of our subcommittee also have been unwavering heroes in their support for the program.

My limited time does not enable me to tell you about every hero that has contributed to the success of the National Marrow Donor Program, but each of my colleagues, without whose support the program could not have grown, can take great pride in their role in saving lives. Many of my colleagues have taken up the cause in their own districts and have held numerous, very successful donor recruitment campaigns that have contributed to the growth of the donor rolls. My colleague from New Jersey, JIM SAXTON, and my colleague from Virginia, FRANK WOLF, have taken a special interest in donor recruitment efforts.

While we can all take great pride in this program's record of success, we must be aware that much work remains ahead. Although we will find matched donors for as many as 500 patients in the next 12 months, we need to understand that there are as many as 12,000 other patients whose only chance at life is an unrelated marrow transplant. With funds included in this legislation, and in the Defense appropriations bill approved earlier this month, our donor recruitment efforts will move forward to build a large, ethnically diverse registry that will give every patient an opportunity to find a matched donor. The success of our program already has spread around the world as mar-

row continues to cross geographic, ideological, and political borders every month to save lives.

Funds included in these bills also will enable us to continue to give special attention to the need to increase the number of minority donors. Although black Americans, Hispanics, and Asian-Americans remain seriously underrepresented, we have made great progress in this regard over the past 12 months. During that time, with the funds appropriated by this Congress, the number of minority volunteers has increased sixfold.

Mr. Chairman, marrow transplantation and the National Marrow Donor Program truly are modern medical miracles. Through this program, lives are being saved every day here and throughout the world.

I know, because my oldest daughter, Pamela Ernest, has been given a second chance at life through the gift of marrow from her brother. Pam was lucky. She had an identical matched brother and sister to donate marrow. More than 70 percent of the Americans in need of a marrow transplant are not as lucky. For them, there is no matched sibling donor. Their only hope rests in the National Marrow Donor Program.

With the continued support of the Appropriations Committee and this Congress, we will continue our efforts in the weeks, months, and years ahead to increase the donor rolls so that we can find a matched donor for every patient in need of a marrow transplant. This is a promise that I have made to hundreds of patients throughout our Nation, including my good friend Grant Hartley of St. Petersburg, FL, and together we can see that this promise becomes a reality and that each of these children, teenagers, and adults are given the opportunity to take advantage of the miracle of marrow transplantation.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to take this time to thank the committee for accepting my amendment which added \$40 million above the President's request for childhood immunizations. The administration's budget, even though it was an increase over last year's spending level, was still, in the view of most experts, woefully short in meeting the needs in this area.

U.S. immunization rates for childhood diseases, such as polio, measles, rubella, mumps, and other diseases like hepatitis B, are woefully inadequate. They are embarrassingly low.

We rank 17th in the world in terms of our overall immunization rates for some of these diseases. In fact, if you take a look at the immunization rate for minority populations in this country, we rank 56th in the world, well below countries such as Botswana.

I think that is a national disgrace, and I think it is a public health danger, and I am very pleased that the committee made as one of its top priorities the addition of this \$40 million above the President's budget for this very important item.

I am also pleased that the committee recognized the need to provide addi-

tional educational opportunities for middle-class Americans through its strengthening of the SEOG Student Aid Program.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], an outstanding leader on our committee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman NATCHER and CARL PURSELL for the excellent work they have done on this bill. The choices are very difficult, and BILL and CARL have done yeomen's work under extremely trying circumstances to produce a bill we can all be proud of. CARL has done an outstanding job as ranking member in his first year, getting up to speed in a very short time.

We had a very tight allocation, we had new programs to fund. We would have liked to have done more for many crucial programs. But this is a good bill that everyone ought to support.

Mr. Chairman, under these difficult circumstances, the staff was under extra pressure. I want to commend Mike Stephens, Sue Quantius, Bob Knisely, and Mark Mioduski. Their professionalism is unsurpassed in Congress. In addition, I want to commend Dr. Dave Recker, who just came on CARL PURSELL's staff. His expertise on the NIH will be a great asset to our side.

It is both an honor and a pleasure for me to serve on this outstanding subcommittee, with dedicated leaders and members and highly competent staff. We may disagree on some matters from time to time, but we always are able to work through and work out our differences and produce a bill that with fair accuracy reflects the values and priorities of our Nation.

Let me tell you some of the things that are in this bill, to give an idea of the breadth and importance of these programs.

For biomedical research, we are funding crucial research on chronic fatigue syndrome, a widespread and baffling disease which affects millions of Americans. There is money to track the disease and investigate the cause.

As the chairman mentioned earlier, we have a women's health initiative in the bill. But we also have an initiative on prostate research to investigate prostate cancer, the second leading cause of cancer deaths in men, and benign prostatic hyperplasia [BPH], the leading cause of surgery in men. We have money for cancer centers, which get research from the lab to the patient and funding for the Center for Medical Rehabilitation Research to help people with physical disabilities.

The bill helps communities whose tax bases have been obliterated by Federal installations—impact aid to compensate school districts for the cost of educating military dependents.

We are funding unemployment insurance administration to make sure that

the States have the personnel and equipment to process unemployment claims. Without this program, no one in this country would receive unemployment benefits.

There are programs to resettle Soviet refugees. We have fought for years for their right to immigrate. With a very small Federal investment and the help of volunteer agencies across this country, we are successfully resettling these refugees. We are teaching them English, getting them jobs, and helping them find housing. With a little help, these people become productive, contributing members of American society some of whom ultimately learn to have a greater appreciation for our values and traditions than some of us.

We have money to help bring the National Museum of Health and Medicine—one of our Nation's finest museums—back to Independence Avenue where it belongs. And we continue the excellent work of the Peace Institute under the leadership of Ambassador Sam Lewis. This organization brings scholars and policymakers together to develop conflict resolution techniques to promote American values throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, the related agencies often are overlooked in this bill, but are equally important as the programs for the three departments. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting provides alternative TV and radio services nationwide, and in many places is the only broadcast service available. The ACTION agency provides volunteer social work nationwide—drug counseling, senior services, and literacy training.

The Railroad Retirement Board is in this bill. This is the federally administered pension system for railroad employees similar to Social Security. We have a new Chairman at the Board and a new management representative. Together with OMB they have put together a new management initiative to streamline and improve management of the Board. This is a very important program to eliminate fraud, professionalize the tax accounting, improve debt collection and claims processing, and preserve the integrity of the trust fund. The funding for this initiative is conditioned on RRB meeting specific performance and money saving objectives according to a detailed 5-year plan.

Finally, this bill prohibits enforcement of the "gag" rule, an extremely important provision in light of the Supreme Court ruling in *Rust versus Sullivan*. Our bill prevents the Department of Health and Human Services from denying women information regarding their constitutional rights. This provision has broad and deep support on both of sides of the aisle, in many cases regardless of position on abortion because this is even a more fundamental question, one regarding the honest relationship between citi-

zens and their government, and I would urge the President to listen to the medical profession and from people all across the Nation and sign the bill when it comes to his desk containing the Porter amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. We have made the tough choices. We are within the allocation which is very tight. I commend Chairman NATCHER and CARL PURSELL, and I urge the Members' support of H.R. 2707.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1992 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and related agencies appropriation bill. I would like to commend Mr. NATCHER, chairman of the subcommittee, and Mr. PURSELL, the ranking member, and my other distinguished colleagues for reporting a bill that provides services for a large number of the citizens of the United States. I feel that the committee has targeted several areas of need, including training for migrant and seasonal farmworkers, AIDS prevention, bilingual education, the Minority Disadvantaged Act, and programs for the elderly, and has allocated funds appropriate to these needs.

In the area of AIDS new funds were provided for the Ryan White CARE bill, including \$7 million to reimburse dental schools which provide much needed services to AIDS victims. The services provided by these schools play a vital role in the detection and early intervention of AIDS and HIV related infections.

The bill also includes funds to continue programs of immunization, including hepatitis B, which is more contagious and prevalent than AIDS. The committee recognizes the need for immunizations of children in inner cities and children of recent immigrants and has targeted these two areas in its attempt to insure adequate immunization for all children entering school. An additional \$1 million is included for the Centers for Disease Control to establish a demonstration project designed to address the serious problem of TB in minority populations in the inner city.

I am also pleased that this appropriations bill provides funding for a variety of aging programs such as the Community Service Employment Programs, meals, minority initiatives, as well as research and aging demographics and training. Although I would have preferred to put more funds in these programs, I feel that our commitment to the elderly of this country remains strong and unshaken.

Though I would like to have included much larger sums of money for Alzheimer's disease and related disorders research and other special aging initiatives, I am pleased that the committee, under severe budget constraints, has increased the funding for research on Alzheimer's and other diseases afflicting the elderly population. However, we still have a long way to go. It is critical that we continue our commitment to increase research, education, and service efforts on behalf of older Americans.

The Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education bill provides a significant increase for education programs, including \$48 million in additional funding for bilingual education. These funds will allow the Department to augment its efforts in the areas of developmental bilingual education, family English literacy programs, and the training of bilingual personnel. I am pleased to see the committee demonstrate such a commitment to bilingual education.

As you well know, Mr. Chairman, there is a program of great concern to me which remains a problem within this bill. The deferral of funds to fiscal year 1993 for the State legalization impact assistance grants (SLIAG) will have an overwhelming effect on those States which have the largest influx of immigrants. This deferral will place a huge burden on the States to provide services for these immigrants. Under the landmark Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 Congress made a commitment to help the States with some of the costs associated with absorbing newly legalized aliens into their communities. The Federal Government has promised the States that it would share the financial responsibility for the costs of the Federal Government's decision to legalize millions of undocumented aliens. We should honor that commitment. Without SLIAG funds, health, welfare, and education services will be severely affected. Cuts in SLIAG funding would actually force the closure of some of the infrastructure that provides these services, affecting not just newly legalized aliens, but all citizens who use these services. Chairman NATCHER, you have played a vital and constructive role in assuring that SLIAG was funded.

While I am keenly aware of the budgetary circumstances under which this bill was funded, I must express my sincere hope that this situation can be rectified as we take our bill to conference with the Senate.

I commend Chairman NATCHER for presenting us with such a fine bill in a lean fiscal year. I support him in the tough decisions he made regarding programs so important to all the people of the United States and I urge all my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2707, the fiscal year 1992 Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill. This bill contains funding for the many programs which play an indispensable role in keeping citizens of our Nation healthy, educated, and employed. As a member of the subcommittee, I would like to commend the leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the chairman of the subcommittee.

During the subcommittee's deliberations on this bill, Chairman NATCHER often said that this would be a "good bill." True to his word, he brings to you today a bill which addresses the welfare and needs of all of our citizens. Funding levels contained in this bill reflect his leadership and unrelenting commitment to providing the Amer-

ican people with the labor, health, social service, and education programs they need and deserve. It is an honor to serve on this committee under his leadership.

I want to also express my appreciation to the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL]. CARL had a difficult job of stepping into the shoes of our beloved Sil Conte. This was a difficult job, but Mr. PURSELL has done an outstanding job of working with all of us on this committee.

We drafted this bill in a climate of stifling fiscal constraints. Despite the limitations placed on us by the 1991 budget enforcement agreement, the committee found a way not only to maintain current funding levels, but to increase funding for AIDS, biomedical research, infant mortality, Head Start, immunizations, compensatory education for the disadvantaged, and many of the other programs funded under this bill.

Specifically, H.R. 2707 provides \$144.7 billion for entitlement programs, a \$16.2 billion increase over the amount provided last year. For discretionary programs, \$58.5 billion was provided, an increase of \$2.3 billion over the fiscal year 1991 levels.

I am particularly pleased to note that \$319 million was provided for the infant mortality initiative. This represents an increase of \$114 million over the 1991 level. Of this amount, half is designated for healthy start, the President's proposal, and half for infant mortality grants to community health centers in targeted regions. This proposal is of special interest to my constituents in Cleveland, OH; 1988 data compiled by the Health Resources Services Administration indicates that the infant mortality rate in Cleveland is the sixth highest in the Nation. With an average rate of 16.9 deaths per 1,000 live births, the rate of infant death in Cleveland is higher than that of certain Third World countries.

The bill also provides approximately \$88.6 million in funding for programs authorized by the Disadvantaged Minority Health Improvement Act. This is about a \$30 million increase over last year's level. Programs funded under this act support the education, training, and recruitment of minority students and personnel in the health professions. Funds also will be used for the coordination and support of research, treatment, and prevention efforts directed toward ending the disparities between the health status of whites and minority Americans.

In addition to programs funded under the Disadvantaged Minority Health Improvement Act, other initiatives benefiting minorities include a \$10 million appropriation for the National Institutes of Health, Office of Minority Health. These funds will be utilized in research areas which disproportion-

ately affect minority Americans. This action, combined with funding of the Disadvantaged Minority Health Improvement Act programs, signals the committee's commitment to increasing resources in the areas of minority health and training.

In the area of AIDS, the bill provides approximately \$1.87 billion for research, education, and other activities directed at the prevention and treatment of AIDS. Currently, there are an estimated 172,000 reported cases of AIDS in this country; and, it is estimated that 1 million persons in the United States are infected with the disease. What is equally significant is the fact that women constitute one of the fastest growing segments of the AIDS population. For this reason, language contained in this bill directs the Centers for Disease Control to give enhanced attention to the gender-specific effects of the disease.

Also contained in this bill is an appropriation of \$5 million for a family support centers demonstration. Authorized by the Stewart McKinney Homeless Act last year, these centers will provide comprehensive supportive services to low-income individuals and families, with a focus on those previously homeless or at-risk of becoming homeless and residing in government-assisted housing. Under the authorization language, gateway grants also are to be provided as part of the demonstration. Gateway grants will provide onsite education, training, and related supportive services to young residents of public housing.

In addition to these health and human service initiatives, I am particularly pleased with the action the committee took in reference to education. The bill provides \$31.4 billion for education programs, representing an increase of \$4.3 billion over 1991 levels, and \$1.7 billion over the President's request. The bill gives its highest priority in funding to the compensatory education for the disadvantaged program, providing \$7.1 billion for chapter I grants, representing an increase of \$1 billion over the 1991 level. For the handicapped, \$2.6 billion was provided, a \$170 million increase over 1991 and \$56 million above the President's request. Head Start will receive \$2.2 billion, an increase of \$250 million over 1991 and \$150 million over the President's request. Increased funding also is provided for our Nation's college students, bringing the total student aid appropriation to \$6.9 billion in fiscal year 1992, \$139 million more than the amount provided last year.

Furthermore, recognizing the historic and crucial role historically black colleges and universities play in educating African-Americans, and other minority students, the bill provides \$100 million to support the title III undergraduate program, strengthening historically black colleges and uni-

versities. This represents a \$12.2 million increase over both the President's request and the 1991 amount. The graduate program authorized under title III will receive \$12 million.

Howard University, one of our Nation's preeminent historically black colleges would receive \$213 million, \$22 million above the budget request. The bill also endorses the continuation of the legal training for the disadvantaged [CLEO] and the special programs for the disadvantaged [TRIO] programs. The President proposed no funding for CLEO, and recommended the consolidation of the TRIO program, a program which assists low-income persons who are potentially first-generation college students. The committee accepted neither of these recommendations.

Finally, I am pleased to note that the bill provides \$3.2 billion for the State unemployment fund, and puts a mechanism in place which provides for the release of additional funds to States, automatically, should the level of unemployment workload exceed that estimated in the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, we all are aware of the budget caps which limit our ability to be totally responsive to all of our domestic needs. Despite these caps, we have produced a bill which, in unequivocal terms, reaffirms Federal support for those Labor, Health and Human Service, and Education programs which need to be at the top of our list of priorities. More importantly, passage of H.R. 2707 gives us the opportunity to let the American people know that Congress not only knows what they want, but we are responding to their needs. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support passage of this vital measure.

□ 1300

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER], an outstanding Member of Congress, who has done outstanding work in rural legislation.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2707, the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriation measure for fiscal year 1992. This is a fiscally responsible measure providing much needed funding for programs meeting the basic needs of the American people.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank our subcommittee chairman, BILL NATCHER, and our new ranking Republican member, CARL PURSELL, for their excellent work in developing this appropriations measure. We faced an extraordinarily tough funding situation in our subcommittee this year, necessitating hard choices among worthy, competing programs and needs. With the leadership of Congressman

NATCHER and PURSELL, I believe we are bringing a balanced measure to the floor today, one that serves the American people well and makes wise use of taxpayers' dollars.

This measure puts our Nation's children first. We have provided \$138.6 million to fund Secretary Sullivan's healthy start initiative to attack the serious problem of infant mortality in our inner-city and rural areas. For every dollar we invest in prenatal care, we save \$3 in health care costs for low birthweight babies. We have also included an increase of \$80 million for childhood immunization programs, realizing that for every dollar we spend on immunizations, we save \$10 in health care costs.

The first of the education goals announced at the education summit is that every child start school ready to learn. To help realize this goal, we have provided a \$250 million increase for the Head Start Program.

One of the major concerns of rural Americans is access to health care. In Minnesota and many other rural areas, severe and growing shortages of physicians, nurses, physician assistants, and allied health professionals are seriously eroding access to primary care and forcing hospitals to close. I wish to particularly express my appreciation to our chairman and ranking member and to my colleagues on the subcommittee for agreeing to increasing funding for the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan forgiveness programs by \$10 million—an almost 20 percent increase. That is a big increase, but it will go to good use. These programs provide highly effective, immediate, and long-term relief to our rural communities most severely affected by health professions shortages and will help us achieve our goal of eliminating shortage areas by the year 2000.

In addition, the measure before us restores funding for other programs important to maintaining and improving access to care in rural areas, including the rural health care transition grant program, health professions education programs, and nursing education. I will work with my colleagues as the appropriations process continues to further strengthen funding for these programs.

Another national priority I have worked with my colleagues on the subcommittee and Congressman TOM COLEMAN to meet is math and science education. The number of our talented college graduates choosing graduate studies in math and science and careers as researchers and educators is sharply declining, placing the quality of math and science education in our elementary, secondary, and post-secondary schools and our Nation's progress and international competitiveness at grave risk.

The measure before us provides a \$5 million increase for the Coleman fel-

lowships, which provide assistance to graduate students in the sciences and math who are needy and who are planning careers in research and education.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this appropriations measure. Like many of you, I am opposed to provisions in the measure prohibiting the Department of Health and Human Services from implementing regulations to clarify that abortion is not a method of family planning. I pledge to work as the process continues to remove these provisions.

But overall, this measure merits your support. It is a fair and balanced bill which meets pressing domestic needs and makes wise use of taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished author of the program.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman's leadership on the Committee on Appropriations to secure an increase again this year in the funding for this area where we will be able to produce and provide 1,800 new Ph.D.'s in math and science, American citizens who will go out and teach other American citizens in the future, and I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his continued support as well.

I rise in support of H.R. 2707, the Labor, Health and Human Services appropriations bill. This bill contains a substantially increased appropriation for education in 1992. I would like to commend Chairman NATCHER, ranking member PURSELL, and the members of the committee for their hard work in bringing forth this legislation.

I would specifically like to address my support to the increased appropriation contained in the bill for part D of the Higher Education Act, Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need.

Our graduate education programs produce the people and the knowledge this Nation needs to maintain and sharpen its competitive edge. But despite the fact that the United States has the largest and most advanced higher educational system in the world, our technological superiority is in jeopardy. Our R&D work force is increasingly sustained by foreign nationals, as the number of U.S. citizens pursuing scientific careers declines. Some alarming statistics bear this out:

In 1972, 80 percent of physical science doctorates awarded by U.S. universities went to U.S. citizens; by 1988, that percentage had dropped to less than 65 percent.

In engineering, the percentage of Ph.D's earned by U.S. citizens dropped from 67 percent in 1972 to 46 percent in 1988.

Foreign students, faculty, and industrial scientists bring with them a rich array of talent; but it is a source of talent which will become increasingly unreliable as the demand for their talent—and the capacity to support it—increases in their native countries. The dramatic

development of science and technology in the countries with which we compete is evident:

Europe continues to overtake the United States in its investment in civilian R&D. In 1989, the combined civilian R&D expenditures for the European Community and the European Free Trade Association exceeded ours for the first time.

The United States now trails France, Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom in the percentage of students selecting engineering as their first degree, and we are only slightly ahead of Japan in the percentage selecting the natural sciences.

It is anticipated that unless something is done, a sharply increased demand for Ph.D.'s in the United States will outstrip a comparatively level supply before the turn of the century. In the natural sciences and engineering, alone, it is estimated that if current trends continue, the Nation could face an average annual shortfall of 9,600 Ph.D.'s between 1995 and 2010.

As ranking member on the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, I was deeply involved in the development of the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need Program during the last reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. This program was specifically developed to help our Nation's universities address this critical problem by directing resources to doctoral programs in areas of national need such as mathematics, sciences, engineering, and foreign language and area studies.

Under the program, 3-year grants are awarded on a competitive basis to deserving graduate departments to provide them with the necessary resources to increase the number of students educated in their doctoral programs. Institutions can receive grants averaging nearly \$200,000. These grants are used to provide students with stipends of up to \$10,000 and funding to support the costs of their tuition, fees, and other program costs.

I am pleased that the Congress has funded the program at progressively increased levels of funding in each of the 4 years since it has been authorized: \$7.7 million in fiscal year 1988; \$12.8 million in fiscal year 1989; \$15.8 million in fiscal year 1990; and \$24.9 million in fiscal year 1991. These appropriations, totaling over \$60 million, have enabled 350 new and continuing institutional grants to award approximately 4,000 student traineeships.

The appropriation proposed in this legislation would bring funding for this program to the level of \$30 million in fiscal year 1992. This level of funding will enable grants to be given to approximately 150 institutional departments enabling up to 1,800 students to receive traineeships in academic year—fiscal year 1992–93.

Recently the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education heard testimony on the topic of graduate education and on this program in particular. In the hearing Dr. Peter May, chairman of the mathematics department at the University of Chicago testified to the positive impact this program is already having on the enrollment of U.S. citizens in doctoral programs. He reported that in academic year 1988–89, only 43 percent of the Ph.D's granted in mathematics by U.S. universities went to U.S. citizens but that 56 percent of students in

the Ph.D pipeline were U.S. citizens. Dr. May attributed this progress in large measure to the increased opportunities for U.S. doctoral students made possible by the National Need Program.

Mr. Chairman, I would again like to thank Chairman NATCHER and the members of the committee for their assistance in funding this important program. I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of this measure.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. EARLY].

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Chairman, this particular year was the most difficult of the 17 years that I have been on this committee with this bill. In these eyes, this bill is \$2 billion underfunded in moneys that can be spent productively and in the best interests of the people of the United States.

I also see this bill as being improved from what they had, and I think it was a fine year for the chairman, and the ranking member who succeeds my good friend Sil Conte did really a noble job.

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, the money in this bill is funded to what the expert witnesses suggested the money should be funded to. The first thing the committee did was, at the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], increased immunizations \$40 million. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] suggested an additional \$40 million, so this is \$80 million more than the 1991 budget for immunizations.

The committee raised the NIH \$50 million from the President's mark, which, in this Member's eyes, is still considerably short. The staff redistributed \$145 million in reducing bureaucracy, and improving the NIH budget. I think the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] did a good job with this bill considering the obvious shortage of available funds.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, because the time is very limited at this point, I will wait until we get into the amendment process to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman and the ranking member, if I can, concerning the level of funding for the President's antidrug programs that are contained in this bill.

I have been concerned that, in a number of the appropriation bills that have been coming through, the level of funding has been below the President's request, and I am concerned about the message this sends to our communities, our schools, and other areas.

I would look forward to that colloquy when we get to the amendment process.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]

has produced again another masterpiece.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, I commend him.

He, under most difficult budget constraints, put the dollars in education where they will yield the most in real dividends.

I especially commend him for the increase of \$250 million in Head Start. All studies indicate that the educational, social, and fiscal return on these dollars is enormous.

The increase in chapter 1 will improve the academic achievement of children who are performing below the appropriate age level.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. NATCHER's bill will do much to help achieve the goals for education set out by the President and Governor's of this Nation.

I salute Mr. NATCHER for being Mr. Education.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, it would take me 100 minutes to say thank you to the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], and to the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], as well as other members of the Committee on Appropriations, for the parents and for the children of this country.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of our Committee on Appropriations, especially our subcommittee, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], I want to thank you. All down through the years you joined with us, you worked hard, and there is not a Member in this House who knows more about education and health than you do and works any harder to see that these programs are fully funded and fully authorized.

I just wanted to make that statement.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank the committee on behalf of the parents and the children for the 12-percent increase in chapter 1, for \$100 million in Even Start, which will give us for the first time a State formula grant program where we are helping the illiterate parents become more literate and, at the same time, teaching them what it is that they can do to help their own preschool children become preschool-ready for reading; for the migrant children, we say thank you for the 9.2-percent increase; for the President's increase in education program, we thank you; for the graduate assistance in areas of critical need, we thank you, and for all of those who benefit from Head Start, we say thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2707, a bill providing appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for fiscal year 1992.

First of all, I want to once again commend and thank Chairman NATCHER, the ranking member Mr. PURSELL, and the members of the Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee, for their continued generous support of and leadership in the vital policy and programmatic areas encompassed by this bill.

In particular, I want to express my appreciation for their continued leadership in Federal support for education, which they have certainly reaffirmed through this bill by providing the Department of Education with a 12-percent increase in discretionary funding over the current fiscal year. Since I have always viewed chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as the backbone of the Federal effort to help all disadvantaged students in school, I was particularly gratified with the bill's recommended funding level for basic grants to local educational agencies, a 12-percent increase over the Congressional Budget Office's fiscal year 1992 baseline level for these grants.

When I appeared before the Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee in early May, I also recommended substantial increases in the funding of two other chapter 1 components, the Even Start Program and the Migrant Children State Agency Program. In the case of Even Start, I pointed out that everything we had learned about the program's results indicated that it definitely warranted an accelerated rate of expansion. Needless to say, I was delighted to find that H.R. 2707 recommended doubling Even Start's level of funding for the coming fiscal year, and that the level provided—\$100 million—will for the first time permit the program to make the transition to a State formula grant activity, and will thus allow local education agencies in all States to participate in the program.

As for the Migrant Children Program, I noted that while our efforts to help these children had been very rewarding—most particularly through the accomplishment of reducing their dropout rate by 40 percent over a decade—even though the funding of the chapter 1 account as a whole had increased dramatically over these past few years, this has not been reflected in the funding of the Migrant Children Program. I am pleased that H.R. 2707 recommends a 9.2-percent increase over the current fiscal year's funding level for this program.

I want to thank the Appropriations Committee for its careful, and to the extent possible favorable, consideration of President Bush's educational

excellence initiatives. I was pleased to find that the Appropriations Committee had taken the exceptional step of providing bill language which reaffirms the role of the authorizing committee. This bill also permits the initial funding of such educational improvement initiatives as may be authorized through new legislation if such is enacted prior to the end of the year.

The committee's understanding of the significance of the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need Program continues to be reflected in the consistency with which it has supported its growth. H.R. 2707 recommends increasing its funding level by 20 percent over the current fiscal year. This increase will permit the number of fellowships made available under this program to jump from 1,493 during this year to 1,799 during fiscal year 1992.

In my testimony early last month, I urged funding Head Start during the coming fiscal year at the \$2.3 billion level which had been assumed for the program in our budget resolution. I was very pleased to see that this bill assures that Head Start's fiscal year 1992 funding will be not less than \$2.202 billion, which definitely puts the program in the growth path envisioned for it in the budget resolution.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to once again extend my thanks to the entire Appropriations Committee, which has continued to demonstrate its responsiveness to some of the most pressing needs of our society.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the distinguished chairman of the HHS Appropriations Subcommittee, for the outstanding job he does for the House of Representatives and the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] will offer on this floor in a few minutes. It attempts to restore some \$134 million to the appropriations for drug abuse treatment and prevention that are now below what the President has asked for. I know, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] knows, that this amendment is out of order.

But I rise because it is the concept which I support, and because the so-called drug czar has seen fit to politicize this issue by having a press conference yesterday on the Capitol steps. He did not ask me or other members of the committee whether we could work with the administration to restore the funds. He did not ask why the President of the United States had failed until yesterday to send a bill that would authorize the funds. He did not ask for Democratic Members to join with him and his Republican Members

in order to make certain that this is a bipartisan issue.

The issue of drug abuse is too important to believe that we can do it as Democrats or Republicans. As chairman of the Select Narcotics Committee, I have never had a Democratic meeting in order to achieve a legislative goal, and I do hope that in the future the drug czar will attempt to achieve the goals of this administration in a bipartisan, apolitical manner.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics, I especially want to comment on the funding in the bill for drug abuse treatment, prevention, education, and research programs. For authorized antidrug activities, the amount recommended in the committee's bill is slightly over the President's proposal. Unfortunately, however, the total amount in the bill for anti-drug programs is somewhat below the President's request.

The shortfall occurs because many of the increases requested by the President are for continuing programs or new initiatives that are not currently authorized. While I recognize that the amounts requested by the President may be subject to points of order on the floor, I believe the House should be doing all that it can to fully fund the President's requests, and I would support such efforts.

The discussion over drug funding should not be a partisan political debate between Republicans and Democrats. Yesterday, the President's Drug Policy Coordinator, Governor Martinez, came to Capitol Hill for a press conference with the minority leader, Mr. MICHEL, and several Republican House Members to announce the introduction of the administration's Treatment and Prevention Act of 1991. This bill implements the demand side of the President's drug strategy and requests authorization for a number of the funding proposals the Appropriations Committee was unable to consider in the bill before us today.

Governor Martinez singled out by name Members of the House on this side of the aisle who should take the lead in restoring funds requested by the administration. Drug abuse and drug crime do not lend themselves to Republican or Democratic solutions. Our approach to these problems must be bipartisan.

It is time to get serious about the drug problem and work together to come up with the money we need to support effective programs. We do not need to just throw money at the problem for the sake of saying we are increasing drug spending. We are already spending billions of dollars on drug programs and the amount spent has increased very rapidly in recent years. Now it is time to ask not just "How much," but "What are we getting for our investment?"

The administration wants America to believe that we are winning the war on drugs. The truth is that serious drug abuse and drug crime remain as intractable as ever, destroying individuals, families, and entire communities at great cost to our society.

If we are truly committed to fighting a war on drugs, we have to be prepared for the long haul. Partisan politics has no place in our anti-drug strategy. No problem threatens the long-term security and prosperity of our Nation more than drugs.

Drug abuse and drug crime are truly national emergencies. I agree with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. WHITTEN, who, in speaking on the Justice appropriations bill a few weeks ago, said we should handle a national emergency of this sort by taking it out from under the budget ceilings as the President has done in other areas.

Today, I call on the President to join with the Congress in declaring drug abuse and drug crime national emergencies and to work together to find the resources necessary for an effective drug strategy. The budget agreement has not stopped us from finding billions of dollars to bail out failing financial institutions, to fight a Persian Gulf war and to aid the refugees that war left in its wake. Protecting the American people from drugs is no less of an emergency and demands no less of a response.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my distress and anger over the Appropriations Committee's decision to slash the budget for Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program by 38 percent. The impact of this cut will devastate low-income families throughout the United States, but will weigh most heavily on families in Maine and other cold weather States.

Maine is particularly dependent on LIHEAP as a major source of its assistance for home heating. The State served over 53,000 households in 1990 with an average assistance level of \$280. In fiscal year 1991 Maine received \$23.5 million—33 percent less in program funds than 1985-86—and this includes over \$4 million in supplemental assistance that the State received due to the excessive cost of heating fuel this past winter. The State is finding itself forced to serve more households with less resources. This situation cannot continue.

The committee's recommendation would cut Maine's funding by nearly \$10 million. It is estimated that at this level of reduction, over 17,000 more households in Maine will be literally left out in the cold.

I have heard the argument that LIHEAP is no longer necessary since the program was only intended to help households cope with the oil price crisis of the 1970's. Well, we only need to look at the last 2 years to see why LIHEAP is still vital. In 1989 the average price for fuel oil was 75 cents per gallon. This past winter, the average cost of fuel oil had increased to \$1.10 per gallon and reached a high point of \$1.35 per gallon.

As a result, the average Mainer's fuel bill has increased from \$600 per year in 1989 to \$880 this year. But, the average level of LIHEAP assistance in Maine only covers an amount equal to that price increase alone. When you consider that two-thirds of Maine's LIHEAP customers were at or below the poverty level, it becomes apparent

just how much of an impact the committee's proposal will have.

Certainly we face tough economic times and budgetary constraints but to make these cuts on the back of our low income families is unconscionable. LIHEAP currently only serves 25 percent of eligible households and pays an average of less than 25 percent of their total home energy bills. If the committee's funding level for fiscal year 1992 is maintained, almost 2 million more households will be unable to receive assistance.

Regrettably, the committee has attempted to hide its action behind the creation of an energy assistance emergency fund of \$600 million. These funds would only be released if the President submitted a formal request designating the need as an emergency as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Now, we are all painfully aware of this administration's position with respect to LIHEAP and its intention to eliminate the program entirely. These are not the people that we want to be making the decisions as to whether or not there is an emergency need for funding.

Access to affordable home heating oil is a necessity, particularly in areas like Maine where cold weather creates a demand for heating oil much earlier than other areas of the country.

Mr. Chairman, we manage to find room in our \$1.3 trillion budget for all manner of bricks and mortar and pork, of both domestic and foreign vintage. Can we not provide funds sufficient to prevent Americans from freezing in the winter?

I urge my colleagues to seek full funding for LIHEAP by the conferees when this bill goes to conference. The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program is far too important to the well-being of our low-income families.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my frustration at the process we have set up that forces us to weigh the relative importance of Head Start versus job training money. Not cancer treatment versus the superconducting supercollider. Not childhood vaccine programs versus the space station. But cancer treatment versus low-income energy assistance and AIDS funding.

I recognize the constraints under which members of this subcommittee are operating. There is not enough money to fund all of these programs and cuts have to be made. But to slash by 40 percent funds to help low-income people heat their homes is criminal. From \$1.6 billion to less than \$1 billion.

Is this any way to remember Silvio Conte? Is this what happens when the champion of an important Federal program is no longer here to protect it? Is this the tribute that this body pays to his memory?

Silvio Conte was passionate about many subjects. But there was none that incited him more than the notion that this House, and this Congress and this Government would be willing to allow poor people to suffer—and in

some cases, die—in homes that they were unable to heat.

This cut comes on top of 40-percent reductions in this program since 1981. We are not talking about cutting off Federal funds from middle-income Americans, or even Americans who are just poor. We are talking about telling people whose average incomes are only \$6,000 a year—the poorest of the poor—that we cannot help them any longer.

Even at current levels of spending, less than 25 percent of eligible households are served by LIHEAP. With a 40-percent reduction, as many as 2 million families could be cut off from energy assistance this winter.

This cut will be devastating in my State and my district. Last year the Massachusetts budget included \$11 million for fuel assistance. This year the budget was zero. There was less money for more applicants. And this was an unusually warm winter. What are we going to do if we have a normally cold winter?

In my district alone, there were over 1,000 new applicants for assistance. When I told the individuals who administer the program about these cuts, they were flabbergasted. They serve children and families, the disabled, and hundreds of elderly on fixed incomes. These people are already struggling to pay electric bills that are among the highest in the Nation. Without the LIHEAP Program to fill their oil tanks, they will have to choose between heating and eating.

This is not a choice they should be forced to make.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill is of very special importance because it sets much of the human resources agenda for the Nation. All of the needs served by this bill are in their own way worthwhile. Yet there is seldom enough money to go around.

In this way, the Labor-HHS-Education bill for fiscal year 1992 is no different than in the past. However, in one important way this bill is very different than in past years; and that is in respect to funding for LIHEAP, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program which was cut by nearly 40 percent last year.

LIHEAP provides critical assistance to the poor and elderly by helping them pay for their energy bills. Although LIHEAP serves over 6 million households in all 50 States, funding for this program has steadily declined from \$2.1 billion in 1985 to \$1.6 billion in fiscal year 1991.

The reason for this decline has been a combination of the availability of oil overcharge money to the States and a lack of support by the administration. The oil overcharge money was a temporary excuse that we never accepted and that has now largely run out. Unfortunately, opposition by the administration has become a permanent fixture.

In order to address the conditions that had led to a decline in funding the program, last year Congress passed a four-year authorization for LIHEAP. This authorization contained a number of revisions designed to improve the operation of this program and raised the authorization level for fiscal year 1992 to \$2.23 billion.

The fiscal year 1992 budget resolution passed earlier this year recommended funding LIHEAP at the Congressional Budget Office

baseline of \$1.675. Although the program could have used additional money, the CBO baseline would have been sufficient to preserve services at the fiscal year 1991 level and was adopted as a concession to fiscal reality.

After passage of the budget resolution, a majority of the authorizing subcommittee that I chair wrote to the Appropriations Committee requesting that the Labor-HHS Subcommittee be given sufficient funding to accommodate the recommended level for LIHEAP. In a separate letter, 231 members of the House also wrote to express their support.

If the overall priorities laid out in the budget resolution had been followed, then the share of funding made available to the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Subcommittee would have been enough to give adequate funding to LIHEAP. However, the outlay level made available to the subcommittee was below that necessary to maintain all of the programs in this bill at a current services level. Regrettably, something had to give, and unfortunately LIHEAP was selected.

This appropriations bill includes funding for health, welfare, and education. As a result, Members voting on this bill have been put in an impossible situation requiring them to choose whether they would rather be wise, warm, or well. We should not have to choose between these necessities, and that is why we had gone to great lengths to avoid this no-win dilemma.

I am therefore extremely disappointed that the Appropriations Committee was not able to set priorities in a way that would have followed the budget resolution and protected this program. Therefore, I would like to make it very clear that I do not support the cut in the LIHEAP Program in this bill and will work to restore it.

Furthermore, I would like to call on the President and the Appropriations Committee to reconsider their position on funding for this program and to pledge to work with the authorizing committees and other Members to raise the funding for this program. Hopefully, this kind of cooperation will lead to a way around this unwinnable dilemma.

□ 1310

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS].

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, I sincerely applaud the chairman on behalf of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the Mine Safety and Health Administration.

The 6-percent increase in funding for OSHA exceeds certain inflation levels, and therefore permits OSHA to continue expanding some of its operational activities for the first time in 20 years.

The House has now crossed a \$300 million mark for OSHA which is quite a way to celebrate OSHA's 20th anniversary. Of course, we would be more appreciative if the agency received more dollars, but we understand the problems involved.

I stand in very strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2707, the appropriations bill for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

We all know what constraints the House has been operating under in this year's appropriations process. We can all recognize the difficult task faced by Appropriations Committee and subcommittee members as they grapple with funding programs that are critical to the well-being of every American family knowing full well that we can only stretch the dollars so far.

Given those constraints, I commend both BILL NATCHER, the gentleman from Kentucky, and CARL PURSELL, the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman and ranking Republican, respectively, of the Subcommittee on Labor, HHS, and Education, for the product we have before us. This bill shows their true sensitivity to the needs of many Americans—workers, students, and others.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, I applaud the efforts in this bill on behalf of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA] and the Mine Safety and Health Administration [MSHA]. Given the funding constraints, I can understand why the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health [NIOSH] was frozen at the 1991 funding level, but I am concerned that such a freeze could have a serious—and negative—impact on research in critical areas of occupational safety and health, most notably in agricultural and construction safety and health.

The 6-percent increase in funding for OSHA exceeds current inflation levels and, therefore, permits OSHA to continue expanding some of its operational activities. For the first time in 20 years, the House has crossed the \$300 million mark for OSHA, quite a way to celebrate OSHA's 20th anniversary.

Of course, we would be more appreciative if the agency received more dollars with which to work, but the increase offers OSHA an opportunity to complete a number of major projects, especially the promulgation of a chemical process safety standard, a revised asbestos standard, and better means of addressing the constant problem of 2,500 construction fatalities and 200,000 serious construction injuries each and every year.

I am especially gratified to see the work of the subcommittee in modifying the language which restricted OSHA from enforcing regulations and standards in business with fewer than 10 employees. The bill before us now permits OSHA to provide technical assistance to those employers, to conduct inspections in response to an employee complaint, to take actions necessary to protect employees for imminent dangers and health hazards, and to follow up on accidents in which even one employee is killed or hospitalized.

This latter point is most important. Right now, if an accident occurs at a construction site, for example, and fewer than five workers are hospitalized, the employer does not even have to notify OSHA within a specified period of time.

In our legislative activities, we are preparing to revise this flaw in OSHA's administrative program. It is our contention that when a worker is injured seriously enough to be hos-

pitalized, that accident should be treated in at least the same way a fatality is handled—virtually immediate notice to OSHA, followed by an OSHA inspection.

These reporting requirements should be consistent for all businesses, whether there are 500 employees or 5 employees.

It is my understanding that an amendment will be offered later to revise this language so as to prevent OSHA from learning about such accidents unless there are five hospitalizations.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

The threat to workers' lives is not measured by the size of the workplace. An employer with 5 workers who does not meet safety and health standards is endangering the lives of those employees just as much as the employer with 500 or 5,000 employees who also ignores the rules. We must allow OSHA the opportunity to investigate those accidents that result in fatalities or serious injuries, especially when an injured worker is hospitalized.

The Appropriations Subcommittee is to be especially commended for its attention to funding for MSHA. By increasing MSHA's funding by 7½ percent, we are providing an opportunity for the agency to continue its efforts to reduce deaths and injuries.

Many of us can remember those days when the annual death toll in the mining industry, both coal and metal-nonmetal, topped the 300 per year mark.

Today, in part due to shrinkage of activity in mines, in part due to a shift toward more automated equipment, and in part due to the activities of MSHA, mining fatalities have been under the 100 mark for the past several years.

But that doesn't mean we can afford to relax our efforts. Mining is hazardous work. There are any number of things that can go wrong in a mine—improper ventilation, blocked passages, methane, coal dust, and so forth—that might result in roof falls, explosions, or fires. And, when you are a mile or more underground, when something goes wrong, there are few places where you can escape tragedy.

Whether we agree that MSHA is doing or has been doing the best job it can, that agency, like OSHA, needs our support so that it can continue to prevent those incidents that tragically take lives.

And that is why I am disappointed that there is no increase in funding for NIOSH. We need more research into occupational diseases and illnesses. We need more study of indoor air quality and the effects of bad air or poor ventilation on workers. We need more examination of the 10 leading causes of occupational injuries and illnesses.

By freezing the funds for NIOSH, we jeopardize those activities. Yes, there are still funds for some research, but some will have to be cut back. Some will never get started.

If the scientists who are scheduled to do the research leave the agency because their projects are trimmed or eliminated, then, even when the dollars are available, they will not be—and this critical research in occupational safety and health will never be done.

I can only hope that the other body will see fit to provide additional dollars for NIOSH so that during the conference on this bill, we can do our best to keep critical studies going.

As a member of the Postsecondary Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, I want to say a few words about student assistance funding in H.R. 2707.

I am pleased that the Subcommittee on Labor, HHS, and Education recognized that our authorizing committee has the responsibility for reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, but, at the same time, expressed its concern that the administration's Pell grant proposal would have eliminated more than 400,000 students.

I am disappointed that the bill provides \$24 million less in Pell grant awards than provided in last year's appropriations bill, but the \$100 million contingency fund to cover unanticipated program costs may mean that program dollars will not be used for those purposes.

I commend the subcommittee for appreciating the value of the Perkins loans, which are low-cost loans for needy students which are administered by individual institutions.

It was a sad day when the administration recommended no funding for this critical program, but at least we in the House realize its value and importance.

Thus, while I do have some reservations about portions of H.R. 2707, I do understand the limitations placed on Mr. NATCHER and Mr. PURSELL in trying to achieve a great bill. I commend them for bringing to us a good bill and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, whereas I appreciate the good work of the Labor/HHS Subcommittee, I am greatly disappointed that the subcommittee has decided to dramatically cut the funding the President has requested for drug treatment and prevention programs. These cuts will mean that 250,000 fewer Americans will be able to obtain drug treatment. That's right—250,000. That is unacceptable, and Members should know exactly what they are voting for in this bill when it comes to drug treatment.

An important part of what the subcommittee left out of this appropriation bill is the President's request for \$68 million for new drug treatment spaces. Worse still is the fact that this bill would cut \$33 million from current drug treatment services. That is simply unreasonable to those of us who believe that illegal narcotics remain our most important national security issue.

That is why in a few minutes I will be offering an amendment that will restore \$134 million of the President's requests for our most important national drug treatment and prevention programs. Without this spending, 16,000 Federal and 64,000 State and local drug treatment slots will be lost. That means up to 250,000 Americans won't have the drug treatment they desperately need.

This is not the only area in which some in the Congress have tried to

emasculate the President's program for fighting the war on drugs. Already, \$383 million has been stripped from the administration's anti-drug budget request. Here are some highlights:

The sum of \$41 million cut from the State Department budget, including \$19 million slashed from military assistance to Andean countries fighting the drug traffickers; \$202 million cut from the Justice Department, including \$42 million from DEA, which among other things will result in 90 fewer DEA agents;

Along with the cuts in treatment programs in this Labor/HHS bill, this represents a major blow to our Nation's efforts in combating substance abuse, drug trafficking, and violent crime associated with the drug trade.

We all know some advances have been made in our Nation's fight against drugs. But I strongly agree with my good friend, CHARLIE RANGEL, that we cannot let down our guard. We cannot declare victory, turn tail, and head for home. That seems to be what some in this Congress are willing to do. We should not let it happen.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Shaw amendment to restore the \$134 million requested by the President for drug treatment programs.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is not adopted, there will be 16,000 fewer Federal drug treatment spots in 64,000 fewer State and local treatment spots. With the drug epidemic threatening the very social fiber of our Nation, such a loss of treatment opportunities is both outrageous and unacceptable.

Present estimates, according to chemical health experts, show 5.5 million Americans are chemically dependent and in need of treatment. This amendment obviously represents only a modest attempt to respond to this compelling need, given our budget constraints. Turning our backs on the essential treatment component of our antidrug abuse efforts is not only shortsighted, but simply wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I know firsthand the value of treatment for chemical dependency. Without such an opportunity, that I received 10 years ago, I wouldn't be here today, given my 12 years of alcohol abuse.

Mr. Chairman, based on my experiences of the past 10 years working with other alcoholics and addicts, I can tell you, that treatment does work and the need for more treatment opportunities for Americans who want help is overwhelming.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard virtually every politician call the drug and alcohol abuse epidemic our country's most pressing domestic problem. Today, Members of Congress have the opportunity to put their votes where their rhetoric is.

The day has arrived for Congress to take a stand on the drug problem. We cannot afford to let these critical treatment slots go unfunded. We cannot afford to cut funding for the States' treatment programs.

Mr. Chairman, I plead with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this critical drug treatment amendment.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to call to this body's attention a funding decision that highlights our Nation's misguided priorities. What I refer to is the Appropriations Committee recommended funding level for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP]. Last year, this vital program was funded at \$1.4 billion; this year the committee has recommended a funding of \$1 billion. This is above the administration's request of \$925 million, but far below the current fiscal year and, more importantly, the level of need.

LIHEAP provides home heating assistance to people receiving public aid, the elderly and those who are living below the poverty line. This means that our most vulnerable citizens—children, senior citizens, and the ill and disabled—are at risk. For many, the help they get from LIHEAP means the difference between heating their homes and risking illness or death from exposure to the cold.

Just as I cannot understand how we can opt to fund a space station over housing, redundant and excessive weapons systems over school lunches and scholarships, I fail to comprehend how we can cut funding for home energy assistance. Obviously, Mr. Bush, with the help of the Appropriations Committee, does not intend for one of his "thousand points of light" to shine in the homes of those in need of assistance to pay heating and lighting utility bills.

As I lament the skewed priorities and values of this country, I wonder when we will realize the error of the decisions we make today. I only hope that when we are awakened to the realities of our actions, it is not too late to right the wrongs and solve the problems that misguided fiscal policy was wrought.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the provision in the Labor-HHS Committee bill that overturns the administration's gag rule to outlaw the discussion of all family planning options in clinics supported by title X funds. I urge my colleagues to support the committee bill as it is without any changes to this provision.

The Bush administration's gag rule is poor health policy, discriminatory against a certain group—poor women—and probably violates the first amendment.

The gag rule sets up a two-tiered system of medicine based solely on income. It also denies health care professionals the right of free speech.

I cannot support any program that gags a health care professional from giving all legal medical options to a patient. To do so would be both unethical and immoral.

The gag rule would require doctors, who are sworn to provide the best possible health care to those they treat, to violate the Hippocratic oath. That would be forced, in effect, to practice political medicine.

The even greater danger of this policy is its broader implications. We should not allow the

administration to gag free speech in order to pursue a specific political agenda: Ending legal abortions.

A policy of politically controlled speech could be applied to other programs such as doctors receiving Medicare funds, lawyers receiving public defender funds, school teachers receiving Federal funds, or lawyers receiving public defender funds. I fear where this policy could eventually lead.

Congress needs to act quickly to reestablish the right to free speech for every American, regardless of whether or not they receive Federal funds.

Today with this legislation we have a chance to eliminate the gag rule policy and by doing this confirm our commitment to free speech. We can also remove the shackles of political control over professional medical opinion. And finally, we can erase the proposed two-tier system whereby low income women receive different medical advice from all others when facing crucial personal decisions on pregnancy.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairman NATCHER and Mr. PURSELL for addressing one of my concerns about health care access for medically underserved communities.

Last year, Congress reauthorized the National Health Service Corps Programs. I was personally interested in the bill for a number of reasons but particularly because of a health care crisis in my district. In early 1990, a community and migrant health center in Dade City, FL, was forced to eliminate obstetric services when a national health service corps obstetrician-gynecologist resigned from the facility. Because the doctor left before his commitment with the National Health Service Corps had been completed, the clinic was not prepared for his departure and did not have the resources to hire a replacement.

National Health Service Corps medical professionals who break their commitment to the Government are required to pay a penalty fee based on the number of years served in the corps and the amount of money owed to the Government. This particular doctor's contract was bought out by a private group of doctors who wanted him to join their practice. As a result, obstetric services were discontinued in the Dade City facility and expectant mothers were forced to deliver their infants in a nearby hospital emergency room instead of the hospital maternity ward.

Even more disheartening is the fact that the penalty money went directly to the general revenue fund—not to the community clinic where the money was desperately needed. I felt this needed to be changed and saw an opportunity to do so when the Energy and Commerce Committee was considering the reauthorization of the program.

When the committee considered this bill, I authored an amendment, which was unanimously approved, that would provide some relief to health centers that lose their corps professionals prematurely. My provision created a special fund under the National Health Service Corps targeted specifically for clinics that lose health professionals before their commitment has been completed. The purpose of the fund is to enable clinics to operate at full capacity instead of allowing the overall health delivery

system to decline when a corps professional resigns unexpectedly. The fund would assist these facilities with recruitment and replacement of another health professional. The money for this fund would come from the penalty dollars paid by health professionals who defaulted on their National Health Service Corps loans.

Through this bill, the fund will receive \$1.5 million in fiscal year 1992. It is my hope that this special fund will prevent other health centers from closing their doors on their patients who are in dire need of health services.

Again, I am very grateful to the Appropriations Health Subcommittee for including my request in their appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my concern about the reduction in funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP] included in H.R. 2707, the Labor Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill. This program provides important energy assistance to many low-income people in this country.

In fiscal year 1991, LIHEAP received an appropriation of \$1.6 billion. H.R. 2707 would reduce funding for LIHEAP to \$1 billion in fiscal year 1992 with an additional \$600 million being available as a contingency, under a Presidentially granted energy assistance emergency fund. The chances of the President making this money available are considered very unlikely.

LIHEAP provides energy assistance to low-income children and families, the disabled and many fixed income senior citizens. The average family income of a LIHEAP recipient is \$6,000 a year. People in this income bracket traditionally spend 65 percent of their income on rent and utilities, which leaves them with very little money for other expenses. If this reduction is allowed to take place, my home State of New York stands to lose \$88 million, which would translate into 250,000 fewer people being served by this program.

LIHEAP has a strong history of helping people stay warm during the long winter months. In December 1989, when we had an unexpected cold streak, the LIHEAP program helped many families afford the cost of heating their homes.

Mr. Chairman, LIHEAP is an invaluable program. I urge my colleagues to do everything possible to see that full funding for this program is restored.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill to fund our Nation's health, education, and training programs. I particularly want to call attention to the funding provided in this bill for the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Chairman, just a few weeks ago, we had a debate here on the House floor in which Members described the multitude of medical benefits they envisioned from the building of the space station. According to one Member:

[T]here are medical solutions that await us up there. The space station is a solution to a lot of the medical mysteries that lie wasting away in veterans' hospitals.

Another Member said:

The laboratory will give us unique opportunities to study cardiovascular disease, hypertension, osteoporosis, anemia, diabetes, and the basic immune functions. Such re-

search can lead to new medicines to treat diseases like cancer and AIDS.

Yet another Member told this body that space station-based research may actually lead to a cure for cancer. A cure for cancer.

Mr. Chairman, it may well be that a decade or more from now, after we spend from \$40 billion to \$100 billion on a space station, we may see some medical research spinoffs. But this body is required to make choices and set priorities, and I believe the National Institutes of Health offer us a greater potential for medical breakthroughs. We need to give more emphasis to the potential for medical discoveries that can happen through the programs funded by this bill, rather than focusing on the vague promises and hopes of a space-based medical miracle in the future.

A broad coalition of voluntary health organizations which promote research on the prevention, treatment, and cure of variety of diseases, joined together in the following statement regarding the National Institutes of Health. They said:

Since World War II, better than half of the 100 scientists that have been awarded the Nobel Prize in medicine and physiology had prior support from or experience at the NIH before being honored. No other research institution comes close on this measure of excellence.

They went on to say:

This unparalleled expertise has led to a long list of major discoveries. These include: identifying the cause of and possible treatments for AIDS; defining the genetic markers for diseases such as Huntington's disease and cystic fibrosis; developing recombinant DNA technology; discovering vaccines against hepatitis B and influenza; developing the immunosuppressant cyclosporin; refining the powerful antibiotic penicillin; and determining the linkages between smoking and lung cancer.

Finally, they noted that when our Nation's research priorities are placed elsewhere, opportunities for medical breakthroughs are missed. They said:

Significant opportunities recently missed at NIH due to funding limitations included projects to: evaluate the role of suppressor oncogenes on lung, colon, and breast cancer; develop a monoclonal antibody treatment for multiple sclerosis; investigate the use of immunosuppressants in treating Crohn's disease; and manage childhood asthma.

Mr. Chairman, only one-fourth of the NIH grant proposals that have been identified as worthy of support each year are actually funded by NIH. The other three-fourths of these proposals are left unfunded despite their potential to lead to medical discoveries that could save lives and alleviate human suffering.

I am pleased that the Appropriations Committee was able to provide \$50 million more for NIH than the President requested. I believe we need to do even more. If we want to maximize our ability to tap the scientific community for medical advancements, we need to reorient our Nation's research budget to focus more on what we can do now through expanded NIH funding rather than on what we might be able to do a decade from now if the space station is built.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my strong support for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP]. I

find it tragic that H.R. 2707, the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992 which passed the House today severely cut funding for this vital program.

The House Appropriations Committee slashed LIHEAP by nearly 40 percent to \$1 billion. Additional moneys can only be released if the administration, which sought the funding reductions in the first place, declares an emergency. While I understand the need for fiscal constraint in this era of budget deficits, a reduction of 40 percent in LIHEAP is inequitable and irresponsible.

I represent six counties near Lake Ontario in upstate New York. As one can imagine, winters can be extremely cold in this region and LIHEAP is a critical program for many low-income people in my district. Federal assistance for high heating costs is not a wasteful Federal subsidy in my congressional district. Quite simply it saves lives.

I also serve as dean and chairman of the New York State congressional delegation. We in New York will lose more than any other State in the country in energy assistance if the present spending reductions remain in the bill. Hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers who need our help to meet energy costs will lose benefits while literally millions more will suffer nationwide. Further, it is estimated that LIHEAP funding for our State will fall by \$87.5 million. Given the budgetary crisis we are experiencing in New York, our State government will certainly be unable to make up the shortfall.

I urge members of the Appropriations Committees in both bodies to raise the current level of funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program before enactment of H.R. 2707. We must do all in our power to ensure that an adequate level of funding for LIHEAP be restored to meet the basic human needs that are addressed by the program.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with my colleagues and express support for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP].

I strongly support LIHEAP. It provides critical assistance to many low-income elderly, disabled, and families with children in my district.

Earlier this year, I testified before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, urging funding for LIHEAP at the current services level of \$1.675 billion—the amount approved by Congress in the fiscal 1992 budget resolution.

Not only did LIHEAP not get funded at the current services level, the committee cut LIHEAP funding by \$600 million below last year's level. The committee proposes a program of \$1 billion.

This action is extreme. It represents a cut of more than 40 percent below the amount necessary merely to maintain the current level of services for the program.

I only pray that our next winter in Michigan—and throughout the Northeast and Midwest—is a mild one. If it is not, this major funding reduction will cause great hardship for many low-income people. I shudder to think of the consequences of our failure to adequately fund this essential program.

LIHEAP provides critical assistance to some of the most vulnerable members of our soci-

ety. It meets a basic human need. Far too many low-income households—families with children, the disabled, and fixed-income elderly—must choose between heating their homes and other necessities. Nearly 60 percent of LIHEAP households are families with incomes under \$6,000 per year.

Unfortunately, the need for LIHEAP has grown while available resources have not kept pace with that need. During the past decade, the number of federally eligible households increased almost 28 percent. At present, only a quarter of eligible households receive help. Despite this growth, LIHEAP appropriations have declined more than 20 percent between fiscal 1986 and 1991—and by an even larger amount if inflation is factored in.

The committee's action continues this downward trend. For Michigan, this funding reduction means real hardship. Michigan would lose more than \$31 million resulting in almost 95,000 households being eliminated from the program. Alternatively, payments would be significantly reduced for current recipients.

On such a beautiful day as today, it is hard to think about winter. But I am fearful our failure to act today will come back to haunt us. This winter, when children and the elderly are freezing, our failure to act will be all too apparent. Maybe then we will correct our mistake here today and adequately fund LIHEAP.

I do hope the House Appropriations Subcommittee will do everything possible to secure adequate funding for LIHEAP during the conference with the Senate.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I believe the activities this bill funds are some of the most important in the Federal Government. Protecting our workers, educating our young people, and caring for the sick are services which I am proud the Federal Government provides.

But, one very important and worthwhile program which has felt the pain of the budget ax is the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP]. The \$600 million cut in LIHEAP's regular funding will make it very difficult for many, many Americans, including a large number in my district.

The individuals and families in southern Illinois who receive LIHEAP help are the lucky ones. I have received lots of letters from people who were not able to qualify for LIHEAP, and are having a very difficult time making ends meet.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues involved with this legislation to increase the program's funding when the bill goes to conference with the Senate. LIHEAP is vital to millions of Americans and it is a program which this House should wholeheartedly support.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, the 1980's dealt Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP] recipients a devastating double blow. The first punch came in higher energy costs, as the energy bills facing low-income households nearly doubled over the decade. The average residential energy expenditures by low-income families increased to nearly \$1,000 up from just \$575 a decade before. This increase has come despite good-conscious efforts to conserve energy through Federal and State weatherization programs, which has succeeded in dropping energy consumption in low-income households by 13 percent over the same decade.

The second punch came as appropriations for the program dropped by over a third from the 1982 level. As a result, the average annual LIHEAP heating benefit had decreased from \$173 to \$124 by 1989.

Today the House goes for the knockout with a disastrous 40-percent cut in LIHEAP funding from its level just 1 year ago. This means that LIHEAP funding will drop as much in 1 year, from fiscal year 1991 to fiscal year 1992, as it did throughout the entire 1980's. Such a cut would terminate energy assistance for as many as 2 million families nationwide.

As the chairman of the New England congressional energy caucus, I have heard from colleagues from our region on both sides of the aisle who are outraged by this draconian cut. Over 100,000 New England households will lose their energy assistance if the proposed 1992 allocation is maintained. In my own State of Massachusetts, over 40,000 families will be cut from the program as the Federal contribution drops by over \$27 million.

LIHEAP recipients are the last group that should pay through drastically cut services. Even before the proposed cuts, LIHEAP is able to serve fewer than 25 percent of eligible households and on average pays less than 25 percent of those recipients' energy bills. The majority of these recipients have annual family incomes of under \$6,000 and devote 65 percent of their income to rent and utilities. In my State of Massachusetts, two out of five LIHEAP recipients are elderly and face even greater financial pressures because of this.

LIHEAP helps the poorest of the poor meet one of humanity's most basic needs. It is not, as the administration has argued, an obsolete program designed for the energy crisis of the 1970's and no longer needed. LIHEAP helps the poor meet the personal energy crisis that comes in the mail from their utility companies at the end of each month. As the impact of the recession cuts deeper into the income levels of America's poor, more and more households are in vital need of LIHEAP's assistance.

Last year the House and the Massachusetts delegation lost LIHEAP's champion and most eloquent spokesman, Silvio Conte. Although his name will forever be associated with the good works of the LIHEAP Program, each year Silvio helped craft a bill that would strike the right balance between the many worthy programs to which he gave his support—from health research, to education, to child care.

Unfortunately, the bill before the House today does not succeed in striking such a balance. Mr. Chairman, I understand the tremendous budgetary pressures that have led to the choices in the Labor, HHS, and Education bill. Despite this, we are placed in an unacceptable position—choosing whether our constituents end up cold, dumb, or dead.

I urge my colleagues to reverse this perilous cut in LIHEAP in conference this year in order to protect those least able to afford the drastic consequences of such a severe cut.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP]. LIHEAP took a devastating cut in this bill—38 percent below last year's level. This cut means that 2.3 million families will not be able to receive LIHEAP benefits.

LIHEAP plays a vital role in the Northeast, assuring that 6 million families—the poor, el-

derly, and disabled—have adequate resources for meeting their home heating needs. Low-income families currently pay close to four times as much of their income for energy as the average family. In spite of program cutbacks, LIHEAP has remained the primary vehicle for assisting these families in meeting their home heating needs. During fiscal year 1991, the Northeast will receive close to \$555 million in Federal funds for this purpose.

What does this program mean for the 34th District of New York? In the winter of 1990–1991, it provided aid to 30,032 households—one fifth of all the families in the district. In Allegany County, for example, 50 percent of the money was spent on emergency cases. If this money hadn't been there, these people would have lost their heat. Half of the recipients in Allegany County are elderly and nearly 60 percent must live on less than \$6,000 per year.

Our only hope now is that the funding level can be brought up during the conference on this bill. I have spoken personally with Chairman NATCHER. He has assured me that he will do everything he can to restore funding for LIHEAP, and I am confident he will do his best.

Mr. Chairman, we provide hundreds of billions of dollars for people in need, but tell me—of all the human needs in the dead of winter—is there anything more important than providing warmth to those who cannot afford it otherwise?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak in favor of the fiscal year 1992 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. I commend the efforts of the Chairman, Mr. NATCHER, and the ranking minority member, Mr. PURSELL, and the other members of the committee in producing a bill that addresses many of the educational needs of this Nation.

This bill represents a commitment to education, especially to the President's proposal, America 2000. America 2000 is a four-step proposal that would: Develop voluntary, national tests to help students reach new world class standards in five core subjects, create model schools for tomorrow's students, calls on corporations to work with schools and communities in upgrading necessary skills, and asks communities to adopt educational strategies.

The fiscal year 1992 bill contains \$500 million for educational improvement activities that are authorized in law by December 31 of this year; \$250 million is specifically allocated for America 2000. The \$250 million contingency fund helps us to lay the foundation for the President's education agenda. This is a rare occasion where the House Appropriations Committee has provided funds for programs that have yet to be authorized. I assure my colleagues, in particular, Chairman NATCHER and Mr. PURSELL, that the House Education and Labor Committee has every intention of authorizing all America 2000 initiatives and will work with President Bush and the Senate in seeing that this legislation is enacted prior to adjournment of the 1991 session.

Last year, the Congress passed the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act. Having been very involved in last year's reauthorization effort, I am pleased that the appropriators

have given a \$400 million increase to vocational and adult education programs.

I would also like to thank the Appropriations Committee for the continuation of funding for Attention Deficit Disorder Centers. These information centers help educators, researchers, and parents respond to the educational needs of students with attention deficit disorders.

Although many education programs received significant increases, several education and health programs were not as fortunate. These include Pell grants and the alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health block grant.

The proposed fiscal year 1992 Pell grant allocation in the bill is somewhat disappointing. Once the House and Senate complete work on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, I am confident that the Congress will appropriate the additional dollars needed to match the reauthorized level and that Pell grants will also be made available to part-time students.

The proposed alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health block grant allocation for fiscal year 1992 is distressing. The \$33.7 million reduction will be especially harmful to the States as they try to offer adequate prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs to all those who need such services.

As an advocate and trustee of Gallaudet University, I especially want to take this opportunity to thank Chairman NATCHER and Mr. PURSELL for the \$910,000 increase in the proposed allocation for Gallaudet, a total appropriation of \$73.172 million. Of the increase, \$850,000 will be used for funding computers. The percentage of the student body that actively uses the computer system is 80 percent. The number has quadrupled over the past 3 years.

Gallaudet University has a very ambitious priority list for 1992. These initiatives include: Expanding research programs to promote the equalization of opportunities for all deaf individuals, increasing the use of technology as a tool for instruction, serving as a national and international source of information, and professional training for deaf and hard of hearing people. A particularly interesting project that Gallaudet will begin within the coming year focuses on communication. The provost and the vice president for administration and business are developing plans for research regarding effective sign communication in postsecondary classrooms.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations and the other members of the subcommittee for producing a bill that will improve many of our education programs and social services for fiscal year 1992.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in praising the work of the subcommittee on this appropriations bill and, in particular, to thank the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman NATCHER of all the good work that has gone into this legislation.

The national unemployment rate rose from 6.5 percent to 6.9 percent last month. In my home State of Michigan, the news is even worse: The unemployment rate currently stands at 9.7 percent. For these people, the recession is far from over.

At times like these, working Americans who find themselves unemployed through no fault of their own rely on our unemployment insurance [UI] to see them through. But as members of the Appropriations Committee well know, the proper functioning of the UI program depends crucially on the administrative funding provided under this bill.

When the recession deepened earlier this year, we faced a shortfall in administrative funding for the States. The committee provided the necessary moneys in the supplemental appropriations bill. The UI system was paralyzed in many places, unable to cope with the enormous new demands placed on it, and the extra funding helped ease the situation. The long lines at unemployment offices and delays in claims processing largely disappeared.

But providing additional money through the supplemental appropriation process is at best only a temporary solution. The real problem is the supplemental process itself, which often delivers too little relief too late. A system that takes three or four months to respond to the immediate needs of our workers is a system that doesn't work properly.

During committee consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill, I raised with Chairman NATCHER the idea of establishing a contingency reserve fund that would automatically pay out additional administrative moneys if there were unanticipated increases in unemployment. This idea was first brought to my attention by an alliance of employer and employee groups from Michigan, and I thought it was a good first step in solving the chronic shortages of UI administrative financing. In a bipartisan display of support, the entire Michigan delegation recently sent a letter endorsing this proposal and asking for its inclusion in the Labor-HHS bill this year.

I am pleased, therefore, to see that the committee has established a contingency reserve fund in this legislation, and I want to personally thank Chairman NATCHER for his cooperation in securing this important reform. He promised last March that the subcommittee would seriously consider the concept this year, and as always, he was true to his word.

I also want to note that the committee provided the full amount requested by the Bush administration for UI administration, not the significantly lower amount assumed in the budget resolution. This was a difficult but wise decision, all the more so because of the other pressing needs the Committee had to consider.

It remains to be seen whether these changes will completely protect the integrity of our UI program. Continuing budget pressures and a new, somewhat ambiguous, sequester procedure mean that adequate future funding for administering the UI program remains in doubt. I continue to think that making UI a mandatory spending program would both ensure the proper and efficient operation of our UI program and also protect other domestic programs from the large and growing needs of the States in administering programs like UI. But that idea will have to wait for another day.

On behalf of the working men and women of Michigan, I want to express my gratitude to the committee for a job well done, and I look forward to working with Chairman WHITTEN,

Chairman NATCHER, and other members of the committee on this issue in the future.

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2707 as it was reported out of the Appropriations Committee. This legislation contains a provision, offered by Representative JOHN PORTER, that would prohibit any Federal funds from being used to enforce the administration's gag rule regulations. These regulations, promulgated by the Reagan administration, supported by the Bush administration, and declared constitutional by the Supreme Court, prohibit physicians from providing their patients with legal medical information.

The gag rule mandates that physicians provide women with half truths about the options available to them—even when their lives are in danger. In effect, the gag rule legalizes malpractice.

Any decision that a woman makes concerning abortion is painful, troublesome, and intensely personal. It is a decision that should be made by a woman, in consultation with her physician, and with her family when possible. Yet how can we expect a woman to make an intelligent, informed decision when she is not provided with all of the information necessary to make that decision? I would ask my colleagues, has there ever been a time that you asked your staff to provide you with less information about an important vote because it would help you make a better decision? I would hope not.

For 4 years, I have fought to reverse the international version of the gag rule, the Mexico City policy. In all of these years, I never imagined that I would be fighting to reverse such a misguided policy on a domestic level. It is inconceivable to me that two of the three branches of this Government would support regulations that so blatantly restrict free speech and the free flow of information—especially when that information could save a woman's life.

Mr. Chairman, 2 weeks ago the House voted to reverse the international gag rule and restore U.S. funding to nongovernmental and multilateral organizations that counsel women about abortion in countries where abortion is legal. I urge my colleagues to extend this same right to clinics within the United States that receive Federal funding. Let's get the government out of the doctor's office and allow women to be advised of all of the legal medical options related to a pregnancy. Support H.R. 2707 as it was reported out of committee.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to proposed funding cuts in LIHEAP—the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program. If our friend and colleague Mr. Conte were here on the floor today, clad in a plaid blazer, he would remind us of how critical this program is to the Northeast region of the United States. Though I am not as loud as my colleague was, nor as skilled in writing verse, my message is just as sincere and just as resolute.

Mr. Chairman, a 40-percent in this important program is just not acceptable. It is not reasonable for it hurts the very citizens that need energy assistance the most. There are many places in the budget that deserve trimming. LIHEAP is not one of them. Such a cut would

eliminate 2 million families from the program or significantly reduce payments for current recipients. And it is important to remember that this cut is in addition to the already tedious strain this program has endured through the years.

During the past decade, the number of federally eligible households has increased by almost 28 percent. Further, at the present, only a quarter of the eligible households receive help. Despite this growth, LIHEAP appropriations have declined more than 20 percent since fiscal year 1986.

The committee's solution is to set up a contingency fund for release only if the President declares a national emergency. Pointing to the situation I have just described, Mr. Chairman, by my definition we are already in the midst of a national emergency. The ability to heat one's home should not be a privilege—it is hardly a frivolous expense. Home heating is a basic human need.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the conference committee to reexamine this issue with an eye toward maintaining funding levels for this critical program.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago several Members, including myself, recognized the 10-year anniversary of the AIDS epidemic. We called for continued vigilance against this great threat to our Nation's public health. Today, the strength of our convictions is being tested. And, I'm afraid, we are falling short of our stated goals.

I applaud the work of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee. The distinguished chairman, Mr. NATCHER, has proven to be a true advocate for AIDS treatment and research. The bill before us includes a \$63 million increase over fiscal year 1991. Within that increase is an additional \$26 million for the Ryan White AIDS CARE programs. That's \$26 million more than the President requested. Despite the expanding number of AIDS cases, including a one-third increase in my State of New York, President Bush thinks that emergency funding can remain level. I commend Mr. NATCHER for taking the lead on increasing resources for the Ryan White CARE Act.

Unfortunately, our cities will continue to suffer from the explosion in the number of AIDS patients. Recently, the U.S. Conference of Mayors reported dramatic increases in the number of AIDS patients. In New York City, anywhere from 125,000 to 235,000 people are affected with the HIV virus. By the year 1996, according to the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the number of AIDS cases in many cities will increase by more than 200 percent.

According to the U.S. Conference of Mayors, Federal AIDS-assistance funds are simply insufficient to meet local demand. Public resources cover a large percentage of AIDS cases. Service systems are strained. Federal funds provided under the Ryan White ACT are barely helping to ameliorate the burden placed on local governments. All the cities surveyed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors believe they will be unable to meet projected demand for HIV-related prevention, education, and health services. They are looking to the Federal Government for help.

I know members of the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Subcommittee, and oth-

ers of us in Congress, wanted to give a larger funding increase to the Ryan White CARE programs. It is a shame that last year's budget agreement prevents us from acting more decisively on such a critical issue. In order to rein in the deficit, we are forced to choose between feeding those who are already hungry or treating those who will soon be sick. The richest nation in the world should be able to do both. Once again, we see that the big party the Republicans threw in the 1980's had a price. Too bad the people who weren't invited end up footing the bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill providing appropriations for fiscal year 1992 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. I commend the work of Chairman NATCHER and his colleagues on the subcommittee in particular for their hard work on Older Americans Act programs.

We are all aware of the constraints imposed on us by the budget summit agreement. Nonetheless, this appropriations bill funds Older Americans Act programs at the same level as last year. In a short time, we will be considering the reauthorization of the act and we will have the opportunity to debate these programs more fully. I would note at this time the report language which urges the U.S. Administration on Aging to promote minority participation in Older Americans Act programs and to improve its data collection efforts. Both of these concerns have been mentioned to me by many in the aging community and I endorse this report language.

As chairman of the Aging Committee's Subcommittee on Human Services, I am especially pleased to note that the Appropriations Committee has restored the \$47,500,000 cut that President Bush requested in the title V, Senior Community Service Employment Program. In March, I held a subcommittee hearing to examine the impact of this drastic cut on the people the program served. We learned that approximately 7,800 individuals would lose their jobs. These 7,800 people are elderly women and men with low incomes who are eager to work in public service jobs. They are willing to continue to contribute to their communities. There is no rationale for a cut like this, and I made the point to the Secretary of the Department of Labor when I met with her subsequent to the hearing. The Appropriations Committee is to be commended for rejecting this foolhardy and mean-spirited proposal. I only regret that so many people had to expend so much effort in staving off a cut that should never have been made, instead of working to increase the funding for the program. I urge the administration to heed this message and stop trying to weaken a successful program.

I also strongly support the Committee's action in continuing to fund the elder abuse prevention and treatment program, and the ombudsman program. Just last month, I held a hearing on the problem of elder abuse and it is clear that the Older Americans Act can play a pivotal role in the elder abuse efforts. A week ago, I met with the associate executive director of the Family Service League of Suffolk County, the agency which provides ombudsman services in my district. I heard how strapped they are for funds to run the pro-

gram. Here I must emphasize that the ombudsmen in Suffolk County are all volunteers, who do their jobs under, at times, difficult circumstances. We should not be misled by the fact that these ombudsmen are volunteers—it still takes resources to run such an important program. I wish that we could provide increased funding for both these programs at this time, but it is not possible. However, I am encouraged that a number of my colleagues and I are working to develop a new elder rights provision of the Older Americans Act which we hope will strengthen the elder abuse, ombudsman, and other advocacy programs.

Finally, I must thank Chairman NATCHER for continuing to fund a demonstration program which I strongly believe in. The 1989 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act contained a provision I introduced, section 10404, the Intergenerational Demonstration Project for Disabled Children. This project grew out of the innovative Family Program of the National Council on the Aging. It seeks to determine whether the use of volunteer senior aides to provide basic medical assistance and support to families with moderately or severely disabled chronically ill children contributes to reducing the cost of care for such children.

The U.S. Administration on Aging has just issued its request for proposals for the funds for fiscal year 1991 and the continuation of this program through fiscal year 1992 is welcome news indeed. It is most important that we continue to fund this demonstration program and that we provide the resources for a thorough and comprehensive evaluation of this model.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, today the House is scheduled to vote on H.R. 2707, the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. One billion dollars is included in this bill for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP]. Although \$1 billion may appear to be a generous level of funding, unfortunately, it is actually a cut of almost 40 percent in 1 year. In fact, suggested funding for this program may affect as many as 2 million families across the Nation.

In Hawaii, we use some of the most expensive oil and electricity in the Western Hemisphere, yet the average incomes of our low-income citizens are comparable to the poorest of the Southern States on the mainland. LIHEAP, like food stamps, is one of the few grants available to working poor and recently unemployed families. For low-income Americans rising natural gas, electric, and home-heating-oil prices are not only a temporary irritation but a chronic drag on inadequate incomes, one whose weight has increased enormously since the energy crisis of the mid-seventies.

LIHEAP helps families with children and the elderly avoid loss of utilities and the health and housing consequences that follow, which, all too often, includes eviction. The majority of the recipients are families with incomes under \$6,000. During 1990, the Honolulu Community Action Program, Inc.'s Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program provided crisis intervention assistance to 760 households and energy credit assistance to 3,158 households. Without assistance to pay for utility bills, many

of these households would be unable to pay for the higher costs and face the prospects of a utility shutoff. The elderly, disabled and low-income households on fixed incomes have the least amount of discretionary funds to cope with such changes.

I understand that Congress faces difficult budgetary decisions in this era of limitations. However, we cannot forget or ignore those who are less fortunate. Therefore, I urge the Members of this House to give special attention to the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program and its needs.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I join in the plea of our distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control that we not politicize the antidrug abuse effort. Chairman RANGEL is to be commended for his bipartisan, apolitical approach to dealing with the deadly drug epidemic.

But this caveat does not dim the tragic reality of the drug problem which, unfortunately, is not adequately addressed by this legislation, H.R. 2707.

Mr. Chairman, 5.5 million Americans are chemically dependent and unable to get into treatment programs. Because the Shaw amendment was objected to on a point of order, \$134 million requested by the President will not go to these drug treatment needs. That means 16,000 fewer Federal drug treatment slots and 64,000 fewer State and local treatment slots.

Mr. Chairman, it's simply wrong to let these critical treatment slots go unfunded. It's wrong to cut the States' treatment programs.

The consensus in Congress and throughout the country is that we truly need a comprehensive approach to the drug problem. Treatment is a crucial component of such an approach. As one law enforcement official said recently, "We could lock up every drug dealer and user in America, and we would still have a drug epidemic."

Cutting the President's request for drug treatment programs by \$134 million is both shortsighted and tragic.

Mr. Chairman, I truly hope Members on both sides of the aisle will work in the bipartisan spirit cited by Chairman RANGEL to restore these critical treatment funds in the conference committee.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill, H.R. 2707. I commend the work of the subcommittee especially the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman NATCHER and the ranking member from Michigan, Mr. PURSELL.

This bill takes important steps in providing funding for many worthy programs. However, I was disappointed to see that the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP] did not receive the full amount necessary to continue this important program.

The bill provides \$1 billion for LIHEAP which is a reduction of \$610 million from the fiscal year 1991 funding level. This means an estimated loss of \$28 million for my home State of New Jersey. More importantly, this means that many families, approximately 103,000 in New Jersey alone, that have depended upon this program in the cold winter months will not be able to participate. Estimates show that the average recipient in my State would see their benefit decreased from \$400 to \$236.

I would encourage the subcommittee to work with the Senate to see if funding could be found in order to provide these needed benefits that so many families depend on.

Mr. GREEN of New York. I am pleased to rise in support of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. Of all the important and valuable programs funded by this bill, the one that is of special concern and interest to me is the Ryan White CARE Program, which targets desperately needed funding for the treatment of people with AIDS to those localities hardest hit by the AIDS epidemic.

As the Representative of a district within such a locality, I would have liked to see a much greater increase in fiscal year 1992 funding for Ryan White because the fiscal year 1991 appropriation fell far short of the authorization. However, understanding the severe fiscal constraints faced by the members of the subcommittee, I shall not take issue here with the level of funding provided. I should like to say, however, that I hope we continue to seek ways to build on the commitment first made back in 1982 by my esteemed colleagues, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] and the late gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], to provide the funding needed to address all aspects of the AIDS epidemic, including research, education, prevention, and treatment.

I should also like to thank the new ranking member of the Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], for the interest he has shown in this devastating disease, especially his willingness to visit with me this week the Beth Israel Medical Center in my district, which provides outstanding service to people with AIDS. I look forward to our continued efforts to ameliorate this tragic epidemic.

Although the AIDS epidemic and funding for the Ryan White programs are my top priorities in the Labor-HHS-Education bill, there are two other programs within the bill that I wish to bring attention to. First, the office of refugee settlement and the refugee cash and medical assistance grant program are suffering reductions that will seriously hamper efforts to resettle the thousands of refugees who are waiting to come to the United States from many corners of the world. I believe we have a responsibility to help those who are drawn to our shores by the dream of a better life and would hope that we continue our efforts to find the resources to fulfill that commitment.

Second, the funding provided in this bill for LIHEAP, the program that provides energy assistance to low-income children and families, the disabled, and fixed-income elderly, represents a cut of nearly 40 percent. That cut potentially threatens 1.9 million families who require assistance for their basic energy needs, such as heating, light, hot water, and emergency cooling. I am troubled by such a drastic reduction that will affect so many of our most vulnerable citizens. I hope that this issue can be revisited at some point with better results.

On the positive side, the bill's denial of funding to enforce the gag rule on family planning clinics is an important blow on behalf of free speech and the sanctity of the physician-patient relationship.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I wish to reiterate that I am fully aware of the constraints that guided the decisions of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], and their colleagues on the subcommittee. Despite some disappointment I feel over the level of Ryan White funding, I shall vote for the Labor-HHS-Education bill and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, stop and think for a minute—today we are discussing a \$204 billion spending bill, of which \$145 billion is mandatory spending—money that must be spent just to perpetuate the status quo. If we do this without at least stopping to consider breaking the cycle of spending more money for health care that meets less and less of our needs, we are merely perpetuating the myth that nothing is wrong with our health care system.

When will we face reality? Our country is in a health care crisis and we cannot just roll merrily along as if nothing were wrong. When will we stop? When we spend 15 or 20 or 30 percent of our gross national product on health care instead of 11 percent? Today, almost half of our total health care spending is shouldered by the Federal Government. Our appropriations process has become so cumbersome that we are forced to gloss over major areas of concern in one enormous, kitchen-sink type bill. Every day I get dozens of letters from my constituents—they are fearful that Congress' only plan to cope with the out-of-control health care costs is to cut Medicare and Medicaid. So far, we haven't given them much reason to think otherwise. It's true, these programs have outgrown their original intent—they have become bigger than was ever anticipated and, most frightening of all, they still are not enough.

We cannot cut these programs indiscriminately, but we must find a more effective use of our health care dollar. To do this, we need a sign from our leadership that they are committed to real, meaningful health care reform. I urge my colleagues not to let the debate on this vital issue begin and end with today's votes. Let's not take the easy way out—let's consider the alternatives. Those of us working on the Republican health care task force have already begun to spell out creative proposals to address our health care challenges and we are most anxious to turn the attention of this House to these possibilities.

Aren't we concerned, as a body, about long-term care for our elderly? What about the cost of defensive medicine, a problem that can be alleviated with malpractice reform?

Can we continue to ignore the plight of the uninsured, whose numbers are growing daily? Mr. Chairman, we all know the money we appropriate is not monopoly money—it comes from the hard work of American families. Let's open our eyes and recognize that the majority of the funds in this bill are channeled into a broken system, a system in dire need of replacement.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, because of our reluctance to raise revenues to address pressing social needs we are faced with a crisis in funding for our low-income home energy assistance programs. I am certain that the subcommittee has great difficulty in meeting the sequestration targets; a choice between re-

ductions in funding for breast cancer research, assistance to historically black colleges or minority health scholarships could not have been easy.

Yet, New York State faces the real possibility of losing \$88 million for fiscal year 1992. In real terms, over 250,000 families will no longer be able to participate in the LIHEAP Program. LIHEAP recipients are low-income children and families, the disabled and many fixed-income elderly. These are families with an average yearly income of \$6,000. Nearly 65 percent of this income traditionally goes to pay for rent and utilities, leaving little to cover other living expenses.

There is no greater argument for attacking the deficit problem through increased revenue than the choice we are presented with in this bill, to fund education and health programs or to deny energy assistance to low-income Americans. I have said repeatedly that we cannot cut ourselves out of this deficit. We only wind up robbing Peter to pay Paul and the people who suffer are those who can least afford it, poor and low-income Americans.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2707, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, and related agencies appropriations bill of 1992. I wish to recognize the efforts of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky and his colleagues. In particular, I am quite gratified that they have recognized the continued crisis in health in the minority community.

As I read the report for this bill, I note that the Appropriations Committee recognizes the need to address the high incidence in minority communities of cancer, heart disease and, now, HIV-related diseases along with recurring threats of tuberculosis and measles, and other devastating health problems related to impoverished lifestyles. I concur with the report that alcohol consumption along with narcotics use as well as poor diet has exacerbated the poor state of health in the minority community. I share the committee's praise for the Health and Human Services Secretary's recognition that efforts be made to develop programs to encourage healthy lifestyles in the minority community.

That is why I am so pleased to see that the committee is urging the Secretary to consider funding demonstration programs to address the problems of lifestyle and minority health. Indeed, the report notes that the committee believes that inner-city hospitals can play a vital role in this effort. I concur. I do because in my district there is a minority run nonprofit hospital dedicated to the improvement of the health of the minority community. North General Hospital in the face of every adversity that an inner-city hospital can face has made extraordinary strides to reach out to the community and make a difference. North General has already begun to plan and to raise money in the private sector to establish a program to educate the minority community on healthy lifestyles and to track its efforts in doing so. If the Secretary is inclined to follow his own statements and the urgings of the committee to establish demonstration efforts to affect healthy lifestyles in minority communities, I could recommend no better institution than North General to undertake the responsibility.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong disappointment in the limited funds allocated for research on ovarian cancer under the Labor, Health and Human Services appropriations bill. This bill designates \$30 million for research in the areas of breast, ovarian, and prostate cancer.

The sum of \$30 million is hardly adequate to support the kind of research needed for three major forms of cancers that afflict thousands of men and women in our society.

Furthermore, the grouping of these three types of research only diminishes the chances for more research dollars in the area of ovarian cancer. I see no reason why we should pit one type of research over another for research dollars.

This kind of allocation will only prove to perpetuate the medical gender gap that continues to shortchange women of the desperately needed funds for women's health research.

The critical lack of knowledge about ovarian cancer is just another example of the neglect in women's health research.

Ovarian cancer is a dangerous killer, that will strike nearly 21,000 women this year. The disturbing fact is that at least two-thirds of these women will die. Unlike breast cancer there is no early detection test to diagnose the disease in its early stages. In most cases once a woman is diagnosed the cancer is already in an advanced stage.

Mr. Chairman, for too long the women of this Nation have been silent and have been deprived of adequate attention to our health needs. I stand before you today to let this Congress know that we will be silent no longer and at every opportunity we will continue to press for equal access to the desperately needed funds to advance the health status of the women of this Nation.

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Chairman, I commend the Appropriations Committee for delivering an excellent piece of legislation at a time when our budget must be tight and there is not a lot of extra money to go around. But I want to call attention to one program that I believe both the President requested and the committee funded at far too low a level. That program is the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, or LIHEAP. Unfortunately, this bill cuts funding to LIHEAP by more than one-third from last year's level. Such a substantial cut, even in these financially difficult times, will present serious difficulties for those who benefit from the program, and I strongly urge the committee to reconsider this action as it takes this bill into the conference committee.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a rural, north-eastern area. My district in New Hampshire borders Vermont on one side, Maine on another, and Canada on another. As you might guess, my constituents face long, cold winters. So in New Hampshire, this program is not a luxury—it is a necessity.

Many working families rely on this program to help them make it through the winter. In the middle of winter, these families will have to choose between surviving subzero temperatures or going hungry. The money from this program goes to families who are working hard to pay the bills, but just need a little extra help to make ends meet. I don't think it is too much to ask that we get them this little extra help.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we can find some way to increase the funds allocated for this program—even by a little. I strongly urge the members of this committee to take a second look at this program and try to save some extra money for it in conference.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back what remains of my time.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, I speak today on behalf of a program which I know the gentleman from Kentucky has always championed—Job Corps. I want to assure you that I am committed to working with you to assure that more youth in my congressional district, the State of California, and the Nation have access to the premier education and training program in this country, Job Corps.

I completely support the investment of funds included in the 1992 appropriations bill to enhance Job Corps. Increased drug abuse counselors, higher allowances, and improved facilities are needed, but there are also thousands of youth in Los Angeles who are unable to benefit from Job Corps because there are not enough centers or training opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to share with you some of the cases I see on any given day in the city of Compton. For instance, one of my constituents, 19-year-old Laverne, former gang member and drug dealer recently released from incarceration, is looking for a job to support his wife and young baby, but he is unable to find a job. He is a 10th grade dropout and needs a long-term, intensive education and training program, like Job Corps, to become self-sufficient. So far, such training programs do not exist.

Dorothy, an 18-year-old young mother of two is an eighth grade dropout. She had suffered a drug addiction, and completed a drug rehabilitation program. She is currently on welfare, and has been looking for a job to support her children. Dorothy has successfully stayed away from drugs for over 6 months, but without any hope of obtaining a job and improving her life, how long can we expect her drug rehabilitation to continue?

Dwayne, a 21-year-old African-American, whose mother recently died of breast cancer, graduated from Compton High School, but was unable to pursue a college education. Dwayne had only a minor drug arrest. He aspires to be a productive citizen of the community, but for the past 3 years he has been unable to find a job. Mr. Chairman, this is the story of so many youth in the city of Compton, CA, where over 51 percent of the population are under the age of 25. Law enforcement members of the Compton Police Department and other law enforcement officers who deal with these cases on a daily basis believe that allowing these troubled youth an opportunity in life will help them avoid further problems with the law.

On behalf of the 14 members of the California congressional delegation, who signed a letter endorsing the Job Corps 50-50 expansion plan because less than 1 percent of our youth are served by Job Corps, I am committed to helping you to increase Job Corps capacity. I look forward to working with you in the future to assure that Laverne and Dwayne and thousands of others at-risk-youth can join Job Corps to fulfill their dreams.

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for the opportunity to emphasize

the importance of retaining the appropriated funds for the State legalization impact assistance grant, commonly called SLIAG.

For the 23d Congressional District of Texas, the loss of SLIAG funding means that all who need education assistance and social service programs will suffer. This is not a program specifically for newly legalized residents and citizens, but a program that offers relief to existing overburdened State programs.

Most of you will remember that the purpose of SLIAG funding was to promote citizenship for newly legalized persons. We argued in 1986 that by providing amnesty and help in obtaining citizenship, the great number of undocumented residents would become citizens and vital contributions to this country. To deny them this assistance is to deny them full access to this country.

The original appropriation of SLIAG funds recognized that these State programs would suffer great stress when the amnesty provisions of IRCA went into effect. Although the anticipated impact was slow in coming, it arrived and the need remains. In spite of this well-documented need, we continue to divert funding.

It is my hope that we will correct the omission of SLIAG funding during conference.

Furthermore, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the chairman, Mr. NATCHER, my friend Mr. ROYBAL, who sits on this committee, and Mr. FAZIO for their efforts. The importance of SLIAG funding to areas with high numbers of newly legalized persons cannot be over-emphasized. Again, I urge the conference to restore SLIAG funding.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Chairman, communities across this country will be crippled if the cuts in the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act, so-called LIHEAP, are passed.

As reported by the committee, LIHEAP is funded at 40 percent below this year's funding level of \$1.6 billion. This is \$675 million less than the figure recommended in the fiscal year 92 budget resolution.

If these cuts in LIHEAP funding are enacted, it is estimated that more than 8,000 households in my State of Rhode Island will lose LIHEAP services. Across the country, almost 2 million families will suffer.

LIHEAP is a critical program that works for working people. Without this program, far too many people—families with children, the disabled, elderly on a fixed income—will be forced to choose between heating and eating. Nearly 60 percent of LIHEAP recipients are families with incomes under \$6,000 per year.

Mr. Chairman, the emergency set-aside of \$600 million is not an answer to underfunding this truly essential program. People should not be forced into desperation before the needed funds are released.

Mr. Chairman, reductions in LIHEAP will cause real pain for real people. I urge my colleagues to join me in working to restore in conference the funding needed to help ensure that low-income families across our country do not freeze this winter.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to praise the members of the subcommittee, and particularly the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman NATCHER, for including language in this appropriations bill that

would preclude the administration from implementing the so-called gag rule. I would like to add my voice to those of my many colleagues who are supporting this provision.

The gag rule is really a subtle form of censorship. By warping the doctor-patient relationship, this rule would force health professionals to violate their ethical oaths and legal obligations.

The notion that health care professionals should be restricted in what health care information that they can provide is contrary to the basic fabric of American society. It flies in the face of freedom of speech. It flies in the face of our efforts to increase healthy lifestyles. It flies in the face of common sense and logic. If we are going to restrict physicians and nurses in federally funded clinics from discussing all pregnancy-related options with their patients, what is the next step? Would it be constitutional to prohibit discussing the ill effects of drug abuse based on the argument that it might actually encourage drug use? Or prohibit physicians from warning patients about the dangers of AIDS because arguably it might encourage intercourse? Or prevent them from discussing specific options for treatment that might involve expensive procedures, because this might increase Federal health expenditures?

This provision preventing the use of funds from this bill to implement the gag rule is the right thing to do. It is the right step. Let us take that step, and let us make sure that the administration does not attempt to push us backward.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, President Bush sent his education plan, America 2000, to Congress in early June. The proposal is a bold and innovative strategy to achieve excellence in education by restructuring and revitalizing America's education system.

I am particularly pleased this plan recognizes the important role that business leaders can play in our education process. I would like to mention a program I helped start in my congressional district. It is modeled after the I Have a Dream Program.

Basically, it is a scholarship program to encourage sixth graders to complete high school and go on to a college, technical, or vocational education program. From personal accounts of teachers and counselors, I found that many students in the sixth grade, without the right incentive, were most likely to drop out and never graduate. My program teams business leaders and others with these students and helps them achieve their dreams.

As a businessman, from a highly industrialized part of the country, let me tell you that this scholarship program had another purpose. Businesses in the area were desperate for qualified employees and too many potential employees simply dropped out of school, resulting in a lack of qualified people to fill skilled positions.

The scholarship program was created to give these kids a chance to become productive members of society, and reach their educational and career goals. Not only that, it solved the worker shortage problem for industry. A little, simple business innovation can solve a lot of problems.

It is unfortunate, this appropriation bill does not provide more for this type of innovative

program which can transform America's schools. I support more funds for the President's programs.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the cuts that are in this bill for the Low-Income Housing Energy Assistance Program. The program has suffered some drastic cuts in the last decade, with a proposed level of funding for fiscal year 1992 which is half the appropriated level of fiscal year 1985. While this level of funding may be a solution for balancing the budget it is a real problem for Montanans.

Last year the people in Helena experienced the 12th coldest December on record. On 12 days during that month the temperature did not get above zero. At the same time, folks in Kalispell found themselves digging out from under a record snowfall accompanied by temperatures as low as 35 below zero.

During the last 10 years, the average utility bill for residential customers of the Montana Power Co. has increased by nearly 40 percent. On the other hand, the same period has seen a decline in the actual—unadjusted—incomes of LIHEAP households of more than 5 percent.

Some 21,300 Montana households depend on LIHEAP to help them get through winters that are typically long and frequently severe. If the proposed cuts in LIHEAP are implemented only 14,400 households will receive assistance.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend Chairman NATCHER and his colleagues for their recognition of a life threatening disease which affects families throughout our Nation. As you may have guessed, the disease to which I am referring is breast cancer.

I was very pleased to note that this legislation includes \$50 million for breast and cervical cancer control within the budget of the Centers for Disease Control. As you know, one of every nine women will develop breast cancer this year and, unfortunately, many of those women will not survive the fight for life. With no cure in sight for this disease, the key to survival must be early detection and treatment. While we have tried to pass this message on to the families in our Nation, more attention needs to be given to this issue. I am pleased that these funds have been appropriated for this purpose.

In addition, I am very encouraged that funding has been appropriated for programs to increase attention to breast, ovarian, and prostate cancer within the National Institutes of Health. With this recognition of these very important diseases, I am hopeful that many lives can be saved.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to encourage my colleagues to become more aware of these diseases which plague our families, and ask for their continued support of such important programs, which are included in this legislation.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I was dismayed to see the committee's recommendation to cut funding for the maternal and child health block grant which provides critical health care services to women and children, ranging from prenatal and postpartum care to well-child visits that include immunizations, dental care, and screening for vision and hearing.

Witnesses at a recent select committee told us about numerous innovative one-stop-shopping strategies to help families navigate through the fragmented health care and social services systems. Funding for one-stop-shopping demonstration grants as authorized by OBRA 1989, but only becomes available when triggered by increased in funding to the MCH block grant. I urge my colleagues to provide full funding for the maternal and child health block grant.

I was disappointed to see level funding for lead poisoning prevention, despite Presidential request to double the budget. Lead poisoning is the No. 1 environmental hazard to children. One in six has dangerously elevated levels of lead in their blood. As the select committee has documented, lead exposure is associated with severe retardation, lower IQ, speech and language impairments, learning disabilities, and poor attention skills.

Finally I urge my colleagues to honor our commitment to helping the hundreds of thousands of Americans with HIV disease to obtain urgently needed care and services. While the Ryan White care bill received moderate increases in funding, the proposed level is still only one-third of the authorized level.

(In millions of dollars)

	My request, May 1991	H. Rept. 102-121	Committee (+/-) fiscal year 1991
Health care for homeless families .....	80	51.0	+12.0
National Health Service Corps:			
(1) Loan Repayment and scholarships .....	101	58.8	+10.0
(2) Field placement .....	65	42.3	(1)
Family planning .....	180	(?)	(?)
Abandoned infants assistance (pending reauthorization) .....	15	12.6	(1)
Pediatric AIDS research demos .....	20	19.5	(1)
Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Act:			
Title I: Emergency assistance .....	275	100.0	+12.2
Title II: Comprehensive care programs .....	275	91.8	+4.0
Title III: Early intervention programs .....	305	55.0	+10.1
Sexually transmitted diseases:			
(1) CDC—STD prevention efforts .....	122	85.0	(1)
(2) NIAID—STD branch .....	66	(4)	
Trauma care systems planning and development grants (Public Law 101-590) .....	30	(?)	
Family support/child welfare:			
Child care development block grant .....	825	825.0	(?)
Child welfare services .....	285	273.9	(1)
Independent Living Program .....	70	70.0	+10.0
Family resource and support grants .....	30	(?)	
Temporary Child Care for Children with Disabilities/Crisis Nurseries Act .....	20	11.1	(1)
Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act:			
State grants .....	100	19.5	(1)
Challenge grants .....	50	5.4	(1)
Discretionary grants .....		14.6	(1)
Adoption Opportunities .....	30	12.7	(1)
Family Violence Prevention and Services Act .....	75	10.7	(1)
Education of homeless children and youth .....	50	37.0	+29.7
State Dependent care development grants .....	20	(?)	
Youth in high-risk situations:			
Emergency protective services grants (for children whose parents are substance abusers) .....	40	19.5	(1)
Runaway and Homeless Youth Act .....	50	35.1	(1)
Transitional Living Program for Runaway Youth .....	25	12.0	+2.1
Drug Abuse Prevention Program for Runaway and Homeless Youth .....	20	14.8	(1)

(In millions of dollars)

	My request, May 1991	H. Rept. 102-121	Committee (+/-) fiscal year 1991
Youth gang drug education and prevention . . . . .	20	7.1	-7.7
Office of Substance Abuse Prevention Demonstration Programs (includes grants for pregnant and postpartum women and their infants and the high-risk youth program) . . . . .	381	112.0	(1)

1 Level.

2 No funding.

3 See notes.

4 Not specified.

Note.—Infant Mortality Initiative: According to the committee report, one-half of the appropriation would be awarded to the 10-community Healthy Start initiative proposed by the administration, and the other half would be awarded to infant mortality projects at community and migrant health centers in areas with high infant mortality. The committee rejected the administration's proposal to reallocate \$24 million from the CHC Program and \$9 million from the maternal and child health block grant to the infant mortality initiative. Family Planning: The committee does not provide funding for the family planning program at this time, but will consider funding on an expedited basis if it is authorized prior to October 1, 1991. Child Care and Development Block Grant: According to OBRA 1990, fiscal year 1991 funding for this program will not be released until Sept. 7, 1991. The committee reduces \$145 million of fiscal year 1991 appropriations and provides \$825 million for fiscal year 1992.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2707, the Labor-HHS appropriations for fiscal year 1992.

However, as chairman of the congressional Hispanic caucus, I must express my disappointment that this legislation cuts all funds for fiscal year 1992 for a program of great importance to the Hispanic community and the border region, the State Legalization Impact Assistance Program, SLIAG.

This program was created as part of the 1986 Immigration law to help States cope with the costs of providing critical education, health, and social services to newly legalized immigrants.

Many community-based organizations that provide these vital services depend on receiving SLIAG funding.

This issue is especially important to the Hispanic community, as more than 80 percent of the 3 million people legalized under the 1986 law are Hispanic.

Because the SLIAG program had a lengthy start-up period, it appeared as though the program was running a surplus for the first few years.

The illusion of this surplus led appropriators to rescind over \$1 billion in SLIAG funds during fiscal year 1990 and 1991, and the bill here today eliminates funding for fiscal year 1992.

However, now that programs in Texas, California, Colorado, and other States are reporting increasing demand for SLIAG services, and now that they are prepared to deliver these services, it is clear that the money must be restored to the States and providers.

The current round of cuts in SLIAG threatens English-as-a-second-language classes, civics classes, antidiscrimination programs, and other vital services.

When Congress authorized and appropriated SLIAG funds, we made what amounted to a promise to States and service providers that they would be able to provide these services.

If we withdraw Federal funding now, State Governments, already suffering from large budget deficits and an economic recession, will simply be unable to administer State and

local programs for newly arrived immigrants; programs which the Federal Government has mandated.

Congress must restore at least \$500 million to SLIAG in fiscal year 1992 in order to fulfill its promise and allow such programs to continue to operate.

It is my sincerest hope that this issue will be worked out in conference.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my deep concern over a provision of H.R. 2707, the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. This appropriations bill proposes a tremendous cut in the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. Funding for this very important program will drop from \$1.61 billion to \$1 billion; that's a reduction of almost 40 percent in 1 year. Unfortunately, those who are the recipients of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program will be on the receiving end of this dreadful slash in appropriations. As many as 2 million families consisting of fixed income elderly persons, low income children and the disabled could be disconnected from energy assistance this winter.

This is a very crucial time for many people. The recession has hit us hard. Jobs are being lost all over the country. We, as a nation, are in a financial crisis. Although I understand that cutbacks are needed and we need to conserve our resources, I do not believe that it is necessary to disrupt a program that millions of our constituents are dependent upon. For the majority of Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program recipients, the average family income is less than \$6,000 a year. At the present level of funding, the program still serves less than 25 percent of eligible households.

In my home State of New Jersey alone, there are over an estimated 103,000 households that will be served in fiscal 1992, as opposed to the 153,000 households that were served in fiscal 1989. The proposed fiscal 1992 allocations for New Jersey stand at about \$39 million. This is a difference of \$28 million from fiscal 1991 allocation of \$67 million. The most recent estimates show that the average recipient in the State of New Jersey would see a substantial loss in their benefits, from \$400 to \$236. It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I oppose this cut in funding.

This bill will seemingly force low-income residents to choose which of the basic necessities they can afford. The necessities of affordable housing, safety, education, and health cannot be separated from the energy needs of hot water, heating, and light. These are all elements that are essential to the quality of life of all people. One thing this society can not afford to do is ignore and attempt to suppress the basic needs of its low-income residents. We, in this House, cannot afford to pay the consequences that will arise if these needs are not provided for.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work together to restore funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I have expressed my strong opposition to the treatment of the State Legalization Impact Assistance Grant [SLIAG] Program for fiscal year 1991 by

the Appropriations Committee in the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Act. The committee zeroed out all of the promised \$1.12 billion SLIAG funding for fiscal year 1992.

The design of the SLIAG Program provided for a \$1 billion permanent appropriation for each of 4 years, fiscal year 1988 to 1991. However, the fiscal year 1990 appropriations process reduced that year's \$1 billion appropriation by \$555 million, with a provision that these funds would be restored in fiscal year 1992. The fiscal year 1991 appropriation was reduced by \$567 million—again with a provision to repay the funds in fiscal year 1992, bringing the total payback to \$1.12 billion. That was our promise to fiscally strapped States like Texas, California, and New York. Now we are told that the payback of funds will be deferred to fiscal year 1993, and that such deferral does not represent a permanent reduction in funds available to States.

The continuation of the SLIAG Program is critical to the State of Texas. The program was enacted as part of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 to reimburse part of the State and local costs of education, health and public assistance services provided to undocumented immigrants granted legal status under IRCA's amnesty provisions. In doing so, Congress recognized that legalization would have a major impact on State and local costs, and that the Federal Government should share responsibility for these costs.

The SLIAG Program is essential to the State of Texas. Texas has approximately 440,000 eligible legalized immigrants, which is the second highest concentration in the United States of persons who have applied for legalized status under IRCA. Texas has been awarded a total of \$284,186,223 in the SLIAG Program through fiscal year 1991, or 11.86 percent of the funds allocated in the program. A total of 40 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia have received SLIAG funding since the inception of the program.

I believe that the Federal Government should honor its prior commitments to share fiscal responsibility for the costs of the Federal Government's decision to legalize the status of over 2.5 million undocumented immigrants. In addition, OMB's cost estimates indicate that State and localized IRCA costs are rapidly growing and that States critically need the entire \$1.12 billion payback now—not maybe 2 years from now. Zeroing out the \$1.12 billion in fiscal year 1992 funds will result in an unfair shift in costs from the Federal to State and local governments. It is clear that many States and localities are facing severe fiscal crises and cannot absorb the loss in SLIAG funds without cuts in essential services.

Moreover, health, social service and education services whose costs are reimbursed by SLIAG funds will be adversely affected by SLIAG funding cuts. Over half of all SLIAG funds in some States have been used to reimburse the cost of State and local health services, which are heavily used by legalized immigrants because so many of them lack health insurance. SLIAG cuts would notably worsen the plight of already financially distressed public hospitals. Less SLIAG funds will also mean less resources for public health, mental health, prenatal care, English language classes, and other needed services. Cuts in SLIAG funding

will adversely affect all persons in need, citizens and aliens alike.

Although I remain strongly opposed to the treatment of SLIAG in this year's appropriations act, I recognize that we do not have the votes to require changes at this time. I believe that it is the wiser course to send this bill to conference in the hopes that the commitment made in the colloquy between Chairman WILIAM NATCHER and VIC FAZIO during the debate earlier today will be realized. If this is not done, it is my intention to vote against the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Act when it comes back from conference.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of an increase in funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP] in the Labor-Health and Human Services, Education appropriations bill, H.R. 2707. Almost 2 million families throughout the country could be cut off from energy assistance next winter without this increase.

LIHEAP recipients are families with low incomes, the disabled and the elderly living on fixed incomes. The average family income for the majority of LIHEAP recipient households is less than \$6,000 a year. Even at the current funding of \$1.6 billion, LIHEAP serves less than 25 percent of eligible households.

In my State of Maryland, proposed allocations from fiscal 1991 to fiscal 1992 would be reduced by more than \$13 million. From fiscal 1989 to 1992, the proposed number of households served would be reduced by 27,000. During this past season, the Maryland Energy Assistance Program reported an 11-percent increase in applications, while the available LIHEAP funds to assist them has decreased by 33 percent. It is reported to me that for every person helped with this program, there may be four or five eligible customers who haven't applied at all for energy assistance. In addition, the recent economic downturn has created new unemployment, leading to increased request for LIHEAP funds.

An increase in LIHEAP funding will save low-income Americans from choosing which basic necessities they can afford. Energy needs are essential to the quality of life and cannot be separated from other necessities such as education, affordable housing, and health care. The cost to society for not providing these needs can be tragic.

I urge my colleagues to consider the importance of LIHEAP and to vote in support of a funding increase.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this measure, which will help our Nation make significant progress in meeting urgent human needs.

I would like to focus in on several aspects of the bill which are particularly important to our constituents.

First of all, Chairman NATCHER is helping us move beyond rhetoric and toward reality in making education a No. 1 priority in this Nation. The \$2.5 billion increase for key education programs, including chapter 1 and Head Start, is vital to the future of our children and the future of our economy. These funds are urgently needed and should be strongly supported by every Member of this body.

In addition, I am pleased that the committee has provided a contingency fund for education programs, including \$250 million for programs

which have not yet been authorized. If there is action later this year on a comprehensive bill to improve education, I am hopeful that we will give serious consideration to the concept embodied in the Link-up for Learning Act, H.R. 812, which is aimed at helping local school districts join with social service agencies in coordinating and improving the delivery of vital social services to at-risk youth.

Second, I am particularly pleased that this appropriations measure includes a major increase for the Community Food and Nutrition Program. This vital program that fights hunger among families and children needs our support. As the Chairman understands, there is a vital link between nutrition and learning. If our children are not fed, they will not be educated. This program can make the difference for so many children across the Nation.

Further, I am very appreciative that the committee has seen fit to provide a substantial increase in vitally needed funds for community health centers. In my district and around the Nation, community health centers are providing lifesaving health care services to patrons who otherwise would not receive care. Further, the committee has recognized the important role these centers play in reducing infant mortality by earmarking \$70 million in new funds for community and migrant health centers and by rejecting the President's proposal to divert funds away from these valuable centers.

Finally, this bill will reverse the Supreme Court's decision in *Rust versus Sullivan* and continue the practice of allowing the millions of women who rely on federally funded family planning clinics to get full information regarding their reproductive health as all other Americans.

If this provision is not enacted, we will put women and medical professionals in jeopardy. As a result of the Supreme Court decision in *Rust versus Sullivan*, beginning in July, a woman who goes into a family planning clinic and needs information about abortion will not be provided with the medical facts.

This is intolerable and dangerous. Those who oppose abortion have gone too far. They want to gag doctors by censoring the information health professionals can provide at federally funded clinics. It is totally unfair to even consider the prospect that poor women deserve to receive less comprehensive and inaccurate medical information simply because they must rely on federally funded health care. Make no mistake about it, if the *Rust* decision is not overturned, not only would a poor woman not be told that abortion is legal, she would not be able to obtain a referral to a privately funded clinic even if her life is in danger.

Such restrictions put doctors in a precarious position. They will be forced to choose between violating their Hippocratic Oath and obeying Federal censorship laws. This is totally contrary to all we stand for as a Nation. Americans understand the importance of preserving the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship. We want doctors to tell us all of our options so that we have the information to make the best health care choices.

Over 20 medical and nursing organizations have publicly opposed the gag rule. Last week, the American Medical Association said

that legislation to overturn the gag rule "would keep the long arm of the Federal Government out of the patient-physician relationship and assure the traditional privacy of that relationship." The AMA also said, and I quote, that "political medicine is harmful to the health of all Americans."

Our President has thus far refused to listen. He has promised to veto this bill if it overturns *Rust versus Sullivan*. We cannot let him get away with that. If we do, we will fundamentally change our health care system into one based on politics and not on medical science. This, in turn, will mean that this country will be providing substandard care to its most needy citizens.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the reversal of the gag rule and restore the integrity of our Nation's family planning programs.

Let us keep politics out of the examining room by overturning the gag rule. And let us provide for the future of our Nation by approving this bill, which contains much needed funds that will help us meet urgent human needs in communities across the Nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Chairman, the bill we consider today, H.R. 2707, makes appropriations for the Nation's most important health, welfare, and education programs. I am proud to have been a part of the campaign which this past fall saw the creation of the Offices of Research on Women's Health within the National Institutes of Health [NIH]. As one of the Budget Committee's newest members, I worked earnestly to include in the budget resolution for fiscal year 1992 language which explicitly conveys Congress' concern for women's health research and which recommends \$20 million in direct Federal assistance for new research initiatives through both NIH and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration [ADAMHA]. H.R. 2707 provides necessary funding for these new research initiatives which could mean the difference between life and death for millions for American women.

Despite startling breakthroughs in medical research in recent decades, diseases which target women—breast cancer, ovarian cancer, osteoporosis, pelvic inflammatory disease, clear cell adenocarcinoma, and others—remain shrouded in mystery. More than 57,000 American women will die in this year alone from breast or ovarian cancer. Osteoporosis will cause nearly 250,000 costly and painful hip fractures before the start of 1992. And perhaps most alarming, the 10 to 12 million Americans exposed to the synthetic estrogen drug DES still lives in fear of the drug's unknown effects.

For each of these afflictions, the statistics are alarming and all too familiar. We see the destruction wrought, but we have no grasp of how or why. For instance, we can observe a genetic or hereditary trend in the development of breast and ovarian cancers, but researchers have yet to identify the gene which predisposes a woman to the development of these cancers. And, we know that 1 out of every 1,000 DES-exposed daughters will develop clear cell cancer of the vagina or cervix, but we are ignorant of how this risk is inherited from the mother or how it may be transmitted to third generation offspring. Further, it

seems that every month a new and contradictory report is issued on the relationship between contraceptive use and the risk of breast or ovarian cancer.

Not only has there been a lack of research on diseases which target women, there has also been a lack of women in clinical trials on health questions which affect both of the sexes. For example, the committee report on the budget resolutions, which I helped to craft, cited the widely publicized Physicians Health Study that concluded taking an aspirin might reduce the risk of heart disease. Less publicized was the fact that the studies which led to this conclusion included 22,071 men, but not a single woman.

On the Budget Committee, I fought to make the NIH Office of Research on Women's Health a funding priority because the women of American and the women representing them in Congress have waited long enough for answers to these haunting medical questions. Inattentiveness to women's health on the part of the medical research community has already claimed the lives of too many of our mothers, daughters, sisters, and friends.

No dollar value can be assigned to these lost lives, but we can make a dollar investment in hope for the future by fully funding the Office of Research on Women's Health and other vital research initiatives at NIH. Providing an unprecedented \$12.5 million for the NIH Office of Research on Women's Health, H.R. 2707 makes some important inroads in highlighting the need for women's health research but the bill falls short of meeting the full funding levels necessary if we are to launch a comprehensive assault on the diseases which afflict women.

Under H.R. 2707, breast and ovarian cancer research would, together with prostate cancer research, receive a total funding boost of \$30 million. The research community tells us that this is not enough to undertake an ambitious assault on these cancers. No money has been specifically earmarked for research into the clear cell cancer associated with DES-exposure, which has been clearly identified by the Appropriations Committee as a research priority for the Office of Research on Women's Health. And no appropriation is earmarked for a similar office within ADAMHA which was only recently established within the Office for Science. Surely, Congress can do better.

I will continue to work to bolster the NIH Office of Research on Women's Health. Further, I am committed to the establishment of a fully funded, formal office on women's health at ADAMHA to investigate the extent of mental illness among women, the gender-specific effects of substance abuse, and the effectiveness of mental health and substance abuse treatment programs for women.

Today, I make a promise to America's women and to America's families that tomorrow the effort to fund women's health research will resume; and this effort will continue for as long as it takes to find the answers and develop cures so that women will no longer be plagued by crippling and deadly diseases.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1992 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bills.

There is a total of \$204 billion in this bill, for the combined use of the Departments of HHS,

Labor, and Education, reflecting an increase of \$21 billion over last year's measure for these same purposes.

The bill includes \$1.7 billion more for education programs, and \$481 million for HHS programs than the administration requested.

Of this amount, 71 percent is for entitlement spending, with the remaining 29 percent for discretionary programs.

Job training programs are funded at \$1.8 billion; summer youth employment is funded at \$683 million; Job Corps at \$898.5 million. While Job Training and Job Corps and summer youth employment are important to West Virginia, of particular importance as well is the JTPA Dislocated Workers Program. Dislocated workers, under this bill, will receive \$577 million, providing for early identification of dislocated workers, rapid provision of services, and training.

Also of great interest is the \$50 million set-aside for employment transition assistance provided for under the Clean Air Act. This funding level is expected to support 130,000 training slots.

Even though the administration sought to abolish this program, I am pleased to note that there are \$226 million in this bill for Trade Act Programs, including \$154 million for trade adjustment assistance unemployment benefits. This funding will permit about 24,000 individuals to receive benefits averaging \$182 per week. Also, \$72 million are appropriated for related trade adjustment assistance training, job searches, and job relocation allowances.

The bill provides \$2.2 billion to be drawn from the Employment Security Administration Account of the Unemployment Trust Fund to pay administrative costs of State employment insurance [UI] programs.

I am pleased to note that the past difficulty we have experienced in estimating the amount of UI funds that would be needed for this purpose during a year, is overcome in part by the committee's inclusion of language in the bill establishing a reserve fund to provide additional funds if the level of average weekly insured unemployment claims is projected to exceed the level on which the President's budget is based.

The bill further contains \$175 million from the Employment Security Administration Account of the Unemployment Trust Fund for veterans employment and training programs. This total includes \$79 million for the Disabled Veterans Outreach Program.

This bill includes funding for urgently needed and effective programs that serve the poor and near poor, such as community health centers, child care for individuals at risk for going on AFDC if affordable child care is not available while they work; there are funds for community services under the Community Block Grant Program, and \$850 million for child care State grants.

For LIHEAP there are \$1.6 billion, nearly \$600 million more than the President asked for. Of this total \$600 million will be realized only after the President formally submits a budget request designating those funds as an emergency under the provisions of the budget enforcement provisions of last year's budget agreement.

The enormously successful, much-needed Head Start Program is funded at \$2.2 billion,

an increase of \$250 million over fiscal year 1991.

Mr. Chairman, another group of programs funded under the Labor/HHS/Education appropriations bill are those that educate the economically and educationally disadvantaged children in our States and districts, which includes chapter 1, Head Start, and Even Start.

For all of education's needs, there are \$28.3 billion in this bill for fiscal year 1992, reflecting an increase of \$5.4 billion more than in fiscal year 1991, and \$1.7 billion more than the President requested.

For the successful, urgently needed chapter 1 program, the bill provides \$7.1 billion, a full \$1 billion increase over the fiscal year 1990 appropriation, and \$850 million more than the President's request.

This increased funding for both Head Start and chapter 1 compensatory education for disadvantaged children will help make a real difference in assuring equity in educational opportunity afforded to millions of children who have the least chance of succeeding in school or in life without these two programs.

The bill funds, also, such programs as the aforementioned Even Start, drug free schools and communities, math and science education, magnet schools, dropout prevention, and education for homeless children.

For special education the bill provides \$2.8 billion, a level which represents about 7 percent of the national average excess cost of educating a handicapped child, serving approximately 4.5 million children with disabilities who are expected to be schooled during the 1992-93 school year.

Vocational education is funded at a total of \$1.4 billion, including \$1.1 billion for basic State grants, and \$186 million more than the President requested.

I am more pleased than I can tell you to note that \$100 million have been provided for a program of supplemental grants to States to improve vocational education facilities and equipment in economically depressed areas. During the reauthorization of the Vocational Education Act, I was a member of the Education and Labor Committee. During that process, I joined with my friend and colleague from Kentucky, CHRIS PERKINS, in introducing a combined bill that sought funds for vocational education facilities in bad need of expansion, repair, and renovation of classrooms, as well as for state-of-the-art equipment to train students for jobs not only for the 20th century which we are about to leave behind, but especially for jobs in the 21st century which is before us. For the popular tech-prep program, the bill provides \$100 million for linking high school vocational education students and programs to postsecondary education institutions for up to 2 years after high school graduation. Adult education and literacy programs are funded at \$280 million, \$42 million more than last year. \$250 million of this amount will go for State basic grants, and \$20 million for workplace literacy.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides \$6.9 billion for student financial assistance, and these appropriations represents programs under current law since the Higher Education Act is being reauthorized.

The committee has expressed its concern over the President's proposal that would result

in 400,000 fewer student aid awards in the next year. Pell grants, supplemental grants, work-study grants, Perkins loans, SSI and income-contingent loans are still being funded, with the committee having rejected the administration's proposals to repeal, phase out, or drastically change many of them. The Guaranteed Student Loan Program is intact as an entitlement program, but still subject to recent year's restrictions and improvements to get the default rate down and improve access to low-income as well as middle-income students.

Mr. Chairman, overall I am pleased with the content of H.R. 2707, the annual Labor/HHS/ Education appropriations bill, because it contains funds for so many programs of importance—vital even—to the continued well-being of West Virginians.

While the bill covers many urgently needed health programs, including research and treatment of diseases under NIH, I want to digress just a moment and get parochial, by discussing a group from my State of West Virginia who are banded together to support those unfortunate victims of neurofibromatosis—or NF—a very rare disease.

Mr. Chairman, these individuals who have banded together to form the NF support group, were organized by Brookie Miller of Danville, WV. Their commendable, and compassionate efforts consist of promoting community understanding, coordinating support services, stimulating research, and most of all, providing hope for the victims of neurofibromatosis.

Neurofibromatosis is a genetic disorder which affects neural tissues. Tumors can form anywhere and at anytime on nerve cells, with progressive manifestations resulting in disfigurement or death. There are two types of neurofibromatosis which are neurofibromatosis-1 (NF-1 or VR-NF) and neurofibromatosis-2 (NF-2 or bilateral acoustic NF).

NF-1, which has also been called von Recklinghausen's disease or peripheral neurofibromatosis, occurs in 1 of 4,000 births. Characteristics of this disease are tumors of varying sizes under or on the skin, freckling in the groin or underarm area, possible family history of NF, multiple cafe-au-lait colored spots on the skin, lisch nodules on the iris of the eyes, and optic glioma.

NF-2, which is known as the central form, is estimated to occur in 1 of 50,000 births. Characteristics of the disease are tumors of the spinal cord, brain, and skin. Signs usually appear after puberty, tumors developing in the complex affecting the hearing nerves result in balance problems and hearing loss, and unusual cataracts of the eye forming at an early age.

NF may also be associated with bone deformation, vision impairment, cancer, learning disabilities, hearing loss, and epilepsy. It affects both race and sex equally. The possibility of an affected parent passing it on to an offspring is 50 percent. However, 50 percent of all NF cases have developed from a mutated gene where there is no family history of NF. Both forms of NF are autosomal dominant disorders. Hence, there are no cures for NF and treatment is directed at reducing the symptoms of the disease.

Due to its nature and relative rarity, this disease is one of many orphan diseases that re-

ceives little publicity. I had little knowledge of this disease until Brookie Miller visited my Washington office. Through her work I have learned of the loneliness, confusion, and heartache that the patients with NF and their families feel. While many diseases hold these elements, the external signs of NF are misunderstood because they do not look like a burn or the loss of hair via chemotherapy. As a result of the misunderstanding associated with NF, many patients find that discrimination is rampant.

For this reason, I truly commend the works of Brookie and her support group, as well as Neurofibromatosis, Inc., for their efforts on behalf of those affected by this disease. These groups have helped many victims of this disease to cope with the problems they face daily. They are both nonprofit voluntary health organizations. Their goals include: identifying support services in the community; educating State, Federal, and local legislators of NF families' needs; and cultivating clinical, medical, educational and sociological research which encompasses the need for treatment, prevention, and the development of a cure for NF and its effects.

Today's bill contains an additional \$41,612,000 in funding for the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke. It is my hope the important research on NF will continue and that we may find either a cure or an adequate treatment in the near future.

Mr. Chairman, I am in strong support of H.R. 2707, and urge my colleagues to join with me in support of its passage.

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for H.R. 2707, the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations for fiscal year 1992. The bill appropriates \$765 million for the impact aid program, including \$137 million for section (b) students whose parents live or work on Federal property. This represents an increase of \$144.6 million over the administration's 1992 budget request. Most importantly, the bill restores funding for federally connected "B" students which the administration proposed to eliminate.

I testified and prepared a letter to the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee which 83 Members of the House signed expressing our concern about the administration's impact aid cuts: We are very grateful to the Appropriations Committee and especially Chairman NATCHER and ranking minority member, CARL PURSELL, for recognizing that these cuts would cause serious harm to our Nation's school districts and the families of those schools.

Over 40 years ago, the Congress acknowledged the Federal Government's responsibility to assist school districts that are impacted by Federal installations and educate federally connected students. Public Law 81-874, the impact aid program recognizes the Federal Government's duty to reimburse school districts for the local revenues lost from federally connected parents because of Federal ownership.

In my congressional district—the home of Offutt Air Force Base and the Headquarters of the Strategic Air Command—impact aid is a critical source of funding. This large military installation creates an influx of residents in the

surrounding communities and students in the public schools. For example, the Bellevue School District has over 5,000 federally connected students, the Papillion LaVista School District has about 2,500, and Plattsmouth has 400. Of these 7,000 federally connected students, over half are classified as "B" students. Under President Bush's fiscal year 1992 proposal to eliminate "B" student funding, these school districts would be responsible for educating nearly 3,500 students without the promised Federal funds.

The impact aid program has received drastic cuts made since 1981, at a time when per pupil expenditures for education nationwide have increased an average of 7 percent each of the past 5 years. In this fiscal year, the Federal Government is paying less than 58 percent of the actual cost of Federal impact to these districts. Schools have been scrimping and saving, cutting corners for years to continue to provide a decent education to our federally connected children. There are few corners left to cut.

All parents expect their schools to provide these students a quality education. However, military parents often do not pay property taxes or sales taxes, since they live on Federal property and shop at the PX. So while they expect the community to provide their children with a quality education, they do not provide the revenues the community needs to provide their children an education.

Ultimately, the issue is one of equity. Impact aid does not provide extra funding to these schools. It provides basic funding, for books, teachers' salaries, educational materials and equipment. Congress did not establish these programs as a special benefit; it was the fulfillment of a Federal responsibility to these communities.

I will vote "yes" today to maintain the impact aid program. This is a clear Federal obligation which means a great deal to the students in my congressional district and schools across the country.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2707. I am pleased to note that the committee proposes increases in funding for community economic development [CED] grants which are authorized under the community services block grant section of funding for Health and Human Services. Funding has been increased from \$20.49 million to \$21.5 million for fiscal year 1992.

CED grants are made to private nonprofit community development corporations which use these funds to promote business and economic development projects in poor communities. These funds promote public-private partnerships. According to a recent HHS report, CED funds mobilized more than \$62 million in private investment.

In my State of Arkansas, Arkansas Enterprise Group has used the CED funds to start an organic farming program which has provided new market opportunities for farmers in a very poor part of the State. Arkansas Enterprise Group believes that one of the solutions to the endemic poverty that exists in the Delta and other agricultural regions of Arkansas is to help farmers diversify away from their historic dependence on row crop farming to higher margin produce crops. The funds created a demonstration farm that successfully showed

how crop diversification could be both possible and profitable. The program was made possible through the HHS Office of Community Services.

I heartily endorse such public-private endeavors that promote avenues for economic independence in poor rural areas.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for granting me this time to speak on behalf of the bill.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

#### H.R. 2707

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, namely:

#### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

##### EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For expenses of administering employment and training programs, \$74,188,000, together with not to exceed \$57,129,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

##### TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the Job Training Partnership Act, including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, and the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Job Training Partnership Act, \$4,027,907,000, plus reimbursements, to be available for obligation for the period July 1, 1992, through June 30, 1993, of which \$59,625,000 shall be for carrying out section 401, \$75,288,000 shall be for carrying out section 402, \$9,120,000 shall be for carrying out section 441, \$1,848,000 shall be for the National Commission for Employment Policy, \$2,500,000 shall be for all activities conducted by and through the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee under the Job Training Partnership Act, and \$3,900,000 shall be for service delivery areas under section 101(a)(4)(A)(iii) of the Job Training Partnership Act in addition to amounts otherwise provided under sections 202 and 251(b) of the Act; and, in addition, \$52,464,000 is appropriated for necessary expenses of construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of Job Corps centers, as authorized by the Job Training Partnership Act, in addition to amounts otherwise provided herein for the Job Corps, to be available for obligation for the period July 1, 1992 through June 30, 1995; and, in addition, \$50,000,000 is appropriated for Clean Air Employment Transition Assistance under Part B of Title III of the Job Training Partnership Act, to be available for obligation for the period October 1, 1991 through June 30, 1993; and, in addition, \$7,400,000 is appropriated for activities authorized by title VII, subtitle C of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act: *Provided*, That no funds from any other appropriation shall be used to provide meal services at or for Job Corps centers: *Provided*

*further*, That funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 100-436 to continue acquisition, rehabilitation, and construction of six new Job Corps centers shall be available for obligation through June 30, 1993.

##### COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

To carry out the activities for national grants or contracts with public agencies and public or private nonprofit organizations under paragraph (1)(A) of section 506(a) of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, \$304,481,000.

To carry out the activities for grants to States under paragraph (3) of section 506(a) of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, \$85,879,000.

##### FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES

For payments during the current fiscal year of benefits and payments as authorized by title II of Public Law 95-250, as amended, and of trade adjustment benefit payments and allowances under part I, and for training, for allowances for job search and relocation, and for related State administrative expenses under part II, subchapter B, chapter 2, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, \$226,250,000, together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent appropriation for payments for any period subsequent to September 15 of the current year: *Provided*, That amounts received or recovered pursuant to section 208(e) of Public Law 95-250 shall be available for payments.

##### STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

For activities authorized by the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U.S.C. 49-491-1; 39 U.S.C. 3202(a)(1)(E)); title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 502-504); necessary administrative expenses for carrying out 5 U.S.C. 8501-8523, and sections 225, 231-235 and 243-244, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended; as authorized by section 7c of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, necessary administrative expenses under sections 101(a)(15)(H), 212 (a), (5)(A), (m)(2) and (3), (n)(1), and 218 (g) (1), (2), and (3), and 258(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); necessary administrative expenses to carry out the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit Program under section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and section 221(a) of the Immigration Act of 1990, \$23,377,000 together with not to exceed \$3,151,825,000 (including not to exceed \$2,080,000 which may be used for amortization payments to States which had independent retirement plans in their State employment service agencies prior to 1980), which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, and of which the sums available in the allocation for activities authorized by title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 502-504), and the sums available in the allocation for necessary administrative expenses for carrying out 5 U.S.C. 8501-8523, shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 1992, and of which \$18,427,000 of the amount which may be expended from said trust fund shall be available for obligation for the period April 1, 1992, through December 31, 1992, for automation of the State activities under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 502-504 and 5 U.S.C. 8501-8523), and of which \$21,177,000 together with not to exceed \$783,940,000 of the amount which may be expended from said trust fund shall be available for obligation

for the period July 1, 1992, through June 30, 1993, to fund activities under section 6 of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, including the cost of penalty mail made available to States in lieu of allotments for such purpose, and of which \$12,500,000 of the amount which may be expended from said trust fund shall be available for obligation for the period September 30, 1992, through June 30, 1993, for automation of the State activities under section 6 of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, and of which \$440,703,000 shall be available only to the extent necessary for additional State allocations to administer unemployment compensation laws to finance increases in the number of unemployment insurance claims filed and claims paid or changes in a State law: *Provided*, That to the extent that the Average Weekly Insured Unemployment (AWIU) for fiscal year 1992 is projected by the Department of Labor to exceed the 3.24 million level assumed in the President's fiscal year 1992 Budget Request, based on the Administration's December 1990 economic assumptions, an additional \$30,000,000 shall be available for obligation for every 100,000 increase in the AWIU level (including a pro rata amount for any increment less than 100,000) from the Employment Security Administration Account of the Unemployment Trust Fund. The Appropriations Committees shall be notified immediately of any request by the Department to the Office of Management and Budget to apportion any of these funds.

##### ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS

For repayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by sections 905(d) and 1203 of the Social Security Act, as amended, and to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund as authorized by section 9501(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; and for nonrepayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by section 8509 of title 5, United States Code, and to the "Federal unemployment benefits and allowances" account, to remain available until September 30, 1993, \$236,990,000.

##### LABOR-MANAGEMENT SERVICES

###### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for Labor-Management Services, \$95,840,000.

##### PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

###### PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION FUND

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures, including financial assistance authorized by section 104 of Public Law 96-364, within limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the program through September 30, 1992, for such Corporation: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$47,787,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That expenses of such Corporation in connection with the termination of pension plans, for the acquisition, protection or management, and investment of trust assets, and for benefits administration services shall be considered as non-administrative expenses for the purposes hereof, and excluded from the above limitation.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Employment Standards Administration, including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, \$232,626,000, together with \$1,035,000 which may be expended from the Special Fund in accordance with sections 39(c) and 44(j) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

SPECIAL BENEFITS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses (except administrative expenses) accruing during the current or any prior fiscal year authorized by title 5, chapter 81 of the United States Code; continuation of benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act, 1944; and sections 4(c) and 5(f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. App. 2012); and 50 per centum of the additional compensation and benefits required by section 10(h) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, \$192,000,000, together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation and other benefits for any period subsequent to August 15 of the current year: *Provided*, That such sums as are necessary may be used for a demonstration project under section 8104 of title 5, United States Code, in which the Secretary may reimburse an employer, who is not the employer at the time of injury, for portions of the salary of a reemployed, disabled beneficiary: *Provided further*, That balances of reimbursements from Federal government agencies unobligated on September 30, 1991, shall remain available until expended for the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses: *Provided further*, That in addition there shall be transferred from the Postal Service fund to this appropriation such sums as the Secretary of Labor determines to be the cost of administration for Postal Service employees through September 30, 1992.

BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payments from the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund, \$917,192,000, of which \$861,135,000, shall be available until September 30, 1993, for payment of all benefits as authorized by section 9501(d) (1), (2), (4), and (7), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and interest on advances as authorized by section 9501(c)(2) of that Act, and of which \$30,145,000 shall be available for transfer to Employment Standards Administration, Salaries and Expenses, and \$25,579,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, Salaries and Expenses, and \$333,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, Office of Inspector General, for expenses of operation and administration of the Black Lung Benefits program as authorized by section 9501(d)(5)(A) of that Act: *Provided*, That in addition, such amounts as may be necessary may be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation, interest, or other benefits for any period subsequent to June 15 of the current year: *Provided further*, That in addition such amounts shall be paid from this fund into miscellaneous receipts as the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be the administrative expenses of the Department of the Treasury for administering the fund during

the current fiscal year, as authorized by section 9501(d)(5)(B) of that Act.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH  
ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, \$302,107,000, including \$66,344,000, which shall be the maximum amount available for grants to States under section 23(g) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which grants shall be no less than fifty percent of the costs of State occupational safety and health programs required to be incurred under plans approved by the Secretary under section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to prescribe, issue, administer, or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 which is applicable to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs ten or fewer employees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to prescribe, issue, administer, or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, order or administrative action under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 affecting any work activity by reason of recreational hunting, shooting, or fishing: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to administer or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 with respect to any employer of ten or fewer employees who is included within a category having an occupational injury lost work day case rate, at the most precise Standard Industrial Classification Code for which such data are published, less than the national average rate as such rates are most recently published by the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in accordance with section 24 of that Act (29 U.S.C. 673), except—

(1) to provide, as authorized by such Act, consultation, technical assistance, educational and training services, and to conduct surveys and studies;

(2) to conduct an inspection or investigation in response to an employee complaint, to issue a citation for violations found during such inspection, and to assess a penalty for violations which are not corrected within a reasonable abatement period and for any willful violations found;

(3) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to imminent dangers;

(4) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to health hazards;

(5) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to a report of an employment accident which is fatal to one or more employees or which results in hospitalization of one or more employees, and to take any action pursuant to such investigation authorized by such Act; and

(6) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to complaints of discrimination against employees for exercising rights under such Act:

*Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not apply to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs ten or fewer employees.

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Mine Safety and Health Administration, \$186,157,000, in-

cluding purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work, and the hire of passenger motor vehicles; the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private; the Mine Safety and Health Administration is authorized to promote health and safety education and training in the mining community through cooperative programs with States, industry, and safety associations; and any funds available to the Department may be used, with the approval of the Secretary, to provide for the costs of mine rescue and survival operations in the event of major disaster: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to carry out section 115 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 or to carry out that portion of section 104(g)(1) of such Act relating to the enforcement of any training requirements, with respect to shell dredging, or with respect to any sand, gravel, surface stone, surface clay, colloidal phosphate, or surface limestone mine.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or reimbursements to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, \$258,504,000, together with not to exceed \$50,399,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for Departmental Management, including the hire of 5 sedans, and including \$4,078,000 for the President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities, \$144,319,000, together with not to exceed \$332,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Funds received for services rendered to any entity or person for use of Departmental facilities, including associated utilities and security services, shall be credited to and merged with this fund.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR VETERANS

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Not to exceed \$174,759,000 may be derived from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 2001-10 and 2021-26.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$46,636,000, together with not to exceed \$4,357,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. Appropriations in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for supplies, services, and rental of conference space within the District of Columbia, as the Secretary of Labor shall deem necessary for settlement of labor-management disputes.

SEC. 102. None of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to grant variances, interim orders or letters of clari-

fication to employers which will allow exposure of workers to chemicals or other workplace hazards in excess of existing Occupational Safety and Health Administration standards for the purpose of conducting experiments on workers health or safety.

Sec. 103. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no funds appropriated by this Act may be used to execute or carry out any contract with a non-governmental entity to administer or manage a Civilian Conservation Center of the Job Corps.

Sec. 104. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by the Job Corps program to pay the expenses of legal counsel or representation in any criminal case or proceeding for a Job Corps participant, unless certified to and approved by the Secretary of Labor that a public defender is not available.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriations Act, 1992".

## TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

### HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

#### HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

For carrying out titles III, VII, VIII, XIX, XXVI, and XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, section 427(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, title V of the Social Security Act, the Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986, as amended, Public Law 101-527, Public Law 100-579, and the Native Hawaiian Health Care Act of 1988, \$2,137,533,000, of which \$450,000 shall remain available until expended for interest subsidies on loan guarantees made prior to fiscal year 1981 under part B of title VII of the Public Health Service Act: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$86,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992: *Provided further*, That when the Department of Health and Human Services administers or operates an employee health program for any Federal department or agency, payment for the full estimated cost shall be made by way of reimbursement or in advance to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That user fees authorized by 31 U.S.C. 9701 may be credited to appropriations under this heading, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302.

#### MEDICAL FACILITIES GUARANTEE AND LOAN FUND

#### FEDERAL INTEREST SUBSIDIES FOR MEDICAL FACILITIES

For carrying out subsections (d) and (e) of section 1602 of the Public Health Service Act, \$19,000,000, together with any amounts received by the Secretary in connection with loans and loan guarantees under title VI of the Public Health Service Act, to be available without fiscal year limitation for the payment of interest subsidies. During the fiscal year, no commitments for direct loans or loan guarantees shall be made.

#### HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOANS PROGRAM

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, including the cost of modifying loans, of guaranteed loans authorized by Title VII of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program: *Provided*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the total loan principal any part of which is to be guaranteed at not to exceed \$260,000,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, \$1,500,000.

### VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION

For payments from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund, such sums as may be necessary for claims associated with vaccine-related injury or death with respect to vaccines administered after September 30, 1988, pursuant to subtitle 2 of title XXI of the Public Health Service Act, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That for necessary administrative expenses, not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available from the Trust Fund to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

For compensation of claims resolved by the United States Claims Court related to the administration of vaccines before October 1, 1988, \$80,000,000, to remain available until expended.

### CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

#### DISEASE CONTROL, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING

To carry out titles III, section 794 of title VII, XV, XVII, XIX, and section 1102 of the Public Health Service Act, sections 101, 102, 103, 201, 202, and 203 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, and sections 20, 21, and 22 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; including insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries; and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, \$1,390,662,000, of which \$6,338,000 shall remain available until expended for equipment and construction and renovation of facilities: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$94,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992: *Provided further*, That training of private persons shall be made subject to reimbursement or advances to this appropriation for not in excess of the full cost of such training: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for payment of the costs of medical care, related expenses, and burial expenses hereafter incurred by or on behalf of any person who had participated in the study of untreated syphilis initiated in Tuskegee, Alabama, in 1932, in such amounts and subject to such terms and conditions as prescribed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services and for payment, in such amounts and subject to such terms and conditions, of such costs and expenses hereafter incurred by or on behalf of such person's wife or offspring determined by the Secretary to have suffered injury or disease from syphilis contracted from such person: *Provided further*, That collections from user fees may be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That amounts received by the National Center for Health Statistics from reimbursable and inter-agency agreements and the sale of data tapes may be credited to this appropriation and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That in addition to amounts provided herein, up to \$25,000,000 shall be available from amounts available under section 2711 of the Public Health Service Act, to carry out the National Center for Health Statistics surveys: *Provided further*, That employees of the Public Health Service, both civilian and Commissioned Officer, detailed to States or municipalities as assignees under authority of section 214 of the Public Health Service Act in the instance where in excess of 50 percent of salaries and benefits of the assignee is paid directly or indirectly by the State or municipality, and employees of the National Center for Health Statistics, who are assisting other Federal organizations on data collection and analysis and whose salaries are fully reimbursed by the organizations requesting the services, shall be treated as non-Federal employees for reporting purposes only.

### NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

#### NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to cancer, \$1,830,509,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$63,446,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL HEART, LUNG, AND BLOOD INSTITUTE

For carrying out sections 301 and 1105 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to cardiovascular, lung, and blood diseases, and blood and blood products, \$1,202,398,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$54,555,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to dental disease, \$161,235,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$7,903,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DIABETES AND DIGESTIVE AND KIDNEY DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to diabetes and digestive and kidney diseases, \$667,820,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$28,457,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS AND STROKE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to neurological disorders and stroke, \$583,355,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$27,357,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to allergy and infectious diseases, \$972,830,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$45,627,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to general medical sciences, \$820,160,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$48,104,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to child health and human development, \$524,661,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$27,368,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to eye diseases and visual disorders, \$272,260,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$12,504,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For carrying out sections 301 and 311, and title IV of the Public Health Service Act

with respect to environmental health sciences, \$254,912,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$8,846,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON AGING

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to aging, \$362,528,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$16,308,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND MUSCULOSKELETAL AND SKIN DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to arthritis, and musculoskeletal and skin diseases, \$204,977,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$7,593,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DEAFNESS AND OTHER COMMUNICATION DISORDERS

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to deafness and other communication disorders, \$144,495,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$7,486,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH RESOURCES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to research resources and general research support grants, \$309,200,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$15,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used to pay recipients of the general research support grants program any amount for indirect expenses in connection with such grants.

#### NATIONAL CENTER FOR NURSING RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to nursing research, \$43,143,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$2,646,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL CENTER FOR HUMAN GENOME RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to human genome research, \$93,115,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER

For carrying out the activities at the John E. Fogarty International Center, \$19,922,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$800,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to health information communications, \$99,565,000: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$3,500,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

For carrying out the responsibilities of the Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health, \$149,176,000, of which \$25,000,000 shall be for the support of a clinical trial on women's health and shall remain available until

September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$12,500,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992: *Provided further*, That funding shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only.

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction of, and acquisition of equipment for, facilities of or used by the National Institutes of Health, \$108,625,000 to remain available until expended.

#### ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

#### ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH

For carrying out the Public Health Service Act with respect to mental health, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, and alcoholism, section 3521 of Public Law 100-690, section 612 of Public Law 100-77, and the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986, \$2,917,742,000, of which \$5,000,000 for renovation of government owned or leased intramural research facilities shall remain available until expended.

#### ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH

For the expenses necessary for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health and for carrying out titles III, XVII, XX, and XXI of the Public Health Service Act, \$71,318,000, and, in addition, amounts received by the Public Health Service from Freedom of Information Act fees, reimbursable and interagency agreements and the sale of data tapes shall be credited to this appropriation and shall remain available until expended.

#### RETIREMENT PAY AND MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

For retirement pay and medical benefits of Public Health Service Commissioned Officers as authorized by law, and for payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan and Survivor Benefit Plan and for medical care of dependents and retired personnel under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C. ch. 55), and for payments pursuant to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), such amounts as may be required during the current fiscal year.

#### AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH

#### HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH

For carrying out titles III and IX of the Public Health Service Act, and part A of title XI of the Social Security Act, \$95,756,000 together with not to exceed \$4,880,000 to be transferred from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as authorized by section 1142 of the Social Security Act and not to exceed \$1,012,000 to be transferred from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as authorized by section 201(g) of the Social Security Act; and, in addition, amounts received from Freedom of Information Act fees, reimbursable and interagency agreements, and the sale of data tapes shall be credited to this appropriation and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount made available pursuant to section 926(b) of the Public Health Service Act shall not exceed \$13,444,000.

#### HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act, \$46,399,149,000, to remain available until expended.

For making, after May 31, 1992, payments to States under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the last quarter of fiscal year 1992 for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

For making payments to States under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the first quarter of fiscal year 1993, \$17,100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Payment under title XIX may be made for any quarter with respect to a State plan or plan amendment in effect during such quarter, if submitted in or prior to such quarter and approved in that or any subsequent quarter.

#### PAYMENTS TO HEALTH CARE TRUST FUNDS

For payment to the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as provided under sections 217(g) and 1844 of the Social Security Act, sections 103(c) and 111(d) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, section 278(d) of Public Law 97-248, and for administrative expenses incurred pursuant to section 201(g) of the Social Security Act, \$39,421,485,000.

#### PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles XI, XVIII, and XIX of the Social Security Act, title XIII of the Public Health Service Act, the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988, section 4360 of Public Law 101-508, and section 4005(e) of Public Law 100-203, not to exceed \$2,282,055,000 to be transferred to this appropriation as authorized by section 201(g) of the Social Security Act, from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds: *Provided*, That \$257,000,000 of said trust funds shall be expended only to the extent necessary to meet unanticipated costs of agencies or organizations with which agreements have been made to participate in the administration of title XVIII and after maximum absorption of such costs within the remainder of the existing limitation has been achieved: *Provided further*, That all funds derived in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 9701 from organizations established under title XIII of the Public Health Service Act are to be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That all funds collected in accordance with section 353 of the Public Health Service Act are to be credited to this appropriation to remain available until expended.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

#### PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS

For payment to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, as provided under sections 201(m), 228(g), and 1131(b)(2) of the Social Security Act, and section 274A(d)(3)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, \$40,968,000.

#### SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS

For carrying out title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, including the payment of travel expenses on an actual cost or commuted basis, to an individual, for travel incident to medical examinations, and when travel of more than 75 miles is required, to parties, their representatives, and all reasonably necessary witnesses for travel within the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, to reconsideration interviews and to proceedings before administrative law judges, \$617,336,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,

That monthly benefit payments shall be paid consistent with section 215(g) of the Social Security Act.

For making, after July 31 of the current fiscal year, benefit payments to individuals under title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, for costs incurred in the current fiscal year, such amounts as may be necessary.

For making benefit payments under title IV of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 for the first quarter of fiscal year 1993, \$198,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME PROGRAM

For carrying out the Supplemental Security Income Program, title XI of the Social Security Act, section 401 of Public Law 92-603, section 212 of Public Law 93-66, as amended, and section 405 of Public Law 95-216, including payment to the Social Security trust funds for administrative expenses incurred pursuant to section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act, \$13,926,491,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any portion of the funds provided to a State in the current fiscal year and not obligated by the State during that year shall be returned to the Treasury: *Provided*, That for fiscal year 1992 and thereafter, all collections from repayments of overpayments shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury.

For making, after July 31 of the current fiscal year, benefit payments to individuals under title XVI of the Social Security Act, for unanticipated costs incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

For carrying out the Supplemental Security Income Program for the first quarter of fiscal year 1993, \$5,240,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not more than \$4,582,000,000 may be expended, as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein: *Provided*, That travel expense payments under section 1631(h) of such Act for travel to hearings may be made only when travel of more than seventy-five miles is required: *Provided further*, That \$100,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be apportioned for use only to the extent necessary to process workloads not anticipated in the budget estimates, for automation projects and their impact on the workforce, and to meet mandatory increases in costs of agencies or organizations with which agreements have been made to participate in the administration of titles XVI and XVIII and section 221 of the Social Security Act, and after maximum absorption of such costs within the remainder of the existing limitation has been achieved: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, \$80,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992.

#### ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

##### FAMILY SUPPORT PAYMENTS TO STATES

For making payments to States or other non-Federal entities, except as otherwise provided, under titles I, IV-A and -D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), \$11,862,146,000, to remain available until expended.

For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV-A and -D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, for the last three months of the current year for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

For making payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV-A and -D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9) for the first quarter of fiscal year 1993, \$4,000,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR AFDC WORK PROGRAMS

For carrying out aid to families with dependent children work programs, as authorized by part F of title IV of the Social Security Act, \$1,000,000,000.

#### LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

For making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, \$1,000,000,000, of which \$50,000,000 shall become available for making payments on September 30, 1992.

#### ENERGY ASSISTANCE EMERGENCY FUND

For the purpose of establishing an "Energy Assistance Emergency Fund" in the United States Treasury to be available only for grants to any one or more of the fifty States, the District of Columbia, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations receiving direct funding in fiscal year 1992 under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981, \$600,000,000: *Provided*, That all funds available under this heading are hereby designated by Congress to be emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That these funds shall be made available only after submission to Congress of a formal budget request by the President that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the President shall determine the appropriate amounts necessary to meet emergency needs and the allocation of these amounts to any one or more of the fifty States, the District of Columbia, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations.

#### REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE

For making payments for refugee and entrant assistance activities authorized by title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act and section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-422), \$294,014,000, of which \$117,600,000 shall be available for State cash and medical assistance, except that no funds shall be available for State cash and medical assistance after March 31, 1992.

#### INTERIM ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR LEGALIZATION

Section 204(a)(1)(C) of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 is amended by striking "1992" and inserting in its place "1993".

Section 204(b) of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 is amended by adding the following paragraph:

"(5) For fiscal year 1993, the Secretary shall make allotments to States under paragraph (1) no later than October 15, 1992."

#### COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

For making payments under the Community Services Block Grant Act and the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, \$420,724,000, of which \$40,868,000 shall be for carrying out section 681(a) of the Community Services Block Grant Act, and of which \$5,484,000 shall be for carrying out section 681A of said Act with respect to the community food and nutrition program.

#### PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR CHILD CARE ASSISTANCE

For carrying out sections 658A through 658R of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, \$825,000,000, which shall not become available for obligation until September 19, 1992. For carrying out section 402(g)(6) of the Social Security Act, \$25,000,000.

#### PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For necessary administrative expenses to carry out titles I, IV, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, section 204 of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, Public Law 100-77, and section 126 and titles IV and V of Public Law 100-485, \$87,500,000, together with such sums as may be collected, which shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, from fees authorized under section 453 of the Social Security Act: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in Public Law 101-166 for the Commission on Interstate Child Support, \$400,000 shall remain available through September 30, 1992.

#### SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

For monthly payments to States for carrying out the Social Services Block Grant Act, \$2,800,000,000.

#### HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

##### (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, the Older Americans Act of 1965, the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act, the State Dependent Care Development Grants Act, the Head Start Act, the Child Development Associate Scholarship Assistance Act of 1985, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, chapters 1 and 2 of subtitle B of title III of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, the Native American Programs Act of 1974, title II of Public Law 95-266 (adoption opportunities), the Temporary Child Care for Children with Disabilities and Crisis Nurseries Act of 1986, the Comprehensive Child Development Act, the Abandoned Infants Assistance Act of 1988, section 10404 of Public Law 101-239 (volunteer senior aides demonstration) and part B of title IV and section 1110 of the Social Security Act, \$3,496,357,000, of which up to \$6,225,000 shall remain available until expended for information resources management.

Of the funds provided under this heading in Public Law 101-517 for carrying out the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, \$144,925,000 are hereby rescinded.

#### PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE

For carrying out part E of title IV of the Social Security Act, \$2,614,005,000, of which \$118,476,000 shall be for payment of prior years' claims.

#### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

##### GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, for general departmental management, including hire of six medium sedans, \$91,673,000, of which \$24,079,000 shall be available for expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel, together with \$31,001,000, of which \$26,031,000 shall be available for expenses necessary for the Office of the General Counsel, to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of

the Social Security Act from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein.

#### OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$63,842,000, together with not to exceed \$37,833,000, to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein.

#### OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For expenses necessary for the Office for Civil Rights, \$18,524,000, together with not to exceed \$4,000,000, to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein.

#### POLICY RESEARCH

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, research studies under section 1110 of the Social Security Act, \$5,037,000.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. None of the funds made available by this Act for the National Institutes of Health, except for those appropriated to the "Office of the Director", may be used to provide forward funding or multiyear funding of research project grants except in those cases where the Director of the National Institutes of Health has determined that such funding is specifically required because of the scientific requirements of a particular research project grant.

SEC. 202. Appropriations in this or any other Act shall be available for expenses for active commissioned officers in the Public Health Service Reserve Corps and for not to exceed 2,400 commissioned officers in the Regular Corps; expenses incident to the dissemination of health information in foreign countries through exhibits and other appropriate means; advances of funds for compensation, travel, and subsistence expenses (or per diem in lieu thereof) for persons coming from abroad to participate in health or scientific activities of the Department pursuant to law; expenses of primary and secondary schooling of dependents in foreign countries, of Public Health Service commissioned officers stationed in foreign countries, at costs for any given area not in excess of those of the Department of Defense for the same area, when it is determined by the Secretary that the schools available in the locality are unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents, and for the transportation of such dependents between such schools and their places of residence when the schools are not accessible to such dependents by regular means of transportation; expenses for medical care for civilian and commissioned employees of the Public Health Service and their dependents assigned abroad on a permanent basis in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may provide; rental or lease of living quarters (for periods not exceeding five years), and provision of heat, fuel, and light and maintenance, improvement, and repair of such quarters, and advance payments therefor, for civilian officers and employees of the Public Health Service who are United States citizens and who have a permanent station in a foreign country; purchase, erection, and maintenance of temporary or portable structures; and for the payment of compensation to consultants or individual scientists appointed for limited periods of time pursuant to section 207(f) or section 207(g) of the Public Health Service Act, at rates established by the Assistant Secretary for

Health, or the Secretary where such action is required by statute, not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior-level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376.

SEC. 203. None of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to perform abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term.

SEC. 204. Funds advanced to the National Institutes of Health Management Fund from appropriations in this Act shall be available for the expenses of sharing medical care facilities and resources pursuant to section 327A of the Public Health Service Act.

SEC. 205. Funds appropriated in this title shall be available for not to exceed \$37,000 for official reception and representation expenses when specifically approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 206. Amounts received from employees of the Department in payment for room and board may be credited to the appropriation accounts which finance the activities of the Public Health Service.

SEC. 207. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to provide special retention pay (bonuses) under paragraph (4) of 37 U.S.C. 302(a) to any regular or reserve medical officer of the Public Health Service for any period during which the officer is assigned to the clinical, research, or staff associate program administered by the National Institutes of Health or the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration.

SEC. 208. Funds provided in this Act may be used for one-year contracts which are to be performed in two fiscal years, so long as the total amount for such contracts is obligated in the year for which the funds are appropriated.

SEC. 209. The Secretary shall make available through assignment not more than 60 employees of the Public Health Service to assist in child survival activities and to work in AIDS programs through and with funds provided by the Agency for International Development, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund or the World Health Organization.

SEC. 210. For the purpose of insuring proper management of federally supported computer systems and data bases, funds appropriated by this Act are available for the purchase of dedicated telephone service between the private residences of employees assigned to computer centers funded under this Act, and the computer centers to which such employees are assigned.

SEC. 211. None of the funds appropriated by this title shall be used to pay for any research program or project or any program, project, or course which is of an experimental nature, or any other activity involving human participants, which is determined by the Secretary or a court of competent jurisdiction to present a danger to the physical, mental, or emotional well-being of a participant or subject of such program, project, or course, without the written, informed consent of each participant or subject, or a participant's parents or legal guardian, if such participant or subject is under eighteen years of age. The Secretary shall adopt appropriate regulations respecting this section.

SEC. 212. None of the funds appropriated in this title for the National Institutes of Health and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration shall be used to pay the salary of an individual, through a grant or other extramural mechanism, at a rate in excess of \$125,000 per year.

SEC. 213. No funds appropriated under this Act shall be used by the National Institutes

of Health, or any other Federal agency, or recipient of Federal funds on any project that entails the capture or procurement of chimpanzees obtained from the wild. For purposes of this section, the term "recipient of Federal funds" includes private citizens, corporations, or other research institutions located outside of the United States that are recipients of Federal funds.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Health and Human Services Appropriations Act, 1992".

#### TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

##### COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For carrying out the activities authorized by chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, and by section 418A of the Higher Education Act, \$7,075,750,000, of which \$7,042,750,000 shall become available on July 1, 1992 and shall remain available through September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That \$5,805,000,000 shall be available for basic grants under section 1005, \$645,000,000 shall be available for concentration grants under section 1006, \$100,000,000 shall be available for the Even Start program under part B, of which not to exceed 2 percent shall be available for a national evaluation and not to exceed 5 percent shall be available for State administration, \$322,000,000 shall be available for migrant education activities under subpart 1 of part D, \$36,000,000 shall be available for delinquent and neglected education activities under subpart 3 of part D, \$64,500,000 shall be for State administration under section 1404, and \$32,250,000 shall be for program improvement activities under section 1405: *Provided further*, That no State shall receive less than \$340,000 from the amounts made available under this appropriation for concentration grants under section 1006: *Provided further*, That no State shall receive less than \$375,000 from the amounts made available under this appropriation for State administration grants under section 1404.

##### IMPACT AID

For carrying out programs of financial assistance to federally affected schools as authorized by Public Laws 81-815 and 81-874, as amended, \$764,756,000, of which \$585,540,000 shall be for payments under section 3(a), \$136,626,000 shall be for payments under section 3(b), \$16,590,000 shall be for Federal property payments under section 2 and \$26,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for construction and renovation of school facilities including \$10,000,000 for awards under section 10, \$10,000,000 for awards under sections 14(a) and 14(b), and \$6,000,000 for awards under sections 5 and 14(c): *Provided*, That none of the funds available for section 3 shall be used for payments under section 5(b)(2): *Provided further*, That funds available for section 2 may be used for payments under section 5(b)(2) of 50 percent of a local educational agency's payment for the prior fiscal year based on its entitlement established under section 2: *Provided further*, That all payments under section 3 shall be based on the number of children who, during the prior fiscal year, were in average daily attendance at the schools of a local educational agency and for whom such agency provided free public education: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3(d)(3)(A), aggregate current expenditure and average daily attendance data for the third preceding fiscal year shall be used to compute local contribution rates: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 3(d)(2)(B), 3(d)(3)(B)(ii), and

3(h)(2), eligibility and entitlement determinations for those sections shall be computed on the basis of data from the fiscal year preceding each fiscal year described in those respective sections for fiscal year 1991.

#### SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

For carrying out the activities authorized by chapter 2 of title I and titles II, III, IV, V, without regard to sections 5112(a) and 5112(c)(2)(A), and VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended; the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; the Civil Rights Act of 1964; title V of the Higher Education Act, as amended; title IV of Public Law 100-297; and the Follow Through Act, \$1,577,618,000, of which \$1,238,709,000 shall become available on July 1, 1992, and remain available through September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated, \$27,600,000 shall be for national programs under part B of chapter 2 of title I, up to \$2,000,000 shall be available for the national evaluation of the dropout prevention demonstration program under title VI, and \$240,000,000 shall be for State grants for mathematics and science education under part A of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended.

#### EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out educational improvement activities authorized in law, including activities under the Head Start Act, \$500,000,000 which shall become available on July 1, 1992, and remain available through September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That the allocation of these funds, which may be transferred as necessary to other Department of Education accounts, shall be determined by the Secretary of Education in consultation with the Congress based on authorizing legislation enacted into law as of December 31, 1991: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be allocated to initiate programs proposed by the President in his budget amendments of June 7, 1991 unless these activities shall be specifically authorized during 1991: *Provided further*, That not less than \$250,000,000 of these funds shall be transferred to the Head Start program administered by the Department of Health and Human Services.

#### BILINGUAL AND IMMIGRANT EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, title VII and part D of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, \$249,000,000, of which \$36,000,000 shall be for training activities under part C of title VII.

#### SPECIAL EDUCATION

For carrying out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and title I, chapter 1, part D, subpart 2 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, \$2,822,676,000, of which \$1,976,095,000 for section 611, \$295,920,000 for section 619, \$175,000,000 for section 685 and \$135,661,000 for title I, chapter 1, part D, subpart 2 shall become available for obligation on July 1, 1992, and shall remain available through September 30, 1993.

#### REHABILITATION SERVICES AND DISABILITY RESEARCH

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Public Law 100-407, and the Helen Keller National Center Act, as amended, \$1,998,501,000, of which \$18,368,000 shall be for special demonstration programs under sections 311 (a), (b), and (c).

#### SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

##### AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

For carrying out the Act of March 3, 1879, as amended (20 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), \$5,500,000.

##### NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

For the National Technical Institute for the Deaf under titles II and IV of the Education of the Deaf Act of 1986 (20 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.), \$38,500,000.

##### GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

For the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School, the Model Secondary School for the Deaf, and the partial support of Gallaudet University under titles I and IV of the Education of the Deaf Act of 1986 (20 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.), \$73,172,000, of which \$976,000 shall be for the endowment program as authorized under section 407 and shall be available until expended, and \$2,500,000 shall be for construction and shall be available until expended.

#### VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, the Adult Education Act, and the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, \$1,651,500,000 of which \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the national assessment of vocational education and of which the remainder shall become available for obligation on July 1, 1992 and shall remain available through September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That of the amounts made available under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, \$29,000,000 shall be for national programs under title IV, including \$12,000,000 for research, of which \$6,000,000 shall be for the National Center for Research on Vocational Education and \$2,000,000 shall be for technical assistance under section 404(d); \$12,000,000 for demonstrations and \$5,000,000 for data collection: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under the Adult Education Act, \$1,000,000 shall be available only for demonstration programs under section 372(d), \$4,000,000 shall be for national programs under section 383, and \$5,000,000 shall be for literacy clearinghouse activities under section 384.

#### STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

For carrying out subparts 1, 2, and 3 of part A and parts C, D, and E of title IV of the Higher Education Act, as amended, \$6,853,000,000, which shall remain available through September 30, 1993, and of which \$100,000,000 shall only be available if such funds are necessary to pay a maximum grant of \$2,400 during the 1992-1993 program year, which shall be the maximum Pell grant that a student may receive: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 479A of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, student financial aid administrators shall be authorized, on the basis of adequate documentation, to make necessary adjustments to the cost of attendance and the expected student or parent contribution (or both) and to use supplementary information about the financial status or personal circumstances of eligible applicants only for purposes of selecting recipients and determining the amount of awards under subpart 2 of part A, and parts B, C, and E of title IV of the Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 411F(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, the term "annual adjusted family income" shall, under special circumstances prescribed by the Secretary, mean the sum received in the first calendar

year of the award year from the sources described in that section: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 411(b)(6) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, no Pell grant for award year 1992-1993 shall be awarded to any student who is attending an institution of higher education on a less than half-time basis.

#### GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS

##### (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

For payment of obligations incurred under contract authority entered into pursuant to title IV, part B, of the Higher Education Act, as amended, \$3,105,711,000.

##### GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS PROGRAM

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, including the cost of modifying loans, of guaranteed loans entered into pursuant to title IV, part B, of the Higher Education Act, as amended, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program.

For administrative expenses to carry out the program of guaranteed loans entered into pursuant to title IV, part B, of the Higher Education Act, as amended, \$46,433,000, to cover the federal administration of the guaranteed student loans program pursuant to the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, titles I, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, and XII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, the Excellence in Mathematics, Science and Engineering Education Act of 1990, and title XIII, part H, subpart 1 of the Education Amendments of 1980, \$821,438,000, of which \$7,500,000 for endowment activities under section 332 of part C of title III of the Higher Education Act and \$19,412,000 for interest subsidies under part D of title VII of the Higher Education Act shall remain available until expended and \$300,000 shall be for section 775, part G, title VII: *Provided further*, That \$9,271,000 provided herein for carrying out subpart 6 of part A of title IV shall be available notwithstanding sections 419G(b) and 419I(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070d-37(b) and 1070d-39(a)): *Provided further*, That \$1,450,000 of the amount provided herein for subpart 4 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act shall be for an evaluation of Special Programs for the Disadvantaged to examine the effectiveness of current programs and to identify program improvements.

#### HOWARD UNIVERSITY

For partial support of Howard University (20 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), \$212,960,000, of which \$2,928,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for a matching endowment grant to be administered in accordance with the Howard University Endowment Act (Public Law 98-480), and \$23,600,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for emergency construction needs.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES LOANS

The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available under this heading and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitation, as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the program for the current fiscal year. For the fiscal year 1992, no new commitments for loans may be made from the fund established pursuant to title VII, section 733

of the Higher Education Act, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1132d-2).

COLLEGE HOUSING AND ACADEMIC FACILITIES  
LOANS

Pursuant to title VII, part F of the Higher Education Act, as amended, for necessary expenses of the college housing and academic facilities loans program, the Secretary shall make expenditures, contracts, and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitation.

COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

Pursuant to title VII, part F of the Higher Education Act, as amended, for necessary expenses of the college housing loans program, previously carried out under title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, the Secretary shall make expenditures and enter into contracts without regard to fiscal year limitation using loan repayments and other resources available to this account. Any unobligated balances becoming available from fixed fees paid into this account pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1749d, relating to payment of costs for inspections and site visits, shall be available for the operating expenses of this account.

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND  
IMPROVEMENT

For carrying out the activities authorized by section 405 and section 406 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended; section 1562, section 2012, and title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended; part B of title III of Public Law 100-297; title V of the Higher Education Act, as amended; and section 6041 of Public Law 100-418, \$228,999,000, of which \$25,300,000 shall be for research centers; \$35,049,000 shall be for regional laboratories including \$10,000,000 for rural initiatives; \$7,175,000 shall be for the Educational Resources Information Center; \$976,000 shall be for field-initiated studies; \$8,000,000 shall be for a high technology demonstration grant, including equipment; \$50,000,000 shall be for education statistics; \$28,000,000 shall be for national assessment activities; \$19,000,000 shall be for activities under the Fund for Innovation in Education, including not less than \$4,500,000 for comprehensive school health programs; \$5,284,000 shall be for Grants for Schools and Teachers under subpart 1, and \$3,611,000 shall be for Family School Partnerships under subpart 2 of part B of title III of Public Law 100-297; \$14,000,000 shall be for national diffusion activities under section 1562; \$14,000,000 shall be for national programs under section 2012; \$9,732,000 shall be for Javits gifted and talented students education; \$4,233,000 shall be for educational partnerships; \$1,769,000 shall be for territorial teacher training; and \$370,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 1993, shall be for Leadership in Educational Administration.

In addition to these amounts \$4,880,000 shall be available for teaching standards activities under the same terms, conditions and limitations applicable to funding made available for this purpose in fiscal year 1991.

LIBRARIES

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VI of the Library Services and Construction Act (20 U.S.C. ch. 16), and titles II and VI of the Higher Education Act, \$142,747,000 of which \$14,218,000 shall be used to carry out the provisions of title II of the Library Services and Construction Act and shall remain available until expended, and \$5,000,000 shall be for section 222 and \$325,000 shall be for section 223 of the Higher Education Act.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT  
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Department of Education Organization Act, including rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and hire of three passenger motor vehicles, \$301,952,000.

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For expenses necessary for the Office for Civil Rights, as authorized by section 203 of the Department of Education Organization Act, \$56,000,000.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Inspector General, as authorized by section 212 of the Department of Education Organization Act, \$26,932,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Funds appropriated in this Act to the American Printing House for the Blind, Howard University, the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, and Gallaudet University shall be subject to financial and program audit by the Secretary of Education and the Secretary may withhold all or any portion of these appropriations if he determines that an institution has not cooperated fully in the conduct of such audits.

SEC. 302. No part of the funds contained in this title may be used to force any school or school district which is desegregated as that term is defined in title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, to take any action to force the busing of students; to force on account of race, creed or color the abolishment of any school so desegregated; or to force the transfer or assignment of any student attending any elementary or secondary school so desegregated to or from a particular school over the protest of his or her parents or parent.

SEC. 303. (a) No part of the funds contained in this title shall be used to force any school or school district which is desegregated as that term is defined in title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, to take any action to force the busing of students; to require the abolishment of any school so desegregated; or to force on account of race, creed or color the transfer of students to or from a particular school so desegregated as a condition precedent to obtaining Federal funds otherwise available to any State, school district or school.

(b) No funds appropriated in this Act may be used for the transportation of students or teachers (or for the purchase of equipment for such transportation) in order to overcome racial imbalance in any school or school system, or for the transportation of students or teachers (or for the purchase of equipment for such transportation) in order to carry out a plan of racial desegregation of any school or school system.

SEC. 304. None of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to require, directly or indirectly, the transportation of any student to a school other than the school which is nearest the student's home, except for a student requiring special education, to the school offering such special education, in order to comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For the purpose of this section an indirect requirement of transportation of students includes the transportation of students to carry out a plan involving the reorganization of the grade structure of schools, the pairing of schools, or the clustering of schools, or any combination of grade restructuring, pairing or clustering. The prohibition described in this section

does not include the establishment of magnet schools.

SEC. 305. No funds appropriated under this Act may be used to prevent the implementation of programs of voluntary prayer and meditation in the public schools.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Education Appropriations Act, 1992".

TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES

ACTION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for Action to carry out the provisions of the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973, as amended, \$193,678,000: *Provided*, That \$32,693,000 shall be available for title I, section 102, and \$1,000,000 shall be available for title I, part C.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

For payment to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, as authorized by the Communications Act of 1934, an amount which shall be available within limitations specified by that Act, for the fiscal year 1994, \$253,309,000: *Provided*, That no funds made available to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting by this Act shall be used to pay for receptions, parties, or similar forms of entertainment for Government officials or employees: *Provided further*, That none of the funds contained in this paragraph shall be available or used to aid or support any program or activity from which any person is excluded, or is denied benefits, or is discriminated against, on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, or sex.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION  
SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 171-180, 182-183), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and for expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Civil Service Reform Act, Public Law 95-454 (5 U.S.C. chapter 71), \$28,118,000.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW  
COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission (30 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), \$4,357,000.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ACQUIRED IMMUNE  
DEFICIENCY SYNDROME

For expenses necessary for the National Commission on Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome as authorized by subtitle D of title II of Public Law 100-607, \$2,000,000.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND  
INFORMATION SCIENCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, established by the Act of July 20, 1970 (Public Law 91-845), \$750,000.

NATIONAL COMMISSION TO PREVENT INFANT  
MORTALITY

For necessary expenses of the National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality, established by section 203 of the National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality Act of 1986, Public Law 99-660, \$390,000, which shall remain available until expended.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the National Council on Disability as authorized by title

IV of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, \$1,497,000.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended (29 U.S.C. 141-167), and other laws, \$162,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2(3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (29 U.S.C. 152), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, and as defined in section 3(f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203), and including in said definition employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on a mutual, nonprofit basis and at least 95 per centum of the water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming purposes.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U.S.C. 151-188), including emergency boards appointed by the President, \$6,775,000.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW  
COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the expenses necessary for the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission (29 U.S.C. 661), \$6,497,000.

PHYSICIAN PAYMENT REVIEW COMMISSION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out section 1845(a) of the Social Security Act, \$4,300,000, to be transferred to this appropriation from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

PROSPECTIVE PAYMENT ASSESSMENT  
COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out section 1886(e) of the Social Security Act, \$4,030,000, to be transferred to this appropriation from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD  
DUAL BENEFITS PAYMENTS ACCOUNT

For payment to the Dual Benefits Payments Account, authorized under section 15(d) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974, \$315,000,000 which shall include amounts becoming available in fiscal year 1992 pursuant to section 224(c)(1)(B) of Public Law 98-76: *Provided*, That the total amount provided herein shall be immediately credited to the account: *Provided further*, That the amount provided herein plus the interest earned thereon shall be available for payments through September 30, 1992.

FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO THE RAILROAD  
RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS

For payment to the accounts established in the Treasury for the payment of benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act for interest earned on unnegotiated checks, \$400,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993, which shall be the maximum amount available for payment pursuant to section 417 of Public Law 98-76.

SPECIAL MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT FUND

To effect management improvements, including the reduction of backlogs, accuracy of taxation accounting, and debt collection, \$3,264,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement accounts and railroad unemployment insurance account: *Provided*, That these funds shall supplement, not supplant, existing resources devoted to such operations and improvements.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for the Railroad Retirement Board, \$74,037,000 to be derived from the railroad retirement accounts: *Provided*, That \$200,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available only to the extent necessary to process workloads not anticipated in the budget estimates and after maximum absorption of the costs of such workloads within the remainder of the existing limitation has been achieved: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, no portion of this limitation shall be available for payments of standard level user charges pursuant to section 210(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 490(j); 45 U.S.C. 231-231u).

LIMITATION ON RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT  
INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION FUND

For further expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board, for administration of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, not less than \$17,263,000 shall be apportioned for fiscal year 1992 from moneys credited to the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund.

LIMITATION ON THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR  
GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of Inspector General for audit, investigatory and review activities, as authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, not more than \$6,089,000, to be derived from the railroad retirement accounts and railroad unemployment insurance account.

SOLDIERS' AND AIRMEN'S HOME  
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For maintenance and operation of the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, to be paid from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund, \$40,581,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the payment of hospitalization of members of the Home in United States Army hospitals at rates in excess of those prescribed by the Secretary of the Army upon recommendation of the Board of Commissioners and the Surgeon General of the Army.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

For construction and renovation of the physical plant, to be paid from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund, \$4,220,000, to remain available until expended.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE  
OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Institute of Peace as authorized in the United States Institute of Peace Act, \$8,393,000.

UNITED STATES NAVAL HOME  
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of the United States Naval Home, to be paid from funds available to the Naval Home in the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund, \$10,055,000, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

CAPITAL PROGRAM

For construction and renovation of the physical plant to be paid from funds available to the Naval Home in the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund, \$1,253,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 502. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be expended by an executive agency, as referred to in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), pursuant to any obligation for services by contract, unless such executive agency has awarded and entered into such contract in full compliance with such Act and regulations promulgated thereunder.

SEC. 503. Appropriations contained in this Act, available for salaries and expenses, shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior-level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376.

SEC. 504. Appropriations contained in this Act, available for salaries and expenses, shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902).

SEC. 505. Appropriations contained in this Act, available for salaries and expenses, shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities.

SEC. 506. No part of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to provide a loan, guarantee of a loan, a grant, the salary of or any remuneration whatever to any individual applying for admission, attending, employed by, teaching at, or doing research at an institution of higher education who has engaged in conduct on or after August 1, 1969, which involves the use of (or the assistance to others in the use of) force or the threat of force or the seizure of property under the control of an institution of higher education, to require or prevent the availability of certain curricula, or to prevent the faculty, administrative officials, or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies at such institution.

SEC. 507. The Secretaries of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education are authorized to transfer unexpended balances of prior appropriations to accounts corresponding to current appropriations provided in this Act: *Provided*, That such transferred balances are used for the same purpose, and for the same periods of time, for which they were originally appropriated.

SEC. 508. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 509. (a) No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, for the preparation, distribution, or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television, or

film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress, except in presentation to the Congress itself.

(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any grant or contract recipient, or agent acting for such recipient, related to any activity designed to influence legislation or appropriations pending before the Congress.

SEC. 510. The Secretaries of Labor and Education are each authorized to make available not to exceed \$7,500 from funds available for salaries and expenses under titles I and III, respectively, for official reception and representation expenses; the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is authorized to make available for official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$2,500 from the funds available for "Salaries and expenses, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service"; and the Chairman of the National Mediation Board is authorized to make available for official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$2,500 from funds available for "Salaries and expenses, National Mediation Board."

SEC. 511. When issuing statements, press releases, requests for proposals, bid solicitations and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part with Federal money, all grantees receiving Federal funds, including but not limited to State and local governments, shall clearly state (1) the percentage of the total costs of the program or project which will be financed with Federal money, (2) the dollar amount of Federal funds for the project or program, and (3) percentage and dollar amount of the total costs of the project or program that will be financed by nongovernmental sources.

SEC. 512. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1992 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 513. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of the Department of Labor are hereby reduced by \$30,000,000; salaries and expenses of the Department of Education are hereby reduced by \$10,000,000; and salaries and expenses of the Department of Health and Human Services are hereby reduced by \$124,000,000, including \$8,000,000 of funds appropriated in this Act for travel costs of the Public Health Service: *Provided*, That the reduction for travel costs shall be from the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations.

Mr. NATCHER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I through section 501 and through 513 on page 74, line 10, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against any provisions of titles I, II, III, IV, and the beginning of V?

#### POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the language beginning on page 36, line 10, through page 37, line 5 of title II, vio-

lates House rule XXI, clause 2, because it legislates on an appropriations bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair on the point of order.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHARP). The point of order is conceded, and therefore the point of order is sustained and the language is stricken.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order on page 28, line 25. I would like to strike "XX."

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order on this request.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHARP). Accordingly, the point of order is sustained because funds for title XX are not authorized by law and the language referring to title XX on line 25 of page 28 is stricken.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENNY

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PENNY: Page 46, after line 15, insert the following new section:

SEC. 214. The amounts otherwise provided in this title for "OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH" and "GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT" are decreased by \$2,000,000 and \$10,000,000, respectively, and for "HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES (INCLUDING RECISSION)" are increased by \$12,000,000.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment goes to reductions in administrative accounts in order to make an additional \$12 million available for the Head Start Program, to serve an additional 4,000 students.

I rise to offer an amendment to increase funding for the Head Start early intervention and education program \$12 million by decreasing funding by an equivalent amount for general departmental management at the Department of Health and Human Services.

I had hoped to be able to increase funding for Head Start by even more than \$12 million, but I was sensitive to the need to protect human service programs. Examining the committee-reported bill, I discovered that funds appropriated for departmental management were increased in many cases beyond their budget requests.

The amendment I offer here reduces \$10 million of the almost \$13 million increase slated for general departmental management and \$2 million of the \$4.15 million appropriated for the Assistant Secretary of Health and transfers that \$12 million to the appropriation that funds Head Start.

Let's keep a few things in mind:

First, in both cases, the new appropriations for management function at HHS were not requested. I have tried to be sensitive of the need of the Department to effectively manage departmental operations, but why give the Department funds they didn't request?

Next, since these funds I would delete were not requested, no layoffs would

take place; in fact, even with my amendment, the Department receives more funds for management next year than they received this year, \$5 million more in the case of the two administrative accounts I impact.

So, the issue as far as I see it is between funding increases for the bureaucracy that were not requested and additional funds for Head Start—for American families. The additional appropriations for Head Start contained in my amendment would allow an additional 4,000 children to be served next fiscal year.

Monday of this week the National Commission on Children recommended full funding of Head Start, yet here we are today with an appropriations measure that funds only one-half of the authorized level—\$4.273 million in fiscal year 1992—for Head Start. The committee has increased funding for Head Start by \$250 million and I commend them, but at that rate we will not fully fund this program until next century.

I am rightly viewed as a budget cutter. I am proud of that reputation. But budget making is really about priorities and spending. The amendment I offer today is one of deciding between priorities: bureaucrats or children.

I vote for our children. Please join me in support of Head Start.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PENNY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, on the amendment that now is pending before the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] has been kind enough to permit Members to see this amendment in advance.

The amendment, as the Chairman knows, offsets the increase by taking \$2 million out of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health and \$10 million out of general departmental management, making a total of \$12 million, the amount that is added to Head Start.

Mr. Chairman, certainly under no circumstances would we ask this committee of the House to make any move that would hurt Head Start. I do not know of a Member in this House that is against the Head Start Program, and on this side we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1320

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the bill through section 513 and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on sections 514 and 515 of the bill and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the gentlewoman from

California [Mrs. BOXER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SHAW. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, if I might inquire, as I said in the general debate, I have an amendment to offer.

My question to the committee chairman is how many amendments are there? I am not trying to prolong this; however, I want to be sure that all Members will have a chance to be heard on their amendments.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, as far as we know on this side, I would say to the gentleman from Florida, we know of only two amendments, which will require very little time.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to engage the distinguished chairman and the ranking minority member in a brief colloquy.

The administration is committed to winning the war against drugs. The President has requested large increases in the Federal antidrug budget every year; however, given some of our recent actions, I am concerned about our resolve in the drug war.

Many antidrug accounts in this bill, such as the Health and Human Services block grants and research grants, and the Education Department's emergency grants, have been funded at levels below the President's request. These drastic reductions will translate into first the loss of more than 16,000 Federal treatment slots and more than 64,000 State and local treatment slots; second, the inability to serve over 224,000 individuals seeking drug treatment; and third, the loss of opportunity to do some students counseling and the training of community leaders.

The Chairman, this sends the wrong message to our cities, our schools, and our drug-ridden neighborhoods. We cannot afford to walk away from this fight. Therefore, I would like to engage the chairman, if I might, in a colloquy, and offer my assistance and ask if the gentleman would be willing to work with the other body and in the conference to increase the drug-related accounts in these bills in that conference.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the full committee and one of the able members, will yield, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this statement to the gentleman and to the committee.

The bill, as the gentleman knows, provides \$2.8 billion for substance

abuse activities. This amount is somewhat below the President's request, largely because, as the gentleman knows, many of the programs in the request are not currently authorized.

The committee has followed a consistent policy of not funding unauthorized programs above the 1991 level.

The President requested increases for many of these programs as well as funding for a new, unauthorized \$68 million treatment capacity expansion program, which the committee had to defer.

The authorized activities in the committee bill in the aggregate are slightly above the President's request. The President requested \$1,191,842,000 for these activities, and the committee bill provides \$1,192,750,000.

Once the authorization for these programs becomes law, the Committee will consider funding for new or expanded programs requested by the President, and we join with the gentleman in his statement to the committee as to the importance of these programs.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, we hope that these programs will be authorized by the time this bill gets to conference.

In addition, the alcohol, mental abuse, and drug abuse grants are currently authorized. We would hope that we could work in conference to fund both the programs that would be authorized and those programs that are already authorized.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the willingness of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky to work with us on that.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, with respect to breast cancer research and other areas related to breast cancer that are in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Kentucky knows, I appeared before his committee on behalf of my bill, H.R. 2210, to put \$50 million more in research and clinical trials for a disease that is in epidemic proportions. Once every 11 minutes a woman finds out that she has breast cancer.

The gentleman from Kentucky has been very gracious to me and to others in hearing our pleas for this and has even attended seminars and so on and stayed the whole time.

So I would ask the gentleman from Kentucky, can the gentleman clarify for myself and for victims of breast cancer and their families across the Nation exactly what this bill does?

I have read the report. There are references to breast cancer, but I would ask the gentleman from Kentucky by how much does the bill increase fund-

ing for research specific to breast cancer and other areas?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, as regards breast cancer, the President's budget, as we know, proposes an increase of \$12 million. This bill increases that amount substantially.

A significant share of the \$30 million allotted to the Cancer Institute, perhaps as much as \$18 to \$20 million, is expected to go to breast cancer.

At least \$5 million from the women's health study is likely to focus on breast cancer, and a share of the \$10 million allocated to the Office of Research on Women's Health will be for a study of the link between breast cancer and contraceptives.

Mr. Chairman, I should also note that our bill provides \$50 million for the new breast and cervical cancer screening program, which is \$29 million above the 1991 level.

As the gentlewoman knows, last year when we marked up our bill, the authorization for the \$50 million that the gentlewoman from Ohio knows as much about as any Member of Congress and has worked harder than anyone that I know of, we did not have it in time for our markup. In the conference we said to them on the other side, "We know it is not in the conference. It is important enough that we want it in the conference."

Finally they agreed to \$30 million. That little cut that went across the board carried us down to \$29 million.

It is fully authorized now.

For the money for breast and cervical cancer screening we have \$50 million, the full amount.

When the gentlewoman from Ohio appeared before our committee, I wanted to tell her at that time that at her request we were going with the full amount of \$50 million, which we did.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, let me personally and publicly thank the gentleman from Kentucky, and also the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] and others, but the gentleman from Kentucky in particular for his resolve on this matter.

I only hope—I am very, very grateful—I know I speak on behalf of women and their families across the country, because we know we need more research and we want to find a cure. My only hope is that the Senate will not have zero in their budget, as they did in the last Congress, and that the wishes of the gentleman from Kentucky will prevail and, if anything, gets even stronger, because the gentleman from Kentucky has always kept to his work as far as I am concerned.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend, my dear friend, the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

□ 1330

Mrs. LLOYD. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as many in this body know, I underwent surgery recently for breast cancer. I say this not to invoke sympathy on myself but to invoke a greater awareness of the necessity for more research dollars going into the area of breast cancer research. Today we have so little knowledge of the causes of breast cancer, and a cure for breast cancer must be found if we are going to change this. If not, you are going to see 44,000 American women continue to have their lives claimed by breast cancer each year.

So I do commend the committee for their action in this area.

Mr. Chairman, as many in this body know, I recently underwent surgery for breast cancer. I mention this not for anyone's sympathy, but so that my recent experience can bring about changes in the way women receive health care in this Nation. I now find myself in the midst of the growing numbers of American women that will be struck by breast cancer each year. I am fortunate though, simply because I had a mammogram every year.

We are able to stop smoking to avoid lung cancer, but to date we have nothing to tell women to avoid breast cancer. A cause for breast cancer must be found in order to change this. If not, 1 in 9 American women will continue to develop breast cancer.

There has been little progress in finding the cure for this disease. That is why the National Institute of Cancer must be funded to the fullest level possible. NCI has several programs currently investigating breast cancer. These must be continued, and expanded, in order to stop this tragedy.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HUTTO). The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] has expired.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, because of the magnitude of this issue, that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, under the reservation, if I might just ask: We are within a 30-minute time limit where all the different issues have to be raised by amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, might I ask unanimous consent that 3 minutes be extended onto that time limit?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to praise the gentlewoman in the well [Ms. OAKAR]. Mr. Chairman, last year the gentlewoman took to the floor and just insisted in the dead of night that we do something about breast cancer. Here we have a colleague with us today, who is looking wonderful, and she is a survivor. I will say this: When we asked the folks at home what concerns them, one of the first things they will say is, 1 in 9 women, 1 in 9 is going to get breast cancer.

Mr. Chairman, we need to do more. We need to do more. I compliment the gentlewoman from Ohio on her leadership, and I compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. OAKAR. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR]. Mr. Chairman, I also welcome our colleague back from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

I think we want to thank her for her great courage in coming forward and discussing this at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee also.

If anything, we only want more.

Mr. Chairman, we also say that MARY ROSE OAKAR's leadership has been phenomenal.

Ms. OAKAR. I want to say one other thing. We want a cure for breast cancer, and we will never do it unless every child is immunized against breast cancer. We can do it if we have the research dollars. I also want to say that, like Mrs. LLOYD, my own sister has had breast cancer, her next-door neighbor, Jan Nixon, has had breast cancer. Thousands of women, 175,000 of them, will find out they have breast cancer this year, and what they want, what women who are marching across the country who have breast cancer want, is they are thinking of their children and grandchildren. They are saying that if you can support \$1.8 billion for AIDS research, which we all need in AIDS prevention, which we all support, plus the \$65 million that is in the bill, we want to have at least \$50 million for research moneys preserved.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all the women in this country to urge the Senate to adhere to the provisions that the House of Representatives have in the bill for finding a cure for this disease.

Mr. Chairman, I thank, from the bottom of my heart, the members of the committee for their action and for the

other provisions relating to women's health.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NATCHER: On page 36, line 10 insert:

For making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, an additional \$600,000,000: Provided, That all funds available under this paragraph are hereby designated by Congress to be emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: Provided further, That these funds shall be made available only after submission to Congress of a formal budget request by the President that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Mr. NATCHER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would make a technical adjustment to the energy assistance fund provided in the bill. The amendment would restore the original bill language in H.R. 2707 except that it would provide the emergency funds under the terms of the regular Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program rather than leaving the allocation of the funding to the discretion of the President. This is being done at the request of the authorizing committee and we support the change.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we do not object on this side to the technical amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHAW

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHAW: Page 28, strike line 18 and all that follows through line 20 and insert the following:

\$3,051,954,000, of which \$5,000,000 for renovation of government owned or leased intramural research facilities shall remain available until expended, \$1,268,670,000 shall be allocated to the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health block grant, \$68,000,000 shall be allocated to the Capacity Expansion program, \$32,548,000 shall be allocated to the Treatment Grants to Crisis Areas, \$86,698,000 shall be allocated to the Treatment Improvement Grants, \$4446,225,000 shall be allocated to the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and \$281,580,000 shall be allocated to the Office for Substance Abuse Prevention.

On page 47—

(1) in line 24, strike "\$764,756,000" and insert "\$628,130,000"; and  
(2) strike line 26.

Mr. NATCHER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wonder if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] could explain to us the purpose of this amendment if we are not going to have the amendment read.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment would restore the \$33.67 million cut from the alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health services block grant; the \$33.67 million reduction in this block grant is cut from both the 1991 appropriations level and the administration request.

This amendment would restore that request for drug, alcohol, and mental health treatment. It would also fund a treatment capacity expansion program costing \$68 million.

The administration has requested funding for expanding the drug abuse treatment and creating new treatment slots, but the Committee on Appropriations has not included this request in the current bill.

It would also provide \$4.59 million for the Office of Treatment Improvement, which the administration treatment grant and alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health block grants fund.

It would add \$13.1 million in prevention programs at the Office of Substance Abuse Treatment of the Department of Health and Human Services.

It would restore the President's request for funding for the National Institute of Drug Abuse, adding \$14.8 million to the committee recommendation.

The total spending on this amendment is \$134.24 million. This is paid for in the bill by amending an additional section which would strike that amount or \$136.24 million from impact aid. This is the aid that is paid to cities where military bases are located. But it is important to realize that this cut is taken from military personnel who live off of base. This means that the residences in which they are living are in fact paying taxes just like the rest of the community. So it is taking it really from a pork barrel fund which is located in these particular areas.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, do I understand correctly then that the committee has cut the amount the administration requested in drug treatment programs, and the gentleman is attempting to restore the money that was originally proposed by the administration in these drug treatment programs?

Mr. SHAW. The gentleman is correct. All but \$33.67 million is new money. But the cut that I am most concerned about is this \$33.67 million which is cut from last year's funding.

This is the problem that I see.

This is the first time that I can remember this is a step backward in funding drug programs. I think the majority has been, over the years, somewhat critical of the Republican administrations for not supporting more treatment.

Now we have a President who is committed to asking for this money so that we can get to the treatment, so we can get these people back in the mainstream of life and cut down on all the tremendous problems we have with prisons, with law enforcement, and everything else.

So I would hope that the committee would choose to accept this amendment under the point of order and that we can go ahead with a most important program.

We are gaining slightly on the problem of drug abuse. This is no time to fall back. It is time that we really accelerate these programs and really go out there and fight a war that I believe is winnable with the commitment and cooperation of Congress and the President.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his explanation and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

□ 1340

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HUTTO). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized program and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, whereas I am disappointed with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] raising the point of order, I must concede in all honesty that what he says is correct, and, therefore, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HUTTO). The point of order is conceded and sustained.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW]. I would like to commend Mr. SHAW for bringing before the House the crucial issue of funding for drug treatment centers.

Mr. Chairman, I am alarmed about the reduction in antidrug appropriation in the Labor, HHS, and Education appropriations bill. Not only has the Appropriations Committee turned down the President's request for \$134 million for drug treatment programs, but the committee has actually recommended spending \$33 million less in fiscal year 1992 than was spent in fiscal year 1991. This is an ill-founded reduction of an extremely important program.

This Congress is committed to fighting a war on drugs. It is a deadly serious war, with the lifeline of our very Nation at stake. As with any war, there are casualties. I firmly believe that every addict seeking treatment should be able to find it. How can we hope to win the war on drugs if we cannot help those seeking to overcome their addictions?

In my own home State of New York, the New York State antidrug abuse counsel has noted that 75,000 treatment slots are needed. Today there are only slightly more than 50,000 treatment slots available. We are 25,000 slots short in New York State alone. H.R. 2707, in its unamended form, will result in 80,000 fewer treatment slots being made available nationwide. At a time when the incidence of drug abuse is escalating, the number of treatment slots available must be increased. Any reduction of the number of slots will only exacerbate this problem.

Adam Smith taught us many years ago that in order to understand any market, one must look at both supply and demand. In our war against drugs, treatment centers play the crucial role of helping to reduce demand. The Shaw amendment is both a necessary and just measure that will help to correct the gross error made by H.R. 2707. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge all of our colleagues to join in support of this amendment in order to beef up our antidrug efforts.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the committee, if I could.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the ongoing deferral of funds for State legalization impact assistants grants [SLIAG]—the program that provides essential services in support of integrating newly legalized persons into their communities.

As the GAO study which you and Chairman HARKIN requested cites, according to HHS and State estimates, about \$450 million of the amount appropriated for SLIAG for 1992 may be needed during that fiscal year to cover projected drawdowns through the end of fiscal year 1992. It also says that at least three States—California, New York, and Colorado—may not have been allocated sufficient funds to meet their estimated requirements through 1992.

It is my understanding that, given the current bill language, no further legislative action will be required to

insure both that the fiscal year 1992 appropriation is released in 1993 and that, due to this fiscal year 1992 deferral, all of the funds for SLIAG for both fiscal years will indeed be distributed to States by October 15, 1992. Does this reflect the Chairman's understanding of what the bill and report have provided?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is correct. It is my intention and expectation—and that of the subcommittee—to fulfill fiscal year 1992 and 1993 commitments to SLIAG in 1993, as well as to ensure advance release of these funds in October 1992. The committee has provided both legislative and report language requiring no further legislative action in order to guarantee this commitment.

Mr. Chairman, further I would like to say to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] who is in the well, to a member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] and all of those that have talked to us about this matter, "We appreciate your assistance."

Not only that, this is a commitment that was made in 1986 under the basic law which provided for \$1 billion for the fiscal years of 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, and I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] that it is a commitment made in the bill, and the commitment must be carried out.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the chairman for the subcommittee, for his support and cooperation.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for yielding. I especially thank the chairman for his commitment.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say that many of us from California were particularly concerned upon first learning of the decision to defer this appropriation. We understand that the administration requested a revision. We understood the low allocation. Our only hope is that the assurances that have been given can also be considered for purposes of adding language providing greater flexibility for the Department of Health and Human Services to take the unexpended funds, which are estimated to be about \$580 million, and to allow those funds to be allocated in a fashion that would allow the programs in those States that will need the monies to be spent in those States rather than held over. I think that kind of language in the conference committee, plus the chairman's commitment, can

assure all Californians that the commitments made in 1986 will be met.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] in a colloquy on the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program or LIHEAP. I share the concerns of many of my colleagues that the level of funding approved by the full committee for this critical program will not be sufficient to meet the needs of some of society's most needy individuals, the working poor, elderly, handicapped and low-income individuals. A \$1 billion funding level would result in a cut of approximately 40 percent from the current services level. As many as 2 million families could be denied energy assistance.

I have tried unsuccessfully for the past several days to draft an amendment that would restore LIHEAP to a funding level of \$1.6 billion. As you know, Mr. Chairman, such a level would not be a current services budget, but it would closely resemble last year's funding level.

While I am disappointed that the House cannot act today to provide critical funds for this important program, I trust that you will have the ability to work in conference toward a greater level of funding for LIHEAP.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE] knows, we faced many difficult funding decisions this year. Although we were not able to fund LIHEAP at the level that you and many other Members supported for 1992, I do want to express my willingness to work in conference with the Senate to gain greater funding for LIHEAP. You are certainly correct that this is a vital program that serves many needy individuals. Because of LIHEAP's importance to many households across the Nation, it is my intention to work in conference to try to restore LIHEAP funding to a level closer to the 1991 level.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE] that personally I know a little bit about this legislation. At the time we had this up a number of years ago when the program was first authorized, we had problems with someone to introduce the bill. It was a House joint resolution. My name is on that resolution, and I take great pride and honor to say to my colleagues today that I am just

as proud of it today as the day I put my name on it.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] very much for that commitment. My colleagues told me that, when this program was designed and first came to light here on the floor, the gentleman from Kentucky was around at its birth, and that kind of continuing commitment on this program is very reassuring to me, and I am sure that there is some room in conference to increase the level of funding. Those responsible for the program, people such as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will certainly be there trying to put their fingerprints on it and increase the funding level to more appropriate levels, and I thank the gentleman for that commitment.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the committee took note of the efforts by OMB to revise its procedures for indirect cost recoveries for research conducted at universities. Clearly, significant improvements in those procedures must be made to assure Congress and the taxpayers that vital research funds are used effectively.

I understand that, under the OMB plan, certain expenses will be disallowed and certain administrative costs will be capped at 26 percent. If OMB decides to implement the 26 percent cap, is the committee recommending that these changes should be phased in over a period of time, preferably after existing agreements with cognizant agencies have expired?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter, as the gentleman knows, for the Office of Management and Budget to decide, but, if they do decide on a phase-in period, this committee would not object to this approach.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

□ 1350

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who is one of the most respected and admired and liked Members of this body, for the amendment which he offered recently with regard to reinserting the LIHEAP funds which are so important to the people of this country. The Nation owes him thanks for that.

The situation is quite serious. As we know, if the fall and the winter come on very harshly, at the levels of the funding in the committee bill, without the amendment just adopted by the House as offered by the distinguished

gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], there would be literally millions of Americans cold and hungry as well. The LIHEAP funds, with the \$600 million in the amendment, are extremely important. Without the full funding of that particular program, many poor in this country would confront the choice between heating their homes or eating, or they might perhaps be able to do neither. The suffering which would result from that situation would, I believe, be intolerable.

The gentleman has very wisely improved the committee bill by his amendment because he has required that the allocation be according to existing law. I commend him for that. That is very useful.

Under the amendment the President will make the determination whether or not there is an emergency in the country, I believe that is not what the gentleman really would have desired, but rather that the matter be hinged upon an emergency. I believe that he would rather have preferred to see that this is done simply as a matter of law, but I understand the parliamentary and budgetary situation that confronted my friend. I fully understand that.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank the gentleman, who is chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for his assistance not only at this time with our bill but all down through the years since the gentleman has been a Member of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman well knows that when we take care of the health of our people and educate our children, we live in the strongest country in the world. I had the pleasure, Mr. Chairman, of serving with the gentleman's father in the House. When I got here, the gentleman's father was a Member of Congress, and like the gentleman in the well, he was an outstanding Member.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to observe that this is a most important program. Without this amendment and the required Presidential submission, almost 100,000 families would have to have been dropped in just the State of Michigan. In the Midwest as a whole, almost 500,000 families would have been dropped, and in the Nation as a whole almost 2 million households would have been dropped. That would have resulted in a level of hardship that would have been intolerable, I believe, by any standard or measure. So the gentleman is particularly to be commended for what he has done here today.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr.

SHARP], and I have worked with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on various alternatives, and I want him to know that we have appreciated that opportunity and have found the results to be very helpful. The House is going to have to work hard to try to preserve and improve the funding for this program when we go to conference, and I know we can count on the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky and also the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], who has also been active in this matter and whose concerns are well known.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to extend my sincere thanks to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, HHS, and Education, my good friend, BILL NATCHER. The gentleman from Kentucky has once again demonstrated his deep and genuine commitment to those who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Contained in H.R. 2707 is over \$80 million for veterans' employment services which was not included in the administration's budget request. But for the actions of the distinguished chairman, the Disabled Veterans Outreach Program, a highly successful employment program for veterans, would have virtually closed down. This program, which we extended earlier this year, was established by Congress to provide intensive employment services to disabled veterans, and other veterans, in need of job search and placement assistance.

But for the actions of our colleague from Kentucky, the National Veterans Training Institute, which provides training to Federal and State employees and others involved in the delivery of employment services to veterans, would have closed down.

Mr. Chairman, these programs help disabled veterans find jobs. They help veterans of the Persian Gulf war find jobs. They help the fine men and women separating from the military because of downsizing find jobs. They help veterans of Vietnam find jobs.

I know the distinguished chairman had to dig deep to find the funding for these important veterans' employment programs, and I want to express my deep appreciation for his efforts and those of the esteemed ranking minority member of the subcommittee, CARL PURSELL.

WILLIAM NATCHER is a good and valued friend to veterans, and he has more than earned their gratitude and respect. On behalf of all the veterans organizations and military associations who represent millions of veterans from all wars, I thank the subcommittee for its great work.

Ms. LONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Ms. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. The subcommittee chairman, Mr. NATCHER, the committee chairman, Mr. WHITTEN, and the members of the committee did a herculean task as they faced a series of difficult choices.

In particular, I want to highlight the job the committee did with respect to funding the administration of the unemployment program.

While administration costs may not seem, at first, to be a compelling need, this winter there were families in Indiana in line at unemployment offices at 5 o'clock in the morning and individuals waited weeks to receive their benefits, all due to the lack of administrative funds.

These workers had paid their unemployment taxes to qualify for coverage and yet they faced unconscionable delays in receiving their unemployment insurance benefits. It is bad enough when the Government doesn't deliver benefits to individuals in real need. It's worse when the Government takes money from workers with the promise to return it in times of need and the does not come through.

The committee's bill would fully fund all anticipated administrative costs and establish a contingency fund to cover any unanticipated costs should unemployment rise above projections. The contingency fund is important because in both of the last 2 years unanticipated costs arose and unemployed workers endured delays and lines while waiting on supplemental action by the Federal Government.

However, I am concerned that, as has happened in previous years, unemployment funding will be derailed by the time the appropriations process is finished. What is particularly disturbing about this outcome is that the money appropriated for unemployment programs comes from taxes which are dedicated to the program. When Congress underfunds the unemployment program the money simply builds up, unspent in the unemployment trust fund.

I believe we need to reform the way we budget the unemployment trust fund and get it off budget. In the meantime the unemployment provisions bill are good measures and I urge support of the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: On page 74, after line 10,

Insert the following new section, and redesignate subsequent sections accordingly.

SEC. 513. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 5.9 percent.

The Chairman pro tempore. (Mr. HUTTO). The Chair wishes to advise the Members that under the agreement there are 2 minutes left, 1 minute for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and 1 minute for a Member opposed to the amendment.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, in my 1 minute I just want to explain that this is the balanced budget amendment. This is the amount that would have to be reduced from the overall spending in this bill in order to bring us into compliance with the concept that we will increase spending over 1991 levels by 2.4 percent.

Under this particular amendment we would in fact allow every account within this bill to be not only 100 percent of what it was the year previous but it would allow it to be 102.4 percent over the previous year. So in my amendment there are no cuts in spending based upon 1991 spending; there are only increases.

However, there is a reduction in the amounts which the committee is including, and those reductions are in order to ensure that we do in fact stay committed to the balanced budget concept. The committee has done a good job of staying within its 602(b) limitations, but 602(b) limitations, I remind the House, do not get us to a balanced budget agreement. Last year's budget agreement does not assure that we are going to have a balanced budget. Only by voting for amendments of this kind can we be assured that we will achieve a balanced budget by the fiscal year 1995.

Mr. Chairman, this is a 5.9-percent cut. I realize that is a tough thing to do on this bill, but if we are committed to a balanced budget, it ought to be done.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], is accepted, here is what the amendment would do: It would cut this bill \$3 billion \$500 million. As I said at the very beginning, we worked for 14 weeks, we held hearings, and we had hundreds of witnesses who appeared before our subcommittee. We kept this bill under our 602(b) funding allocation for budget authority and outlays.

This is a cut of \$3 billion \$500 million. Just in the Department of Labor alone, there would be a \$500 million reduction. We come down to the Department of Health and Human Services, \$1,450,000,000; breast cancer research and screening, childhood immunization, the National Institutes of Health, and AIDS [acquired immune deficiency syndrome], they are all cut. This cuts them all, Mr. Chairman. We would see cuts in the homeless programs and the

nutrition program for the elderly. The older people in this country throughout the States and communities who need something to eat, they would be affected by this proposed amendment.

There is a lot of pride in these people, Mr. Chairman. They walk in, they are hungry, they need something to eat. If this amendment is adopted, it cuts that program.

The Department of Education would be cut by \$1,385,000,000, including the chapter 1 program, student assistance for higher education and education for the handicapped.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

RECORD VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 55, noes 366, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

AYES—55

- |               |              |                |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Allard        | Dreier       | Miller (OH)    |
| Archer        | Duncan       | Moorhead       |
| Armey         | Fawell       | Nichols        |
| Baker         | Fields       | Oxley          |
| Ballenger     | Gillmor      | Packard        |
| Barton        | Hancock      | Petri          |
| Bennett       | Hansen       | Riggs          |
| Boehner       | Hefley       | Roberts        |
| Bunning       | Herger       | Rohrabacher    |
| Burton        | Hobson       | Santorum       |
| Campbell (CA) | Holloway     | Sensenbrenner  |
| Coble         | Hunter       | Shuster        |
| Combest       | Inhofe       | Slaughter (VA) |
| Cox (CA)      | Johnson (TX) | Stump          |
| Crane         | Kasich       | Thomas (WY)    |
| Dannemeyer    | Kyl          | Walker         |
| DeLay         | Marlenee     | Zeliff         |
| Doolittle     | McCandless   |                |
| Dornan (CA)   | McEwen       |                |

NOES—366

- |              |               |              |
|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Abercrombie  | Brewster      | Coyne        |
| Ackerman     | Brooks        | Cramer       |
| Alexander    | Broomfield    | Cunningham   |
| Anderson     | Browder       | Darden       |
| Andrews (ME) | Brown         | Davis        |
| Andrews (NJ) | Bruce         | de la Garza  |
| Andrews (TX) | Bryant        | DeFazio      |
| Annuzio      | Bustamante    | DeLauro      |
| Anthony      | Byron         | Dellums      |
| Applegate    | Callahan      | Derrick      |
| Aspin        | Camp          | Dickinson    |
| Atkins       | Campbell (CO) | Dicks        |
| AuCoin       | Cardin        | Dingell      |
| Bacchus      | Carper        | Dixon        |
| Barnard      | Carr          | Donnelly     |
| Barrett      | Chandler      | Dooley       |
| Bateman      | Chapman       | Dorgan (ND)  |
| Bellenson    | Clay          | Downey       |
| Bentley      | Clement       | Durbin       |
| Bereuter     | Clinger       | Dwyer        |
| Berman       | Coleman (MO)  | Early        |
| Bevill       | Coleman (TX)  | Eckart       |
| Bilbray      | Collins (IL)  | Edwards (CA) |
| Billirakis   | Collins (MI)  | Edwards (OK) |
| Bliley       | Condit        | Edwards (TX) |
| Boehlert     | Conyers       | Emerson      |
| Bonior       | Cooper        | Engel        |
| Borski       | Costello      | English      |
| Boucher      | Coughlin      | Erdreich     |
| Boxer        | Cox (IL)      | Espy         |

- |               |               |                |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Evans         | Livingston    | Rose           |
| Fascell       | Lloyd         | Rostenkowski   |
| Fazio         | Long          | Roth           |
| Feighan       | Lowery (CA)   | Roukema        |
| Fish          | Lowey (NY)    | Rowland        |
| Flake         | Luken         | Roybal         |
| Foglietta     | Machtley      | Russo          |
| Ford (MI)     | Manton        | Sabo           |
| Ford (TN)     | Markey        | Sanders        |
| Frank (MA)    | Martin        | Sangmeister    |
| Franks (CT)   | Martinez      | Sarpalius      |
| Frost         | Matsui        | Savage         |
| Galleghy      | Mavroules     | Sawyer         |
| Gallo         | Mazzoli       | Saxton         |
| Gaydos        | McCloskey     | Schaefer       |
| Gejdenson     | McCollum      | Scheuer        |
| Gekas         | McCrery       | Schiff         |
| Gephardt      | McCurdy       | Schroeder      |
| Geren         | McDade        | Schulze        |
| Gibbons       | McDermott     | Schumer        |
| Gilchrest     | McGrath       | Serrano        |
| Gilman        | McHugh        | Sharp          |
| Glickman      | McMillan (NC) | Shaw           |
| Gonzalez      | McMillen (MD) | Shays          |
| Goodling      | McNulty       | Sikorski       |
| Gordon        | Meyers        | Sisisky        |
| Goss          | Mfume         | Skaggs         |
| Gradison      | Michel        | Skeen          |
| Grandy        | Miller (CA)   | Skelton        |
| Gray          | Miller (WA)   | Slattery       |
| Green         | Mineta        | Slaughter (NY) |
| Guarini       | Mink          | Smith (FL)     |
| Gunderson     | Moakley       | Smith (IA)     |
| Hall (OH)     | Molinari      | Smith (NJ)     |
| Hall (TX)     | Mollohan      | Smith (OR)     |
| Hamilton      | Montgomery    | Smith (TX)     |
| Hammerschmidt | Moody         | Snowe          |
| Harris        | Morella       | Solarz         |
| Hastert       | Morrison      | Solomon        |
| Hatcher       | Mrazek        | Spence         |
| Hayes (IL)    | Murphy        | Spratt         |
| Hayes (LA)    | Murtha        | Staggers       |
| Hefner        | Myers         | Stallings      |
| Henry         | Nagle         | Stark          |
| Hertel        | Natcher       | Stearns        |
| Hoagland      | Neal (MA)     | Stenholm       |
| Hochbrueckner | Neal (NC)     | Stokes         |
| Horn          | Nowak         | Studds         |
| Horton        | Nussle        | Sweet          |
| Hoyer         | Oakar         | Swift          |
| Hubbard       | Oberstar      | Synar          |
| Huckaby       | Obey          | Tallon         |
| Hughes        | Olin          | Tanner         |
| Hutto         | Olver         | Tauzin         |
| Hyde          | Ortiz         | Taylor (MS)    |
| Ireland       | Orton         | Taylor (NC)    |
| Jacobs        | Owens (NY)    | Thomas (CA)    |
| James         | Owens (UT)    | Thomas (GA)    |
| Jefferson     | Pallone       | Thornton       |
| Jenkins       | Panetta       | Torres         |
| Johnson (CT)  | Parker        | Torricelli     |
| Johnson (SD)  | Patterson     | Towns          |
| Johnston      | Paxon         | Trafficant     |
| Jones (GA)    | Payne (NJ)    | Traxler        |
| Jones (NC)    | Payne (VA)    | Unsoeld        |
| Jontz         | Pease         | Upton          |
| Kanjorski     | Pelosi        | Valentine      |
| Kaptur        | Penny         | Vander Jagt    |
| Kennedy       | Perkins       | Vento          |
| Kennelly      | Peterson (FL) | Visclosky      |
| Kildee        | Peterson (MN) | Volkmer        |
| Kleczka       | Pickett       | Vucanovich     |
| Klug          | Pickle        | Walsh          |
| Kolbe         | Porter        | Washington     |
| Kopetski      | Poshard       | Waters         |
| Kostmayer     | Price         | Waxman         |
| LaFalce       | Pursell       | Weber          |
| Lagomarsino   | Quillen       | Weiss          |
| Lancaster     | Rahall        | Wheat          |
| Lantos        | Ramstad       | Whitten        |
| LaRocco       | Rangel        | Williams       |
| Laughlin      | Ravenel       | Wilson         |
| Leach         | Ray           | Wise           |
| Lehman (CA)   | Reed          | Wolf           |
| Lent          | Regula        | Wolpe          |
| Levin (MI)    | Richardson    | Wyden          |
| Levine (CA)   | Rinaldo       | Wylie          |
| Lewis (CA)    | Ritter        | Yates          |
| Lewis (FL)    | Roe           | Yatron         |
| Lewis (GA)    | Roemer        | Young (AK)     |
| Lightfoot     | Rogers        | Young (FL)     |
| Lipinski      | Ros-Lehtinen  | Zimmer         |

## NOT VOTING—11

Dymally	Kolter	Ridge
Gingrich	Lehman (FL)	Sundquist
Hopkins	Moran	Weldon
Houghton	Rhodes	

□ 1419

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KYL changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 199 on H.R. 2707 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

□ 1420

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the Labor-HHS Appropriations Subcommittee and the gentleman from California, chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health.

The issue, Mr. Chairman, is a proposal by the Health Care Financing Administration to conduct a demonstration project designed to provide cataract surgery to Medicare beneficiaries for a single netotiated global fee.

HCFA's intent is to conduct this demonstration project pursuant to certain waiver authority which the agency purports to be contained in 42 U.S.C. section 1395b-1. Are my colleagues aware of this demonstrated project and the section of the code just cited?

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I am aware.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to advise the gentleman that I, too, am aware of this.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, is it not correct that 42 U.S.C. section 1395b-1 provides HCFA with limited authority to waive compliance with the requirements of the Medicare provisions of the Social Security Act and thus limits the agency's ability to conduct demonstration projects?

Mr. STARK. If the gentleman will yield further, I would inform him that his interpretation is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, is it not also correct that, according to current law, the Department has the authority to waive certain requirements relating to reasonable cost or reasonable charge reimbursements, but does not have the authority to waive other types of reimbursement rules or to

waive the part B deductible and coinsurance requirements?

Mr. STARK. If the gentleman will yield further, I would inform him that that is also correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. Let me just say then, according to the 1989 amendments to the Medicare Act, which will take effect in January 1992, payment for physician service, will not be based upon reasonable charges, but will instead be based on a resource-based relative value scale, or fee schedule.

Under this soon-to-be implemented reimbursement methodology, does HCFA, pursuant to section 1395b-1, have the authority to waive either fee schedule or the deductible and coinsurance requirements as envisioned in the cataract demonstration project?

Mr. STARK. If the gentleman will yield further, I would inform him that it is my understanding of the statute that the Department does not have the necessary authority.

I, together, with my colleague, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means, wrote a letter, dated April 11, to the administrator of the Health Care Financing Administration in this regard.

This letter expresses our concern that the Department does not have the necessary statutory authority to carry out this demonstration.

Mr. SOLOMON. Notwithstanding this clear statutory interpretation and your communications to the agency, I understand from Dr. Wilensky's repeated statements, that HCFA will persist in its pursuit of this demonstration project.

I believe that HCFA should immediately cease and desist from further design and implementation of this project.

Do the gentlemen agree?

Mr. STARK. If the gentleman will yield further, I would tell him that I emphatically agree, that given the clear statutory limitation on HCFA's authority, HCFA should immediately halt further development of this project.

I thank the gentleman for bringing this to our attention, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we would urge HCFA to carefully consider and respond to the concerns that have been raised by the gentleman from New York before it proceeds further with the design and implementation of such a demonstration.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly thank both the chairmen from the bottom of my heart. I know the senior citizens in my small rural communities deeply appreciate it.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the committee bill as written.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Labor-HHS-Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1992. I am not entirely pleased with this bill, but I believe it is the best possible bill under the circumstances.

The bill includes \$2.5 billion, above fiscal year 1991 levels, for education programs, including Head Start. This is consistent with the education assumptions in the House budget resolution as amended by the homefront budget amendment which I offered.

I want to express my appreciation to Chairman NATCHER and the subcommittee for continuing to make critical investments in pre-school programs and elementary and secondary education. This bill increases Education Department discretionary programs by almost 11 percent. It adds \$1 billion for chapter 1, an increase of 16 percent; a \$370 million increase for vocational education, an increase of 37 percent; and a \$200 million increase for handicapped education, an increase that exceeds the rate of inflation. The bill includes an additional \$50 million for the Even Start Program and a \$38 million or 19 percent increase for math-science education.

All told, I support Chairman NATCHER's efforts to uphold the will of the House in endorsing the priorities which my amendment embodied.

Nevertheless, the Labor-HHS-Education bill, so ably constructed by Chairman NATCHER, is drastically underfunded compared to the conference agreement on the budget resolution for fiscal year 1992 which Members adopted by a vote of 239 to 181. It is even substantially underfunded compared to the House passed budget resolution which was adopted by a vote of 261 to 163.

The House passed budget resolution assumed \$1.2 billion more in budget authority and \$1.7 billion more in outlays for this bill than was ultimately allocated to it. The shortfall as compared to the conference report was even more dramatic. The Labor-HHS-Education bill is \$3 billion in budget authority and \$2 billion in outlays below the levels assumed by the conferees.

Thus, while Members thought they were voting for one set of priorities in the budget, those priorities have been turned upside down because the Appropriations Committee has substituted other priorities—which have never been voted on—for those expressed by the House on two separate occasions. This raises fundamental questions. If the Appropriations Committee is not guided by the budget, why do we need to suffer through the budget process? If the Budget Committee cannot impose its will, what purpose does it serve? Is it time to abolish the budget process? What remedy is available to Members if budget priorities are ignored?

The result of these arbitrary decisions is to squeeze discretionary funding in the Labor-HHS-Education bill so that we are forced to make painful tradeoffs. By way of example, the subcommittee was forced to cut funds for low income energy assistance in order to increase funds for Head Start and to make a

downpayment on the President's education initiative. We should all hope for a cool summer, and warm winter, so that we can be spared the nightmare of seniors freezing to death or dying from heat prostration.

While unemployment hovers just below 7 percent and economists debate whether we have begun a meager recovery or are still in recession, we can only find \$50 million more to train and retrain American workers who have been dislocated. While drug related gang violence tears at the heart of American cities, large and small, gang prevention programs have been cut by between one-third and one-half and drug abuse education funds have been frozen.

As we continue preparations for reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, I must express some concern over levels contained in this appropriations bill for student financial assistance. Subcommittee constraints threaten our historical commitment to guaranteeing low- and middle-income students access to quality education. I pledge to work with my good friend, Chairman NATCHER, as the process continues.

We are told that we have no choice. That we must be guided by the Budget Enforcement Act adopted last year. This monstrosity imposed a cap on domestic discretionary spending, precluded transfers from defense spending or foreign aid to domestic spending, and even precluded pay-as-you-go for discretionary spending increases while permitting it for entitlements.

It is absurd to argue that we can't do these things because we have no money. I would argue that our problem is lack of will, not lack of wallet. When the President decided to wage war with Iraq, we found the wallet. When he decided to bail out the savings and loans, we found the wallet. In both cases, the wallet was off-budget.

The issue is will. This administration and its allies in the Congress must recognize that this country's leadership position is precarious, that our standard of living and quality of life is slowly deteriorating, and that we must invest to prosper. To the extent that we indulge in elaborate but arbitrary constructs to try to substitute for backbone and will power we are doing ourselves and the Nation a disservice.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill as the best possible product under the existing budgetary constraints, but I strongly urge my colleagues to carefully analyze what this Budget Enforcement Act is doing. The sooner we repeal this horror, the better.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will briefly summarize this bill with relationship to the guidelines in the budget resolution.

I rise in support of H.R. 2707, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. This is the 11th of the 13 annual appropriations bills to be considered by the House.

The bill provides \$58.510 billion in discretionary budget authority and \$57.808 billion in discretionary outlays, which are \$774 million below the 602(b) subdivisions for discretionary budget au-

thority and \$1 million less than the outlays, respectively, this subcommittee's subdivision.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I plan to inform the House of the status of all spending legislation, and will be issuing a "Dear Colleague" on how each bill compares to the budget resolution.

I look forward to working with the Appropriations Committee on its other bills.

[Factsheet]

H.R. 2707, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1992 (H. REPT. 102-121)

The House Appropriations Committee reported the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 1992 on Thursday, June 20, 1991. Floor consideration of the bill is scheduled for Wednesday, June 26, 1991.

COMPARISON TO THE 602(b) SUBDIVISION

The bill, as reported, provides \$58,510 million in total discretionary budget authority, \$774 million below the Appropriations subdivisions for this subcommittee. The estimated discretionary outlays in the bill are \$1 million below the subdivision totals. Amounts are provided in the domestic and the international categories.

The bill, as reported, provides \$58,502 million of domestic discretionary budget authority, \$773 million less than the Appropriations 602(b) subdivision for this subcommittee. The estimated domestic discretionary outlays in the bill are identical to the subdivision total. A comparison of the bill with the funding subdivisions follows:

COMPARISON TO DOMESTIC SPENDING ALLOCATION  
[In millions of dollars]

	Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies appropriations bill		Appropriations Committee 602(b) subdivision		Bill over (+)/under (-) committee 602(b) subdivision	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Discretionary	58,502	57,800	59,275	57,800	-773	
Mandatory <sup>1</sup>	144,708	143,234	144,708	143,234		
Total	203,210	201,034	203,983	201,034	-773	

<sup>1</sup> Conforms to the Budget Resolution estimates for existing law.  
Note: BA—New budget authority; O—Estimated new outlays.

COMPARISON TO INTERNATIONAL DISCRETIONARY SPENDING ALLOCATION

The bill, as reported, provides \$8 million of international discretionary budget authority for the United States Institute of Peace, \$1 million below the Appropriations subdivision for this subcommittee. The estimated discretionary outlays in the bill are \$1 million below the subdivision total.

[In millions of dollars]

	Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies appropriations bill		Appropriations Committee 602(b) subdivision		Bill over (+)/under (-) committee 602(b) subdivision	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Discretionary	8	8	9	9	-1	-1

Note: BA—New budget authority; O—Estimated new outlays.

The House Appropriations Committee reported the Committee's subdivision of bud-

et authority and outlays in House Report 102-81. These subdivisions are consistent with the allocation of spending responsibility to House committees in House Report 102-69, the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 121, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1992, as adopted by the Congress on May 22, 1991.

Following are major discretionary program highlights for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1992, as reported:

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS  
[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	New outlays
Older Americans Community Service Employment	390	70
Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)	4,138	201
Bureau of Labor Statistics	259	222
State Unemployment Insurance and Employment Service Operations <sup>1</sup>	3,152	2,512
Department of Health and Human Services		
Low-Income Home Energy Assistance <sup>2</sup>	1,000	855
Community Services Block Grant	421	286
Human Development Services (Head Start) <sup>3</sup>	3,496	1,984
Child Care Grants <sup>4</sup>	(2,202)	NA
Refugee and Entrant Assistance	850	-78
	294	206
Department of Education		
Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration	2,918	1,153
National Institutes of Health	8,825	3,706
Centers for Disease Control	1,391	759
Refugee and Entrant Assistance	294	206
Education Excellence <sup>5</sup>	500	60
Compensatory Education	7,076	849
School Improvement Programs (Chapter 2)	1,578	189
Special Education	2,823	347
Bilingual Education	249	30
Impact Aid	765	608
Vocational and Adult Education	1,652	198
Student Financial Assistance	6,853	1,248
Libraries	143	53

<sup>1</sup> The Appropriations Bill also provides an indefinite contingent appropriation for unemployment insurance administration which would provide \$30 million for each 100,000 increase in average weekly insured unemployment claims above the President's estimate of 3.24 million.

<sup>2</sup> The Appropriations Bill also includes a contingent emergency appropriation of \$600 million for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance program available only upon Presidential request and Presidential classification as emergency funding.

<sup>3</sup> The Appropriations Bill provides a contingent appropriation of \$500 million in response to the President's proposal for new Education Excellence programs. If authorizing legislation is enacted by December 31, 1991, up to one-half of this amount, \$250 million, would be available for the newly authorized activities and \$250 million for Head Start. In the event that new legislation is delayed or not accepted by the Congress, the appropriation permits the full \$500 million to be spent on currently authorized programs (with a minimum of \$250 million for Head Start) that directly support educational reform efforts in local school districts.

<sup>4</sup> The Appropriations Bill includes a rescission of \$145 million in budget authority in 1991 for child care grants. With the rescission, the 1992 level is \$250 million above the revised 1991 level compared to \$175 million for the Budget Resolution.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I particularly am pleased to see levels raised for Head Start and other important education projects. At the same time I have to tell the committee that I am unhappy with the proposal to cut \$600 million from LIHEAP, which will directly affect 52,000 households in my home State of Wisconsin.

□ 1530

For many of our elderly, this is the only project they can be involved in.

Mr. Chairman I'd like to begin by commending Chairman NATCHER and Mr. PURSELL for their efforts in bringing this legislation to the floor. There is a great deal in this bill which we can all applaud. In particular, this legislation presents a strong statement of our determination to make education a national priority.

Critical preschool, elementary, and secondary education programs, in particular, are

funded at levels which will allow us to reach out more effectively to insure that kids get off on the right foot and stay on track. Enactment of this legislation will allow us to significantly expand Project Head Start—a goal which many of us share—and it will allow us, through expanded chapter 1 programs, to reach many more educationally and economically disadvantaged students. These are young Americans that need our help and for them this bill provides it.

At the same time, this legislation exemplifies the very difficult budgetary situation in which we find ourselves. The committee has obviously had to make some very tough choices and, to their credit they have met this challenge. Though I commend them for their determination and courage in making education a priority in this bill, I am concerned that the sacrifice this has required has not been fairly apportioned. In particular, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the reduction in funding which the bill proposes for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP] is excessive and unfair.

Cutting \$600 million from LIHEAP will have a direct effect in over 52,000 households in my home State of Wisconsin. Almost 2 million households nationwide will be affected and, as a result, millions of our Nation's working poor and elderly Americans may go without heat and hot water next winter. For most of them, this is the only Federal program that they participate in.

Mr. Chairman, I question the fairness of asking these individuals to bear so much of the cost which the education priorities in this bill make necessary. I hope that as the appropriators move forward into conference and toward final consideration of this bill, that they will consider ways to restore LIHEAP funding and more equitably balance the sacrifices which the priorities in this bill and budgetary reality requires.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the subcommittee's bill, and especially in regard to the language blocking implementation of the dangerous gag rule. I also commend the distinguished chairman for his role in that as well as in the funding for AIDS.

Mr. Chairman, every year I rise in support of this bill that emerges from the subcommittee chaired by Mr. NATCHER. Every year I commend the chairman of that subcommittee for his valiant efforts on behalf of many of the programs that we hold most vital to the welfare of our citizens. And again this year, I rise in support of not only the legislation but also of Mr. NATCHER, who over the years has brought generous appropriations for AIDS research, prevention, and education to the floor. In past years his work, along with that of his colleagues on the subcommittee, has allowed the Federal Government to wage more of a fight against this terrible epidemic than would have occurred if the President's budget requests had been followed.

This year has been difficult. Because of the very tight domestic budget dic-

tated by last year's ill-conceived budget summit agreement and the Gramm-Rudman law, the subcommittee has had to limit its largess. In the process, AIDS programs have suffered. The Ryan White CARE Act, viewed by many including myself as the solution to some of the funding programs faced by localities nationwide, has not received the level of funding I feel is warranted. AIDS research and prevention are also underfunded. The support needed to fight AIDS has not continued to grow at a rate that can keep up with the epidemic, which is far from vanquished.

At a recent hearing held by my subcommittee, I heard testimony about the direction in which the epidemic is heading. Now more and more women, children, intravenous drug users, and poor people are becoming sick. Cities are inundated with poverty-stricken persons, often homeless, who have a myriad of other problems, to which AIDS is the final blow. Our hospitals and clinics are overwhelmed and health care providers burned out after having to care for so many who are so sorely in need of help. I am disappointed that more could not be done for AIDS this year.

This legislation does include some very important language blocking the implementation of the dangerous Rust versus Sullivan Supreme Court decision. Unless counteracted, that decision will block the free flow of information in federally funded title X family planning clinics, rejecting the sanctity of the doctor/patient relationship and reneging on our Nation's commitment to free speech.

The Rust versus Sullivan ruling prohibits title X health care providers from apprising their patients of all the available legal options for an unintended pregnancy. Until Rust versus Sullivan, title X clinics reasonably provided neutral, nondirective counseling and referrals to pregnant women who requested information on their medical options. If Rust versus Sullivan remains unchecked, that comprehensive information that is available to women who attend private health facilities would no longer be available to the low-income women who depend on title X clinics for their reproductive information.

Allowing the Rust versus Sullivan decision to stand will not only hurt low-income women, it will hurt each and every American as it desecrates the doctor/patient relationship. Patients in crisis situations do not want to look at their doctor and wonder whether or not that doctor is giving them all the facts about their medical situation. Patients want to trust their health care providers to assist them in their time of need.

If activated, the title X regulation would cripple the trust relationship that has traditionally been a fun-

damental element of medical practice. It would also force doctors to compromise their medical ethics, requiring that they withhold information from patients. This regulation tampers with the rights of both parties involved and destroys the delicate relationship that is an integral part of good health care.

The damage of allowing Rust versus Sullivan to stand does not stop at the clinic door. It encroaches on our constitutional right to freedom of speech in the realm of federally funded programming. Without the language now present in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill, title X health care providers will be denied the right to freedom of speech in their workplace.

Instead of providing patients with accurate information about their health care options, they will advise their patients according to the dictates of a federally authored script. Limiting the advice permissibly administered in federally funded clinics, the title X regulations set a precedent that could draw the shadow of Federal control over any Government-subsidized program.

Given the Bush administration's traditional antipathy for long-armed Government, the Rust decision becomes ironic. It establishes one of the most invasive policies our Government has ever created, censoring reproductive information and threatening the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship.

Matters of health care must be pursued according to medical, not political, guidelines. I urge my colleagues to protect the free flow of medical information and restore integrity to federally funded programs. Vote in favor of the fiscal year 1992 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments in the bill prior to section 514?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 514. No funds shall be available under this Act to enforce or otherwise implement the regulations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services published at 42 C.F.R. 59.8 or to promulgate any other regulation having the same substance.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the Committee of earlier today, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN].

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the language in this title of the bill which overturns the Supreme Court, or defunds the Supreme Court's gag rule on the advice that health care professionals can give to women regarding their medical options, including the choice of abortion.

This language in this bill protects something that is taken for granted by all people who are lucky enough to be able to afford private medical care. That is the sanctity of the doctor/patient relationship.

Can Members imagine the Government muzzling health care professionals, restricting the kind of information poor women can receive when it comes to the health of their bodies? Even if that woman's health is endangered if she continues her pregnancy? Even if she were the victim of rape or incest? Even if she begged the doctor or the nurse to give her full advice on the full range of medical options available to her. That is what the gag rule does, that the Supreme Court sustained.

This bill blocks those regulations by defunding them. Congress never passed those regulations. This bill blocks the dollars to implement those regulations. Those regulations, my friends, amount to institutionalized medical malpractice. They amount to censorship that creates a precedent that I think should chill every American, whether they believe in abortion or not. A precedent that can extend to almost anything.

Think about it. If this, what is next? Are we going to find ourselves in the future preventing doctors from telling Medicare and Medicaid patients that they cannot tell them about costly medical treatments because of budgetary problems? Is that what is next? The precedent certainly is here in the gag rule.

That is why it deserves to be unfunded. This bill does unfund the gag rule. Shall we silence physicians in the future from sharing information about blood transfusions, because some groups find that objectionable? That could be a precedent as well.

What this sounds like to me, the gag rule and the Supreme Court decision that we unfund in this bill, it sounds more like Romania or Albania than it does a United States Government program designed to serve the health of the people of the United States of America.

Friends, I strongly support this section of the bill. I applaud all Members who worked in the construction of this.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, in the limited time we have, and I welcome this opportunity to debate this issue because it is burdensome, but vitally important. It is so gut wrenching, but it is so very important.

However, I beg to inform Members this is not about free speech. It is about abortion. We have before Members, in the bill, a section that was introduced by my good friend from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] with the support of many others, that ought to be called the Abortion Facilitation Act, because

what it does is impose on a program that was designed and has operated for many years as a program to either get a person to get pregnant, or help a person keep from getting pregnant and to treat venereal disease, STD, sexually transmitted diseases, but not when a person is pregnant. That is another type of service to be supplied elsewhere. This is a program to treat women before they are pregnant.

Now, why did we have this program? Because we have been concerned about infant mortality. The infant mortality rates in the United States of America are appalling. So Congress put together a program that would advise women how to have a baby, how to have a healthy baby, how to nurture their child, or if they wanted to space their children, they would get contraceptive advice. Abortion is not such, although it does help the infant mortality statistics because it kills an unborn child. The program was designed to alleviate that toll, that sad, tragic toll, not to add to it.

So this amendment seeks to make doctors, who should be helping prospective parents plan their families, also recommend that they can exterminate their child, which is really an ethical problem, not a medical problem, and compelling the taxpayers to pay for it. That is what this is about.

Family planning is meant to promote or to prevent conception, pregnancy, not abortion. It is not a gag rule. Read the Yellow Pages. Look under Abortion. Read the newspapers. The ads leap up at readers. They overwhelm readers.

If a woman, comes into one of these clinics and is pregnant and wants advice on how to exterminate her child, the doctor does not push her out the door. He says, "We do not provide that. It is not a part of family planning. Go to the Planned Non-Parenthood Society. They will help you." But if a person wants to go elsewhere, here is a list, and they provide the woman with a list of clinics which may well provide abortion services. Nobody is gagged.

If the Federal Government pays for a course in astronomy, that does not mean they have to subsidize teaching astrology. Smoking is legal. We do not choose to pay to teach people how to smoke. We would pay to teach people how to quit smoking. That is the difference.

A doctor can give any medical advice he wants on his own time and in his own office or out on the street, but when it is one of the programs that are family planning, it should stick to family planning.

Cutting through all the verbiage, if a person thinks abortions are a good idea, or if morally they are neutral, then fine. If a person thinks an unborn child is expendable, they can throw them away, fine. I do not think so. I think once conception has occurred, I

think that we have something there that is the beginning of a human life, not a potential human life. It is human life with a potential. It is small. It is even microscopic, but by God, it is alive, and it is human, and it ought to be treated with dignity, and not torn out and thrown in a pail.

I think abortion is a pestilence, and I do not, I do not—not you, me—I do not want my tax dollars going to facilitate women exterminating—not terminating, every pregnancy terminates—exterminating their unborn child.

Do Members know what it is like? A farm extension agent is supposed to help farmers rotate their crops, teach how to grow soybeans. What if a farmer, coming to a farm extension agent and says, "Look, I know how to rotate. I know how to grow soybeans. I need labor."

□ 1440

"I need help on my farm. Where is the next slave auction? Where can I go get some slaves to work on my farm?"

That makes about as much sense as going to a clinic for family planning and saying, "Where can I kill my unborn child?"

Now, look, John Donne wrote a famous poem in 1603. It is a magnificent electrifying poem, and among its wonderful words, it starts out, "No man is an island sufficient unto himself \* \* \*" and then it says, "Every man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind."

People who think abortion is an acceptable answer to any problem have reversed John Donne. They say, "Every man's birth diminishes me, because there isn't enough to go around."

Abortion is not about choice. That is a process. The executioner has a choice. Shall I use the gas chamber, shall I hang this convict or shall we use an electric chair? Some choice.

Abortion involves the ultimate issue, life or death. If you ran into a burning building and you saved a little child, you would be on the news tonight. You would be getting plaques and honors. If you dove into a cold river and saved somebody, you would be honored for lifesaving; but you will vote to murder, to kill, to exterminate in the most undignified way, millions of children.

There are 1½ million abortions a year. Does it bother you? Do you want to contribute to that toll?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GEJDENSON). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Is there anyone more homeless than an unborn child in the mother's womb and she does not want to give birth to that child? She should be the natural protector of that child, but tragically she has become its deadly adversary. Is there anyone more homeless than that?

Handicapped people, we give them premium parking places because they need that help. God help you if through amniocentesis your parents find out you are going to be born handicapped. You are going to add to the sad toll of 1½ million abortions every year in the name of compassion.

I do not accuse you of hardness of heart, just lack of imagination. You demonstrate a compassion fatigue that prevents you from going beyond the pregnant woman to her unborn, preborn child. That is not a mouse. That is not a breadbasket. That is not a randomly multiplying tumor of cells. That is a tiny human being entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I just say if you like abortions, then fine, you continue to vote that way and answer to your conscience. Mine is clear.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], a distinguished attorney.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership on this.

Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois who followed me into this aisle, a woman is not a parking place. This issue is not about abortion. This issue is about also dealing with women as human beings.

The AMA says you are wrong. The American nurses say you are wrong and all sorts of Americans are saying you are wrong, and that is why the other side has collapsed on this issue, and the gentleman knows it, because you might want to resurrect it as an abortion issue. That is not what we are talking about.

We are talking about the fact that women as mature adults have the right in this Government to hear the entire range of health options, and there probably will not be a doctor able to practice in a clinic if they are not able to give that entire range of health options, because they could be sued for malpractice or any other such thing.

Guess what. Women have brains, but they also have uteruses. They can think. They can sort through those different options, and we are wanting equal treatment to know the options and the medical profession also wants that.

Let me also say that pregnancy is not a 9-month cruise. For some women it can be a health endangering situation. Therefore, the doctor might have the ability to converse with the woman about what you are talking about.

Oh, it would be so simple if it were one life, but we are talking about two lives, and these are not easy choices and they do not belong to the Government of the United States.

When I grew up, people who could not handle where babies came from said they came from the stork. If we do not

stop the Supreme Court, the next generation is going to say babies come from the Supreme Court.

This is an absolute outrage. For 200 years we have been able to deal with women as human beings. I just want to say that we do not want the medical profession gagged when they talk to over half of America's population.

America got a wake up call and they have been calling this body and saying, "Wait a minute. We don't want our tax money going that way. That is ridiculous."

That is why we are not having a vote today. This is a great victory, I think, and I really resent trying to put it into the rhetoric that we have had of the past. This is not that kind of rhetoric. This is about free speech, options, health care, and many lives that the medical profession is trying to treat and treat with the dignity that they are due under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take issue with one of the things that the gentlewoman from Colorado has just said. As someone who practiced law in the barrio for a number of years before coming to this body, it became my experience that a lot of people, including a lot of women who would be utilizing family planning, who would be asking for counseling, perceive an advocacy in what you tell them. Many of them come from a situation which is a desperate situation. I do not see any way in which you can supposedly inform women without being perceived to be advocating.

I do not see any way in which you can have discussion about abortion without in fact persuading, not just informing, but persuading some of those women who want to have an abortion. That is not something that the gentlewoman can change with the fine print. Those are the facts of life.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is missing my point. For some women, this is a life-threatening situation. It is very dangerous not to be able to lay out all those options, that is not an advocacy position. We are talking about free speech.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NAGLE].

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Chairman, I liked the speech of the gentleman from Illinois. It was passionate. It was self-righteous. It was obviously based on deep moral conviction, which I respect.

Where is the motion to strike the language? Where is the political courage of the great conviction? Why dump it back on the President's desk?

For a time today I carried in my pocket, and I still have it, a motion to strike this, to bring this to a vote, but I find my colleagues on that side do not really want to vote about this. They do not want to face it because they know the American public does not agree with them.

This is not about pro-life and pro-choice in its isolation, with all respect to those people who have preceded me. It is also about the Constitution of the United States. It is about the fundamental right of free speech, of the right for a person to say what he wants or she to say what she wants, without the Government's hand on their throats.

We have never in this country told people what they can and cannot say. True, we have regulated how they may say it, but we have never told people in this country that you cannot express yourself. That is what this gag rule does. It says to a 17-year-old girl who is pregnant and whose life is threatened that the constitutional right of free speech does not extend to you. It stops. That is fundamentally wrong.

I have the assurances of Members of this body that sometime this summer we will bring this issue to a vote. We will have a chance to see whether anger and high conviction are matched with political judgment or not.

□ 1450

And when that day comes, those who hold that the Constitution does not apply to pregnant women will have a chance to hold themselves accountable to the voters of this country.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, by now members are aware that the Labor/HHS bill to be considered today includes proabortion language that nullifies a key provision of President Bush's title X regulations recently upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Members probably know as well that because the President stated that he will veto the bill, he stated emphatically that he will veto the bill or any other bill, for the matter, that weakens or nullifies pro-life policy, we do not intend to offer a motion to strike pro-abortion language here today. Rather we will wait until the bill comes back vetoed, as surely it will be, to make our stand in defense of these humane, pro-life, pro-family planning regulations.

We will have our vote on this for all to see.

Mr. Chairman, first promulgated in 1988 but enjoined by a myriad of law-

suits until the high court rendered its opinion on May 23, the administration's title X regulations effectively separate abortion, the destruction of innocent human life from preventive family planning.

Let me remind Members that back in 1970 the conference report in 1970 accompanying the enactment of the title X program make it clear that abortion was outside the scope of the Nation's family planning program. The report said, and I quote, "It is and has been the intent of both houses that funds authorized under this legislation be used only to support preventive family planning services."

The regulations promulgated by the administration in 1988 faithfully strive to implement that original intent and, as such, limit funding to programs which, first, do not include abortion as a method of family planning; second, maintain physical and financial separation from prohibited abortion activities; third, do not engage in any activities that encourage, promote, or advocate abortion as a method of family planning; and, fourth, do not provide counseling and referral for abortion.

Mr. Chairman, counseling and referring for abortion in my view grossly undermines respect for the life of the unborn child. If we were talking about counseling for cancer or a disease, that would be one thing. But, Mr. Chairman, pregnancy is not a disease. An unborn child cannot be likened to a diseased pancreas. This fight is about advocacy and the taxpayers ought not to be forced to subsidize advocacy that destroys children.

I respectfully submit to you and my colleagues that it is utterly inhumane to regard the unborn child in this way as a cancerous tumor or as a wart or as a diseased organ.

If you accept the fact that the unborn are human and if you accept that fact that they are alive, because every abortion stops a beating heart, and unborn kids are worthy of respect and nurturing, not extermination, counseling and referring for abortion ought to be seen as jeopardizing the lives of these children.

If you regard the unborn child as a nonentity, no more entitled to fundamental respect than that tumor, your vote is to overturn those regulations when the override comes around. If dismembering an unborn child or poisoning an unborn child with salt-water and the other methods employed by the abortionists is something you think we ought to be all about and referring for it and counseling for it, then your vote is to overturn these regulations.

The unborn child means nothing to you.

Mr. Chairman, the consequence of abortion referral is very simply that unborn babies die. The consequence of abortion counseling likewise is that unborn babies die.

Mr. Chairman, referrals for prenatal care, on the other hand, provided for in the regulations, recognize that every pregnancy includes two patients, mother and baby. And that both patients are absolutely worthy of respect and the best maternal and prenatal care possible.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me make this very clear: The public is with us on this one. The recent Wirthlin poll which was released on Monday indicates that when people are asked, "Do you favor or oppose offering abortion as a method of birth control in taxpayer-funded family planning programs," a huge majority of Americans, 77 percent, say "no."

The good news, and this is really great news for the right-to-life movement, I would suggest is a disaster for Planned Parenthood and abortion rights advocates.

This closely tracks with previous polls conducted by the Gallup organization and the Boston Globe and the Wirthlin group, which also found that some 83 percent of Americans oppose using abortion as a method of birth control.

And when Americans, Mr. Chairman, are more fully informed about the Supreme Court's Rust decision and are told, "Any Government funds not used for family programs that provide abortions will be given to other family planning programs that provide contraception and other preventative methods of family planning," 69 percent of the American public favor the Rust decision.

This indeed is superb and encouraging news for the pro-life movement. This data conclusively counters the conventional wisdom that the Rust decision and the President's title X policy is unpopular. It is becoming increasingly clear, Mr. Chairman, that the more Americans know about abortion itself, and the title X regulations, and the word is slowly and incrementally getting out, the more support we get.

This is obviously bad news for Planned Parenthood and some of my friends on the other side of the issue. But perhaps Planned Parenthood especially. They have become, in many towns across the United States, the local neighborhood abortionists.

I believe very strongly that in a paradoxical way the more Planned Parenthood rails against these new regulations the more it exposes its own complicity in abortion. They have destroyed since 1980 in excess of 1 million unborn children in their own clinics. They have referred far in excess of 1 million unborn children to other abortion mills.

Mr. Chairman, this policy of the President is a good one, and we will sustain the veto when we get to that point.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon

[Mr. WYDEN], who is a coauthor along with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], of the bill that would in fact overturn the gag rule.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the gentleman very much and commend her for yielding me this time and for her leadership. And particularly, my colleague from Illinois, JOHN PORTER, who has done such a tremendous job now for two Congresses on this issue.

My colleagues, I say this issue is really very simple. That is, are we going to let doctors in this country tell their patients the truth? Because what the gag rule does is it turns mainstream health care on its head. It says that doctors cannot be straight with their patients. It violates the concept of informed consent where doctors would tell patients all their options, all their alternatives, so that patients can make the choice that is best for them and, in particular, it would widen the gap between the health care have's and have-not's.

If you are well-to-do in this country, you can go and see your physician, no problems; you are told your choices.

But now if the gag rule is upheld, if you are low income, we are going to strip you of your rights to health care information.

And in particular, a number of our colleagues have said that we are going to have a debate another day, that the President is going to veto this legislation and we will be back.

Well, I would say that the President of the United States has changed his mind before on the family planning issue, and I just hope that in the months and days ahead, as this debate goes forward, the President of the United States will once again think thoughtfully about what the implications of the gag rule really are because I want our colleagues to understand that once we set the precedent, that if the Government pays for something it can control the speech, after it does that at family planning clinics it can move on to any other program.

As a number of our colleagues have said from both of the bodies, we will have a chance to debate this in the days ahead.

I am very hopeful that the President of the United States, as he has done in the past, will look at these issues on their merits, listen to what the medical profession and others are saying, and then work out a legislative solution so that we can get rid of the repugnant gag rule.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, why is it we can never have a good, tough, clean-shot debate on abortion and what goes on in these so-called family planning clinics? With rare exception it proves the rule, why

is it the old pro-abortion gang that rolls out here and uses oh, the scary bugaboo of "world population" or they use women's rights or they use any type of stream of euphemistic phrases they can to cloud the issue, that what we are talking about is human life, to at least mouthing it so most of those in this House will concede that is a human soul, human being with an immortal soul that we are snuffing out of existence?

□ 1500

Bernard Nathanson, Dr. Bernard Nathanson, who is trying to redeem the 6,000 abortions that he performed earlier in his life, said that he made sure in every clinic he worked with that the receptionist was at least 23 years of age and had had an abortion so that she could intimidate the younger women and the young girls. No one has ever gainsaid or said he was lying. He also told that in the early NARAL meetings how they set up the Holy Roman Catholic Church as their bugaboo, their scapegoat, their way to breed anti-Catholicism in this country and advance their pro-abortion cause, and I have to sit here and listen to Catholic after Catholic get up on this floor and tell me that they know more than Mother Teresa who turned around Gov. Jerry Brown of California and helped to turn around former Democrat Gov. Hugh Carey of New York.

I rise against this whole bill because to pass the HHS appropriations bill with the Rust versus Sullivan repeal language means that:

Minors will be referred without parental notice. This is an irrefutable fact.

Women will be referred for abortion without knowing what hazards may await them or at what state of fetal development their baby is.

Women may be referred to clinics or physicians who do not carry liability insurance. That's cute, isn't it?

Women will be referred by 23-year-old counselors with no medical training, and who by requirement have had abortions themselves.

Women may be referred to clinics or hospitals at which nonphysicians perform abortions.

State governments which receive title X funding may directly or indirectly require an individual or institution to perform, assist, recommend, refer, or counsel for any abortion or to train or to provide for personnel to be trained as a condition of receiving title X grants or contracts even where it is against the religious beliefs of the institution; that is, the St. Agnes versus Reddick case in Baltimore.

Referrals may be made at any point in pregnancy, including cases where the child could live independently of the mother.

Referrals may be made where the aborted baby is to be used for subsequent live, fetal experimentation.

And finally, doctors who oppose abortion for medical, religious, or ethical reasons, will either have to violate their conscience and refer for preborn baby killing or lose their job.

This is not "free speech." This is a free fire zone for killing pre-born children in their mother's womb.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, this bill will reverse the Supreme Court's decision in Rust versus Sullivan and continue the practice of allowing the millions of women who rely on federally funded family planning clinics to get full information regarding their reproductive health as all other Americans.

If this provision is not enacted, we will put women and medical professionals in jeopardy. As a result of the Supreme Court decision in Rust versus Sullivan, beginning in July, a woman who goes into a family planning clinic and needs information about abortion will not be provided with the medical facts.

This is intolerable and dangerous. Those who oppose abortion have gone too far. They want to gag doctors by censoring the information health professionals can provide at federally funded clinics. It is totally unfair to even consider the prospect that poor women deserve to receive less comprehensive and inaccurate medical information simply because they must rely on federally funded health care. Make no mistake about it, if the Rust decision is not overturned, not only would a poor woman not be told that abortion is legal, she would not be able to obtain a referral to a privately funded clinic even if her life is in danger.

Such restrictions put doctors in a precarious position. They will be forced to choose between violating their Hippocratic oath and obeying Federal censorship laws. This is totally contrary to all we stand for as a nation. Americans understand the importance of preserving the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship. We want doctors to tell us all of our options so that we have the information to make the best health care choices.

Over 20 medical and nursing organizations have publicly opposed the gag rule. Last week, the American Medical Association said that legislation to overturn the gag rule "would keep the long arm of the Federal Government out of the patient-physician relationship and assure the traditional privacy of that relationship." The AMA also said, and I quote, that "political medicine is harmful to the health of all Americans."

Our President has thus far refused to listen. He has promised to veto this bill if it overturns Rust versus Sullivan. We cannot let him get away with that. If we do, we will fundamentally change

our health care system into one based on politics and not on medical science. This, in turn, will mean that this country will be providing substandard care to its most needy citizens.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the reversal of the gag rule and restore the integrity of our Nation's family-planning programs.

Let us keep politics out of the examining room. Overturn the gag rule.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, much has been made of the amendment in this bill adopted in the full committee dealing with the so-called gag rule—the rule which prohibits even discussing abortion with anyone seeking advice on options at a clinic which receives any Federal funds. The Supreme Court decision upheld that rule in the absence of a law prohibiting it. The provision in this bill has been described by some as an amendment to overturn that Supreme Court decision. It does no such thing.

While some 21 professional and service organizations issued statements saying they want the rule overturned, the national offices of many of these organizations supported an amendment which merely delayed the implementation of the rule for 1 year and even that is delayed until next October. It keeps this issue alive and is an issue which will divert attention from consideration of many important programs totaling \$203 billion in discretionary funding in this bill for health, education, welfare, training, the elderly, the disabled, and other peoples programs.

I am disappointed to find the Washington offices of national organizations promoting a nonsolution which keeps this issue alive like several others. This approach takes the pressure off of moving a bill. To repeal the rule takes the same number of votes and there is no reason to think there would not be the same number of votes to repeal the rule and solve the issue as it takes to annually support a delay in implementing the rule with all the uncertainties and undesirable effects that approach has.

There are times when there is no way to solve an issue through the regular process and either a temporary stay while a solution in a separate bill is considered must be attached to an appropriation bill, but this is not one of those cases. The Senate has held hearings on such a bill and so have House committees. There are at least three or four ways such a bill could have been brought to the floor in the last 3 years since the issue arose or in the last 3 weeks since the Supreme Court ruled. But instead, those opposing the gag rule chose to first depend on the Court saying the rule is unconstitutional in

the absence of a law instead of giving the Court a law to interpret—and that was a loser—and next to go for a temporary delay delayed until next October instead of legislating a solution now.

I do not see how anyone is served well by this approach unless it is some Washington lobbyists who want to keep the issue alive to justify their continued existence.

Today, we only have the choice of voting for or against a delay in implementing the rule and that will relieve some of the pressure to move a bill, but I urge the appropriate committees to move a bill which will settle the matter permanently.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Porter language regarding title X family planning clinics within the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and related agencies appropriations for fiscal year 1992.

Imagine the horror of being raped and becoming pregnant as a result. Imagine turning to your doctor for counseling and being told that she cannot discuss the option of your having an abortion because the Supreme Court agrees with the administration that abortion is not an appropriate method of family planning. Unfortunately, many women today do not have to imagine this scenario; for them, it is all too real.

The Supreme Court last month, in *Rust versus Sullivan*, upheld the constitutionality of Department of Health and Human Services' regulations—the so-called gag rule—prohibiting federally funded family planning clinics from providing any patient information about abortion. Implemented by the Reagan administration in 1988, these regulations prevent doctors, nurses, and counselors from mentioning abortion, even if specifically asked.

This Supreme Court decision, however, is not even primarily about abortion. It is about free speech, medical integrity, and the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship. It is about the trust that people—especially the poor—place in the Government to assist them in their most serious times of need. When women seek counseling on health matters, they should not have to question the honesty of their physician nor fear the motives behind their doctor's words.

Look at this decision from another perspective. Many of us, including the Bush administration, think that the legal appeals process is too lengthy and cumbersome. But could you imagine a federally appointed lawyer not telling a client of all the legal options? Do we ever want a public defender saying, "This office does not consider it appropriate to appeal wrongful convictions." This is what the Government, in effect, is doing through the gag rule. Because the Federal Government provides funding to the clinics, the administration thinks it can control the speech and agenda of the doctors. It is a dangerous and ominous precedent we set when we let the Government ignore the first amendment simply because it helps pay the bill.

The *Rust* decision is a tremendous blow to the rights of the 3.7 million women served at federally funded clinics across the country. In Texas alone, approximately 180 clinic sites provide such services. Essentially, the high court has ruled that low-income women do not have a right to complete information about their medical condition and legal options—the same rights and options guaranteed to women who visit their private physicians. Poor women have seen their rights become subservient to political posturing.

An estimated 600,000 women treated at federally funded health clinics have a history of health problems, such as diabetes or hypertension, that might make pregnancy dangerous for them. More and more patients are testing positive for sexually transmitted diseases, including AIDS. To not inform these women of the dangers associated with pregnancy is not only bad medicine but an invitation for medical malpractice.

To law school students and legal scholars throughout the country, Supreme Court decisions make for interesting intellectual and hypothetical debates. But to thousands and even millions of Americans, the decisions have a real and profound impact. The *Rust* decision is one of those rulings with practical effects on a large number of citizens. Pregnant women seeking counsel at Federal clinics will be denied assistance or will be given incomplete information and advice if the *Rust* decision becomes policy and if the gag rule continues in force. It is not surprising that many clinics intend to refuse Federal funding for their programs rather than compromise the ethical obligations of their doctors and counselors and the health needs of their patients.

With President Bush apparently unwilling to compromise, the burden falls on Congress to act. Congress must now pass this legislation, with the Porter language unamended and send a loud, clear signal to the Nation whether we want to side with the millions of American women who seek and deserve complete medical counsel and the 80 percent of Americans who oppose the *Rust* ruling in recent public opinion polls; or whether we want to side with narrow-minded officials whose zealotry against choice has led them to support the curtailment of first amendment guarantees and an encroachment into the sacred doctor-patient relationship. The choice is a clear one.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Chairman, because there is nothing more American than the right to free speech and, if this gag rule stands, next it will be on teachers and on ministers. I rise in strong support of this amendment.

This week the National Commission on Children released a report depicting the plight of our Nation's children and making an urgent plea of help to all Americans. The report makes clear that we must invest in the lives of these young Americans now or else forfeit their futures as well as that of our Nation as a whole.

We have also heard in recent weeks about providing a choice for our children in edu-

cation. But while we talk of increasing opportunities for American families we cannot deny the fact that one in five American children are living in poverty and have very few options. Many of these children do not even have a place to call home but instead must seek refuge in a shelter, at a relative's or in the back seat of an abandoned car. These children are so overlooked that we no longer even see them. They have become invisible.

I would like to share the accomplishments of some extraordinary children around the country that have come to my attention over the past few months.

There's Apollo, a sixth grader in Baltimore, who recently was tested as gifted and talented and is now excelling in the advanced academic program of his junior high school.

There's Tommie Jackson, a 9-year-old in Jacksonville, FL, who is so bright and getting such good grades his teachers want him to skip a grade.

There's Ronald, an award-winning high school artist in Minneapolis.

And there's Tio, a promising high school musician in Massachusetts.

All these kids have two things in common. They have talent. And they all have been homeless.

Over the past 2 years, I have heard so many stories of homeless children and their parents battling the odds as they try to stay off the streets and to keep their children in school.

Every year as many as 2 million children experience the horrors of homelessness. Homeless children face tremendous obstacles in their pursuit of an education and even the most conservative estimates from the Department of Education indicate that at least 67,000 homeless children do not attend school regularly. Unless we invest in these children now, we face spending billions in the decades ahead coping with a new generation of homeless adults unable to provide for themselves.

Last year in reauthorizing the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act Congress approved a measure I introduced that addresses the educational needs of homeless youngsters. Today the House of Representatives stands ready to approve a spending bill that contains this little-known but very successful program at a funding level that will enable our country to reap large economic dividends.

Currently the Education of Homeless Children and Youth Program is enabling thousands of homeless children across the country the opportunity to attend school and succeed once they get there. Under this program local educational agencies are now applying for grants to help provide transportation for homeless children, to set up before- and after-school care and tutoring programs, to recognize the gifted and talented among them, and to provide them with school supplies and a hot meal.

We are already seeing the results of these efforts throughout the country.

In Costa Mesa, CA school officials are setting up mobile units in areas where homeless families congregate so that children can be evaluated, tutored, and offered a quiet place to do their homework.

In Bismarck, ND, school officials are arranging cabfares at reduced rates so that kids in

shelters can continue to attend schools in their former neighborhoods.

In Baltimore, MD, a special program is successfully recruiting older students as volunteer tutors to help younger homeless kids with their schoolwork.

In my own congressional district of Rochester, NY, a special placement officer matches children with schools where they are most likely to succeed.

In all of these States educators have recognized the vital role school can play in the lives of homeless youth. For many of these children school has become the only source of stability and continuity in their tumultuous lives.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the homeless children living in the small towns and big cities of our country, I urge my colleagues to support passage of this important legislation.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to make it clear that I strongly support family planning and birth control and contraception.

On the issue of parental notification, however, if a child in Fairfax County, VA, cut his or her head at school, a parent is called before that child's head is stitched. If a child has a headache at school, a parent is called before the child can take an aspirin.

On the issue of abortion, I believe one parent should be notified.

Therefore, I believe it is appropriate that parental notification be included in this legislation.

□ 1510

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] for yielding time to me.

Let us not be fooled. This is not an abortion vote. Not 1 cent, despite the hysterics that we have heard, goes toward abortion. Not 1 cent goes toward advocating abortion, and I stand here absolutely overwhelmed by the implication that has been made that if you mention to a woman her legal right to an abortion, she is blindly going to follow that to fruition.

This is a vote to protect a woman's right to know. This is a vote to keep 4,500 family planning clinics open and a way to give over 4 million women an ability to avert an unwanted pregnancy. This is a vote to uphold and acknowledge the Constitution of the United States.

Oh, this will require an awful large amount of courage and honesty by those Members of this House who are antichoice. This vote requires them to acknowledge what the gag rule is all about, who it really hurts, and the untenable position it puts doctors and patients in.

Let us be clear about one thing when we vote on this: Whether this gag rule

is enforced, abortions will still take place in this country, but family planning clinics would close. The South Bronx Clinic has already stated that rather than be bound by Congress, they will close their doors and women will have nowhere to go in the South Bronx to get family planning information. Women all over America will be more vulnerable to the heavy hand of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the Nation is watching. Women, alone, frightened, and challenged, are watching. Future generations hopefully will see a country that respects our laws and our women.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. (Mr. WHEAT). The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] has 9 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] has 18½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, let us face what is going on here. This whole procedure is the means of avoiding a vote on the floor of this House on parental notification. That is what is going on.

I am the vice chairman of the House Environment Subcommittee, the policy committee which has responsibility for reauthorizing title X. Twice in the last month we have had markups scheduled, and the chairman of that subcommittee knows full well that we have a bipartisan vote to put parental notification into this law. What do they do when they do not want to have a rollcall vote on parental notification on the floor of the House? They go around the back door and they get an amendment to an appropriation bill that precludes a vote on this issue. That is what is going on, and I resent that very much.

This House should have the opportunity and the responsibility to put its votes where about 90 percent of the American public is, that if family planning is going to give counsel to minors, they have the responsibility of notifying the parent before they give that kind of advice. Of the 1½ million abortions every year and this year in this country, a third of them or 500,000 is on teenage mothers. That is a tragedy for this country, and I happen to believe that parents have the responsibility of raising their children, not the Federal Government. They should be the ones to decide whether or not this abortion is to take place.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, reminding my colleagues that this subject is about the gag rule, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman. I would recall for the Members that this is a situation in

which free men and women must again resist the subtle tyranny of ideology over knowledge.

Last month, the Supreme Court vacated the lower court orders that had temporarily restrained the abortion gag rule—the policy, adopted by the Reagan administration, that prohibits federally funded medical clinics from making available to their patients any information on abortion. The decision in *Rust versus Sullivan* provides further evidence of the long-term damage to our freedoms likely to flow from the Reagan-Bush appointments to the Supreme Court.

In its 5 to 4 decision in *Rust*, the Supreme Court decided that the Government does not violate the Constitution by imposing these restrictions on the professional advice given by medical practitioners. There are sound arguments that, legally, the majority opinion is the wrong one, and that the four dissenting Justices had the better-reasoned position. But, the majority has ruled, and, under our system, that means the Government can constitutionally adopt such a policy. Whether the Government should adopt such a policy, however, is an entirely different matter.

Under our form of government, it is this institution—Congress—that writes the laws, and we can change the gag rule adopted by the executive branch.

I believe we should do so, and do so without delay. Because the gag rule is an assault on the medical profession and a threat to women.

For today, we can do the next best thing the prohibit the use of any money to enforce the gag rule. That will effectively constrain application of the rule during the next fiscal year. This funding restriction will pass the House and, I hope, the Senate. But President Bush seems determined to ignore good medicine and the good judgment of the vast majority of Americans and promises to veto this bill on this account. That would be a literal shame, and I wish he'd reconsider.

The gag rule was clearly intended to be an indirect check on a woman's constitutional right to an abortion. And I will oppose all efforts, direct or indirect, to limit or interfere with that right. But, despite the motivation of its authors, this policy does not raise a question about abortion so much as it does about the availability of comprehensive and accurate medical advice—and about the Government's role in helping make that advice available, or in denying it.

I understand that the authors of the gag rule do not believe that abortions are right—and so they decided that when the Government provides funds for health care, those funds should not be used to provide information or advice on abortions.

But let's remember that there are people who sincerely believe that taking medicine is not right, that it's an affront to God, and that prayer should be the only response to illness. None of us would stand still if these beliefs were translated into a medicine gag rule preventing Government-funded health clinics from using prescriptions. We would all recognize this as unconscionable Government interference with health care and with the professional responsibilities of nurses and physicians.

Yet such a farfetched policy is not so very different from the abortion gag rule. The gag rule keeps doctors from saying anything to their patients about one of their medical choices—about abortion, a choice that not only is for now constitutionally protected, but also could even be necessary to save the woman's life. Gagging the doctors places them in an untenable situation: Uphold the law and lie, possibly endangering your patient, perhaps committing malpractice; or reject the law, serve the patient's best interest, and face possible criminal charges.

When people go to see a doctor, they do so because they have a medical problem. They want, need, and deserve the best possible medical treatment, information, and advice. Some government official's opinion about politically correct medical choices is not only irrelevant, it's dangerous. The government has no place in the middle of the doctor-patient relationship. The government belongs in courtrooms and statehouses—not in examining rooms.

And, as is tragically so often the case with a policy intended to oppose abortion, the major victims of the gag rule are among the most vulnerable of people—low-income women, who have no health care alternative to a government-funded clinic. If the gag rule keeps their doctors from giving them comprehensive and accurate medical advice, the patients are left in the dark. Some may end up seeking abortions in a back alley. And some of them may die from the poor medical care they receive in those back alleys.

The gag rule makes no sense. Congress can change it, and Congress should change it. We must not stand by as doctors are prevented from talking to their patients, and as patients are prevented from learning about legitimate medical choices.

We face the subtle tyranny of an ideology, based on a particular set of religious beliefs, a tyranny being exerted over science, medicine, and freedom of speech. I respect the right of adherents to those beliefs to hold them, but not to impose them on others. That is a tyranny we cannot—and will not—permit to stand.

Let us vote to overturn the gag rule.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker tried to intimate that this is a vote on parental notification. It clearly is not. If there is avoidance here, it is directly relating to the issue of advice, not of counsel. It is not of counsel, not even of advice, but of information. If there is anything that is the hallmark of this country, it is that people have a right to know what the law is and what their options are. That is what this amendment is about, nothing more, nothing less.

The gentlewoman from New York was absolutely correct, this is not about abortion or choice. It is about information and the ability of a patient, the ability of a client to have full ac-

cess to the information that morally ought to be theirs.

Mr. Chairman, Justices Blackmun and Marshall said the Sullivan versus Rust decision:

\*\*\* upholds view-point based suppression of speech solely because it is imposed on those dependent on the Government for economic support.

By interpreting the statute to authorize the regulation of abortion-related speech between physician and patient \*\*\* the Secretary and now the Court, have rejected a constitutionally sound construction in favor of one that is by no means clearly constitutional

Under the Court's reasoning,

The first amendment could be read to tolerate any governmental restriction upon an employee's speech so long as that restriction is limited to the funded workplace.

The Government's articulated interest in distorting the doctor-patient dialogue—ensuring that Federal funds are not spent for a purpose outside the scope of the program—falls far short of that necessary to justify suppression of truthful information and professional medical opinion regarding constitutionally protected conduct.

The gag rule conflicts with the professional ethics and guidelines of major medical organizations, including the AMA, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, and the American Academy of Pediatricians which insist on a patient's right to full information.

Health care professionals will be at risk for medical malpractice.

The health of low-income women and adolescents would be compromised because the number of unwanted pregnancies and abortions would increase as a result of the decrease in the number of skilled family planning providers.

A two-tiered health-care system would result with low-income women receiving more limited care and information from federally funded providers compared to affluent women who can afford private health-care providers.

Except in cases of emergency, health-care providers would be prohibited from providing counseling even when abortion is necessary for a woman's health. Providers would be prohibited from answering a direct question regarding abortion, other than to say, "The project does not consider abortion an appropriate method of family planning."

Providers are compelled to choose between offering only Government approved information to pregnant women or forgoing Federal funds.

Providers are prohibited from providing a client with a page from the yellow pages listing clinics where abortion information and services may be obtained.

Providers are prohibited from providing accurate, objective information about abortion in education programs.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am envious of my colleagues who see the issue of abortion in black and white terms. There are those of us who struggle on this floor with each issue that comes up relating to abortion, trying to find what is reasonable and just.

Prior to my election to Congress, I practiced law. One of my specialties

was medical malpractice. I would like to say to this body that the fundamental principle of medical practice in America is informed consent. Unless a patient is informed of all of his legal and medical options and then consents to a medical procedure, a doctor is not permitted under law to perform any medical procedure on that patient. The gag rule and the Rust decision in the Supreme Court preempt the ethical and legal obligations of a medical doctor. That rule denies a doctor the right to fully advise a patient of her legal, medical options. That is why it is opposed by the American Medical Association and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

I would hope that a woman advised of her right to an abortion would still choose to carry her baby to term. But basically she is entitled to the right to know. The gag rule strikes at the heart of the doctor-patient relationship. It is the ultimate intrusion of Government into one of the most sacred relationships under common law. If the Government can silence a doctor from meeting his ethical obligation, if the Government can deny a patient access to information necessary to make an informed consent, then the Government has gone too far.

Mr. Chairman, President Bush is wrong with this gag rule, and the Supreme Court is wrong in sustaining it. The sacred, confidential relationship between a doctor and a patient should be beyond the reach of politics.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the bill's language which forbids the use of funds to enforce the gag rule in title X family planning clinics.

It was the intent of Congress in authorizing our Nation's family planning program—title X of the Public Health Service Act—in 1970, that all women, regardless of their economic circumstances, have access to complete information regarding the options available for managing their health, an illness, or pregnancy. Such information is readily available to women who can privately pay for their health care—it should be equally available to women whose care is subsidized by Government funding. Without question, all patients have a fundamental right to know.

Basic to this health care has always been the ability of health-care provider to equip the patient with the knowledge to make her own reproductive choices. I strongly support the title X family planning program as an impor-

tant means of helping low-income women prevent unintended pregnancy. Over \$1.2 million allocated annually to Connecticut clinics serves nearly 50,000 patients, providing valuable preventive health care services, diagnosis and treatment of disease, and contraceptive methods.

Mr. Chairman, democracy rests on two assumptions: First, that men and women are good, and, second, that given knowledge, they will do the right thing—they will act responsibly.

During the McCarthy era in America, we had great debates about whether, given knowledge, people would act in a morally responsible fashion. After serious and at times stormy national debate, we decided, that knowledge was not to be feared. We decided democracy must provide knowledge freely and trust people to draw the right conclusions. So we gave our students the right to read the Communist Manifesto, to understand communism, because we knew if we taught them about communism and freedom, they would choose freedom.

There is only one group that we do not trust with knowledge, and that is children. As a matter of public policy and parental action, we do censor information for children because we know there is a limit to their ability to handle knowledge responsibly.

Mr. Chairman, this debate that we are having is not about abortion. It is about whether women will have access to knowledge, whether women have a right to know or are to be subject to censorship by Government as children are by parents. And, indirectly, it is about whether women can be trusted, given knowledge, to act in a morally responsible fashion. Make no mistake about it, this is not an abortion issue but a profoundly important matter of the moral equality of women.

□ 1520

Today, we must face squarely whether America, the leader of the free world, believes that women should have free access to knowledge and whether women can exercise and manage knowledge with the same level of moral responsibility as men.

The gag rule proposal is unprecedented. At no time have we ever considered as a matter of public policy censoring information for any group of citizens, much less a group defined by sex. I urge Members to recognize this issue for the profoundly important matter it is and oppose the gag rule.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the coauthor of the antigag rule.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the Porter amendment is obviously concerned with abortion, but it is much more fundamental than that. It is concerning the honest relationship between citizens and their government.

The issue is whether a poor woman coming to a title X-funded family planning clinic, typically her only and primary source of health care, whether the Government can withhold from her, when she declares that she has an unintended pregnancy and specifically asks for help, the information that she needs to exercise her constitutional right—whether the Government can in effect lie to her.

Mr. Chairman, most of our citizens say wait a minute. Of course the Government must tell people the truth. Not the partial truth, but the whole truth. This is America. This is not the way we do things in America.

Physicians and nurses have condemned the gag rule as a politicization of medicine, an unconscionable intrusion between doctor and patient, a rule, that if implemented, would require them to violate medical ethics and subject them to malpractice suits.

Mr. Chairman, the House is, by passing this amendment, sending an unmistakable message to President Bush: No matter how you feel about abortions, the gag rule is beyond the pale. It is unacceptable, because it destroys the vital relationship of faith that must exist in a free society between the governed and their government.

Mr. Chairman, the opponents are afraid to ask for a vote on this matter because they know that this is so. I believe that when the President hears from Republicans, like this one, and there are many, many of us all across this country, hears from members of the medical profession, hears from people everywhere that this is unacceptable, that he will in fact listen, and that he will ultimately sign this bill into law and prevent the gag rule from being implemented.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Porter language contained in the bill and in opposition to the gag rule.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I think all of those who have spoken know that there is no Federal Government money that is spent for abortions. If a referral is made for an abortion, it is done in a separate facility.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an abortion issue. I commend the committee and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for blocking funding to implement the gag rule from Title X family planning. This issue is worded very carefully in the law right now. It says that no money can flow to organizations that promote abortion as a means of family planning.

Well, no organization does that, and no one here supports that.

This wording has been interpreted by the Reagan and Bush administrations as meaning that no money can flow to any organization if they counsel a woman about their full range of options concerning a pregnancy. In fact, they are forbidden from telling a woman all of her options concerning her pregnancy, no matter how sick she is, no matter if she is carrying a seriously malformed fetus, no matter what her desperate condition might be.

Mr. Chairman, this is an issue concerning medical-governmental ethics. How can we sit here in Washington and mandate what a doctor tells a patient? This is an issue concerning the first amendment. We are limiting the freedom of speech. This is an issue concerning discrimination. A woman with money can get appropriate medical advice denied to a poor woman.

Mr. Chairman, I again commend the committee. This onerous gag rule has been with us for too long. I commend the committee for removing it from the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have a list of not 20 organizations which were mentioned, but 50 organizations, which support removal of the gag rule from title X family planning, which I submit for the RECORD.

SUPPORT FAMILY PLANNING AND ELIMINATE THE "GAG" RULE

- Ambulatory Pediatric Association.
- American Academy of Family Practitioners.
- American Academy of Nurse Practitioners.
- American Academy of Pediatrics.
- American College of Nurse Midwives.
- The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.
- American College of Physicians.
- American Fertility Society.
- American Hospital Association.
- American Medical Association.
- American Medical Women's Association.
- American Nurses Association.
- American Public Health Association.
- American Psychiatric Association.
- Association of American Medical Colleges.
- Association of Professors of Gynecology and Obstetrics.
- Association of Reproductive Health Professionals.
- The Organization of Obstetric, Gynecologic & Neonatal Nurses.
- National Association of Community Health Centers.
- National Association of Neonatal Nurses.
- National Conference of Gerontological Nurse Practitioners.
- National Organizations of Nurse Practitioner Faculties.
- Society of Adolescent Medicine.
- American Association of University Women.
- American Baptist Churches.
- American Jewish Committee.
- American Jewish Congress.
- Anti-Defamation League.
- Business and Professional Women/USA.
- Catholics for a Free Choice.
- League of Women Voters.
- Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund.
- Mexican-American Women's National Association.
- National Association of State Boards of Education.

National Audubon Society/Population Program.

National Churches of Christ.  
National Council of Jewish Women.  
National Education Association.  
National Organization of Women.  
National Urban League.  
Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

National Women's Political Caucus.  
Population Institute.  
Population-Environment Balance.  
Union of American Hebrew Congregations.  
United Methodist Church.  
Women's Legal Defense Fund.  
Zero Population Growth.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WHEAT). The Chair would advise Members that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, our precious Bill of Rights is at risk, and women's lives are at risk, unless this Congress acts. President Bush, supported by the Supreme Court, would censor advice and even information that doctors can give their patients in federally funded family planning clinics. Women would not be told that abortion is a medical option, even if they ask.

A woman who can afford a private doctor can get complete health care information. Should President Bush and the Supreme Court prevent poor women from getting the same information? Should President Bush and the Supreme Court force censorship into the health care system?

Mr. Chairman, today I ask Members to join me in telling President Bush and the Supreme Court that it is not OK to censor doctors.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN].

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill, and particularly in support of the section which overturns the erroneous Supreme Court decision.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Porter amendment and in support of the basic premise that government should not seek to undermine what is a clear right granted under Roe versus Wade and under the Constitution: A woman's right to information about all legitimate reproductive options.

Last month, the Supreme Court determined that the first amendment does not apply to physicians providing family planning services—that it can restrict the information doctors provide when counseling patients at crucial times in their personal, private lives.

As a result of this, we will find more tragic, backalley abortions and incredibly complicated situations developing in the lives of people who simply need firm, informative, nondirective counseling by people trained to advise them about their reproductive rights and options.

Medical censorship by the Federal Government leverages Federal funding against family planning clinics in order to deny them the freedom to counsel honestly and objectively. It prevents total disclosure of information that a patient has a right to know and robs women dependent on Federal funding of their right to know and to choose.

Medical censorship by the Federal Government nibbles away at the reproductive health rights of people who are reliant to some degree on the Federal budget. These gag rule regulations also conflict with laws in nearly 40 States that recognize a legal right of recovery for lack of informed consent. Failure to discuss all options upon request may make providers liable for medical malpractice.

We here in Congress have an obligation both to reaffirm the majority's views on free speech and on abortion, and to guarantee our rights as Americans to speak and be counseled freely. I am confident that we will do that today by passing the Porter amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, the program before us has become a lightning rod for the debate on the question of whether a woman has a right to an abortion. But the simple truth is—the Supreme Court has decided that a woman does have that right—and the title X program has not, and will not under this bill, pay for abortion services. The family planning program has proven its value and rightfully deserves reauthorization.

The focus of our debate today is the discriminatory policies the administration has selected to restrict a woman's access to her constitutional right to an abortion and the denial of physicians' and counselors' rights to free speech. The administration's regulatory gag rule requires that physicians treat patients differently depending on their financial status.

Women with money can receive full and truthful counseling about their options, including abortion; those who are forced to rely on the government for their health care and family planning services are denied comprehensive pregnancy counseling.

Over 20 national medical and nursing associations oppose the gag rule including such eminently conservative groups as the American Medical Association, the American Nurses Association, and the American Academy of Pediatrics.

These groups are opposed to the gag rule because it represents unprecedented and unacceptable government interference with sound medical practice. The regulations require health professionals to violate their code of

ethics and to expose themselves to malpractice lawsuits. There is no precedent whatsoever for such a radical departure from medical practice or medical ethics over the decades which not only encourages but requires a doctor to withhold information.

The government is limiting what doctors can say confidentially to patients, an abridgement of both patients' and doctors' rights. It is a perversion of medical practice.

The implications are frightening. The government can now tell doctors, We don't like this treatment—so you can't discuss it with your patients. And if you do discuss it you forgo your rights to any Federal benefits.

Under this logic, tobacco companies could now put pressure on Federal authorities to prohibit doctors from informing patients of the links between tobacco smoking and lung cancer because, as the companies have continually maintained, no absolute cause and effect relationship has been established.

If you forget for one moment that the issue before us is abortion, it is inconceivable that Americans would tolerate a similar policy affecting a doctor's absolute right to advise patients freely, or their ability to consult the full range of health care options available to them.

If passed, H.R. 2707 has the power to restore fairness to family planning services and give women the information necessary to make their own health care decisions.

□ 1530

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

What is happening in our country today? How could we have come to the point where the Congress of the United States or the Supreme Court of the United States believe that they can dictate what doctors can say to their patients or prescribe the treatments that doctors can discuss with their patients.

The gag rule is both repugnant and outrageous, and the Reagan and Bush Supreme Court's decision to uphold it is unbelievable.

Do the opponents of abortion really believe that if they control the speech of doctors they can stop women from receiving abortions? Do they really believe that if they can control the speech of doctors they can control women's minds and actions?

Mr. Chairman, this is a bizarre Orwellian practice that we are engaging in here.

The real issue is not abortion. The real issue is whether or not Congress will allow doctors to fulfill their Hippocratic oaths and practice medicine.

The real issue is whether or not Congress will stand up for women's health and women's rights.

I am proud to join with my colleagues today in voting for a bill which withholds funding for enforcing the gag rule until this body can pass appropriate legislation which repeals this offensive restriction on free speech.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Members of the committee, the gag rule is insulting and degrading to women in this country. It speaks volumes about how we look at women and treat women in this country.

There has been no evidence since the enactment of title X 20 years ago of violating the interpretation of title X, which has been supported by this Congress time and again. And that is to provide information, full medical information to women depending on their circumstances.

There has been no evidence to suggest that it has gone above and beyond that, and it is important to understand that. We must put a stop to this ideological spree that threatens family planning throughout this country and will decimate family planning for low-income women.

The opponents of family planning have an obligation and responsibility to tell Members what alternative they are going to provide to the low-income women, because they are going to be denied those services. We saw this international gag rule imposed on family planning clinics throughout this world and now we are seeking to impose that absurdity on domestic family planning clinics. The President has said this is a personal decision. This is not a decision then that should be made by a decidedly impersonal government.

Mr. Chairman, as we discuss the question of title X and the gag rule regulations, I would like to remind my colleagues of a couple of salient facts.

First is that title X as enacted in 1970, stated that funds could not be provided for abortion as a method of family planning. It doesn't say anything about banning counseling or referral—only actual abortions.

Well, in fact, no funds have been used for that purpose. And if the gag rule regulations are overturned, as this bill provides, no money will be used for nontherapeutic abortions. So it is inaccurate for anyone to suggest that these regulations in any way prevent Federal funds from going for abortions—that's not at issue.

Now, we have heard some people suggesting of late that these regulations don't actually ban the use of the word abortion. I suppose, in an exceedingly limited sense, that is true. A counselor, if asked, can say, "I can't provide abortion counseling or referral, but I can tell you the services we do provide."

That is hardly of any assistance to a woman seeking full information on the situation she

faces. The regulations are as explicit as they could be in banning discussion, and it is disingenuous to sugarcoat it in any other fashion.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen what a gag rule in family planning can do, since one has been in effect internationally under the Mexico City policy—the international gag rule. Rather than reduce the number of abortions, evidence suggests that, under Mexico City, they have likely increased.

Thirty to forty percent of the 500,000 annual maternal deaths worldwide are due to self-induced or unsafe abortion. Complication from pregnancy, childbirth, and unsafe abortions are the leading killers of women of reproductive age throughout the developing nations—the nations affected by the international gag rule.

All of these things have occurred in the wake of a policy designed to curb abortion—a demonstrably failed policy that supporters of the title X gag rule now want to foist on American women.

My colleagues, on June 4, President Bush made a good point in a letter to the congressional leadership. He wrote, "Abortion is a difficult, deeply emotional and very personal decision for all Americans."

Yet with this gag rule, this difficult and deeply emotional decision would no longer be a very personal one for low-income American women: This very personal decision is made for them by a decidedly impersonal Federal Government.

That runs afoul of a prime tenet of health counseling and medicine, as one law professor pointed out: That the patient, not the counselor, must be free to make the final decision about his or her physical well-being.

Somehow, Mr. Chairman, it always comes down to treating women differently than men, whether we're talking about inattention to health needs, inequity in the workplace, or other problems. Women are expected to live with and accept restrictions from which men are exempt.

This gag rule is a restriction without parallel for men. The Federal Government is not limiting what a doctor can say to a low-income male patient. But it is doing so for women.

Frankly, my fear is what will next be restricted for women. Perhaps they will ban clinics receiving Federal funds from telling women that they are pregnant, since pregnancy is a necessary precondition for abortion.

This is an absurd example, to be sure—but it is no more absurd, insulting, and degrading than the proposed gag rule regulations. American women and men are watching this issue very carefully, to see how willing the Federal Government is to intrude in the examining room. They don't like it one bit, Mr. Chairman, and neither do I, so I urge my colleagues to support the gag rule repeal contained in this bill.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER].

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, it is precisely because the international programs mentioned by the gentlewoman in the well have worked so effectively since we got them out of the abortion business that we should have no real fear about the imposition of the title X

regulations. Those programs are operating today in South America, the Philippines, and in other parts of the world more effectively than when they were in the abortion business precisely because they are not running counter to the culture which is profamily planning but deeply antiabortion.

Mr. Chairman, in an otherwise excellent bill, the Porter amendment stands out as a glaring flaw. I want to emphasize, I intend to vote for this bill. I urge all Members to vote for this bill. It is an excellent bill that includes many important programs.

But I hope that this unfortunate flaw is corrected in the conference committee. And if it is necessary, I will support a Presidential veto to correct this flaw.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] calls this bill the people's bill. That is one of the reasons that Members who serve on the subcommittee are so proud to be a part of it. It is also a family and children's bill. We save lives with NIH funding. We protect small children with infant immunizations. We help get youngsters off on a right start in school with Head Start and healthy start funds.

Title X is supposed to fit comfortably into that web of programs. It is supposed to strengthen families by helping them to plan their childbirths.

But we found out in the 1980's that there was a problem. Title X was not being used to plan families but to destroy unborn children. That is offensive to me. It is offensive to many.

It is unfortunate but that is the evidence. This regulation did not fall out of a tree. It was not plucked out of the air. It grew out of the realization and the evidence that planned parenthood clinics specifically and other title X funded clinics were disproportionately referring pregnant women that walked in their doors for abortions. Over 85 percent of pregnant women that walk into planned parenthood clinics end up aborting.

That is offensive to many. It helps destroy the consensus that should exist in support of a real family-planning program that fits into a bill that should strengthen and nurture families, not tear them apart.

Regulations were promulgated to build a wall, yes, a wall, not to keep out family planning but to protect family planning programs, build a wall between family planning and abortion.

Let us talk about what it does not do. It does not prevent any woman who needs an abortion because her life is endangered from receiving one. That is specifically excepted in the language of the regulations.

Second of all, it does not prohibit a provider from using the word "abortion." We have heard that doctors are going to be slapped into jail because they use the word "abortion." It simply states that title X programs are

not engaged in the abortion referral, counseling or providing business and physicians or other health care providers, if asked about abortion, simply say, "This program does not engage in those services." And they provide the patient with a list of other clinics to which they can go to get a range of other forms of advice which may well include information about the availability of abortion.

That is what the title X regulations actually will do. The Porter amendment tears down that wall.

What does that mean? Does it mean that we make abortion illegal? No. Prochoice side has correctly stated, we are not talking about the legality of abortion. We should be talking about an easier issue, from my standpoint, not whether or not we are going to permit abortion, which I understand is divisive, but about whether or not the Federal Government is going to advocate and subsidize and promote and encourage abortion. That ought to be an easier issue for this body.

I have talked to many on the prochoice side of the issue that say they believe in the right to choice, but they are disturbed about abortion, concerned about abortion. They certainly do not want to encourage it. They certainly do not want to subsidize it.

What title X will be doing, if the Porter amendment prevails, is putting the Government not in the business of allowing abortions but promoting it and encouraging it through its family planning programs.

My God, we already have the most liberal abortion laws on the planet, outside of China where it is virtually a requirement. Must we go further and require taxpayers, regardless of their consciences, to advocate abortion.

In many ways this is worse than a violation of the Hyde amendment, which says we will not pay for an abortion specifically, because this may well induce a woman who would otherwise not have an abortion to have one. That is why this issue is important and, as I said, that is why this issue ought to be a relatively easier issue.

Furthermore, if, as I am told, a Member rises and raises a point of order against the parental notification amendment later in the bill, parents will have no voice in this fundamental decision after the Federal Government has paid health care personnel to encourage their daughter to have an abortion. That is an abomination.

So this bill that should exist to nurture families, to strengthen families, to help children, will drive a wedge between parents and their children and will put American taxpayers in the position of subsidizing abortion.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to join with the gentleman in his

remarks and agree with him and rise in opposition to the Porter amendment.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, vote for the bill, but get ready to support the veto.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WHEAT). The Chair advises the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] that he has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] that she has 6½ minutes remaining.

The Chair further advises the gentleman from Michigan that by virtue of the fact that he is a member of the committee and there is no amendment pending, he has the right to close debate.

□ 1540

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Porter language included in H.R. 2707 which denies the use of funding in the bill to implement the gag rule.

It is vital that Congress take every action possible to overturn the Supreme Court decision in *Rust versus Sullivan*. This decision has devastating ramifications for poor women in this country; it will create a class system for women's health by denying poor women full information about their legal reproductive options, while women who can afford private physician care will have complete information and access to these health services. Thus, this decision will further exacerbate the already insufficient health care available to poor women. They represent the most at-risk population, and yet the gag rule will further erode their ability to obtain health services, even when they are the victims of rape, incest, or life-threatening illnesses.

It will also set a dangerous precedent by denying first amendment rights to health professionals and breaking their obligation to their patients to provide complete information. In fact, this decision is expected to result in the departure of many family planning providers from the title X program; thereby further eroding the health of poor women and increasing the number of unintended pregnancies and abortions. Family planning providers will have to choose between providing complete information to their clients and losing Federal funding, or providing only government approved information in order to receive Federal support. This is not a choice that should have to be made in a free society: a society that prides itself on the right to free speech.

This issue is one that should have the support of every Member of this House, regardless of their view on abortion. It establishes a dangerous system of censorship that could be repeated for any number of Federal programs and it dis-

criminate against poor women. In a health system that already provides inadequate care to low-income people, this decision only widens the gap between the haves and the have nots.

I urge my colleagues to support the committee bill and the Porter language. Congress must clearly establish its intent on the gag rule and express its support for equal access to complete information in federally funded family planning programs.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I thank the Chair of the committee for bringing this very important bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, at the time that this bill was voted on in the committee on which I have the privilege of serving, I spoke to my colleagues about this particular Porter amendment. At that time I told them that gathered in that Appropriations Committee room were people with great experience and great knowledge on many subjects, but although a new member on the committee, I thought I knew about something a little more than they did, and that was how it felt to be a woman hearing the news that this administration did not want women to have all the information available to them about their own family planning and their right of freedom of choice.

The gag rule lacks respect for women. How do you know how women will decide when they go into a clinic? With the best information, they will choose the best solution for them.

The gag rule does not respect women. Those who support notification should support this Porter amendment, because this amendment enables a mother and child to receive the information that they need when they go in together.

Those who oppose Porter would not allow a mother even to be able to receive the counseling to give to her own daughter.

I urge support for this bill.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, since fiscal year 1989, poor women in the District of Columbia have suffered in a way that no other women in the United States have suffered on issues of reproductive choice. We have been unable to use our own tax-raised funds to finance abortion in derogation of every principle of democracy and home rule.

We have a crack epidemic in this Capital City, but abortion righters have effectively forced crack addicts to bear seriously damaged children, and then abandon them as boarder babies in our hospitals, creating a crisis on top of a crisis.

Now comes the gag rule. Our clinics will be unable even to advise poor

women of where to go for funds or advice in lieu of seeking help in the District. This is not a rule. This is a cruel edict unworthy of any American court or of the Congress.

Please vote against a two-tiered system of reproductive rights, and please remember those women most cruelly affected, those who live within blocks of the Capitol and are most in need.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thought we were going to get the Government off the American people's back. But what rude beast is this slouching toward us under the guise of compassion for life and support of family?

The other side would at one point gag the health professionals; doctors and nurses cannot mutter the "A" word even if the young woman's life is at risk. Is that compassion for the sanctity of life?

Then with one amazing leap of legerdemain, they want to compel young woman to get permission from their parents, no matter how dysfunctional a family, even if such disclosure might put the young woman at risk of physical abuse or worse. Is this compassion for the sanctity of life?

Gag the professionals, force the kids to talk. They do not want the Federal Government to interfere. What a joke.

At first blush, parental notification sounds innocuous. Young adults should be able to communicate their most intimate problems with both their parents, but sometimes that just cannot or should not happen. Last November, after a hard-fought campaign, the people of Oregon rejected a parental-notification referendum.

I urge my colleagues to have the same insight and courage.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes, the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, by now we know that this bill as it stands prohibits the enforcement of the gag rule, and that is good, and that is a victory for freedom.

By passing this bill, Congress will say that this administration, and no other, and this Supreme Court, and no other, cannot gag our American citizens, cannot force them to lie to other American citizens.

Imagine, a doctor cannot tell a woman in America in 1991 that abortion is a legal option. This gag rule is more than an insult to the American people. It is more than a bad policy for the American people. It is an attack on the fundamental freedoms of America.

How does this administration and this Supreme Court reach to gag these doctors and these nurses? They do it, because these doctors and nurses receive Federal funds for their clinics. Imagine, Federal funds being collected

from the American people to be used against the American people. Imagine using Federal funds as a hammer to pound on the truth.

You take the King's shilling, you speak the King's language. I thought we had a revolution about that.

I say it is time to trust the American people with the truth. I say it is time to get Big Brother Federal Government out of our private and personal lives. Think of it, it is a doctor gagged today, a teacher gagged tomorrow, and they get Federal funds, it is a writer gagged, it is an artist gagged, it is a reporter gagged. Where does it stop? I say it stops here in this House of the people. I say it stops today in this House of the people.

If President Bush vetoes freedom, we will work day and night to restore it. Support this bill and support freedom.

I thank you, my colleagues, for this fine debate.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes, the remainder of my time, to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

□ 1550

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for the Porter language, so that all women, regardless of their ability to pay, can be fully informed of their rights.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2707 and in particular commend my colleague from Illinois, Mr. PORTER for including language in this bill to block the implementation of the so-called gag rule. The debate surrounding the gag rule is not only about abortion, but is about the importance of the doctor-patient relationship and freedom of speech.

There are some 5 million women who are served annually by title X funded family planning clinics for a variety of reasons from cancer screenings to prenatal care for maternal advice. Some of these women also come to title X facilities with unintended, crisis, or unhealthy pregnancies in search of medical advice. However, despite the fact that medical advice is openly given in health clinics across the United States, that medical advice only goes so far. Because of the gag rule, these women cannot receive all the information they should know about how to treat their pregnancy.

The sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship is critical to promoting the good health. For thousands of years, the faith and trust in doctor-patient relationship has been the paradigm of medical practice. If that doctor-patient relationship is curbed or muzzled by the government, then the trust behind that relationship is destroyed and informed consent will no longer exist.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Porter language, support the overturn of the gag rule and allow doctors to tell their patients the truth.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in the libertarian im-

pulse I have seen from surprising circles. "Get the government off your back; get the government out of medical offices." That libertarian impulse does not extend, though, to, "Get the government out of your pocket," when it comes to making you pay for abortions, then the libertarian impulse disappears.

There is no gag rule. Must we govern ourselves by bumper stickers and slogans? Nobody is gagged if a woman comes in and is pregnant, to a clinic that does not deal with pregnant women, it deals with women who do not want to get pregnant. It deals with women who are infertile and want to get pregnant. It does not deal with pregnant women. A person might go see a chiropodist or a brain surgeon, but this clinic does not have a program to deal with pregnant women.

The doctor does not say, "Out, we will not talk to you. I am gagged. I have no freedom of speech." The doctor reaches on his table and hands the woman a list of clinics that will advise her on her rights and her options. They advise both ways. It is a balanced list. She is given a place where she can learn of her options. That is what the program does.

Now, really, what is at stake, is an unbridgeable gap. There is an unbridgeable gap between those who value the unborn as less significant than the rights of autonomy or sovereignty that the pregnant woman wishes to assert. That is paramount, and the rights of the unborn are not only secondary, they do not count. Those Members on the other side say that tiny little atom of humanity surrounded by a woman called "mother" is a member of the human family, and we ought to be including more people in the circle of those that society will exercise responsibility for, including the handicapped, the aged, and the unwanted and unborn. Society that is caring and humane takes care of its people at the margin.

We do not do enough. I understand that, and I concede that. We have to do more. However, killing is not a humane solution to anything.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that our colleagues who oppose a woman's right to choice have decided not to offer an amendment to strike the Porter amendment from this appropriations bill. This decision on their part clearly shows how this issue transcends the traditional abortion debate. This issue is not so much about abortion, but about privacy, free speech, and health care.

The choice to seek an abortion is a medical decision. Any rule that prohibits the simple mention by a physician of a valid option of care to the patient is wrong.

It is particularly disturbing that it has become the policy of this administration to impose upon the privacy of a doctor-patient relationship. When a woman with an unintended pregnancy asks about medical assistance, she should be informed of all the options before

her—prenatal care and delivery, adoption, and abortion. It is contrary to the values of our society to deny individuals information necessary in order to make a well thought out decision.

It is totally unacceptable that under the administration's rule even if a woman directly requests information about where to obtain an abortion, the provider is prohibited from sharing that information. Just as we would allow and expect a physician to counsel a cancer patient on all of the latest treatments and medicines, so too should physicians be able to counsel pregnant women on all available, legal, and appropriate medical procedures. We cannot expect women to make an informed decision about their future health and well-being if they are not given the necessary facts about their options. If the gag rule is upheld, we as Members of Congress are counseling physicians across the country to commit malpractice.

Withholding information from the general public is a dangerous precedent to set. That is exactly what this rule accomplishes. We must ask ourselves, on what grounds can the government limit the information given to our citizens? The people this policy would affect most acutely are those who use federally funded family planning clinics—primarily low-income women. With the upholding of the gag rule, the administration effectively discriminates against those who are less fortunate.

Those who wish to strike this language from the appropriations bill, would like to turn this debate into one on abortion. But if those individuals were to examine the gag rule carefully they would find it has little to do with abortion. Rather it concerns the rights of women to receive adequate information necessary to their health care; regardless of their economic background.

Congress should not condone any limitation on the knowledge of a patient in need of medical care. All women in this country should have the same right to information, regardless of where they seek their medical care.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the subcommittee and its chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], for acknowledging the importance of evaluating ways to manage the care of frail elderly Medicare beneficiaries. Appropriating funds to continue demonstration projects authorized under section 4027(f) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 will assure that Congress receives better information on how to effectively manage care provided to this special population. In the long run, this has the potential of reducing health care costs and improving quality of care by ensuring that the proper mix of diagnostic and therapeutic services are utilized, throughout the patient's episode of illness.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, the debate we are continuing today really began 15 years ago. But throughout all of the general counsel opinions, program guidelines, and litigation, Congress has never before voted to require federally funded family planning clinics to assist women to obtain abortions.

The issue before us is not about free speech. It is about subsidized speech. Let us not fool ourselves into believing that this debate is about the "A" word. It is about the "B" word—baby. What does Congress expect a

family planning counselor to say when a 15-year-old asks, "is it a baby?" It seems to me that however this is answered, the illusion of nondirective counseling is dispelled. Shall we require title X projects to deny it is a baby? Shall we require them to say that if allowed to continue to grow, that the baby will look like its mother and father and that the color of its eyes, hair, height, and so forth, have already been determined?

Those who believe that the Federal Government should not be involved in such a discussion with the use of tax dollars should oppose the Porter language.

Those who believe that the decision to continue or terminate a pregnancy is a private decision between a woman and her physician must oppose the Porter language. The title X counselor does not and cannot provide maternal health care services regardless of whether the pregnancy is continued or aborted. The counselor is an outside third party to that decision with no authority or responsibility in supporting that decision.

Those who believe that the Federal Government should not interfere in that decision should oppose the Porter language. Why? Because you cannot logically say that government should not be involved on the one hand and insist that government sponsor, subsidize, and exert at least some measure of control over that decision on the other. In 1982, the General Accounting Office found that in essence, there was no standard for nondirective counseling. Who can say whether this counseling is being done correctly or not? Is there an obligation, for example, to present adoption in a more favorable light to a teenager who is being coerced into abortion by her boyfriend or parents?

Those who believe that the woman should be protected from exploitation should oppose the Porter language. If we are really concerned about what is being said or not said in those 4,000 title X clinics, we would be having a different debate. The Federal Government requires that a woman who is referred for sterilization be at least 21 years old. We require a written consent form which must be signed by the woman and the physician. We require that the physician certify that the woman is not under the influence of alcohol or drugs. We require a thirty-day waiting period.

None of these protections are provided for under title X. Is sterilization a more serious decision than abortion? If we are concerned that a woman should not be coerced into sacrificing her fertility, should we not be just as concerned that she not sacrifice her unborn child? I suggest that many Members do not want to know what is and what is not being said, they only want the issue to go away.

Finally, let me also make it clear to my colleagues who may erroneously believe that the proponents of this amendment would merely maintain the status quo in regards to counseling and referral. If we allow the regulations to be stopped today, the next step will be a significant expansion of Federal involvement in the abortion decision. Under the Porter-Wyden bill, which is waiting in the wings, there is not even the presumption of a physician-patient relationship. That legislation would make title X clinics into abortion information clearing-houses. It would require title X projects to treat

abortion like any other referral service. This means that the projects would be required to actively assist the woman in obtaining an abortion. The projects would be required to share patient records with the abortion provider. These are significant changes which go beyond the previous title X guidelines.

I urge my colleagues to look past the full-page ads and the skillful political campaign being waged. The issue is, do you want to use tax dollars to tell 15-year-old girls that abortion is an acceptable method of family planning? Do you want to fund that biased viewpoint on abortion? We are not making that decision today, but we will be soon. Let us fully prepare ourselves. Let us begin by clearing away the smokescreen of free speech.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2707, the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992, which contains provisions which repeal the gag rule imposed by the Supreme Court in the recent Rust versus Sullivan decision.

I was shocked and dismayed by the Court's decision which flies in the face of our constitutional guarantee of free speech. At issue also is a physician's ability to counsel patients to the best of his or her ability, and whether the Government can force health care professionals to violate their legal and ethical obligations. I agree with the health care professionals who feel that this policy is nothing more than medical censorship. Last time I checked, abortion is still a legal process and to say something which is legal cannot even be referred to in the course of a conversation is totally absurd. The Court's reasoning is not only unfathomable, it's dangerous.

This decision also raises a question of equity among women. If a woman can afford private health care, she can receive counseling about prenatal care, adoption and abortion; however if she is poor, the Government has the right to dictate to a doctor what a doctor can and cannot tell a patient. I find it startling that a victim of rape or incest who just happens to be poor cannot get the guidance she needs to terminate an unwanted pregnancy—even though abortion is a legal option in America.

Family planning clinics are about the prevention of unintended pregnancies, and by providing contraceptive services which prevent unintended pregnancy, the program strives to lower the demand for abortion. Since the 1970's, title X programs have operated under carefully drafted guidelines which require nondirective, balanced counseling including all available options—prenatal care, infant care, foster care, adoption and abortion. Family planning clinics who receive Federal funds to not perform abortions with Federal moneys, but have given balanced, nondirective counseling about all options available to a pregnant woman. Congress has authorized family planning clinics within this framework that respects a woman's right to truthful answers from her physician and her right to make an informed decision without Government intervention.

I am pleased that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to reauthorize title X clinics without these restrictive regulations and I urge my colleagues to join me today in support of this appropriation bill.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, the Supreme Court and the Bush administration have

embarked on an ill-advised campaign to increase abortions and to insert Government between patients and their doctors. This policy defies common sense.

The Supreme Court has misinterpreted Federal law and given the administration a license to gag doctors. That means, if a patient goes into a family planning clinic, the doctor is regulated by Government and prevented by Government from explaining all the options available to women who may be pregnant or considering starting a family.

This policy will increase abortions. If women believe, when they go to a federally funded clinic, that they're going to get less than honest advice, they're not going to go there even for family planning information. This will increase the number of unwanted pregnancies.

Family planning advice, as best I can figure it, is one of the best ways to cut down the number of abortions in the country. The current situation will not only diminish the quality of that advice, but it will also lead to the shutting down of clinics that can offer family planning alternatives to abortion to women who need such assistance.

Moreover, the American people do not think the Government should be telling doctors what they can say to people. Doctors have an oath that requires all physicians to help their patients get the best and most appropriate care, and an obligation to inform them fully of all options. These obligations go to the heart of the doctor-patient relationship. But what the Supreme Court and the Bush administration are saying is: Government, not the doctor, will decide what information is given a patient, or what an adviser in a clinic can tell them. And such a policy unwisely and unfairly inserts Government into the most intimate dialogue that can occur between a patient and a doctor, the conversation that occurs about planning a family.

Now, we don't pay for abortions and frankly I don't think the Federal Government should, and we don't use our clinics to perform abortions, and I support that policy was well. But this rule, which gags the doctor and stifles the patients is wrong, and the Congress is right to prevent its implementation, until we have the opportunity to overturn it.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 1992 Labor, HHS, and Education appropriation bill. I am particularly appreciative of the committee's decision to accept the Porter amendment on the abortion counseling gag rule. On May 23, the Supreme Court in the *Rust versus Sullivan* decision, upheld a regulation that prohibits federally funded clinics from counseling women on abortion. Current Federal regulations would deny women seeking information regarding how to respond to an unintended pregnancy from receiving accurate information about all of her options, including abortion. This means that even if a woman has been raped, or is a victim of incest, or finds her health seriously threatened by her pregnancy, her doctor would not be able to tell her the truth about her options.

The gag rule not only denies women information they are entitled to receive, but makes it impossible for doctors to practice medicine, and deepens the wedge between the health care haves and have-nots. Well-do-do women

who go to private physicians would be able to learn about all their family planning choices, while poor women would be denied that same information.

Clearly this is an issue that goes well beyond the right to choose an abortion. Serious constitutional questions of free speech are at stake here—and that is why even some strong congressional opponents of abortion have joined with pro-choice advocates in an effort to block implementation of the gag rule. These opponents of abortion realize that if the gag rule is implemented, the number of abortions could increase significantly. When the clinics that can't ethically comply with the gag rule regulations lose their Federal funds, women's health care services will be cut. As a result, poor women won't get access to contraception, which prevents pregnancies. After all, the easiest way to limit the number of abortions is to prevent the need for them in the first place. Twenty-one national medical and nursing organizations—including the American Medical Association, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and the American Nurses Association—have declared the gag rule on title X family planning clinics to be in direct conflict with their codes of ethics. Who can serve as better advisors on this issue than the men and women who spend their days working to save lives? A recent public opinion poll shows that over 70 percent of the American public favor overturning the gag rule.

I urge passage of the Labor, HHS and Education appropriations bill, as amended. And it would be my hope that the President would reconsider his announced intention to veto this bill, and respect the feelings and views of the overwhelming majority of the American public.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives today passed H.R. 2707, the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. One of the most controversial provisions in the bill barred the implementation of the administration regulations prohibiting family planning clinics receiving Federal title X funds from providing information on abortion.

Although a recorded vote was not called for on the issue today, I wish to express my support for the lifting of this so-called gag rule on federally funded family planning clinics. We can no longer have one set of rules for the poor in this country and another set of rules for the rest of America.

If the gag rule remains in place, the gap between those who can afford private health care and those who must attend public clinics will widen. If physicians in federally funded facilities are prohibited from providing all relevant medical information, they are not fully performing their duties and the health of millions of American women may be at risk.

The American Medical Association and other medical groups oppose the administration's restrictions on abortion counseling with good cause. Medical ethics require physicians to provide patients with all available options. The present title X restrictions not only force physicians to breach their ethical oaths but opens them up to potential malpractice suits.

Finally, I support lifting the gag rule on first amendment grounds. Merely providing financial assistance to an organization does not give the Federal Government the right to in-

fringe on the freedom of speech of American citizens. We must allow our physicians to advise their patients to the best of their ability and not interfere with the vital doctor-patient relationship.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the Supreme Court handed down a decision on May 23 entitled *Rust versus Sullivan* that must be overturned by this body.

It must be overturned because it compromises the integrity of the medical profession and requires a separate system for medical care for America's women based on their economic class. Doctors are no longer allowed to give their full, honest and professional advice to all their patients.

Women who are unable to afford private care will no longer receive the same medical advice that women of the same age in the same physical condition will receive from their doctor solely because of the difference in their incomes.

Mr. Chairman, these distinctions are unfair and un-American. They represent a very real threat to the integrity of all of our institutions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge inclusion of the Porter amendment.

Mr. COX of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of section 514 of H.R. 2707. This provision prevents the Secretary of Health and Human Services from using federally appropriated funds to institute the gag rule.

Through its recent rulings, the Supreme Court in *Rust versus Sullivan* has upheld the administration's interpretation of a statute enacted by this Congress creating many constitutional questions. The administration initiated Federal regulations which prohibit the giving of certain information to patients at federally funded title X medical clinics. The gag rule initiated by the Department of Health and Human Services in 1988 does not allow medical professionals the freedom of informing their patients of all medical options available to them.

Currently the gag rule would require doctors to read a script approved by the Government which basically states the clinic does not consider abortion as a family planning alternative. Even if a woman requests information on abortion, or is a victim of rape or incest, the answer is still the same: the clinic cannot advise or even refer a patient on the option of abortion.

Women go to the clinics seeking counsel to enable them to make an informed decision on family planning. They expect to be advised of all possible options available to them without bias. However, bias is just what the gag rule enforces.

What is perhaps most unfortunate of all about the gag rule is the impact it has on those who have no other options for family planning advice. The wealthy will no doubt be able to afford private health care, which provides them with honest and accurate advice on all family planning options. However, the poor and lower middle class can not afford this alternative. They will be forced to brave the consequences of a double standard which prohibits access to information because they can not afford the cost for honest advice.

The gag rule would effectively destroy the doctor patient relationship. How could a pa-

tient ever trust the thoroughness of the medical advice they are receiving at a federally funded clinic, when they know the Federal Government has the power to administratively decide what information should be provided to them regarding certain medical procedures? How could the doctors maintain their code of ethics when they know they are not telling their patients the whole truth?

Many federally funded clinics have stated their decision to refuse Government funding if they would be required to institute the gag rule. These clinics have been forced to choose between Federal funding or allowing their doctors to maintain the constitutional right to free speech, and providing their patients with all options. Understandably with the support of such organizations as Planned Parenthood and the American Medical Association, they have chosen the latter.

It is very frightening to realize the administration is supportive of Government censorship. Will we be subject to a growing Government intrusion in our private lives which will force doctors to practice medicine at the mercy of the Federal Government's Orwellian control? Can we allow this intrusion on medical professionals constitutional rights? One can only wonder who will be the next group subjected to Government control. As elected Members of this Chamber I believe it is our duty and responsibility to insure our constituents, who overwhelmingly oppose such control, that we will not allow this intrusion to occur.

I urge my colleagues to show their support for this provision by voting for its passage. Let's remove the gag rule and restore full and accurate medical advice and allow free speech to remain the right of all.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WHEAT). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, if a point of order is raised against the Weber language on parental notification in this bill, and if the Chairman would sustain the point of order, would I be in order at that time to ask for a rollcall vote on that sustaining of that point of order, making parental notification not in order of this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Any such ruling of the Chair is subject to an appeal, as the gentleman is aware.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. The only way to get the rollcall vote is to appeal the ruling of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That might depend on the effect of the Chair's ruling.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. A further parliamentary inquiry: Is the appeal of a ruling of a Chair interpreted by some in this body as a procedural matter, as distinguished from a substantive matter?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. An appeal of the Chair's ruling goes only to the propriety of the Chair's ruling under the rules.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I interpret the Chair's remarks to mean

it is procedural in nature rather than substantive.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It should not be interpreted as a vote on the merits of the issue at hand.

#### PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DELLUMS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I should not insist upon my privileged motion, but I did not have the opportunity to speak to the significant issue and chose this extraordinary vehicle to gain time to speak to my colleagues.

What we are talking about here is the gag rule, Mr. Chairman. We deal with rules in this body every single day.

In the legislative branch of the Congress there is a closed rule, which means we vote a rule up or down the way it is presented. There is a modified rule, that says there are only certain areas that we can debate. Then, Mr. Chairman, there is an open rule. An open rule means that any issue can be discussed, any issue can be debated.

A number of my colleagues on the other side of this issue have marched in the well, day after day, time after time, challenging gag rules. Why? Because they believe that we ought to have open rules, that we should fear no ideas. We should field no information, and that the Congress of the United States, in its wisdom or the lack thereof, should have the opportunity to work their will.

We are saying that that is what we ought to have. Well, what this debate is about is an open rule in the medical profession. To say that people should not be afraid of ideas, that all options should be available.

I would suggest to my colleagues, how can Members march in the well and challenge the assertion of the gentleman from California, or the gentleman from Illinois regarding the gag rule, and then day after day after day challenge rules that are not open rules? Because when we speak in favor of open rules, we say that all options shall be available to Members. That is the American way. That is the democratic way. Why, suddenly, should we become totalitarian, antidemocratic, violate the Constitution of the United States, and move against free speech, when it comes to a medical open rule?

If we believe that all options ought to be available to Members of Congress, what gives Members the arrogant notion that the elitist right that we have can have options beyond the American people, we truly represent

them; and if we can speak eloquently to open rules and total options available to Members as representatives of the American people, can we march into the well and argue less for those persons for whom we represent? And because they happen to be women, does that give them any less right to have the options available to them?

Finally, as we frame this issue, it ought to be an issue based on the notion of free speech, because that is what this issue is all about. It is not about abortion. It is about trusting the right of American women. I have said oftentimes that many Members do not agree on the substantive issues. However, when we all ought to come together is our commitment to the integrity of the process. What is the process here? It is the Constitution of the United States. It is the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States that sets out the right of free speech. That is what we ought to be about.

If Members can argue on this floor against gag rules that govern legislation, they ought to be willing to stand in this well and challenge gag rules that deny women the opportunity for the total access of information. To do anything less is undignified. To do anything less is un-American. To do anything less is unpatriotic.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Chairman pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. On the gentleman's motion to strike the enacting clause, who is entitled to control the 5 minutes in opposition?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. One Member only is entitled to control the 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I make that request.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A member of the committee takes precedence.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I will control that time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] that he must remain on his feet during this debate. He controls all the time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, in the last speaker, some who I really enjoy hearing because he always has something to say and he says it so interestingly; he talked about elitists, and he looked over here.

□ 1600

I wonder if the gentleman meant the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] who always votes with us on this issue.

I wonder if he meant the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] who always votes with us on this issue.

I wonder if he meant the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] who always votes with us on this issue.

I think characterizing those of us who want to protect the innocent unborn, who is so defenseless in this situation, who cannot rise up in the streets, who cannot vote, who cannot escape, as the elitist right is quite interesting.

I would rather think some of those who want to get rid of people are the elitists who think there are too many unwanted people. There are too many handicapped. There are too many poor. There are too many unwanted children, so the solution? Exterminate them. Get rid of the people. It is certainly a direct way to do it.

I hope that this has been an illuminating discussion. It certainly has been passionate.

I certainly am not angry at anyone. I think this issue transcends ourselves, but I hope we can get some people thinking about it. It is literally an issue of life and death.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in response to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the gentleman was looking at me when he was talking.

You know, you talk about the right of free speech here. How about the right of free speech of that unborn child in the womb? Does not that child have a right to free speech just as much as the mother has the right to free speech?

The data is clearly that over 90 percent of the abortions performed in America today are for purposes of birth control. That is the data.

The irony is that the vast majority, in fact only 9 percent of the American public support abortion as a means of birth control.

What we are talking about in this whole debate, and I will come back to it again, this subterfuge of attaching this prohibition on language to an appropriations bill was designed specifically to avoid the reality that in the Policy Committee, they held an Environment Committee where I serve, we have the votes on a bipartisan basis to require that parental notification be a condition precedent of any young girl being referred to an abortion before that abortion takes place.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, may I stop the gentleman

from California [Mr. DELLUMS] right there, my powerful oratorical friend.

There is an elitist right, just like there is an elitist left. We call your elitist left limousine liberals.

I will show you a list of true multimillionaire and billionaire elitist rightists, and guess what, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], they are all proabortion.

And do you know what they say to me over and over when they refuse to support me? "How are we going to pay for them if we allow them to be born?"

When I talked to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] on this issue 12 years ago, I told the gentleman them in Florida, them were Cuban Americans, them in southern California were Hispanic Americans, them in New York were Puerto Rico Americans, and when the gentleman and I were marching for civil rights, them were African-Americans all over this country.

Elitists rightists in my party are going to be battling over this as a platform issue in Houston in August of next year. You bet we have an elitist right, and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCCOIN] is not part of it, he is on your side, nor is the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], a great Desert Storm hero and popular.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, that was our top gun.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER].

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, I will not take long. I want to address a comment to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], if I can divert him from his friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] that the gentleman and I have had a good relationship over the years. We do not agree on this issue, but I was disappointed in one thing the gentleman said. In his last comment, the gentleman used the word unpatriotic to describe people who oppose him on this issue. The gentleman does not mean that, the gentleman does not mean the use of that word, does he?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, let us strike that.

What I was trying to say is those Members who stand on the floor and articulate their support of open rules, meaning total options, find themselves in a contradictory position when they argue gag rules with women in medical situations. That was my major argument. It is un-American, because it violates the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Henceforth, Mr. Chairman, I guess we can assume from the comments of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]

that from here on he will be voting against every rule that comes out of the Rules Committee, controlled by this party.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] made one quick point. He said this is not about abortions. Previous speakers said the same thing. That is absolutely untrue.

We are talking about an issue where abortion is facilitated by referrals, facilitated by counseling, and even Planned Parenthood some years back in talking about family planning and abortions said in their Planned Parenthood brochure in August 1963, "What is birth control?" the question goes. "Is it in abortion?"

"Definitely not. An abortion kills the life of a baby after it has begun."

That is from Planned Parenthood. They have now changed their minds on that.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WHEAT). The Chair would ask if the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] wishes to withdraw his preferential motion?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The preferential motion is withdrawn.

There being no amendments to section 514, the Clerk will read section 515.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 515. Notwithstanding any other section of this Act, parents shall be notified to the extent and in the manner required by the law of the State in which the health care facility is located. The Secretary may not make a grant under section 1001 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300) unless the entity applying for the grant agrees that the entity will not perform an abortion on an unemancipated minor under the age of 18, and will not permit the facilities of the entity to be used to perform any abortion on such a minor, without regard to whether the abortion is to be performed with any financial assistance provided by the Secretary, unless there has been compliance with one of the following:

(1) A written notification is provided to a parent or legal guardian of the minor stating that an abortion has been requested for the minor, and 48 hours elapses after the notification is provided to the parent: *Provided*, That notification may be delivered personally by a physician or the physician's agent, in which case 48 hours elapses from the time of making personal delivery, or notification may be provided through certified mail, return receipt requested, restricted delivery addressed to a parent or guardian at that individual's dwelling hours or usual place of abode (as defined by rule 4 of the Federal rules of civil procedures for the United States district courts), in which case 48 hours elapses from 12 o'clock noon on the second day of regular mail delivery that follows the day on which the notification is posted.

(2) The physician with principal responsibility for making the decision to perform

the abortion certifies in the minor's medical record that she is suffering from a physical disorder or disease making the abortion necessary to prevent here death and there is insufficient time to provide the required notice.

(3) The minor declares that the pregnancy resulted from incest with a parent or guardian of the minor or that she has been subjected to or is at risk of sexual abuse, child abuse, or child neglect by a parent or guardian, as defined by State law: *Provided*, That in any such case the physician notifies the authorities specified by State law to receive reports of child abuse or neglect of the known or suspected abuse or neglect before the abortion is performed.

(4) The entity complies with a State or local law then in effect that requires that one or both parents or a guardian either be notified or give consent before an abortion is performed on an unemancipated minor under the age of 18, whether or not the State law provides that parental notification or consent may be waived through judicial proceedings.

Mr. PURSELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the section be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise a point of order against this section.

I raise a point of order against section 515, beginning at page 74, line 16, through page 76, line 19 of the bill.

This section proposes to change existing law, and thus constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill, in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling of the Chair on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does any other Member desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I want to understand what we are doing here now.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] has raised a point of order. The issue now is a point of order against a part of the bill that provides for parental notice for an abortion of an unemancipated minor; the gentleman seeks to strike that on a point of order, is that right?

Mr. AUCOIN. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon seeks to strike section 515 of the bill on a point of order.

Mr. DEFAZIO. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does any other Member desire to be heard on the point of order?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, how much time does a Member in opposition to the point of order have on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time is at the discretion of the Chair on a point of order.

Does the gentleman from California wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Yes, I do wish to be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to ask if the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment of the Committee on Energy and Commerce is on the floor?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Regular order, Mr. Chairman; that is not relevant.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask when he planned to bring title X to the floor so that we can debate the merits of the issue on parental notification.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is not speaking to the point of order.

Does the gentleman wish to speak to the point of order?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate to see a gag rule implemented on the Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any other Members who wish to speak to the point of order?

If not, for the reasons stated by the gentleman from Oregon, the point of order against section 515 is sustained. That section is stricken.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1992".

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the preferential motion.

□ 1610

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WHEAT). The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is outrageous that our friends who claim to prochoice, the proabortionists who are in this Chamber, Mr. DEFAZIO by name in this case, has just used a point of order to strike the parental notification language which was affixed in committee, attached to the bill in committee by my good friend, Mr. WEBER from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, this is the most modest minimal policy I think any of us can ask for with regard to the entire issue of abortion. We are talking about minors. Mr. DANNEMEYER indicated earlier about one-third of the number of abortions procured in this country, of the 1.5 million, are on teenagers. And in many cases, if not most, the parents are left out of the equation.

We have instances, and we have had testimony before Mr. WAXMAN's committee and before other committees, by people, by young girls, 14 and 15, who are marched into title X clinics, the baby was aborted, and then the aftermath, the deleterious effects of that child was visited upon that young teenager and the parents found out afterwards.

Is it not ironic that in order for a minor to get her ears pierced, receive an aspirin because of a headache or fever, she needs parental permission? And in that irreversible decision of an abortion where an unborn child is decimated by an abortionist through chemical poisoning or by literal dismemberment, the parents do not even have to know.

Parental notification offered by my good friend was a very modest proposal, and I think our friends on the other side of the issue tipped their hands and they exposed their true feeling about both women and babies.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out the gentleman was certainly well within his right in raising the point of order. But it is important that the country understand exactly what has been struck from the bill. The gentleman from New Jersey has pointed out this is about the most modest parental rights language you could put in. One parent would have to be notified, not two. They merely have to be notified. We do not demand their consent. So even if that one parent objected, the woman could go ahead and have the abortion. It is not parental consent.

There are exceptions for the life of the mother, for rape, or for incest or for those situations where the woman would allege to the physician that she may be subject to abuse if she were to

tell either of her parents about it. You could not have a smaller step in the direction of establishing a minimal parental right than the language of the gentleman from Oregon just struck from the bill.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have been talking about information and what a terrible gag rule it is for the doctor not to give some pregnant women abortion counseling or advice rather than send her where she can get it. What about the lack of information to a mother and a father whose daughter finds herself in an abortion mill being urged to get rid of this embarrassment, this unwanted child? What about your daughter, your unemancipated daughter going under a surgeon's knife or an aspiration machine or whatever method they use to exterminate that unborn child in her womb, and not even letting the parents know about it? That is eroding the family.

Now, the majority party has just come out with a commissioned report that wants to give \$1,000 tax deduction to families for each child. They understand the magic in the words the family. What is more corrosive of the family than having a child go get a major and life threatening, certainly terminal to the unborn, life-threatening surgery without even a requirement of notifying her father and mother? As though the father and mother are irrelevant to the health and the welfare of their daughter.

That is what the gentleman seeks to do and has done, and that is what we all sit silently by meditating.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to explain to the Members of the body here in case any wonder why I did not move to appeal the ruling of the Chair on the issue of affirming the point of order striking out the parental notification language. We all know what goes on around here. That would have been immediately followed by a motion to table so the claim could be made by the members of the majority party who control this place that we are not voting on the merits of parental notification, we are only voting on the merits of sustaining the position of the leadership that you do not want to vote on the issue of parental notification, and how you can avoid that is this procedural tactic that you have used here today to gag our ability to give to the

people of this country an indication of how the 435 Members of this body stand on the issue of parental notification. That is what is going on, and this Member, strong letter to follow, does not like that.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] rise?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's motion.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, no single issue is as important to the integrity of this body as is our willingness to always deal honestly and fairly and forthrightly with each other.

And I rise to oppose this motion and simply to correct some of the previous statements that I have just heard which, in my view, spectacularly mislead the public in terms of what is happening here.

I happen to be one Democrat who in committee voted for the parental notification language. I think that that language was a reasonable effort to try to reach a compromise on this issue. I also happen to recognize that Mr. DEFAZIO, under the rules of the House, has a perfect right to try to strike that language because, as anyone understands who has served here more than 2 days, it is legislating on an appropriation bill.

The Chair was correct parliamentarily in its position even though I do not happen to agree with the practical result.

The point I would simply like to make is this: I do not think this institution has to apologize for the debate we have had here today on this issue, because at least the institution has tried to grapple with this question. We should have done it a long time ago more successfully than we have. But at least today we have been grappling with this issue. Whether you agree with Mr. WEBER or not, there has been an honest effort in this place to try to do that.

I would simply make two points: No. 1, I would plead with both sides, both the proliferators and the prochoicers, to recognize that eventually what the public wants from both of us is not just to win in a narrow sense; what the public wants from all of us is an effort to try to reach a reasonable point of accommodation on a most sensitive and most controversial issue which affects the basic right to life and the basic right to privacy, both of which are legitimate rights to be defended.

And it seems to me, therefore, that sooner or later there needs to be some kind of language, if not the Weber language then some other language, which

may more perfectly preserve the rights of families in situations to which that language was addressed.

But I want to say if there is one failure of leadership on this issue today, it does not lie with anyone here; it lies with the President, because on this bill and on the foreign aid bill which came up last week it is the President who is trying to rule by holding his breath and turning blue and saying "it shall be this way or no way."

And I frankly think the country has a right to better leadership than that.

I think the country has a right to expect the President to engage on this issue. I think the country has a right to expect that the President will sit down with the Congress and try to compromise on this issue so that we can find a reasonable proposition which meets the sensitivities of both sides and maintains the institutional dignity of this House.

So I congratulate the committee for trying to do that. I want to congratulate the people who have legitimately brought their arguments to bear on this issue. I do not want to congratulate those who have chosen to try to obfuscate the procedural situation today.

Most of all, I think the President has an obligation to try to rise above playing the narrow game of narrow, single-interest politics and work out a national accommodation on this issue. That is his responsibility—more than any other public servants—in the country.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to associate myself with the statements the gentleman has made about the responsibilities of the executive and judicial branches, which have in effect placed the Congress in a situation of dealing with this very, very sensitive issue on an appropriation bill.

I think it has to be pointed out, though, that contrary to some of the comments that have been made to kind of obfuscate what this debate is all about, this Congress, this House of Representatives will deal with the reauthorization of title X. Congressman WAXMAN and Congressman DINGELL are preparing to bring that bill to the floor this summer. I know Mr. PORTER and Mr. WYDEN are prepared to debate this issue in the context of that bill.

Again, on the floor we will be dealing with these very, very difficult issues, including the question of parental notification and/or consent, which I think in the long run is the proper forum, the proper approach to dealing with an issue that needs to be understood by all the Members and are not to be carried as a rider on this bill.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I am saddened that the Supreme Court has upheld such fundamentally unfair and flawed regulations that prohibit federally-funded clinics from providing their patients with information about abortion.

But it is now incumbent upon Congress to prevent such an intrusive and illconceived policy from being implemented.

The "gag" rule is the most offensive kind of paternalism that the Government can practice:

It says to women that they are not qualified to make the most deeply personal decisions about their well being and their reproductive lives.

It says to doctors that they are not qualified to exercise their professional judgement.

It says to those involved in this most intimate decision that only the Government is qualified to decide a woman's fate.

These regulations create second class citizens of those women who rely on health clinics rather than private physicians for their health care.

Contrary to the twisted logic of the majority opinion in *Rust versus Sullivan*, the gag rule is a direct and serious intrusion in the doctor patient relationship. It tells doctors what medical information they can and cannot impart to their patients, regardless of the individual circumstances.

This body should rather heed the admonition of Justice Blackmun in his dissent that the force of the first amendment is seriously eroded if it is "read to countenance the deliberate manipulation by the Government of the dialogue between a woman and her physician."

I urge my colleagues to protect the sanctity of the first amendment, to respect the confidentiality of the physician patient relationship, and to uphold a woman's reproductive freedom.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in opposition to a provision of H.R. 2707, the appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for fiscal year 1992. This provision, contained in the appropriations to the Department of Health and Human Services under title II, will slash the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP] from \$1.61 billion to \$1 billion, a cut of almost 40 percent in only 1 year. This comes on top of a 40-percent cut in real terms—after inflation—since fiscal year 1981. As many as 2 million families—or about 6.9 million people—will lose benefits.

Even at current funding of \$1.6 billion, the Low-Income Home Assistance Program serves less than 25 percent of eligible households and on an average pays less than 25 percent of those recipients' total home energy bills. The majority of recipients are families with incomes under \$6,000 a year. According to a study by the center on budget and policy priorities, such households typically pay 65 percent of their entire income for rent and utilities.

Mr. Chairman, I want my distinguished colleagues to understand that this bill should not be misinterpreted as maintaining current funding levels. In fact, the bill would remove \$600 million from the program, setting it aside in a contingency fund available only upon submis-

sion by the President of a formal request designating it as an emergency; as a result, it is anticipated that these funds will not be available to the needy.

The Department of Health and Human Services argues that at a time of continued record deficits at the Federal level, and because energy assistance needs vary greatly from State to State, it is being proposed that States use other resources to cover a greater share of the low-income home energy assistance need. This is a curious argument in that States are now facing record deficits brought on in part because of previous Federal spending cuts, changes in Federal taxes which have affected State revenue, and the recession.

The administration also argues that this program is obsolete because it was a response to the oil price crisis of the 1970's. This is a fallacy. Although the original program was instituted to hold the poor harmless for the impact of oil decontrol, LIHEAP was cited as the safety net for the poor when natural gas price decontrol was authorized in 1983. In fact, less than 20 percent of the poor use fuels derived from oil; most use natural gas.

Mr. Chairman, the cuts in funding for LIHEAP are unacceptable. The impact on the States and territories will be devastating. In my district where about 60 percent of the population would qualify for LIHEAP benefits because the family income in American Samoa is so low, at the current funding level of only \$31,000, we are only able to serve under 200 low-income families. If this provision passes today, about 40 percent of that amount will be cut. The administration suggest that other funds are available to these low-income households, so they do not need LIHEAP. In fact, Mr. Speaker, American Samoa does not have other public assistance programs such as food stamp, AFDC, and the SSI Program, so these funds are desperately needed.

I urge my colleagues fully fund this program as well as the drug education and prevention funds which have also been reduced in this legislation. When you vote today, please vote against these reductions.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to associate myself with the words of my distinguished colleague Congressman THOMAS RIDGE and his efforts to help restore full funding to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP]; and at the same time I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee Congressman NATCHER for his efforts and his willingness to discuss this program in conference.

LIHEAP is a vital program that deserves the continued support of the Federal Government. LIHEAP provides a necessity of life to the poor and disadvantaged, and equitably distributes the cost to all Americans as a basic social responsibility.

This appropriation bill provides \$1 billion for LIHEAP. This is a reduction of \$610 million from the fiscal year 1991 funding level. It is estimated that in my State of New Jersey alone that we will lose about \$28 million if the funding for LIHEAP is reduced to the \$1 billion funding level. Current estimates show that the average recipient in New Jersey would see their average benefits slashed from \$400 to \$236.

As many as 2 million families will be cut off from energy assistance this winter. This bill forces low income Americans to choose which basic necessities they can afford. Energy needs—heating, light, hot water, and emergency cooling—are essential to the quality of life. They cannot be separated from the necessities of education, affordable housing, or health. The costs to society of not providing for these needs can be tragic.

The cuts in funding for LIHEAP are disappointing. Yet I am hopeful that with the strong leadership of Chairman NATCHER and the members of the subcommittee we can collectively work together in conference to restore the funding of this vital program.

I urge my colleagues to look at these cuts and how they will affect your constituents; and I ask the Members in the other body to truly consider the effects that this cut will have on our Nation's disadvantaged when they consider this appropriation bill in the Senate.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my dismay over H.R. 2707's proposed cut of LIHEAP, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. This program serves low-income children and families, the disabled, and many fixed income elderly. The average family income for a LIHEAP recipient household is less than \$6,000 a year. For these families, LIHEAP does not supply frivolities; rather, it allows their basic energy needs—for heating, light, hot water, emergency cooling—to be met.

In my home State of New York alone, an estimated quarter of a million households will no longer be eligible for the LIHEAP Program. Nationwide, the number of ineligible swells to 1.9 million. Families that do qualify will be forced to choose among energy needs: Will they pay the rent or have light; heat the house or have hot water?

The argument has been made that fully funding LIHEAP would use money which could otherwise be allocated for education programs served under the HHS budget. We must consider that even the best education programs will not aid poor children if they must return to a house in which it is too cold to study due to the decrease in LIHEAP funding.

I realize that times are tough and we must control Federal spending. However as the ranks of the "new poor" continue to grow, this Congress cannot afford to overlook the needs of the less fortunate and slash this crucial program.

□ 1620

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WHEAT). All time has expired.

Does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] insist upon his preferential motion?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the preferential motion is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

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

and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having assumed the chair, Mr. WHEAT, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2707) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

□ 1624

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 353, nays 74, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

YEAS—353

Abercrombie	Bateman	Broomfield
Ackerman	Bellenson	Browder
Alexander	Bentley	Brown
Anderson	Bereuter	Bruce
Andrews (ME)	Berman	Bryant
Andrews (NJ)	Bevill	Bustamante
Andrews (TX)	Bilbray	Byron
Annunzio	Bilirakis	Callahan
Anthony	Bliley	Camp
Applegate	Boehlert	Campbell (CA)
Aspin	Bonior	Campbell (CO)
Atkins	Borski	Cardin
AuCoin	Boucher	Carper
Bacchus	Boxer	Carr
Baker	Brewster	Chandler
Barnard	Brooks	Chapman

Clay	Hobson	Oberstar
Clement	Hochbrueckner	Obey
Clinger	Horn	Olin
Coble	Horton	Olver
Coleman (MO)	Houghton	Ortiz
Coleman (TX)	Hoyer	Orton
Collins (IL)	Hubbard	Owens (NY)
Collins (MI)	Huckaby	Owens (UT)
Condit	Hughes	Oxley
Conyers	Jacobs	Panetta
Cooper	James	Parker
Costello	Jefferson	Patterson
Coughlin	Jenkins	Payne (NJ)
Cox (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Payne (VA)
Coyne	Johnson (SD)	Pease
Cramer	Johnston	Pelosi
Cunningham	Jones (GA)	Penny
Darden	Jones (NC)	Perkins
Davis	Jontz	Peterson (FL)
de la Garza	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
DeFazio	Kaptur	Pickett
DeLauro	Kasich	Pickle
Dellums	Kennedy	Porter
Derrick	Kennelly	Poshard
Dickinson	Kildee	Price
Dicks	Kleczka	Pursell
Dingell	Klug	Rahall
Dixon	Kolbe	Ramstad
Donnelly	Kolter	Rangel
Dooley	Kopetski	Ravenel
Dorgan (ND)	Kostmayer	Ray
Downey	LaFalce	Reed
Duncan	Lancaster	Regula
Durbin	Lantos	Richardson
Dwyer	LaRocco	Ridge
Dymally	Laughlin	Riggs
Early	Leach	Rinaldo
Eckart	Lehman (CA)	Ritter
Edwards (CA)	Lehman (FL)	Roemer
Edwards (TX)	Lent	Rogers
Emerson	Levin (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen
Engel	Levine (CA)	Rose
English	Lewis (CA)	Rostenkowski
Erdreich	Lewis (FL)	Roukema
Espy	Lewis (GA)	Rowland
Evans	Lloyd	Roybal
Fascell	Long	Russo
Fazio	Lowery (CA)	Sabo
Feighan	Lowey (NY)	Sanders
Fish	Luken	Sangmeister
Flake	Machtley	Savage
Foglietta	Manton	Sawyer
Ford (MI)	Markey	Saxton
Ford (TN)	Martin	Schaefer
Frank (MA)	Martinez	Scheuer
Franks (CT)	Matsui	Schiff
Frost	Mavroules	Schroeder
Gallo	Mazzoli	Schulze
Gaydos	McCloskey	Schumer
Gejdenson	McCrery	Serrano
Gekas	McCurdy	Sharp
Gephardt	McDade	Shaw
Geren	McDermott	Shays
Gibbons	McHugh	Sikorski
Gilchrest	McMillen (MD)	Sisisky
Gillmor	McNulty	Skaggs
Gilman	Meyers	Skeen
Gingrich	Mfume	Skelton
Glickman	Miller (CA)	Slattery
Gonzalez	Miller (WA)	Slaughter (NY)
Goodling	Mineta	Slaughter (VA)
Gordon	Mink	Smith (FL)
Goss	Moakley	Smith (IA)
Grandy	Mollinari	Smith (TX)
Gray	Mollohan	Snowe
Green	Montgomery	Solarz
Guarini	Moody	Spratt
Gunderson	Moran	Staggers
Hall (OH)	Morella	Stallings
Hamilton	Morrison	Stark
Hammerschmidt	Murphy	Stearns
Harris	Murtha	Stenholm
Hastert	Myers	Stokes
Hatcher	Nagle	Studds
Hayes (IL)	Natcher	Swett
Hayes (LA)	Neal (MA)	Swift
Hefner	Neal (NC)	Synar
Hertel	Nowak	Tallon
Hoagland	Oakar	Tanner

Taylor (MS)	Vento	Williams
Taylor (NC)	Visclosky	Wilson
Thomas (GA)	Volkmer	Wise
Thornton	Vucanovich	Wolf
Torres	Walsh	Wolpe
Torricelli	Washington	Wyden
Towns	Waters	Wyllie
Traficant	Waxman	Yates
Traxler	Weber	Yatron
Unsoeld	Weiss	Young (AK)
Upton	Weldon	Young (FL)
Valentine	Wheat	Zimmer
Vander Jagt	Whitten	

NAYS—74

Allard	Hansen	Nichols
Archer	Hefley	Nussle
Army	Henry	Packard
Ballenger	Herger	Pallone
Barrett	Holloway	Paxon
Barton	Hunter	Petri
Bennett	Hutto	Quillen
Boehner	Hyde	Roberts
Bunning	Inhofe	Roe
Burton	Ireland	Rohrabacher
Combest	Johnson (TX)	Roth
Cox (CA)	Kyl	Santorum
Crane	Lagomarsino	Sarpalius
Dannemeyer	Lightfoot	Sensenbrenner
DeLay	Lipinski	Shuster
Doolittle	Livingston	Smith (NJ)
Dornan (CA)	Marlenee	Smith (OR)
Dreier	McCandless	Spence
Edwards (OK)	McCollum	Stump
Fawell	McEwen	Tauzin
Fields	McGrath	Thomas (CA)
Galleghy	McMillan (NC)	Thomas (WY)
Gradison	Michel	Walker
Hall (TX)	Miller (OH)	Zeliff
Hancock	Moorhead	

NOT VOTING—5

Hopkins	Rhodes	Sundquist
Mrazek	Solomon	

□ 1646

Messrs. IRELAND, GALLEGLY, SPENCE, and JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. COBLE, VOLKMER, KASICH, and EMERSON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DETAILED TABLE SETTING FORTH AMOUNTS PROVIDED IN H.R. 2707, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. NATCHER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a detailed table showing the amounts provided for in H.R. 2707, the bill just passed, with appropriate comparisons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mrs. UNSOELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

**H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor,  
Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies**

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>SUMMARY</b>					
<b>Title I - Department of Labor:</b>					
Federal Funds.....	7,541,537,000	7,336,447,000	7,435,073,000	-108,464,000	+98,626,000
Trust Funds.....	(3,345,157,000)	(3,398,136,000)	(3,512,648,000)	(+167,491,000)	(+114,512,000)
<b>Title II - Department of Health and Human Services:</b>					
Federal Funds (all years).....	151,535,902,000	165,857,345,000	167,266,742,000	+15,730,840,000	+1,609,397,000
Current year.....	(130,398,968,000)	(139,119,345,000)	(139,605,750,000)	(+9,206,782,000)	(+486,405,000)
1993 advance.....	(21,136,934,000)	(26,538,000,000)	(27,660,992,000)	(+6,524,058,000)	(+1,122,992,000)
Trust Funds.....	(6,554,729,000)	(6,543,148,000)	(6,937,781,000)	(+383,052,000)	(+394,633,000)
<b>Title III - Department of Education:</b>					
Federal Funds.....	22,883,520,000	26,580,972,000	28,266,159,000	+5,382,639,000	+1,885,187,000
Total including Guaranteed Student Loans.....	(27,093,338,000)	(29,656,683,000)	(31,341,870,000)	(+4,248,532,000)	(+1,685,187,000)
<b>Title IV - Related Agencies:</b>					
Federal Funds (all years).....	1,079,950,000	1,036,650,000	1,030,273,000	-49,677,000	-6,377,000
Current year.....	(761,314,000)	(776,650,000)	(776,964,000)	(+15,650,000)	(+314,000)
1994 advance.....	(318,636,000)	(260,000,000)	(253,309,000)	(-65,327,000)	(-6,691,000)
Trust Funds.....	(98,731,000)	(121,615,000)	(108,983,000)	(+10,252,000)	(-12,632,000)
<b>Total, all titles:</b>					
Federal Funds (all years).....	183,040,909,000	200,611,414,000	203,998,247,000	+20,957,338,000	+3,386,833,000
Current year.....	(161,585,339,000)	(173,813,414,000)	(176,083,946,000)	(+14,498,607,000)	(+2,270,532,000)
1993 advance.....	(21,136,934,000)	(26,538,000,000)	(27,660,992,000)	(+6,524,058,000)	(+1,122,992,000)
1994 advance.....	(318,636,000)	(260,000,000)	(253,309,000)	(-65,327,000)	(-6,691,000)
Trust Funds.....	(9,998,617,000)	(10,062,899,000)	(10,559,412,000)	(+560,795,000)	(+496,513,000)
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF LABOR</b>					
<b>EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION</b>					
<b>PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION 1/</b>					
Job training programs.....	19,884,000	21,528,000	21,528,000	+1,644,000	.....
Trust funds.....	(2,118,000)	(2,179,000)	(2,179,000)	(+61,000)	.....
Employment security.....	316,000	442,000	442,000	+126,000	.....
Trust funds.....	(12,611,000)	(13,472,000)	(13,472,000)	(+861,000)	.....
Financial and administrative management.....	13,343,000	14,502,000	14,502,000	+1,159,000	.....
Trust funds.....	(10,075,000)	(10,686,000)	(10,686,000)	(+611,000)	.....
Executive direction and administration.....	4,376,000	5,031,000	5,031,000	+655,000	.....
Trust funds.....	(3,670,000)	(4,047,000)	(4,047,000)	(+377,000)	.....
Regional operations.....	15,215,000	16,132,000	16,132,000	+917,000	.....
Trust funds.....	(24,319,000)	(26,745,000)	(26,745,000)	(+2,426,000)	.....
Apprenticeship services.....	16,051,000	16,553,000	16,553,000	+502,000	.....
<b>Total, Program Administration.....</b>	<b>122,178,000</b>	<b>131,317,000</b>	<b>131,317,000</b>	<b>+9,139,000</b>	<b>.....</b>
Federal funds.....	69,185,000	74,188,000	74,188,000	+5,003,000	.....
Trust funds.....	(52,993,000)	(57,129,000)	(57,129,000)	(+4,136,000)	.....
<b>TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES</b>					
<b>Grants to States:</b>					
Block grant.....	1,778,484,000	1,778,484,000	1,773,484,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000
Summer youth employment and training program.....	682,912,000	682,912,000	682,912,000	.....	.....
Dislocated worker assistance.....	526,986,000	526,986,000	576,986,000	+50,000,000	+50,000,000
<b>Federally administered programs:</b>					
Native Americans.....	59,625,000	58,690,000	59,625,000	.....	+935,000
Migrants and seasonal farmworkers.....	70,288,000	56,911,000	75,288,000	+5,000,000	+18,377,000
<b>Job Corps:</b>					
Operations.....	800,238,000	837,033,000	846,033,000	+45,795,000	+9,000,000
Construction and renovation 2/.....	67,259,000	50,464,000	52,464,000	-14,795,000	+2,000,000
Subtotal, Job Corps.....	867,497,000	887,497,000	898,497,000	+31,000,000	+11,000,000
Veterans' employment.....	9,120,000	8,792,000	9,120,000	.....	+328,000
<b>National activities:</b>					
Pilots and demonstrations.....	36,216,000	27,753,000	27,753,000	-8,463,000	.....
Research, demonstration and evaluation.....	12,927,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-2,927,000	.....
Other.....	22,673,000	13,706,000	16,706,000	-5,967,000	+3,000,000
Subtotal, National activities.....	71,816,000	51,459,000	54,459,000	-17,357,000	+3,000,000
Subtotal, Federal activities.....	1,078,346,000	1,063,349,000	1,096,989,000	+18,643,000	+33,640,000
<b>Total, Job Training Partnership Act.....</b>	<b>4,066,728,000</b>	<b>4,051,731,000</b>	<b>4,130,371,000</b>	<b>+63,643,000</b>	<b>+78,640,000</b>
Job training for the homeless.....	11,723,000	.....	7,400,000	-3,823,000	+7,400,000
<b>Total, Training and Employment Services.....</b>	<b>4,077,951,000</b>	<b>4,051,731,000</b>	<b>4,137,771,000</b>	<b>+59,820,000</b>	<b>+86,040,000</b>

1/ Reflects reprogramming approved 5/91.

2/ 1992 request includes \$20,000,000 reappropriation request.

H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS</b>					
National contracts.....	304,481,000	267,395,000	304,481,000		+ 37,086,000
State grants.....	85,879,000	75,419,000	85,879,000		+ 10,460,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>390,360,000</b>	<b>342,814,000</b>	<b>390,360,000</b>		<b>+ 47,546,000</b>
<b>FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES 1/</b>					
Trade adjustment.....	269,000,000	226,000,000	226,000,000	-43,000,000	
Other activities.....	500,000	250,000	250,000	-250,000	
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>269,500,000</b>	<b>226,250,000</b>	<b>226,250,000</b>	<b>-43,250,000</b>	
<b>STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS</b>					
<b>Unemployment Compensation (Trust Funds):</b>					
State Operations 2/.....	(1,458,435,000)	(1,510,973,000)	(1,510,973,000)	(+ 52,538,000)	
State integrity activities.....	(278,249,000)	(304,723,000)	(304,723,000)	(+ 26,474,000)	
National Activities.....	(6,213,000)	(6,486,000)	(6,486,000)	(+ 273,000)	
Contingency.....	(391,544,000)	(440,703,000)	(440,703,000)	(+ 49,159,000)	
<b>Subtotal, Unemployment Compensation (trust funds).....</b>	<b>(2,134,441,000)</b>	<b>(2,262,885,000)</b>	<b>(2,262,885,000)</b>	<b>(+ 128,444,000)</b>	
<b>Employment Service:</b>					
<b>Allotments to States:</b>					
Federal funds.....	21,177,000	22,500,000	21,177,000		-1,323,000
Trust funds.....	(783,940,000)	(727,500,000)	(783,940,000)		(+ 56,440,000)
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>805,117,000</b>	<b>750,000,000</b>	<b>805,117,000</b>		<b>+ 55,117,000</b>
<b>National Activities:</b>					
Federal funds.....	3,806,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	-1,606,000	
Trust funds 3/.....	(56,114,000)	(72,500,000)	(85,000,000)	(+ 28,886,000)	(+ 12,500,000)
Targeted jobs tax credit 4/.....	(19,518,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+ 482,000)	
<b>Subtotal, Employment Service.....</b>	<b>884,555,000</b>	<b>844,700,000</b>	<b>912,317,000</b>	<b>+ 27,762,000</b>	<b>+ 67,617,000</b>
Federal funds.....	24,983,000	24,700,000	23,377,000	-1,606,000	-1,323,000
Trust funds.....	(859,572,000)	(820,000,000)	(888,940,000)	(+ 29,368,000)	(+ 68,940,000)
<b>Total, State Unemployment 5/.....</b>	<b>3,018,996,000</b>	<b>3,107,585,000</b>	<b>3,175,202,000</b>	<b>+ 156,206,000</b>	<b>+ 67,617,000</b>
Federal Funds.....	24,983,000	24,700,000	23,377,000	-1,606,000	-1,323,000
Trust Funds.....	(2,994,013,000)	(3,082,885,000)	(3,151,825,000)	(+ 157,812,000)	(+ 68,940,000)
<b>ADVANCES TO UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND AND OTHER FUNDS.....</b>					
	328,000,000	236,990,000	236,990,000	-91,010,000	
<b>Total, Employment and Training Administration.....</b>	<b>8,206,985,000</b>	<b>8,086,687,000</b>	<b>8,297,890,000</b>	<b>+ 90,905,000</b>	<b>+ 201,203,000</b>
Federal funds.....	5,159,979,000	4,959,673,000	5,089,936,000	-71,043,000	+ 132,263,000
Trust funds.....	(3,047,006,000)	(3,140,014,000)	(3,208,954,000)	(+ 161,948,000)	(+ 68,940,000)
<b>LABOR - MANAGEMENT SERVICES</b>					
<b>SALARIES AND EXPENSES</b>					
Labor-management relations service.....	5,733,000	5,526,000	5,526,000	-207,000	
Labor-management standards enforcement.....	25,238,000	26,530,000	26,530,000	+ 1,292,000	
Pension and welfare benefit programs.....	56,405,000	63,784,000	63,784,000	+ 7,379,000	
<b>Total, LMSA.....</b>	<b>87,376,000</b>	<b>95,840,000</b>	<b>95,840,000</b>	<b>+ 8,464,000</b>	
<b>PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION</b>					
Program Administration subject to limitation (Trust Funds).....	(41,641,000)	(47,787,000)	(47,787,000)	(+ 6,146,000)	
Services related to terminations not subject to limitations (Trust Funds).....	(27,773,000)	(25,025,000)	(25,025,000)	(-2,748,000)	
<b>Total, PBGC (trust funds).....</b>	<b>(69,414,000)</b>	<b>(72,812,000)</b>	<b>(72,812,000)</b>	<b>(+ 3,398,000)</b>	
<b>EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION</b>					
<b>SALARIES AND EXPENSES 1/</b>					
Enforcement of wage and hour standards.....	91,295,000	97,336,000	97,336,000	+ 6,041,000	
Federal contractor EEO standards enforcement.....	52,585,000	55,909,000	55,909,000	+ 3,324,000	
Federal programs for workers' compensation.....	60,427,000	67,985,000	67,985,000	+ 7,558,000	
Trust funds.....	(992,000)	(1,035,000)	(1,035,000)	(+ 43,000)	
Executive direction and support services.....	10,846,000	11,398,000	11,398,000	+ 550,000	
<b>Total, salaries and expenses.....</b>	<b>216,145,000</b>	<b>233,661,000</b>	<b>233,661,000</b>	<b>+ 17,516,000</b>	
Federal funds.....	215,153,000	232,626,000	232,626,000	+ 17,473,000	
Trust funds.....	(992,000)	(1,035,000)	(1,035,000)	(+ 43,000)	

1/ Does not include \$164,000,000 in savings proposed for later transmittal.

2/ FY 1991 total includes \$18,427,000 for automation activities, available for obligation April 1, 1991.

3/ FY 1991 total for computer operations not available for obligation until Oct. 1, 1991. Recommendation includes \$12,500,000 for computer operations, not available for obligation until 9/30/92.

4/ Reflects FY 1992 budget amendment transmitted Feb. 22, 1991.

5/ Includes Federal, Trust and advance Trust funds.

**H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor,  
Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies**

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>SPECIAL BENEFITS</b>					
Federal employees compensation benefits.....	318,000,000	188,000,000	188,000,000	-130,000,000	
Longshore and harbor workers' benefits.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000		
<b>Total, Special Benefits.....</b>	<b>322,000,000</b>	<b>192,000,000</b>	<b>192,000,000</b>	<b>-130,000,000</b>	
<b>BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND</b>					
Benefit payments and interest on advances.....	866,019,000	861,135,000	861,135,000	-4,884,000	
Employment Standards Administration, salaries and expenses.....	28,900,000	30,145,000	30,145,000	+1,245,000	
Departmental Management, salaries and expenses.....	23,171,000	25,579,000	25,579,000	+2,408,000	
Departmental Management, Inspector general.....	371,000	333,000	333,000	-38,000	
<b>Subtotal, Black Lung Disability Trust Fund, appropriation....</b>	<b>918,461,000</b>	<b>917,192,000</b>	<b>917,192,000</b>	<b>-1,269,000</b>	
Treasury administrative costs (indefinite).....	756,000	756,000	756,000		
<b>Total, Black Lung Disability Trust Fund.....</b>	<b>919,217,000</b>	<b>917,948,000</b>	<b>917,948,000</b>	<b>-1,269,000</b>	
<b>Total, Employment Standards Administration.....</b>	<b>1,457,362,000</b>	<b>1,343,609,000</b>	<b>1,343,609,000</b>	<b>-113,753,000</b>	
Federal funds.....	1,456,370,000	1,342,574,000	1,342,574,000	-113,796,000	
Trust funds.....	(992,000)	(1,035,000)	(1,035,000)	(+43,000)	
<b>OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION</b>					
<b>SALARIES AND EXPENSES 1/</b>					
Safety and health standards.....	7,620,000	8,078,000	8,078,000	+458,000	
Enforcement:					
Federal Enforcement.....	123,935,000	133,508,000	133,508,000	+9,573,000	
State programs.....	63,731,000	66,344,000	66,344,000	+2,613,000	
Technical Support.....	16,684,000	17,708,000	17,708,000	+1,024,000	
Compliance Assistance.....	37,370,000	38,942,000	38,942,000	+1,572,000	
Safety and health statistics.....	29,116,000	30,390,000	30,390,000	+1,274,000	
Executive direction and administration.....	6,737,000	7,137,000	7,137,000	+400,000	
<b>Total, OSHA.....</b>	<b>285,193,000</b>	<b>302,107,000</b>	<b>302,107,000</b>	<b>+16,914,000</b>	
<b>MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION 2/</b>					
<b>SALARIES AND EXPENSES</b>					
Enforcement:					
Coal.....	87,338,000	94,750,000	94,750,000	+7,412,000	
Metal/nonmetal.....	35,223,000	37,718,000	37,718,000	+2,495,000	
Standards development.....	1,363,000	1,516,000	1,516,000	+153,000	
Assessments.....	2,313,000	2,455,000	2,455,000	+142,000	
Educational policy and development.....	14,953,000	14,152,000	14,152,000	-801,000	
Technical support.....	20,563,000	21,322,000	21,322,000	+759,000	
Program administration.....	11,808,000	14,244,000	14,244,000	+2,436,000	
<b>Total, Mine Safety and Health Administration.....</b>	<b>173,561,000</b>	<b>186,157,000</b>	<b>186,157,000</b>	<b>+12,596,000</b>	
<b>BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS</b>					
<b>SALARIES AND EXPENSES</b>					
Employment and Unemployment Statistics.....	87,159,000	85,709,000	85,709,000	+18,550,000	
Labor Market Information (Trust Funds).....	(51,488,000)	(50,399,000)	(50,399,000)	(-1,089,000)	
Prices and cost of living.....	74,336,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	+10,664,000	
Wages and industrial relations.....	25,738,000	45,216,000	45,216,000	+19,478,000	
Productivity and technology.....	5,999,000	6,316,000	6,316,000	+617,000	
Economic growth and employment projections.....	3,479,000	3,844,000	3,844,000	+365,000	
Executive direction and staff services.....	27,258,000	32,419,000	32,419,000	+5,161,000	
<b>Total, Bureau of Labor Statistics.....</b>	<b>255,157,000</b>	<b>308,903,000</b>	<b>308,903,000</b>	<b>+53,746,000</b>	
Federal Funds.....	203,669,000	258,504,000	258,504,000	+54,835,000	
Trust Funds.....	(51,488,000)	(50,399,000)	(50,399,000)	(-1,089,000)	
<b>DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT</b>					
<b>SALARIES AND EXPENSES</b>					
Executive direction.....	21,419,000	27,911,000	24,911,000	+3,492,000	-3,000,000
Legal services.....	52,722,000	58,588,000	58,588,000	+5,868,000	
Trust funds 3/.....	(278,000)	(332,000)	(332,000)	(+54,000)	
International labor affairs.....	8,572,000	7,284,000	7,284,000	+712,000	
Administration and management.....	20,209,000	21,812,000	21,175,000	+968,000	-637,000
Adjudication.....	14,903,000	16,187,000	16,187,000	+1,584,000	
Promoting employment of the disabled.....	4,077,000	4,078,000	4,078,000	+1,000	
Women's Bureau.....	7,413,000	7,562,000	7,562,000	+149,000	
Civil Rights Activities.....	4,338,000	4,534,000	4,534,000	+196,000	
<b>Total, Salaries and expenses.....</b>	<b>131,631,000</b>	<b>148,288,000</b>	<b>144,651,000</b>	<b>+13,020,000</b>	<b>-3,637,000</b>
Federal funds.....	131,353,000	147,956,000	144,319,000	+12,966,000	-3,637,000
Trust funds.....	(278,000)	(332,000)	(332,000)	(+54,000)	

1/ Reflects reprogramming approved 5/91.

2/ Reflects reprogramming approved 5/91.

3/ FY 1992 amount incorrectly reflected in Appendix bill language.

H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING</b>					
State Administration:					
Disabled Veterans Outreach Program.....	(77,170,000)	(34,910,000)	(79,170,000)	(+2,000,000)	(+44,260,000)
Local Veterans Employment Program.....	(71,095,000)	(74,223,000)	(73,095,000)	(+2,000,000)	(-1,128,000)
Subtotal, State Administration.....	(148,265,000)	(109,133,000)	(152,265,000)	(+4,000,000)	(+43,132,000)
Federal Administration.....	(21,180,000)	(20,054,000)	(20,054,000)	(-1,126,000)	
National Veterans Training Institute.....	(2,440,000)		(2,440,000)		(+2,440,000)
Total, Trust Funds.....	(171,885,000)	(129,187,000)	(174,759,000)	(+2,874,000)	(+45,572,000)
<b>OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL 1/</b>					
Audit:					
Federal funds.....	20,883,000	20,873,000	20,873,000	-20,000	
Trust funds.....	(3,784,000)	(4,023,000)	(4,023,000)	(+239,000)	
Investigation:					
Federal funds.....	7,729,000	8,245,000	8,245,000	+516,000	
Trust funds.....	(310,000)	(334,000)	(334,000)	(+24,000)	
Office of Labor Racketeering.....	10,495,000	11,322,000	11,322,000	+827,000	
Executive Direction and Management.....	5,119,000	6,398,000	6,398,000	+1,277,000	
Total, Office of the Inspector General.....	48,130,000	50,993,000	50,993,000	+2,863,000	
Federal funds.....	44,036,000	46,636,000	46,636,000	+2,600,000	
Trust funds.....	(4,094,000)	(4,367,000)	(4,367,000)	(+263,000)	
Total, Departmental Management.....	351,646,000	328,468,000	370,403,000	+18,757,000	+41,935,000
Federal funds.....	175,389,000	194,592,000	190,955,000	+15,586,000	-3,637,000
Trust funds.....	(178,257,000)	(133,876,000)	(179,448,000)	(+3,191,000)	(+45,572,000)
Undistributed salaries and expenses reduction.....			-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000
Total, Labor Department 2/.....	10,888,894,000	10,734,583,000	10,947,721,000	+61,027,000	+213,138,000
Federal funds.....	7,541,537,000	7,336,447,000	7,435,073,000	-106,484,000	+98,626,000
Trust funds.....	(3,345,157,000)	(3,398,136,000)	(3,512,648,000)	(+167,491,000)	(+114,512,000)
<b>TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</b>					
<b>HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION</b>					
<b>HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES 3/</b>					
Health Care Delivery and Assistance:					
Community health centers.....	478,191,000	478,191,000	478,191,000		
Rural outreach grants.....	19,518,000			-19,518,000	
HUD health service grants.....	3,418,000	3,000,000	7,500,000	+4,084,000	+4,500,000
Targeted infant mortality initiative:					
Healthy start.....	25,000,000	138,659,000	69,330,000	+44,330,000	-69,329,000
Community health centers.....			69,329,000	+69,329,000	+69,329,000
Subtotal.....	25,000,000	138,659,000	138,659,000	+113,659,000	
Total, Community Health Services.....	526,125,000	619,850,000	624,350,000	+98,225,000	+4,500,000
Migrant health.....	51,723,000	51,723,000	51,723,000		
Black lung clinics.....	3,708,000	3,708,000	3,708,000		
Health care for the homeless.....	39,036,000	63,041,000	51,000,000	+11,984,000	-12,041,000
Family planning.....	144,311,000	150,000,000		-144,311,000	-150,000,000
National Health Service Corps:					
Field placements.....	42,256,000	42,256,000	42,256,000		
Loans and scholarships.....	48,795,000	53,795,000	58,795,000	+10,000,000	+5,000,000
Subtotal, National Health Service Corps.....	91,051,000	96,051,000	101,051,000	+10,000,000	+5,000,000
Hansen's Disease services (Carville).....	19,792,000	19,489,000	19,489,000	-303,000	
Payment to Hawaii, treatment of Hansen's Disease.....	3,383,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	-383,000	
Home health demonstration grants.....	2,928,000			-2,928,000	
Total, Health Care Delivery and Assistance.....	882,057,000	1,006,862,000	854,321,000	-27,736,000	-152,541,000
Health Professions:					
Exceptional need scholarships.....	9,759,000	10,400,000	9,759,000		-641,000
Minority centers of excellence.....	14,151,000	14,920,000	27,920,000	+13,769,000	+13,000,000
Public health special projects.....	3,757,000		3,757,000		+3,757,000
Health administration grants.....	1,554,000		1,554,000		+1,554,000
Public health traineeships.....	3,418,000		3,418,000		+3,418,000
Health administration traineeships.....	484,000		484,000		+484,000
Preventive medicine residencies.....	1,654,000		1,654,000		+1,654,000
Family medicine residencies.....	36,108,000		36,108,000		+36,108,000
General dentistry residencies.....	3,834,000		3,834,000		+3,834,000
General internal medicine and pediatrics.....	17,256,000		17,256,000		+17,256,000
Family medicine departments.....	6,831,000		6,831,000		+6,831,000
Physician assistants.....	5,021,000		5,021,000		+5,021,000
Area health education centers.....	19,237,000		19,237,000		+19,237,000

1/ Reflects reprogramming approved 5/91.

2/ Includes Federal and Trust funds.

3/ Budget and recommendation include delayed obligation of \$86,000,000 until Sept. 19, 1992.

**H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor,  
Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies**

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
Health education and training centers.....	3,904,000		3,904,000		+ 3,904,000
Health professions data analysis.....	1,762,000		1,762,000		+ 1,762,000
Disadvantaged assistance.....	30,817,000	32,841,000	30,817,000		-2,024,000
Disadvantaged minority health improvement.....	10,734,000	10,734,000	23,234,000	+12,500,000	+12,500,000
Minority HPSL initiative.....	2,928,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	+12,072,000	
Allied health grants and contracts.....	1,659,000		1,659,000		+ 1,659,000
Interdisciplinary traineeships.....	4,392,000		4,392,000		+ 4,392,000
Health professions special education initiatives.....	2,398,000		2,398,000		+ 2,398,000
Geriatric centers and training.....	13,708,000		13,708,000		+13,708,000
Pacific Basin activities (including Medical officer training).....	2,440,000		2,440,000		+ 2,440,000
Native Hawaiian health care.....	3,416,000		3,416,000		+ 3,416,000
National practitioner data bank.....	1,926,000	5,000,000	7,000,000	+5,074,000	+ 2,000,000
User fees.....		-5,000,000	-5,000,000		
<b>Nurse training:</b>					
Advanced nurse education.....	12,463,000		12,463,000		+ 12,463,000
Nurse practitioners / nurse midwives.....	14,639,000		14,639,000		+ 14,639,000
Special projects.....	10,532,000		10,532,000		+ 10,532,000
Traineeships.....	13,684,000		13,684,000		+13,684,000
Nurse anesthetists.....	1,430,000		1,430,000		+ 1,430,000
Undergraduate scholarships.....	2,380,000		2,380,000		+ 2,380,000
Loan repayment for shortage area service.....	1,455,000		1,455,000		+ 1,455,000
Nurse disadvantaged assistance.....	3,416,000	4,160,000	3,416,000		-744,000
<b>Subtotal, Nurse training.....</b>	<b>59,979,000</b>	<b>4,160,000</b>	<b>59,979,000</b>		<b>+55,819,000</b>
<b>Total, Health professions.....</b>	<b>263,125,000</b>	<b>88,055,000</b>	<b>301,540,000</b>	<b>+ 38,415,000</b>	<b>+ 213,485,000</b>
<b>MCH and Resources Development:</b>					
Maternal and child health block grant.....	587,310,000	553,627,000	580,000,000	-7,310,000	+ 26,373,000
Pediatric emergency care.....	4,880,000		4,880,000		+ 4,880,000
Organ transplantation.....	3,723,000	3,387,000	5,137,000	+1,414,000	+ 1,750,000
Health teaching facilities interest subsidies.....	478,000	450,000	450,000		-28,000
Perinatal facilities.....	976,000				-976,000
<b>Total, Resources Development.....</b>	<b>597,365,000</b>	<b>557,464,000</b>	<b>590,467,000</b>	<b>-8,898,000</b>	<b>+ 33,003,000</b>
Buildings and facilities.....	1,844,000			-1,844,000	
Rural health research.....	4,674,000	4,139,000	4,139,000		-535,000
<b>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS):</b>					
Training of health personnel.....	17,029,000	17,029,000	17,029,000		
Facilities renovation grants.....	4,029,000	4,029,000			-4,029,000
Pediatric health care demonstrations.....	19,518,000	19,518,000	19,518,000		
<b>Ryan White AIDS Programs:</b>					
Emergency assistance.....	87,831,000	87,831,000	100,000,000	+ 12,169,000	+ 12,169,000
Comprehensive care programs.....	87,831,000	87,831,000	91,819,000	+ 3,988,000	+ 3,988,000
Early intervention program.....	44,891,000	44,891,000	55,000,000	+ 10,109,000	+ 10,109,000
<b>Subtotal, Ryan White AIDS programs.....</b>	<b>220,553,000</b>	<b>220,553,000</b>	<b>246,819,000</b>	<b>+ 26,266,000</b>	<b>+ 26,266,000</b>
<b>Subtotal, AIDS.....</b>	<b>261,129,000</b>	<b>261,129,000</b>	<b>283,366,000</b>	<b>+ 22,237,000</b>	<b>+ 22,237,000</b>
Program management including AIDS.....	98,548,000	100,851,000	103,700,000	+ 5,152,000	+ 2,849,000
<b>Total, Health resources and services.....</b>	<b>2,108,742,000</b>	<b>2,018,500,000</b>	<b>2,137,533,000</b>	<b>+ 28,791,000</b>	<b>+ 119,033,000</b>
<b>MEDICAL FACILITIES GUARANTEE AND LOAN FUND: Interest subsidy program.....</b>	<b>20,000,000</b>	<b>19,000,000</b>	<b>19,000,000</b>	<b>-1,000,000</b>	
<b>HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOANS PROGRAM (HEAL):</b>					
New loan subsidies.....		21,813,000	30,000,000	+ 30,000,000	+ 8,187,000
Liquidating account.....		35,502,000	48,000,000	+ 48,000,000	+ 12,498,000
HEAL loan limitation (non-add).....	(260,000,000)	(185,000,000)	(260,000,000)		(+ 75,000,000)
<b>Subtotal.....</b>		<b>57,315,000</b>	<b>78,000,000</b>	<b>+ 78,000,000</b>	<b>+ 20,685,000</b>
Program management.....	1,400,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	+ 100,000	
<b>Total, HEAL.....</b>	<b>1,400,000</b>	<b>58,815,000</b>	<b>79,500,000</b>	<b>+ 78,100,000</b>	<b>+ 20,685,000</b>
<b>VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION:</b>					
Pre - FY89 claims (appropriation).....	79,920,000		80,000,000	+ 80,000	+ 80,000,000
Post - FY88 claims (trust fund).....	154,080,000	84,920,000	84,920,000	-69,160,000	
HRSA administration (trust fund).....	2,500,000	2,000,000	2,500,000		+ 500,000
<b>Subtotal, Vaccine injury compensation.....</b>	<b>236,500,000</b>	<b>86,920,000</b>	<b>167,420,000</b>	<b>-69,080,000</b>	<b>+ 80,500,000</b>
<b>Total, Health Resources and Services Administration.....</b>	<b>2,386,642,000</b>	<b>2,183,235,000</b>	<b>2,403,453,000</b>	<b>+ 36,811,000</b>	<b>+ 220,218,000</b>
<b>CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL DISEASE CONTROL 1/</b>					
Preventive Health Services Block Grant.....	92,702,000	107,472,000	92,702,000		-14,770,000
Prevention centers.....	4,367,000	3,949,000	4,367,000		+ 418,000
Lead poisoning prevention.....	7,790,000	14,949,000	7,790,000		-7,159,000
<b>Sexually transmitted diseases:</b>					
Grants.....	73,638,000	77,638,000	73,638,000		-4,000,000
Direct operations.....	11,330,000	11,910,000	11,330,000		-580,000
<b>Subtotal, Sexually transmitted diseases.....</b>	<b>84,968,000</b>	<b>89,548,000</b>	<b>84,968,000</b>		<b>-4,580,000</b>

1/ Budget and recommendation include delayed obligation of \$94,000,000 until Sept. 19, 1992.

H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>Immunization:</b>					
Grants.....	182,004,000	208,885,000	248,885,000	+66,861,000	+40,000,000
Direct operations.....	30,129,000	46,510,000	46,510,000	+16,381,000	
Vaccine stockpile.....	2,928,000			-2,928,000	
Adverse events reporting.....	2,470,000	2,470,000	2,470,000		
<b>Subtotal, Immunization programs.....</b>	<b>217,531,000</b>	<b>257,845,000</b>	<b>297,845,000</b>	<b>+80,314,000</b>	<b>+40,000,000</b>
<b>Infectious disease excluding AIDS/TB:</b>					
Tuberculosis grants.....	43,689,000	45,179,000	45,179,000	+1,490,000	
Chronic and environmental disease prevention.....	9,109,000	12,334,000	13,334,000	+4,225,000	+1,000,000
Breast and cervical cancer screening.....	51,408,000	56,664,000	56,664,000	+5,256,000	
Injury control.....	29,259,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	+20,741,000	
	24,036,000	26,066,000	26,066,000	+2,030,000	
<b>Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH):</b>					
Research.....	86,508,000	86,508,000	86,508,000		
Training.....	10,472,000	10,472,000	10,472,000		
<b>Subtotal, NIOSH.....</b>	<b>96,980,000</b>	<b>96,980,000</b>	<b>96,980,000</b>		
<b>National Center for Health Statistics:</b>					
Program operations.....	48,301,000	48,301,000	48,301,000		
Program support.....	3,105,000	3,105,000	3,105,000		
1% evaluation funds (non-add).....	(19,000,000)	(33,800,000)	(25,000,000)	(+8,000,000)	(-8,800,000)
<b>Subtotal, health statistics.....</b>	<b>51,406,000</b>	<b>51,406,000</b>	<b>51,406,000</b>		
<b>Epidemic services:</b>					
Buildings and facilities.....	68,714,000	78,228,000	73,714,000	+5,000,000	-4,514,000
Program management.....	31,951,000	8,338,000	6,338,000	-25,613,000	-2,000,000
Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS).....	3,016,000	3,309,000	3,309,000	+293,000	
	494,660,000	484,660,000	480,000,000	-14,660,000	-14,660,000
<b>Total, Disease Control.....</b>	<b>1,311,586,000</b>	<b>1,396,927,000</b>	<b>1,390,662,000</b>	<b>+79,076,000</b>	<b>-6,265,000</b>
<b>NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH (INCLUDES AIDS) 1/</b>					
<b>National Cancer Institute.....</b>					
Research training.....	1,676,507,000	1,772,560,000	1,793,257,000	+116,750,000	+20,697,000
	37,252,000	37,670,000	37,252,000		-418,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>1,713,759,000</b>	<b>1,810,230,000</b>	<b>1,830,509,000</b>	<b>+116,750,000</b>	<b>+20,279,000</b>
<b>National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute.....</b>					
Research training.....	1,080,251,000	1,162,725,000	1,155,707,000	+75,456,000	-7,018,000
	46,691,000	47,199,000	46,691,000		-508,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>1,126,942,000</b>	<b>1,209,924,000</b>	<b>1,202,398,000</b>	<b>+75,456,000</b>	<b>-7,526,000</b>
<b>National Institute of Dental Research.....</b>					
Research training.....	142,867,000	154,771,000	155,184,000	+12,317,000	+413,000
	6,051,000	6,168,000	6,051,000		-117,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>148,918,000</b>	<b>160,939,000</b>	<b>161,235,000</b>	<b>+12,317,000</b>	<b>+296,000</b>
<b>National Institute of Diabetes, Digestive, and Kidney Diseases.....</b>					
Research training.....	590,853,000	633,863,000	643,401,000	+52,548,000	+9,538,000
	24,419,000	24,694,000	24,419,000		-275,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>615,272,000</b>	<b>658,557,000</b>	<b>667,820,000</b>	<b>+52,548,000</b>	<b>+9,263,000</b>
<b>National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke.....</b>					
Research training.....	528,398,000	569,838,000	570,010,000	+41,612,000	+172,000
	13,345,000	13,517,000	13,345,000		-172,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>541,743,000</b>	<b>583,355,000</b>	<b>583,355,000</b>	<b>+41,612,000</b>	
<b>National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.....</b>					
Research training.....	887,089,000	955,581,000	952,843,000	+65,554,000	-2,938,000
	20,187,000	21,130,000	20,187,000		-943,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>907,276,000</b>	<b>976,711,000</b>	<b>972,830,000</b>	<b>+65,554,000</b>	<b>-3,881,000</b>
<b>National Institute of General Medical Sciences.....</b>					
Research training.....	667,930,000	738,292,000	728,080,000	+60,150,000	-10,212,000
	92,080,000	94,888,000	92,080,000		-2,808,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>760,010,000</b>	<b>833,180,000</b>	<b>820,160,000</b>	<b>+60,150,000</b>	<b>-13,020,000</b>
<b>National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.....</b>					
Research training.....	462,584,000	503,137,000	508,289,000	+45,705,000	+5,152,000
	16,372,000	17,447,000	16,372,000		-1,075,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>478,956,000</b>	<b>520,584,000</b>	<b>524,661,000</b>	<b>+45,705,000</b>	<b>+4,077,000</b>
<b>National Eye Institute.....</b>					
Research training.....	245,947,000	264,767,000	264,966,000	+19,019,000	+199,000
	7,294,000	7,493,000	7,294,000		-199,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>253,241,000</b>	<b>272,260,000</b>	<b>272,260,000</b>	<b>+19,019,000</b>	
<b>National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences.....</b>					
Research training.....	230,122,000	243,472,000	244,006,000	+13,884,000	+534,000
	10,906,000	11,012,000	10,906,000		-106,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>241,028,000</b>	<b>254,484,000</b>	<b>254,912,000</b>	<b>+13,884,000</b>	<b>+428,000</b>
<b>National Institute on Aging.....</b>					
Research training.....	313,969,000	338,664,000	352,745,000	+38,776,000	+14,081,000
	9,783,000	9,894,000	9,783,000		-111,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>323,752,000</b>	<b>348,558,000</b>	<b>362,528,000</b>	<b>+38,776,000</b>	<b>+13,970,000</b>
<b>National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases.....</b>					
Research training.....	186,393,000	197,859,000	198,123,000	+11,730,000	+264,000
	6,854,000	6,938,000	6,854,000		-84,000
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>193,247,000</b>	<b>204,797,000</b>	<b>204,977,000</b>	<b>+11,730,000</b>	<b>+180,000</b>

1/ Budget and recommendation include delayed obligation of \$400,000,000 until Sept. 19, 1992.

**H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor,  
Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies**

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders.....	130,950,000	142,287,000	140,510,000	+9,560,000	-1,777,000
Research training.....	3,985,000	4,034,000	3,985,000		-49,000
Subtotal.....	134,935,000	146,321,000	144,495,000	+9,560,000	-1,826,000
National Center for Research Resources.....	332,589,000	318,230,000	308,534,000	-26,055,000	-11,696,000
Research training.....	2,668,000	2,745,000	2,668,000		-79,000
Subtotal.....	335,255,000	320,975,000	309,200,000	-26,055,000	-11,775,000
National Center for Nursing Research.....	35,330,000	39,247,000	38,751,000	+3,421,000	-496,000
Research training.....	4,392,000	4,500,000	4,392,000		-108,000
Subtotal.....	39,722,000	43,747,000	43,143,000	+3,421,000	-604,000
National Center for Human Genome Research.....	83,308,000	105,178,000	89,008,000	+5,697,000	-16,172,000
Research training.....	4,109,000	5,309,000	4,109,000		-1,200,000
Subtotal.....	87,418,000	110,487,000	93,115,000	+5,697,000	-17,372,000
John E. Fogarty International Center.....	17,518,000	19,922,000	19,922,000	+2,403,000	
National Library of Medicine:					
Regular program.....	69,251,000	73,308,000	74,408,000	+8,157,000	+1,100,000
Medical library assistance.....	14,691,000	16,309,000	14,691,000		-1,618,000
Biotechnology information.....	10,466,000	10,937,000	10,466,000		-471,000
Subtotal.....	91,408,000	100,554,000	99,565,000	+8,157,000	-889,000
Office of the Director.....	97,651,000	95,176,000	149,176,000	+51,525,000	+54,000,000
Buildings and facilities.....	168,687,000	104,125,000	108,625,000	-60,062,000	+4,500,000
Total, N.I.H. funding including AIDS.....	8,276,739,000	8,774,886,000	8,824,886,000	+548,147,000	+50,000,000
<b>ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION</b>					
<b>ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH (INCLUDES AIDS)</b>					
National Institute of Mental Health:					
Research.....	455,500,000	491,754,000	491,754,000	+36,254,000	
Instrumentation grants.....	1,323,000	1,338,000	1,323,000		-15,000
Research training.....	26,942,000	27,701,000	26,942,000		-759,000
Clinical training.....	13,670,000		8,000,000	-5,670,000	+8,000,000
Community support demonstrations.....	24,885,000	25,880,000	24,885,000		-995,000
Prevention demonstrations.....	4,880,000	5,075,000	4,880,000		-195,000
Grants to States for the homeless (PATH).....	26,153,000	43,116,000	26,153,000		-16,963,000
Homeless services demonstrations.....	5,861,000		5,861,000		+5,861,000
Homeless research demonstrations.....		20,000,000			-20,000,000
Protection and advocacy.....	15,614,000		15,614,000		+15,614,000
Direct operations.....	40,982,000	43,982,000	43,982,000	+3,000,000	
Subtotal, mental health.....	615,810,000	658,846,000	649,394,000	+33,584,000	-9,452,000
National Institute on Drug Abuse:					
Research.....	257,896,000	284,624,000	270,000,000	+12,104,000	-14,624,000
Instrumentation grants.....	504,000	524,000	504,000		-20,000
Research training.....	6,783,000	7,020,000	6,783,000		-237,000
Treatment demonstrations.....	45,465,000	46,955,000	46,955,000	+1,490,000	
AIDS demonstrations.....	73,193,000	71,550,000	71,550,000	-1,643,000	
Direct operations.....	32,186,000	35,552,000	35,552,000	+3,366,000	
Subtotal, drug abuse.....	416,027,000	448,225,000	431,344,000	+15,317,000	-14,881,000
National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse:					
Research.....	138,849,000	149,932,000	149,932,000	+11,083,000	
Instrumentation grants.....	575,000	581,000	575,000		-6,000
Research training.....	3,542,000	3,668,000	3,542,000		-124,000
Substance abuse homeless demonstrations.....	15,983,000		15,983,000		+15,983,000
Direct operations.....	11,789,000	12,596,000	12,596,000	+807,000	
Subtotal, alcoholism.....	170,738,000	166,775,000	182,628,000	+11,890,000	+15,853,000
Office for Treatment Improvement:					
Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health block grant.....	1,268,670,000	1,268,670,000	1,235,000,000	-33,670,000	-33,670,000
Treatment grants to crisis areas.....	31,296,000	32,548,000	31,296,000		-1,252,000
Treatment improvement grants.....	83,363,000	86,698,000	83,363,000		-3,335,000
Capacity expansion program.....		68,000,000			-68,000,000
Transfer from forfeiture fund.....		(31,000,000)			(-31,000,000)
Treatment waiting list grants reappropriation.....	38,545,000			-38,545,000	
Direct operations.....	5,209,000	7,718,000	7,718,000	+2,509,000	
Subtotal, Treatment Improvement.....	1,427,083,000	1,463,634,000	1,357,377,000	-69,706,000	-106,257,000
Office for Substance Abuse Prevention:					
Prevention programs.....	112,003,000	125,505,000	112,003,000		-13,502,000
Community youth activity program.....	20,162,000		15,162,000	-5,000,000	+15,162,000
Community prevention grants.....	99,118,000	113,852,000	99,118,000		-14,734,000
Training.....	25,986,000	25,986,000	25,986,000		
Direct operations.....	14,200,000	16,237,000	16,237,000	+2,037,000	
Subtotal, Substance Abuse Prevention.....	271,469,000	281,580,000	268,506,000	-2,963,000	-13,074,000

**H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies**

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
Treatment outcome evaluations.....	8,134,000	8,598,000	8,598,000	+464,000	
Buildings and facilities.....	7,775,000	7,775,000	5,000,000	-2,775,000	-2,775,000
Office of the Administrator.....	11,368,000	14,895,000	14,895,000	+3,527,000	
<b>Total, Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health.....</b>	<b>2,928,404,000</b>	<b>3,048,328,000</b>	<b>2,917,742,000</b>	<b>-10,862,000</b>	<b>-130,586,000</b>
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL.....	11,711,000			-11,711,000	
<b>Total, Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration.....</b>	<b>2,940,115,000</b>	<b>3,048,328,000</b>	<b>2,917,742,000</b>	<b>-22,373,000</b>	<b>-130,586,000</b>
<b>ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH</b>					
<b>OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH 1/</b>					
Population affairs: Adolescent family life.....	7,789,000	12,000,000		-7,789,000	-12,000,000
Health Initiatives:					
Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion.....	4,577,000	4,577,000	4,027,000	-550,000	-550,000
Physical fitness and sports.....	1,443,000	1,443,000	1,443,000		
Minority health.....	14,470,000	15,016,000	15,016,000	+546,000	
National vaccine program.....	9,831,000	2,300,000	12,500,000	+2,869,000	+10,200,000
Health Service Management.....	21,020,000	21,220,000	21,770,000	+750,000	+550,000
Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS).....	8,238,000	8,773,000	8,773,000	+535,000	
Undistributed.....			5,789,000	+5,789,000	+5,789,000
<b>Total, OASH.....</b>	<b>67,168,000</b>	<b>65,329,000</b>	<b>69,318,000</b>	<b>+2,150,000</b>	<b>+3,989,000</b>
<b>RETIREMENT PAY AND MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS 2/</b>					
Retirement payments.....	95,717,000	104,303,000	104,303,000	+8,586,000	
Survivors benefits.....	5,926,000	6,850,000	6,850,000	+724,000	
Dependent's medical care.....	19,230,000	20,499,000	20,499,000	+1,269,000	
Military Services Credits.....	3,399,000	3,222,000	3,222,000	-177,000	
<b>Total, Retirement pay and medical benefits.....</b>	<b>124,272,000</b>	<b>134,874,000</b>	<b>134,874,000</b>	<b>+10,402,000</b>	
<b>AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH</b>					
Health services research:					
Research.....	25,424,000	5,329,000	25,424,000		+20,095,000
Trust funds.....	(1,012,000)	(1,050,000)	(1,012,000)		(-38,000)
AIDS.....	10,252,000	10,800,000	10,252,000		-548,000
Program support.....	2,274,000	2,330,000	2,274,000		-56,000
<b>Subtotal including trust funds.....</b>	<b>38,962,000</b>	<b>19,509,000</b>	<b>38,962,000</b>		<b>+19,453,000</b>
1% evaluation funding (non-add).....	(13,444,000)	(39,544,000)	(13,444,000)		(-26,100,000)
Medical treatment effectiveness:					
Federal funds.....	57,808,000	15,824,000	57,808,000		+41,982,000
Trust funds.....	(4,880,000)	(36,723,000)	(4,880,000)		(-31,843,000)
<b>Subtotal, Medical treatment effectiveness.....</b>	<b>62,888,000</b>	<b>52,547,000</b>	<b>62,888,000</b>		<b>+10,139,000</b>
1% evaluation funding (non-add).....		(10,400,000)			(-10,400,000)
<b>Total, Health Care Policy and Research:</b>					
Federal Funds.....	95,756,000	34,283,000	95,756,000		+61,473,000
Trust funds.....	(5,892,000)	(37,773,000)	(5,892,000)		(-31,881,000)
<b>Total, 1% evaluation funding (non-add).....</b>	<b>(13,444,000)</b>	<b>(49,944,000)</b>	<b>(13,444,000)</b>		<b>(-36,500,000)</b>
<b>Total, Health Care Policy and Research (non-add).....</b>	<b>(115,092,000)</b>	<b>(122,000,000)</b>	<b>(115,092,000)</b>		<b>(-6,908,000)</b>
PHS travel reduction.....			-8,000,000	-8,000,000	-8,000,000
<b>Total, Public Health Service:</b>					
Federal Funds.....	15,182,278,000	15,637,862,000	15,828,491,000	+646,213,000	+190,829,000
Trust funds.....	(5,892,000)	(37,773,000)	(5,892,000)		(-31,881,000)
<b>HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION</b>					
<b>GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID 3/</b>					
Medicaid current law benefits.....	48,794,085,000	56,712,895,000	56,712,895,000	+7,918,810,000	
State and local administration.....	2,760,865,000	3,186,254,000	3,186,254,000	+425,389,000	
Proposed legislation.....		-91,500,000			+91,500,000
<b>Subtotal, Medicaid program level, FY 1992.....</b>	<b>51,554,950,000</b>	<b>59,807,649,000</b>	<b>59,899,149,000</b>	<b>+8,344,199,000</b>	<b>+91,500,000</b>
Less funds advanced in prior year.....	-10,400,000,000	-13,500,000,000	-13,500,000,000	-3,100,000,000	
<b>Total, current request, FY 1992.....</b>	<b>41,154,950,000</b>	<b>46,307,649,000</b>	<b>46,399,149,000</b>	<b>+5,244,199,000</b>	<b>+91,500,000</b>
New advance, 1st quarter, FY 1993.....	13,500,000,000	17,100,000,000	17,100,000,000	+3,600,000,000	

1/ Budget proposes delayed obligation of \$4,000,000 until Sept. 19, 1992.  
 2/ Does not include \$110,953,000 in savings proposed for later transmittal.  
 3/ Does not include \$25,000,000 in legislative additions proposed for later transmittal.

**H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor,  
Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies**

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>PAYMENTS TO HEALTH CARE TRUST FUNDS 1/</b>					
Supplemental medical insurance.....	34,730,000,000	38,884,000,000	38,884,000,000	+3,954,000,000	.....
Hospital insurance for uninsured.....	559,000,000	584,000,000	584,000,000	+25,000,000	.....
Federal uninsured payment.....	48,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000	-9,000,000	.....
Program management.....	.....	118,485,000	118,485,000	+118,485,000	.....
Proposed legislation.....	.....	-20,402,000	.....	.....	+20,402,000
<b>Total, Payment to Trust Funds.....</b>	<b>35,335,000,000</b>	<b>39,401,083,000</b>	<b>39,421,485,000</b>	<b>+4,086,485,000</b>	<b>+20,402,000</b>
<b>PROGRAM MANAGEMENT</b>					
<b>Research, demonstration, and evaluation:</b>					
Regular program, trust funds.....	(35,621,000)	(36,000,000)	(45,621,000)	(+10,000,000)	(+9,621,000)
Rural hospital transition demonstrations, trust funds.....	(24,398,000)	.....	(21,000,000)	(-3,398,000)	(+21,000,000)
Essential access community hospitals, trust funds.....	(9,759,000)	.....	(9,759,000)	.....	(+9,759,000)
<b>Subtotal, research, demonstration, and evaluation.....</b>	<b>(69,778,000)</b>	<b>(36,000,000)</b>	<b>(76,380,000)</b>	<b>(+6,802,000)</b>	<b>(+40,380,000)</b>
<b>Medicare Contractors (Trust Funds):</b>					
Operating funds, current.....	(1,493,959,000)	(1,457,000,000)	(1,457,000,000)	(-36,959,000)	.....
Contingency reserve fund.....	(58,210,000)	(100,000,000)	(257,000,000)	(+198,790,000)	(+157,000,000)
<b>Subtotal, Contractors.....</b>	<b>(1,552,169,000)</b>	<b>(1,557,000,000)</b>	<b>(1,714,000,000)</b>	<b>(+161,831,000)</b>	<b>(+157,000,000)</b>
<b>State Certification:</b>					
Medicare certification, trust funds.....	(159,497,000)	(180,000,000)	(180,000,000)	(+503,000)	.....
Proposed legislation, user fees, trust funds.....	.....	(-180,000,000)	.....	.....	(+180,000,000)
<b>Subtotal, State certification.....</b>	<b>(159,497,000)</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>(180,000,000)</b>	<b>(+503,000)</b>	<b>(+180,000,000)</b>
<b>Federal Administration:</b>					
Trust funds.....	(301,409,000)	(333,008,000)	(331,752,000)	(+30,343,000)	(-1,254,000)
Less current law user fees.....	(-248,000)	(-77,000)	(-77,000)	(+171,000)	.....
Proposed legislation, user fees, trust funds.....	.....	(-34,902,000)	.....	.....	(+34,902,000)
<b>Subtotal, Federal Administration.....</b>	<b>(301,161,000)</b>	<b>(298,027,000)</b>	<b>(331,675,000)</b>	<b>(+30,514,000)</b>	<b>(+33,648,000)</b>
<b>Total, Program management.....</b>	<b>(2,082,605,000)</b>	<b>(1,891,027,000)</b>	<b>(2,282,055,000)</b>	<b>(+199,450,000)</b>	<b>(+391,028,000)</b>
<b>Total, Health Care Financing Administration:</b>					
Federal funds.....	89,989,950,000	102,808,732,000	102,920,634,000	+12,930,684,000	+111,902,000
Current year, FY 1992.....	(76,489,950,000)	(85,708,732,000)	(85,820,634,000)	(+9,330,684,000)	(+111,902,000)
New advance, 1st quarter, FY 1993.....	(13,500,000,000)	(17,100,000,000)	(17,100,000,000)	(+3,600,000,000)	.....
Trust funds.....	(2,082,605,000)	(1,891,027,000)	(2,282,055,000)	(+199,450,000)	(+391,028,000)
<b>SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION</b>					
<b>PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS.....</b>	<b>46,958,000</b>	<b>40,968,000</b>	<b>40,968,000</b>	<b>-5,990,000</b>	<b>.....</b>
<b>SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS</b>					
Benefit payments.....	837,511,000	813,000,000	813,000,000	-24,511,000	.....
Administration.....	7,081,000	7,336,000	7,336,000	+255,000	.....
<b>Subtotal, Black Lung, FY 1992 program level.....</b>	<b>844,592,000</b>	<b>820,336,000</b>	<b>820,336,000</b>	<b>-24,256,000</b>	<b>.....</b>
Less funds advanced in prior year.....	-215,000,000	-203,000,000	-203,000,000	+12,000,000	.....
<b>Total, Black Lung, current request, FY 1992.....</b>	<b>629,592,000</b>	<b>617,336,000</b>	<b>617,336,000</b>	<b>-12,256,000</b>	<b>.....</b>
New advance, 1st quarter, FY 1993.....	203,000,000	198,000,000	198,000,000	-5,000,000	.....
<b>SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME 2/</b>					
Federal benefit payments.....	18,184,751,000	18,105,000,000	18,105,000,000	-79,751,000	.....
Beneficiary services.....	32,517,000	39,100,000	39,100,000	+6,583,000	.....
Research demonstration.....	8,275,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	+2,725,000	.....
Administration.....	1,183,378,000	1,321,391,000	1,321,391,000	+138,013,000	.....
Zebley administration.....	232,000,000	.....	.....	-232,000,000	.....
<b>Subtotal, SSI FY 1992 program level.....</b>	<b>17,840,921,000</b>	<b>17,476,491,000</b>	<b>17,476,491,000</b>	<b>-164,430,000</b>	<b>.....</b>
Less funds advanced in prior year.....	-3,157,000,000	-3,550,000,000	-3,550,000,000	-393,000,000	.....
<b>Total, SSI, current request, FY 1992.....</b>	<b>14,683,921,000</b>	<b>13,926,491,000</b>	<b>13,926,491,000</b>	<b>-557,430,000</b>	<b>.....</b>
New advance, 1st quarter, FY 1993.....	3,550,000,000	5,240,000,000	5,240,000,000	+1,690,000,000	.....
<b>LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES (Trust Funds) 3/.....</b>	<b>(3,557,159,000)</b>	<b>(3,884,000,000)</b>	<b>(3,934,000,000)</b>	<b>(+376,841,000)</b>	<b>(+50,000,000)</b>
Zebley administration.....	(232,000,000)	.....	.....	(-232,000,000)	.....
Portion treated as budget authority.....	(600,150,000)	(648,000,000)	(648,000,000)	(+47,850,000)	.....
(Contingency reserve, non-add).....	(48,385,000)	(50,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(+53,615,000)	(+50,000,000)
<b>Subtotal, LAE.....</b>	<b>(4,389,309,000)</b>	<b>(4,532,000,000)</b>	<b>(4,582,000,000)</b>	<b>(+192,691,000)</b>	<b>(+50,000,000)</b>
<b>Total, Social Security Administration:</b>					
Federal funds.....	18,913,471,000	20,022,795,000	20,022,795,000	+1,109,324,000	.....
Current year FY 1992.....	(15,180,471,000)	(14,584,795,000)	(14,584,795,000)	(-575,676,000)	.....
New advances, 1st quarter FY 1993.....	(3,753,000,000)	(5,438,000,000)	(5,438,000,000)	(+1,685,000,000)	.....
Trust funds.....	(4,389,309,000)	(4,532,000,000)	(4,582,000,000)	(+192,691,000)	(+50,000,000)

1/ Does not include \$960,000,000 in legislative savings proposed for later transmittal.

2/ Does not include \$96,000,000 in legislative savings proposed for later transmittal.

3/ Budget and recommendation include delayed obligation of \$80,000,000 until Sept. 19, 1992.

### H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES</b>					
<b>FAMILY SUPPORT PAYMENTS TO STATES 1/</b>					
Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) .....	11,296,000,000	12,135,000,000	12,135,000,000	+839,000,000	
Payments to territories .....	16,346,000	16,346,000	16,346,000		
Emergency assistance .....	191,600,000	176,900,000	176,900,000	-14,700,000	
Repatriation .....	5,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-4,000,000	
State and local welfare administration .....	1,448,200,000	1,512,800,000	1,512,800,000	+64,600,000	
Work activities / child care .....	317,000,000	433,000,000	433,000,000	+116,000,000	
At risk child care .....	150,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	+150,000,000	
Proposed regulatory savings .....		-38,900,000	-38,900,000	-38,900,000	
Subtotal, Welfare payments .....	13,424,146,000	14,536,146,000	14,536,146,000	+1,112,000,000	
Child Support Enforcement:					
State and local administration .....	1,181,000,000	1,309,000,000	1,309,000,000	+128,000,000	
Federal incentive payments .....	296,000,000	332,000,000	332,000,000	+36,000,000	
Less federal share collections .....	-908,000,000	-1,015,000,000	-1,015,000,000	-109,000,000	
Subtotal, Child support .....	571,000,000	626,000,000	626,000,000	+55,000,000	
Total, Payments, FY 1992 program level .....	13,995,146,000	15,162,146,000	15,162,146,000	+1,167,000,000	
Less funds advanced in previous years .....	-3,000,000,000	-3,300,000,000	-3,300,000,000	-300,000,000	
Total, Payments, current request, FY 1992 .....	10,995,146,000	11,862,146,000	11,862,146,000	+867,000,000	
New advance, 1st quarter, FY 1993 .....	3,300,000,000	4,000,000,000	4,000,000,000	+700,000,000	
PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR AFDC WORK PROGRAMS .....	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000		
<b>ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS</b>					
<b>LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE:</b>					
Regular program 2/ .....	1,415,055,000	925,000,000	1,000,000,000	-415,055,000	+75,000,000
Emergency allocation 3/ .....			(600,000,000)	(+600,000,000)	(+600,000,000)
ENERGY EMERGENCY CONTINGENCY FUND .....	195,180,000	100,000,000		-195,180,000	-100,000,000
Total, Energy assistance programs .....	1,610,235,000	1,025,000,000	1,000,000,000	-610,235,000	-25,000,000
Total including contingency .....	(1,610,235,000)	(1,025,000,000)	(1,600,000,000)	(-10,235,000)	(+575,000,000)
<b>REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE</b>					
Cash and medical assistance 4/ .....	234,216,000		117,600,000	-116,616,000	+117,600,000
Social services .....	82,952,000		82,952,000		+82,952,000
Voluntary agency program .....	39,036,000		39,036,000		+39,036,000
Preventive health .....	5,631,000		5,631,000		+5,631,000
Targeted assistance .....	48,795,000		48,795,000		+48,795,000
Undistributed .....		410,630,000			-410,630,000
Total, Refugee Resettlement .....	410,630,000	410,630,000	294,014,000	-116,616,000	-116,616,000
<b>STATE LEGALIZATION IMPACT ASSISTANCE GRANTS</b>					
Current year .....	-566,854,000	-1,122,992,000	-1,122,992,000	-556,138,000	
Advance funding .....	583,934,000		1,122,992,000	+539,058,000	+1,122,992,000
Total .....	17,080,000	-1,122,992,000		-17,080,000	+1,122,992,000
<b>COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT</b>					
Grants to States for Community Services .....	349,372,000		349,372,000		+349,372,000
Homeless services grants .....	33,181,000		25,000,000	-8,181,000	+25,000,000
Discretionary funds:					
Community economic development .....	20,494,000		21,500,000	+1,006,000	+21,500,000
Rural housing .....	4,099,000		4,099,000		+4,099,000
Farmworker assistance .....	3,025,000		3,025,000		+3,025,000
National youth sports .....	10,832,000	10,832,000	12,000,000	+1,168,000	+1,168,000
Technical assistance .....	244,000		244,000		+244,000
Subtotal, discretionary funds .....	38,694,000	10,832,000	40,868,000	+2,174,000	+30,036,000
Community Partnerships .....	4,050,000			-4,050,000	
Community Food and Nutrition .....	2,440,000		5,484,000	+3,044,000	+5,484,000
Total, Community services .....	427,737,000	10,832,000	420,724,000	-7,013,000	+409,892,000
<b>GRANTS TO STATES FOR CHILD CARE 5/</b>					
Block grants to States .....	731,925,000	731,925,000	825,000,000	+93,075,000	+93,075,000
Rescission .....	-144,925,000			+144,925,000	
Subtotal, block grants .....	587,000,000	731,925,000	825,000,000	+238,000,000	+93,075,000
Licensing grants to States .....	13,000,000	13,000,000	25,000,000	+12,000,000	+12,000,000
Total, Child care grants .....	600,000,000	744,925,000	850,000,000	+250,000,000	+105,075,000

1/ Does not include \$120,000,000 in legislative savings proposed for later transmittal.

2/ FY 1991 total includes \$74,610,000 for obligation Sept. 30, 1991. FY 1992 request and recommendation include delayed obligation of \$50,000,000 until Sept. 30, 1992.

3/ Available only upon submission of a formal budget request designating the need for funds as an emergency as defined by the BEA.

4/ Includes State administrative costs.

5/ FY 1991 total makes available Sept. 7, 1991. FY 1992 request and recommendation include delayed obligation of these funds until Sept. 19, 1992. Recommendation assumes rescission of \$144,925,000 of FY 1991 funds.

**H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor,  
Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies**

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION</b>					
Federal Administration.....	76,093,000	81,000,000	81,000,000	+4,907,000	
Research and evaluation.....	10,735,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	-4,235,000	
Total, program administration.....	86,828,000	87,500,000	87,500,000	+672,000	
<b>SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT (TITLE XX)</b> .....	2,800,000,000	2,800,000,000	2,800,000,000		
<b>HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES</b>					
Programs for Children, Youth, and Families:					
Head start:					
Regular grants.....	1,951,800,000	2,051,800,000	1,983,800,000	+12,000,000	-88,000,000
Transfer from "Educational Excellence".....			(250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)
Subtotal.....	(1,951,800,000)	(2,051,800,000)	(2,213,800,000)	(+262,000,000)	(+162,000,000)
Child development associate scholarships.....	1,397,000	1,397,000	1,397,000		
Family crisis program:					
Child abuse state grants.....	19,518,000	19,518,000	19,518,000		
Child abuse challenge grants.....	5,367,000	5,367,000	5,367,000		
Runaway and homeless youth.....	35,132,000	35,132,000	35,132,000		
Family violence.....	10,735,000	10,735,000	10,735,000		
Abandoned infants assistance.....	12,557,000	12,557,000	12,557,000		
Emergency protection grants - substance abuse.....	19,518,000	19,518,000	19,518,000		
Subtotal, family crisis.....	102,827,000	102,827,000	102,827,000		
Dependent care planning and development.....	13,175,000	13,175,000	13,175,000		
Child welfare services 1/.....	273,911,000	273,911,000	273,911,000		
Less amounts derived by transfer.....	-27,352,000			+27,352,000	
Subtotal, child welfare services.....	246,559,000	273,911,000	273,911,000	+27,352,000	
Subtotal, Programs for Children, Youth, and Families.....	2,315,758,000	2,443,110,000	2,355,110,000	+39,352,000	-88,000,000
Programs for the Aging:					
Grants to States:					
Supportive services and centers.....	290,818,000	290,818,000	290,818,000		
Ombudsman activities.....	5,367,000	5,367,000	5,367,000		
Nutrition:					
Congregate meals.....	361,083,000	361,083,000	361,083,000		
Home-delivered meals.....	87,831,000	87,831,000	87,831,000		
Federal Council on Aging 2/.....	181,000	181,000	181,000		
Grants to Indians.....	14,639,000	14,639,000	14,639,000		
Frail elderly in-home services.....	6,831,000	6,831,000	6,831,000		
Subtotal, Aging programs.....	766,750,000	766,750,000	766,750,000		
Developmental disabilities program:					
State grants.....	64,409,000	64,409,000	64,409,000		
Protection and advocacy.....	20,982,000	20,982,000	20,982,000		
Subtotal, Developmental disabilities.....	85,391,000	85,391,000	85,391,000		
Native American Programs.....	33,376,000	33,376,000	33,376,000		
Human services research, training and demonstration:					
Comprehensive child development centers.....	24,398,000	24,398,000	45,000,000	+20,602,000	+20,602,000
Child abuse discretionary activities.....	14,839,000	14,839,000	14,839,000		+1,000
Runaway youth - transitional living.....	9,939,000	9,939,000	12,000,000	+2,061,000	+2,061,000
Runaway youth activities - drugs.....	14,788,000	14,788,000	14,788,000		
Youth gang substance abuse.....	14,788,000	14,788,000	7,100,000	-7,688,000	-7,688,000
Temporary childcare/crisis nurseries.....	11,055,000	11,055,000	11,055,000		
Child welfare training.....	3,559,000	3,559,000	3,559,000		
Child welfare research.....	6,652,000	7,807,000	6,652,000		-1,155,000
Adoption opportunities.....	12,687,000	12,687,000	12,687,000		
Aging research, training and special projects.....	26,917,000	25,941,000	25,941,000	-976,000	
Social services research.....	2,879,000	3,879,000	7,879,000	+5,000,000	+4,000,000
Developmental disabilities special projects.....	3,025,000	3,025,000	3,025,000		
Developmental disabilities university affiliated programs.....	13,907,000	13,907,000	15,407,000	+1,500,000	+1,500,000
Total, Human services research, training and demonstration.....	159,229,000	160,407,000	179,730,000	+20,501,000	+19,323,000
Program direction.....	73,906,000	88,000,000	88,000,000	+14,094,000	
Total, Human Development Services.....	3,434,410,000	3,577,034,000	3,508,357,000	+73,947,000	-68,677,000

1/ Does not include \$90,000,000 in legislative additions proposed for later transmittal.

2/ President's budget proposes to fund under Program direction.

H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE 1/</b>					
Foster care .....	1,813,186,000	2,223,668,000	2,223,668,000	+ 410,482,000	
Adoption assistance .....	189,832,000	201,861,000	201,861,000	+ 12,029,000	
Independent living .....	80,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	+ 10,000,000	
Prior year claims .....	520,911,000	118,476,000	118,476,000	-402,435,000	
Transfer to child welfare service .....	27,352,000			-27,352,000	
<b>Total, Payments to States .....</b>	<b>2,611,281,000</b>	<b>2,614,005,000</b>	<b>2,614,005,000</b>	<b>+ 2,724,000</b>	
<b>Total, Administration for Children and Families .....</b>	<b>27,293,347,000</b>	<b>27,009,080,000</b>	<b>28,436,748,000</b>	<b>+ 1,143,399,000</b>	<b>+ 1,427,666,000</b>
Current year .....	(23,554,338,000)	(23,009,080,000)	(23,313,754,000)	(-240,584,000)	(+ 304,674,000)
FY 1993 .....	(3,883,934,000)	(4,000,000,000)	(5,122,992,000)	(+ 1,239,058,000)	(+ 1,122,992,000)
<b>OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY 2/</b>					
<b>GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT:</b>					
Federal funds .....	78,944,000	91,673,000	86,673,000	+ 7,729,000	-5,000,000
Trust funds .....	(22,451,000)	(22,786,000)	(19,111,000)	(-3,340,000)	(-3,675,000)
Portion treated as budget authority .....	(7,899,000)	(8,215,000)	(6,890,000)	(-1,009,000)	(-1,325,000)
<b>Total, Departmental management .....</b>	<b>109,294,000</b>	<b>122,674,000</b>	<b>112,674,000</b>	<b>+ 3,380,000</b>	<b>-10,000,000</b>
<b>OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL:</b>					
Federal funds .....	51,918,000	63,842,000	63,842,000	+ 11,924,000	
Trust funds .....	(19,202,000)	(20,478,000)	(16,363,000)	(-2,839,000)	(-4,113,000)
Portion treated as budget authority .....	(23,467,000)	(26,871,000)	(21,470,000)	(-1,997,000)	(-5,401,000)
<b>Total, Inspector General .....</b>	<b>94,587,000</b>	<b>111,189,000</b>	<b>101,675,000</b>	<b>+ 7,088,000</b>	<b>-9,514,000</b>
<b>OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS:</b>					
Federal funds .....	17,066,000	18,524,000	18,524,000	+ 1,458,000	
Trust funds .....	(97,000)	(99,000)	(99,000)	(+ 2,000)	
Portion treated as budget authority .....	(3,807,000)	(3,901,000)	(3,901,000)	(+ 94,000)	
<b>Total, Civil Rights .....</b>	<b>20,970,000</b>	<b>22,524,000</b>	<b>22,524,000</b>	<b>+ 1,554,000</b>	
<b>POLICY RESEARCH .....</b>	<b>8,928,000</b>	<b>5,037,000</b>	<b>5,037,000</b>	<b>-3,891,000</b>	
<b>Total, Office of the Secretary:</b>					
Federal funds .....	156,856,000	179,076,000	174,076,000	+ 17,220,000	-5,000,000
Trust funds .....	(76,923,000)	(82,348,000)	(67,834,000)	(-9,089,000)	(-14,514,000)
<b>Total, Office of the Secretary .....</b>	<b>(233,779,000)</b>	<b>(261,424,000)</b>	<b>(241,910,000)</b>	<b>(+ 8,131,000)</b>	<b>(-19,514,000)</b>
<b>UNDISTRIBUTED SALARIES AND EXPENSES REDUCTION .....</b>			<b>-116,000,000</b>	<b>-116,000,000</b>	<b>-116,000,000</b>
<b>Total, Department of Health and Human Services:</b>					
Federal Funds .....	151,535,902,000	165,657,345,000	167,266,742,000	+ 15,730,840,000	+ 1,609,397,000
Current year FY 1992 .....	(130,398,968,000)	(139,119,345,000)	(139,605,750,000)	(+ 9,206,782,000)	(+ 486,405,000)
FY 1993 .....	(21,136,934,000)	(26,538,000,000)	(27,660,992,000)	(+ 6,524,058,000)	(+ 1,122,992,000)
Trust funds .....	(6,554,729,000)	(6,543,148,000)	(6,937,781,000)	(+ 383,052,000)	(+ 394,633,000)
<b>TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION</b>					
<b>COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED 3/</b>					
<b>Grants for the Disadvantaged (Chapter 1):</b>					
<b>Grants to local educational agencies: 4/</b>					
Basic grants .....	5,001,975,000	5,001,975,000	5,805,000,000	+ 803,025,000	+ 803,025,000
Concentration grants .....	555,775,000	674,775,000	645,000,000	+ 89,225,000	-29,775,000
<b>Subtotal, grants to LEA's .....</b>	<b>5,557,750,000</b>	<b>5,676,750,000</b>	<b>6,450,000,000</b>	<b>+ 892,250,000</b>	<b>+ 773,250,000</b>
Capital expenses for private school children .....	36,108,000	36,108,000	38,000,000	+ 1,892,000	+ 1,892,000
Even start .....	49,771,000	60,000,000	100,000,000	+ 50,229,000	+ 40,000,000
<b>State agency programs:</b>					
Migrant .....	294,596,000	294,596,000	322,000,000	+ 27,404,000	+ 27,404,000
Neglected and delinquent .....	36,108,000	36,108,000	36,000,000	-108,000	-108,000
State administration .....	59,140,000	59,140,000	64,500,000	+ 5,360,000	+ 5,360,000
State program improvement grants .....	14,785,000	30,000,000	32,250,000	+ 17,465,000	+ 2,250,000
Evaluation and technical assistance 5/ .....	13,175,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	+ 3,825,000	
Rural technical assistance centers 5/ .....	4,463,000	4,463,000	5,000,000	+ 537,000	+ 537,000
<b>Total, Chapter 1 .....</b>	<b>6,085,896,000</b>	<b>6,214,185,000</b>	<b>7,064,750,000</b>	<b>+ 998,854,000</b>	<b>+ 850,585,000</b>

1/ Does not include \$246,631,000 in legislative savings proposed for later transmittal.

2/ Does not include \$5,000,000 for a clearinghouse proposed in legislation for later transmittal.

3/ \$200 million originally requested within this account for Choice Schools considered under the Educational Excellence account.

4/ Handicapped activities transferred to Special Education account.

5/ Current funded.

### H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>Migrant education:</b>					
High school equivalency program 1/ .....	7,807,000	8,135,000	8,500,000	+693,000	+365,000
College assistance migrant program 1/ .....	1,952,000	2,034,000	2,500,000	+548,000	+466,000
Subtotal, migrant education .....	9,759,000	10,169,000	11,000,000	+1,241,000	+831,000
Total, Compensatory Education programs .....	6,075,855,000	6,224,334,000	7,075,750,000	+1,000,095,000	+851,416,000
<b>IMPACT AID</b>					
<b>Maintenance and operations:</b>					
Payments for "a" children .....	585,540,000	588,540,000	585,540,000		-3,000,000
Payments for "b" children .....	136,626,000		136,626,000		+136,626,000
Payments for Federal property (Section 2) .....	16,590,000	16,590,000	16,590,000		
Payments related to decreased activity (Section 3e) .....	1,952,000			-1,952,000	
Subtotal .....	740,708,000	805,130,000	738,756,000	-1,952,000	+133,826,000
Disaster assistance (Section 7) .....	13,663,000			-13,663,000	
Construction .....	26,349,000	15,000,000	26,000,000	-349,000	+11,000,000
Total, impact aid .....	780,720,000	820,130,000	784,756,000	-15,964,000	+144,826,000
<b>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS 2/</b>					
<b>Educational improvement (Chapter 2):</b>					
<b>State and Local Programs:</b>					
State block grants 3/ .....	448,914,000	448,914,000	450,000,000	+1,086,000	+1,086,000
Evaluation .....	976,000			-976,000	
Subtotal .....	448,890,000	448,914,000	450,000,000	+110,000	+1,086,000
<b>National programs:</b>					
Inexpensive book distribution (RIF) .....	9,271,000	9,271,000	10,000,000	+729,000	+729,000
<b>Arts in education:</b>					
Regular program .....	4,392,000	4,392,000	3,700,000	-692,000	-692,000
Initial forward funding 3/ .....			4,900,000	+4,900,000	+4,900,000
Law - related education .....	5,855,000		9,000,000	+3,145,000	+9,000,000
Subtotal, National programs .....	19,518,000	13,663,000	27,800,000	+8,082,000	+13,937,000
Total, Chapter 2 .....	468,408,000	462,577,000	477,800,000	+8,192,000	+15,023,000
<b>Drug-free schools and communities:</b>					
State grants 3/ .....	497,709,000	497,709,000	497,709,000		
School personnel training .....	23,395,000	23,395,000	23,395,000		
<b>National programs:</b>					
Regular programs .....	60,914,000	60,914,000	60,914,000		
Emergency grants .....	24,331,000	49,500,000	25,000,000	+889,000	-24,500,000
Subtotal, drug-free schools .....	606,349,000	631,518,000	607,018,000	+669,000	-24,500,000
<b>Strengthening teaching and administration:</b>					
Eisenhower mathematics & science education State grants 3/ .....	202,011,000	239,011,000	240,000,000	+37,989,000	+989,000
Christa McAuliffe fellowships .....	1,954,000	2,038,000	2,000,000	+46,000	-36,000
<b>Other school improvement programs:</b>					
Magnet schools, desegregation program .....	109,977,000	109,977,000	110,000,000	+23,000	+23,000
Education for homeless children and youth 3/ 4/ .....	7,313,000		37,000,000	+29,687,000	+37,000,000
Women's educational equity .....	1,995,000	500,000	2,000,000	+5,000	+1,500,000
Training and advisory services (Civil Rights IV-A) .....	21,329,000	21,329,000	22,000,000	+671,000	+671,000
Dropout prevention demonstrations .....	34,064,000	29,214,000	50,000,000	+15,836,000	+20,786,000
General assistance to the Virgin Islands .....	4,366,000	4,366,000	4,500,000	+134,000	+134,000
Ellender fellowships/Close up 3/ .....	4,101,000		4,100,000	-1,000	+4,100,000
Follow through .....	7,265,000		10,000,000	+2,735,000	+10,000,000
Native Hawaiian Education .....	6,366,000		6,400,000	+34,000	+6,400,000
Foreign Language Assistance 3/ .....	4,880,000		5,000,000	+120,000	+5,000,000
Subtotal, other school improvement programs .....	201,856,000	165,386,000	251,000,000	+49,344,000	+85,614,000
National writing project .....	1,952,000			-1,952,000	
School year extension study commission .....	976,000			-976,000	
Total, School Improvement programs .....	1,484,306,000	1,500,528,000	1,577,618,000	+83,312,000	+77,090,000
Subtotal, forward funded .....	(1,164,928,000)	(1,185,634,000)	(1,238,709,000)	(+73,781,000)	(+53,075,000)

1/ Current funded.

2/ Many activities previously funded in this account transferred to Education Research and Improvement.

3/ Forward funded.

4/ 1992 homeless funds requested under new HUD block grant.

H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE / AMERICA 2000</b>					
<b>Educational Excellence:</b>					
New generation of American schools.....		180,000,000			-180,000,000
Merit schools.....		100,000,000			-100,000,000
Governors' academies for teachers.....		70,000,000			-70,000,000
Governors' academies for school leaders.....		22,500,000			-22,500,000
Assistance for parental choice programs.....		200,000,000			-200,000,000
Choice demonstrations of national significance.....		30,000,000			-30,000,000
Alternative teacher and principal certification.....		25,000,000			-25,000,000
Commission on time, study, learning, and teaching.....		1,000,000			-1,000,000
<b>Subtotal, Educational excellence.....</b>		<b>628,500,000</b>			<b>-628,500,000</b>
<b>Vocational and Adult Education:</b>					
Regional literacy resource centers.....		5,000,000			-5,000,000
Literacy initiatives.....		5,000,000			-5,000,000
Higher Education: Endowment grants for HBCUs.....		10,000,000			-10,000,000
<b>Assessment, Statistics, Research and Improvement:</b>					
World class standards/achievement tests.....		12,400,000			-12,400,000
Goals panel: National report card.....		2,000,000			-2,000,000
America on line.....		5,000,000			-5,000,000
Assessing workplace literacy skills.....		2,000,000			-2,000,000
Statistics: Expansion of the adult literacy survey.....		1,100,000			-1,100,000
Assessment: Preparing interim tests.....		5,000,000			-5,000,000
Fund for the Improvement & Reform of Schools and Teaching.....		10,700,000			-10,700,000
<b>Subtotal, ASRI.....</b>		<b>38,200,000</b>			<b>-38,200,000</b>
Departmental Management: Program administration.....		3,300,000			-3,300,000
Head start 1/.....			250,000,000	+250,000,000	+250,000,000
Consolidated funds.....			250,000,000	+250,000,000	+250,000,000
<b>Total, Educational excellence.....</b>		<b>690,000,000</b>	<b>500,000,000</b>	<b>+500,000,000</b>	<b>-190,000,000</b>
<b>BILINGUAL AND IMMIGRANT EDUCATION</b>					
<b>Bilingual education:</b>					
Bilingual programs.....	121,039,000	123,814,000	171,000,000	+49,961,000	+47,186,000
Support services.....	11,632,000	11,632,000	12,000,000	+368,000	+368,000
Training grants.....	36,066,000	36,066,000	36,000,000	-66,000	-66,000
Immigrant education.....	29,277,000	29,277,000	30,000,000	+723,000	+723,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>198,014,000</b>	<b>200,788,000</b>	<b>249,000,000</b>	<b>+50,986,000</b>	<b>+48,211,000</b>
<b>SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>					
<b>State grants:</b>					
EHA grants to States part "b".....	1,854,210,000	1,976,095,000	1,976,095,000	+121,885,000	
Chapter 1 handicapped grants.....	148,881,000	125,661,000	135,661,000	-13,200,000	+10,000,000
Preschool grants.....	292,770,000	295,920,000	295,920,000	+3,150,000	
Grants for infants and families.....	117,108,000	128,819,000	175,000,000	+57,892,000	+46,181,000
<b>Subtotal, State grants.....</b>	<b>2,412,949,000</b>	<b>2,526,495,000</b>	<b>2,582,676,000</b>	<b>+169,727,000</b>	<b>+56,181,000</b>
<b>Special purpose funds:</b>					
Deaf-blindness.....	12,849,000	12,849,000	13,000,000	+151,000	+151,000
Severe disabilities.....	7,869,000	7,869,000	8,000,000	+131,000	+131,000
Serious emotional disturbance.....	1,952,000	1,952,000	4,000,000	+2,048,000	+2,048,000
Early childhood education.....	24,202,000	24,202,000	25,000,000	+798,000	+798,000
Secondary and transitional services.....	14,639,000	14,639,000	17,000,000	+2,361,000	+2,361,000
Postsecondary education.....	8,559,000	8,559,000	9,000,000	+441,000	+441,000
Innovation and development.....	20,174,000	20,174,000	24,000,000	+3,826,000	+3,826,000
Media and captioning services.....	16,424,000	16,424,000	17,000,000	+576,000	+576,000
Technology applications.....	5,593,000	5,593,000	10,000,000	+4,407,000	+4,407,000
Special studies.....	3,904,000	3,904,000	4,000,000	+96,000	+96,000
Personnel development.....	69,289,000	69,289,000	89,800,000	+20,511,000	+20,511,000
Parent training.....	9,759,000	9,759,000	10,200,000	+441,000	+441,000
Clearing houses.....	1,525,000	1,525,000	2,000,000	+475,000	+475,000
Regional resource centers.....	6,620,000	6,620,000	7,000,000	+380,000	+380,000
<b>Subtotal, Special purpose funds.....</b>	<b>203,358,000</b>	<b>203,358,000</b>	<b>240,000,000</b>	<b>+36,642,000</b>	<b>+36,642,000</b>
<b>Total, Special education.....</b>	<b>2,616,307,000</b>	<b>2,729,853,000</b>	<b>2,822,676,000</b>	<b>+206,369,000</b>	<b>+92,823,000</b>
<b>REHABILITATION SERVICES AND DISABILITY RESEARCH</b>					
<b>Vocational rehabilitation State grants:</b>					
Grants to States.....	1,632,625,000		1,735,480,000	+102,855,000	+1,735,480,000
Supported employment State grants.....	29,150,000		29,150,000		+29,150,000
Client assistance.....	8,310,000		8,310,000		+8,310,000
<b>Subtotal, State grants.....</b>	<b>1,670,085,000</b>		<b>1,772,940,000</b>	<b>+102,855,000</b>	<b>+1,772,940,000</b>
<b>Special purpose funds:</b>					
Special demonstration programs.....	18,368,000		18,368,000		+18,368,000
Supported employment projects.....	10,023,000		10,023,000		+10,023,000
Recreational programs.....	2,617,000		2,617,000		+2,617,000
Migratory workers.....	1,060,000		1,060,000		+1,060,000
Projects with industry.....	19,445,000		19,445,000		+19,445,000
Heien Kellier National Center.....	5,367,000		5,367,000		+5,367,000

1/ To be made available on July 1, 1992.

**H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor,  
Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies**

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>Independent living:</b>					
Comprehensive services.....	13,619,000		13,619,000		+ 13,619,000
Centers.....	27,579,000		27,579,000		+ 27,579,000
Services for older blind.....	5,914,000		5,914,000		+ 5,914,000
Protection and advocacy for severely disabled.....	976,000		976,000		+ 976,000
Subtotal, Independent living.....	48,088,000		48,088,000		+ 48,088,000
Training.....	33,353,000		33,353,000		+ 33,353,000
National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research.....	58,924,000		58,924,000		+ 58,924,000
Technology assistance.....	20,982,000	27,340,000	27,340,000	+ 6,358,000	
Evaluation.....	976,000		976,000		+ 976,000
Subtotal, Special purpose funds.....	219,203,000	27,340,000	225,561,000	+ 6,358,000	+ 198,221,000
Consolidated request, new legislation 1/.....		1,976,040,000			-1,976,040,000
Total, Rehabilitation services.....	1,889,288,000	2,003,380,000	1,998,501,000	+ 109,213,000	-4,879,000
<b>SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES</b>					
AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND.....	6,136,000	6,136,000	5,500,000	-636,000	-636,000
<b>NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF:</b>					
Operations.....	36,884,000	36,884,000	38,500,000	+ 1,616,000	+ 1,616,000
Endowment grant.....	328,000	342,000		-328,000	-342,000
Subtotal, N T I D.....	37,212,000	37,226,000	38,500,000	+ 1,288,000	+ 1,274,000
<b>GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY:</b>					
University programs.....	47,623,000	47,623,000	47,623,000		
Computer acquisition.....			850,000	+ 850,000	+ 850,000
Precollege programs 2/.....	21,223,000	21,223,000	21,223,000		
Endowment grant.....	976,000	1,000,000	976,000		-24,000
Construction.....	2,440,000	1,000,000	2,500,000	+ 60,000	+ 1,500,000
Subtotal, Gallaudet University.....	72,262,000	70,846,000	73,172,000	+ 910,000	+ 2,328,000
Total, Special Institutions for Disabled.....	115,610,000	114,208,000	117,172,000	+ 1,562,000	+ 2,964,000
<b>VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION</b>					
<b>Vocational education:</b>					
Basic grants.....	856,503,000	890,656,000	1,077,000,000	+ 220,497,000	+ 186,344,000
Supplemental grants, equipment.....			100,000,000	+ 100,000,000	+ 100,000,000
Community - based organizations.....	11,711,000	11,711,000	12,000,000	+ 289,000	+ 289,000
Consumer and homemaking education.....	33,352,000		38,000,000	+ 4,648,000	+ 38,000,000
State councils.....	8,783,000	8,783,000	8,000,000	+ 217,000	+ 217,000
Tech Prep.....	63,434,000	63,434,000	100,000,000	+ 36,566,000	+ 36,566,000
Tribally controlled post-secondary vocational Institutions.....	2,440,000	2,440,000	2,500,000	+ 60,000	+ 60,000
<b>National programs:</b>					
Research.....	6,831,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+ 3,169,000	
Technical assistance, sec. 404 (d).....			2,000,000	+ 2,000,000	+ 2,000,000
Demonstrations.....	12,970,000	9,000,000	12,000,000	-970,000	+ 3,000,000
Data systems including NOICC/SOICC.....	4,880,000	4,880,000	5,000,000	+ 120,000	+ 120,000
Subtotal, national programs.....	24,681,000	23,880,000	29,000,000	+ 4,319,000	+ 5,120,000
Bilingual vocational training.....	2,888,000	2,888,000	3,000,000	+ 112,000	+ 112,000
Subtotal, Applied technology education.....	1,003,792,000	1,003,792,000	1,370,500,000	+ 366,708,000	+ 366,708,000
<b>Adult education:</b>					
State Programs.....	201,035,000	221,500,000	250,000,000	+ 48,965,000	+ 28,500,000
National programs.....	7,807,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	+ 1,193,000	
Literacy training for homeless adults.....	9,759,000			-9,759,000	
Workplace literacy partnerships.....	19,251,000	19,251,000	20,000,000	+ 749,000	+ 749,000
English literacy grants.....	976,000	976,000	1,000,000	+ 24,000	+ 24,000
Subtotal, adult education.....	238,828,000	250,727,000	280,000,000	+ 41,172,000	+ 29,273,000
Technology education demonstrations.....	964,000		1,000,000	+ 36,000	+ 1,000,000
Commercial truck driver training.....	1,952,000			-1,952,000	
Total, Vocational and adult education.....	1,245,536,000	1,254,519,000	1,651,500,000	+ 405,964,000	+ 396,981,000
<b>STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE</b>					
Pell Grants: Academic year 1992 - 1993 3/.....	5,374,282,000	5,775,121,000	5,350,000,000	-24,282,000	-425,121,000
Contingency.....			100,000,000	+ 100,000,000	+ 100,000,000
Presidential Scholarships, new legislation.....		170,000,000			-170,000,000
Supplemental educational opportunity grants.....	520,155,000	346,945,000	570,000,000	+ 49,845,000	+ 223,055,000
Work-study.....	594,689,000	396,615,000	595,000,000	+ 311,000	+ 198,385,000
Income contingent loans.....	4,880,000	10,000,000	5,000,000	+ 120,000	-5,000,000

1/ President's budget proposes for later transmittal.

2/ Kendall Elementary and Model Secondary Schools.

3/ 1991 includes prior year shortfall and contingency.

**H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies**

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>Perkins loans:</b>					
Federal capital contributions.....	156,144,000	.....	156,000,000	-144,000	+156,000,000
Loan cancellations.....	.....	15,000,000	13,000,000	+13,000,000	-2,000,000
Subtotal, Perkins loans.....	156,144,000	15,000,000	169,000,000	+12,856,000	+154,000,000
State student incentive grants.....	63,531,000	.....	64,000,000	+469,000	+64,000,000
Total, Student Financial Assistance 1/.....	6,713,681,000	6,713,681,000	6,853,000,000	+139,319,000	+139,319,000
<b>GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS (LIQUIDATING) 2/</b>					
Contract authority to liquidate pre-1992 loan subsidies.....	(4,209,818,000)	(3,075,711,000)	(3,075,711,000)	(-1,134,107,000)	.....
Appropriation, including shortfalls (non-add).....	(5,381,422,000)	(3,105,711,000)	(3,105,711,000)	(-2,275,711,000)	.....
<b>GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS PROGRAM</b>					
<b>Guaranteed Student Loans:</b>					
New loan subsidies (contract authority).....	.....	2,655,636,000	2,655,636,000	+2,655,636,000	.....
Mandatory admin expenses (contract authority).....	.....	164,611,000	164,611,000	+164,611,000	.....
Total 3/.....	.....	2,820,247,000	2,820,247,000	+2,820,247,000	.....
GSL LOAN ADMINISTRATION.....	34,671,000	46,433,000	46,433,000	+11,762,000	.....
<b>HIGHER EDUCATION</b>					
<b>Aid for institutional development:</b>					
Strengthening institutions.....	87,831,000	87,831,000	90,000,000	+2,169,000	+2,169,000
Strengthening historically black colleges and univ.....	87,831,000	87,831,000	100,000,000	+12,169,000	+12,169,000
Strengthening historically black grad institutions.....	11,711,000	11,711,000	12,000,000	+289,000	+289,000
Endowment grants.....	17,482,000	7,462,000	7,500,000	-9,982,000	+38,000
Subtotal, Institutional development.....	204,835,000	194,835,000	209,500,000	+4,665,000	+14,665,000
<b>Program development:</b>					
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.....	14,839,000	14,839,000	15,000,000	+361,000	+361,000
Minority science improvement.....	5,855,000	6,101,000	6,000,000	+145,000	-101,000
Innovative projects for community services.....	1,464,000	6,830,000	1,463,000	-1,000	-5,367,000
Student Literacy Corps.....	5,367,000	.....	5,367,000	.....	+5,367,000
<b>International education and foreign language studies:</b>					
Domestic programs.....	28,670,000	28,670,000	34,000,000	+5,330,000	+5,330,000
Overseas programs.....	5,855,000	5,855,000	6,000,000	+145,000	+145,000
Foreign language and area studies fellowships VI.....	11,342,000	11,342,000	13,000,000	+1,658,000	+1,658,000
Subtotal, International education.....	45,867,000	45,867,000	53,000,000	+7,133,000	+7,133,000
Cooperative education.....	13,175,000	13,175,000	14,000,000	+825,000	+825,000
Law school clinical experience.....	5,855,000	.....	8,000,000	+2,145,000	+8,000,000
Subtotal, Program development.....	92,222,000	86,612,000	102,830,000	+10,608,000	+16,218,000
<b>Construction:</b>					
Interest subsidy grants, prior year construction.....	20,396,000	19,412,000	19,412,000	-984,000	.....
Academic facilities.....	4,197,000	.....	.....	-4,197,000	.....
Subtotal, Construction.....	24,593,000	19,412,000	19,412,000	-5,181,000	.....
<b>Special grants:</b>					
Assistance to Guam.....	488,000	.....	500,000	+12,000	+500,000
Margaret Chase Smith Library.....	878,000	.....	.....	-976,000	.....
John McCormack Institute.....	2,928,000	.....	.....	-2,928,000	.....
Robert A. Taft Institute.....	683,000	550,000	550,000	-133,000	.....
Magnuson Endowment.....	2,928,000	.....	.....	-2,928,000	.....
Model Law Center, Seton Hall University.....	5,367,000	.....	.....	-5,367,000	.....
Bethune-Cookman.....	.....	.....	300,000	+300,000	+300,000
Subtotal, Undergraduate outreach.....	13,370,000	550,000	1,350,000	-12,020,000	+800,000
<b>Special programs for the disadvantaged (TRIO plus):</b>					
Student support services.....	120,700,000	129,799,000	126,099,000	+5,399,000	-3,700,000
Undergraduate outreach 4/.....	203,382,000	253,000,000	249,000,000	+45,818,000	-4,000,000
Subtotal, Undergraduate outreach.....	324,082,000	382,799,000	375,099,000	+51,017,000	-7,700,000
<b>Graduate outreach:</b>					
Ronald E. McNair post-baccalaureate program.....	5,000,000	.....	5,000,000	.....	+5,000,000
Minority participation in graduate education.....	5,953,000	.....	5,826,000	-127,000	+5,826,000
McNair graduate outreach (proposed legislation).....	.....	10,826,000	.....	.....	-10,826,000
Subtotal, Graduate outreach.....	10,953,000	10,826,000	10,826,000	-127,000	.....
School, college and university partnerships.....	3,904,000	.....	4,000,000	+96,000	+4,000,000
Staff training.....	3,700,000	.....	3,700,000	.....	+3,700,000
Evaluation.....	976,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	+474,000	.....
Subtotal, Special programs for disadvantaged.....	343,615,000	395,075,000	395,075,000	+51,460,000	.....

1/ President's budget proposes for later transmittal.  
 2/ Excludes legislative savings of \$49,759,000 proposed for later transmittal.  
 3/ President's budget proposes for later transmittal.  
 4/ President's budget proposes consolidated grants not approved by Committee.

**H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor,  
Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies**

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>Undergraduate scholarships:</b>					
Byrd honors scholarships.....	9,271,000	9,271,000	9,271,000		
National science scholars.....	976,000	10,000,000	4,500,000	+3,524,000	-5,500,000
Douglas teacher scholarships.....	14,639,000	14,639,000	15,000,000	+361,000	+361,000
<b>Subtotal, Undergraduate scholarships.....</b>	<b>24,886,000</b>	<b>33,910,000</b>	<b>28,771,000</b>	<b>+3,885,000</b>	<b>-5,139,000</b>
<b>Graduate fellowships:</b>					
Harris graduate fellowships.....	17,566,000		17,800,000	+34,000	+17,600,000
Harris public service fellowships.....	3,198,000		3,200,000	+2,000	+3,200,000
Javits fellowships.....	7,807,000		8,000,000	+193,000	+8,000,000
Graduate assistance in areas of national need.....	24,885,000		30,000,000	+5,115,000	+30,000,000
Library career training 1/.....	651,000			-651,000	
National graduate fellowships (proposed legislation).....		54,107,000			-54,107,000
<b>Subtotal, Graduate fellowships.....</b>	<b>54,107,000</b>	<b>54,107,000</b>	<b>58,800,000</b>	<b>+4,693,000</b>	<b>+4,693,000</b>
Veterans' education outreach.....	2,733,000		2,700,000	-33,000	+2,700,000
Legal training for the disadvantaged (CLEO).....	2,928,000		3,000,000	+72,000	+3,000,000
<b>Total, Higher education 2/.....</b>	<b>763,289,000</b>	<b>784,501,000</b>	<b>821,438,000</b>	<b>+58,149,000</b>	<b>+38,837,000</b>
<b>HOWARD UNIVERSITY</b>					
Academic program.....	153,515,000	153,515,000	153,515,000		
Endowment grant.....	2,928,000	4,500,000	2,928,000		-1,572,000
Research.....	4,616,000	4,616,000	4,616,000		
Howard University Hospital.....	28,301,000	28,301,000	28,301,000		
Emergency construction.....	5,855,000		23,600,000	+17,745,000	+23,600,000
<b>Total, Howard University.....</b>	<b>195,215,000</b>	<b>190,932,000</b>	<b>212,960,000</b>	<b>+17,745,000</b>	<b>+22,028,000</b>
<b>COLLEGE HOUSING AND ACADEMIC FACILITIES LOANS (LIQUIDATING):</b>					
Borrowing authority.....	29,277,000			-29,277,000	
Interest subsidy payments.....	8,449,000	3,598,000	3,598,000	-4,851,000	
<b>Total, College Housing Liquidating.....</b>	<b>37,726,000</b>	<b>3,598,000</b>	<b>3,598,000</b>	<b>-34,128,000</b>	
<b>EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT</b>					
Research.....	64,714,000	74,296,000	71,000,000	+6,286,000	-3,296,000
High technology demonstration program.....			8,000,000	+8,000,000	+8,000,000
Statistics.....	44,313,000	51,974,000	50,000,000	+5,687,000	-1,974,000
Assessment (NAEP).....	19,211,000	28,086,000	28,000,000	+8,789,000	-86,000
Fund for Innovation in Education.....	27,737,000	27,737,000	19,000,000	-8,737,000	-8,737,000
Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching:					
Grants for schools and teachers.....	5,284,000	1,880,000	5,284,000		+3,404,000
Family-school partnerships.....	3,611,000	927,000	3,611,000		+2,684,000
Eisenhower mathematics and science education national program.....	11,711,000	14,711,000	14,000,000	+2,289,000	-711,000
National Diffusion Network.....	14,151,000	14,151,000	14,000,000	-151,000	-151,000
Blue ribbon schools.....	885,000	885,000		-885,000	-885,000
Javits gifted and talented students education.....	9,732,000	9,732,000	9,732,000		
Star schools.....	14,417,000	10,000,000		-14,417,000	-10,000,000
Educational partnerships.....	4,233,000	4,233,000	4,233,000		
Territorial teacher training.....	1,789,000	1,789,000	1,789,000		
Leadership in educational administration (LEAD).....	3,831,000	370,000	370,000	-3,461,000	
Midcareer teacher training.....	987,000			-987,000	
National board for professional teacher standards.....	4,880,000		4,880,000		+4,880,000
National council on educational goals.....	1,952,000			-1,952,000	
Innovations in teacher education, new legislation 3/.....		20,000,000			-20,000,000
<b>Total, E R S I.....</b>	<b>233,418,000</b>	<b>260,751,000</b>	<b>233,879,000</b>	<b>+461,000</b>	<b>-26,872,000</b>
<b>LIBRARIES</b>					
<b>Public libraries:</b>					
Services.....	83,898,000	35,000,000	83,898,000		+48,898,000
Construction.....	19,218,000		14,218,000	-5,000,000	+14,218,000
Interlibrary cooperation.....	19,908,000		19,908,000		+19,908,000
Training 4/.....			5,000,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000
Research and demonstrations.....	325,000		325,000		+325,000
Research libraries.....	5,855,000		5,855,000		+5,855,000
Library literacy programs.....	8,183,000		8,183,000		+8,183,000
College library technology.....	3,904,000		3,904,000		+3,904,000
Foreign language materials (Title V-LSCA, VI-HEA).....	978,000		1,476,000	+500,000	+1,476,000
<b>Total, Libraries.....</b>	<b>142,247,000</b>	<b>35,000,000</b>	<b>142,747,000</b>	<b>+500,000</b>	<b>+107,747,000</b>

1/ See "Libraries" account.

2/ President's budget proposes \$778,096,000 for later transmittal.

3/ President's budget proposes for later transmittal.

4/ Training funds requested under Higher Education.

H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT</b>					
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.....	284,595,000	303,567,000	301,952,000	+17,357,000	-1,615,000
OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, SALARIES AND EXPENSES.....	48,405,000	56,000,000	56,000,000	+7,595,000	.....
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL, SALARIES AND EXPENSES.....	24,837,000	28,521,000	26,932,000	+2,085,000	-1,589,000
UNDISTRIBUTED SALARIES AND EXPENSES REDUCTION.....	.....	.....	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
<b>Total, Departmental management.....</b>	<b>357,837,000</b>	<b>388,088,000</b>	<b>374,884,000</b>	<b>+17,047,000</b>	<b>-13,204,000</b>
<b>Total, Department of Education.....</b>	<b>22,883,520,000</b>	<b>26,580,972,000</b>	<b>28,266,159,000</b>	<b>+5,382,639,000</b>	<b>+1,885,187,000</b>
<b>Total including Guaranteed Student Loans.....</b>	<b>(27,093,338,000)</b>	<b>(29,656,883,000)</b>	<b>(31,341,870,000)</b>	<b>(+4,248,532,000)</b>	<b>(+1,685,187,000)</b>
<b>TITLE IV - RELATED AGENCIES</b>					
<b>Action (Domestic Programs):</b>					
<b>Volunteers in Service to America:</b>					
VISTA operations.....	30,287,000	35,803,000	32,693,000	+2,406,000	-3,110,000
VISTA Literacy Corps.....	4,621,000	4,930,000	4,821,000	.....	-309,000
Student Community Service.....	976,000	976,000	976,000	.....	.....
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>35,884,000</b>	<b>41,709,000</b>	<b>38,290,000</b>	<b>+2,406,000</b>	<b>-3,419,000</b>
Special Volunteer Programs: Drug programs.....	2,191,000	1,451,000	1,000,000	-1,191,000	-451,000
<b>Older Americans Volunteer Programs:</b>					
Foster Grandparents Program.....	62,946,000	62,946,000	62,946,000	.....	.....
Senior Companion Program.....	27,569,000	27,569,000	27,569,000	.....	.....
Retired Senior Volunteer Program.....	33,425,000	33,425,000	33,425,000	.....	.....
<b>Subtotal, Older Volunteers.....</b>	<b>123,940,000</b>	<b>123,940,000</b>	<b>123,940,000</b>	.....	.....
Inspector General.....	976,000	1,017,000	920,000	-56,000	-97,000
Program Support.....	28,301,000	30,435,000	29,528,000	+1,227,000	-907,000
<b>Total, Action.....</b>	<b>191,292,000</b>	<b>198,552,000</b>	<b>193,678,000</b>	<b>+2,386,000</b>	<b>-4,874,000</b>
<b>Corporation for Public Broadcasting: 1/</b>					
FY 1994 (current request).....	253,309,000	260,000,000	253,309,000	.....	-6,691,000
FY 1993 satellite replacement.....	65,327,000	.....	.....	-65,327,000	.....
<b>Subtotal, Corporation for Public Broadcasting.....</b>	<b>318,636,000</b>	<b>260,000,000</b>	<b>253,309,000</b>	<b>-65,327,000</b>	<b>-6,691,000</b>
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	27,037,000	28,145,000	28,118,000	+1,081,000	-27,000
Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.....	4,189,000	4,719,000	4,357,000	+188,000	-362,000
National Commission on Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome.....	2,928,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	-928,000	-1,000,000
National Commission on Children.....	1,073,000	.....	.....	-1,073,000	.....
National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.....	732,000	911,000	750,000	+18,000	-161,000
National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality.....	390,000	.....	390,000	.....	+390,000
National Council on Disability.....	1,439,000	1,842,000	1,497,000	+58,000	-145,000
National Labor Relations Board.....	147,481,000	162,000,000	162,000,000	+14,539,000	.....
National Mediation Board.....	6,514,000	7,008,000	6,775,000	+261,000	-233,000
Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission.....	6,247,000	6,711,000	6,497,000	+250,000	-214,000
Physician Payment Review Commission (trust funds).....	(3,778,000)	(4,495,000)	(4,300,000)	(+522,000)	(-195,000)
Prospective Payment Assessment Commission (trust funds).....	(3,875,000)	(4,210,000)	(4,030,000)	(+155,000)	(-180,000)
<b>Railroad Retirement Board:</b>					
Dual benefits payments account 2/.....	326,927,000	315,000,000	315,000,000	-11,927,000	.....
Interest payment.....	.....	.....	8,000,000	+8,000,000	+8,000,000
Less income tax receipts on dual benefits.....	-16,000,000	-18,000,000	-18,000,000	-2,000,000	.....
<b>Subtotal, dual benefits.....</b>	<b>310,927,000</b>	<b>297,000,000</b>	<b>306,000,000</b>	<b>-4,927,000</b>	<b>+9,000,000</b>
Federal payment to the Railroad Retirement Account.....	400,000	400,000	400,000	.....	.....
<b>Limitation on administration:</b>					
(Retirement).....	(69,936,000)	(74,037,000)	(74,037,000)	(+4,101,000)	.....
(Unemployment).....	(15,287,000)	(17,263,000)	(17,263,000)	(+1,976,000)	.....
<b>Subtotal, administration.....</b>	<b>(85,223,000)</b>	<b>(91,300,000)</b>	<b>(91,300,000)</b>	<b>(+6,077,000)</b>	.....
(Special Management Improvement Fund) 3/.....	.....	(13,910,000)	(3,264,000)	(+3,284,000)	(-10,646,000)
<b>Total, limitation on administration.....</b>	<b>(85,223,000)</b>	<b>(105,210,000)</b>	<b>(94,564,000)</b>	<b>(+9,341,000)</b>	<b>(-10,646,000)</b>
(Review activity).....	(5,855,000)	(7,700,000)	(6,089,000)	(+234,000)	(-1,611,000)
<b>Soldiers' and Airmen's Home (trust fund limitation):</b>					
Operation and maintenance.....	40,581,000	42,123,000	40,581,000	.....	-1,542,000
Capital outlay.....	11,223,000	4,220,000	4,220,000	-7,003,000	.....
United States Institute of Peace.....	8,393,000	8,911,000	8,393,000	.....	-518,000
<b>United States Naval Home (trust fund limitation):</b>					
Operation and maintenance.....	.....	10,055,000	10,055,000	+10,055,000	.....
Capital program.....	.....	1,253,000	1,253,000	+1,253,000	.....
White House Conference on Library and Information Services.....	488,000	.....	.....	-488,000	.....
<b>Total, Title IV, Related Agencies:</b>					
<b>Federal Funds (all years).....</b>	<b>1,079,950,000</b>	<b>1,036,850,000</b>	<b>1,030,273,000</b>	<b>-49,877,000</b>	<b>-6,377,000</b>
Current year, FY 1992.....	(761,314,000)	(776,850,000)	(776,964,000)	(+15,650,000)	(+314,000)
FY 1994.....	(318,636,000)	(260,000,000)	(253,309,000)	(-65,327,000)	(-6,691,000)
Trust funds.....	(98,731,000)	(121,815,000)	(108,983,000)	(+10,252,000)	(-12,632,000)

1/ FY 1991 appropriation advance in FY 1989 is \$298,870,000. FY 1992 appropriation advance in FY 1990 is \$327,280,000. FY 1993 appropriation advance in FY 1991 is \$318,636,000.

2/ Does not include \$78,750,000 in legislative savings proposed for later transmittal.

3/ Request available for FY 1992 - FY 1996. Recommendation available for FY 1992 only.

**H.R. 2707 - Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations for the Departments of Labor,  
Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies**

	FY 1991 Comparable	FY 1992 Request	FY 1992 Bill	Bill vs FY 1991 Comparable	Bill vs FY 1992 Request
<b>SUMMARY</b>					
<b>Title I - Department of Labor:</b>					
Federal Funds.....	7,541,537,000	7,336,447,000	7,435,073,000	-106,464,000	+98,626,000
Trust Funds.....	(3,345,157,000)	(3,396,136,000)	(3,512,648,000)	(+167,491,000)	(+114,512,000)
<b>Title II - Department of Health and Human Services:</b>					
Federal Funds (all years).....	151,535,902,000	165,657,345,000	167,266,742,000	+15,730,840,000	+1,609,397,000
Current year.....	(130,398,968,000)	(139,119,345,000)	(139,605,750,000)	(+9,206,782,000)	(+486,405,000)
1993 advance.....	(21,136,934,000)	(26,538,000,000)	(27,660,992,000)	(+6,524,058,000)	(+1,122,992,000)
Trust Funds.....	(6,554,729,000)	(6,543,148,000)	(6,937,781,000)	(+383,052,000)	(+394,633,000)
<b>Title III - Department of Education:</b>					
Federal Funds.....	22,883,520,000	26,580,972,000	28,266,159,000	+5,382,639,000	+1,685,187,000
Total including Guaranteed Student Loans.....	(27,063,338,000)	(29,656,683,000)	(31,341,870,000)	(+4,248,532,000)	(+1,685,187,000)
<b>Title IV - Related Agencies:</b>					
Federal Funds (all years).....	1,079,950,000	1,036,650,000	1,030,273,000	-49,677,000	-6,377,000
Current year.....	(781,314,000)	(776,650,000)	(776,984,000)	(+15,650,000)	(+314,000)
1994 advance.....	(318,636,000)	(260,000,000)	(253,309,000)	(-65,327,000)	(-6,691,000)
Trust Funds.....	(98,731,000)	(121,615,000)	(106,983,000)	(+10,252,000)	(-12,832,000)
<b>Total, all titles:</b>					
Federal Funds (all years).....	183,040,909,000	200,611,414,000	203,998,247,000	+20,957,338,000	+3,386,833,000
Current year.....	(161,585,339,000)	(173,813,414,000)	(176,083,946,000)	(+14,498,607,000)	(+2,270,532,000)
1993 advance.....	(21,136,934,000)	(26,538,000,000)	(27,660,992,000)	(+6,524,058,000)	(+1,122,992,000)
1994 advance.....	(318,636,000)	(260,000,000)	(253,309,000)	(-65,327,000)	(-6,691,000)
Trust Funds.....	(9,998,617,000)	(10,062,899,000)	(10,559,412,000)	(+560,795,000)	(+496,513,000)

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL 6 P.M., WEDNESDAY, JULY 3, 1991, TO FILE SUNDRY REPORTS**

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations have until 6 p.m. on Wednesday, July 3, 1991, to file sundry reports.

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

There was no objection.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE TO HAVE UNTIL 6 P.M., FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 1991, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2507, THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH REVITALIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1991**

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce have until 6 p.m., Friday, June 28, 1991, to file the report on H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Amendments of 1991, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

**AUTHORIZING USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL IN CEREMONY TO HONOR MEMBERS OF ARMED SERVICES AND CIVILIANS STILL IMPRISONED, MISSING, AND UNACCOUNTED FOR AS RESULT OF VIETNAM CONFLICT**

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 158) authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol by the National League of POW/MIA Families for a ceremony to honor the members of the armed services and civilians still imprisoned, missing, and unaccounted for as a result of the Vietnam conflict.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

□ 1650

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BARRETT. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] for the purpose of explaining his request.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

House Concurrent Resolution 158 provides for the use of the Capitol rotunda

by the National League of POW/MIA Families on July 13, 1991 at 11 a.m. for a ceremony to honor the members of the armed services and civilians still imprisoned, missing and unaccounted for as a result of the Vietnam conflict.

Today, over 2300 American servicemen remain unaccounted for in Southeast Asia. This ceremony will underscore our ongoing efforts to achieve the fullest possible accounting of these missing American servicemen and civilians as soon as possible.

Mr. BARRETT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 158, authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol by the National League of POW/MIA Families for a ceremony to honor the members of the Armed Forces and civilians who are still in prison, missing and unaccounted for as a result of the Vietnam conflict.

As the gentleman from Missouri has just stated, there are 2,273 American men and women, both military and civilian, who are still missing as a result of the Vietnam conflict. Those POW/MIA's are tragic heroes, lost patriots, sustained for years by an unyielding love for their country.

We have an obligation to remember these brave individuals and to recog-

nize their dedication and to honor their fate.

The National League of POW/MIA Families is dedicated to achieving the fullest possible accounting for those still missing as well as the repatriation of all recoverable remains of those who sacrificed their lives serving our Nation in Southeast Asia.

This must be our solemn commitment. As Secretary of Defense Cheney has so eloquently stated, and I quote:

A nation that will not care for those fallen in battle, a nation that will not seek freedom for those held captive, a nation that forgets its missing in action, such a nation has lost its soul. That will not be the final legacy of Vietnam.

This ceremony will ensure that though these brave men and women are lost, that they might be found in the memory of a proud and grateful Nation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to unanimously support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, further reserving right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the Republican leader.

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I am happy to join with our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], as a cosponsor of this particular resolution.

As a former combat infantryman in the Second World War, I know from personal experience what it is to have buddies listed as missing in action when there was uncertainty as to their fate or their whereabouts after a skirmish, a firefight or a full-fledged battle.

But I also realize that the anguish felt by the families of POW/MIA's is infinitely greater than that felt by even the closest comrade-in-arms of a POW/MIA and that is why I consider it an honor to be a sponsor of the resolution.

The National League of POW/MIA Families is the largest, most effective and most dedicated group of its kind in the United States today. The league has worked with a number of administrations and with bipartisan congressional task forces to keep this issue alive. Through bipartisan support of both bodies in the 100th Congress, the league's POW/MIA flag stands permanently displayed over in the great rotunda of this Capitol Building. It is there as a symbol of our Nation's commitment to resolving the fate of America's POW/MIA's.

Therefore, it is only fitting that league members should get the chance to use the great rotunda to honor those in prison, missing, and unaccounted for from the Vietnam war.

In my long experience in Congress, few issues have generated such fierce emotions as this one. There are those

who are critical of the Government's efforts in this area. I believe the critics of the Government's POW/MIA effort over the years have a right to be heard, to present their case to the Congress. That is why the House task force has played such a major role in improving the POW/MIA effort.

I just want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] for their patience, their dedication and the belief in the cause of the POW/MIA families.

As in many issues that generate such emotions, there are going to be heated, sometimes fierce disagreements as to the efficiency of public policy. Some critics of POW/MIA policy believe in a conspiratorial view of history in which five American Presidents, innumerable Defense Department officials and administrations of both parties, the House POW/MIA Task Force and the League of POW/MIA families are all engaged in some monstrous plot to thwart efforts to find out the truth about the POW/MIA's.

Conspiracy theorists do not allow for errors in judgment or in differing but honest interpretations of data or errors made solely because of the complexity of the POW/MIA issue. Every fault in the system, according to theorists, can be traced to a sinister, decades-long effort to deliberately keep POW/MIA's in captivity. I mention this only to emphasize that it is the conspiracy cult that gains the headlines of the POW/MIA issue. The conspiracy cult makes sensational charges amounting to accusations of treasonous conduct on the part of the Government employees or league members and then offers no evidence to support let alone prove the outrageous slanders. They were invited to come before the Intelligence Committee to lay it on the line and under oath and none have responded to the request. The quiet efficient work of the league, the House task force and the Defense Department does not get the same kind of media interest.

I hope the work of the task force and the league will get the kind of respect and attention it deserves.

A look at the complete evidence, not partially selected data, will show that our Government's efforts to help resolve the uncertainty of POW/MIA families has improved in recent years. It is not perfect. It has faults. It has got to be improved. But the important thing is that the Government is trying to do what is right for POW/MIA families.

In conclusion, let me just say to all the families of POW/MIA's, I pledge our willingness to do all we can to keep up the fight to account for their loved ones who will be honored in the great rotunda on July 13, 1991.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. BARRETT. Madam Speaker, I do not object to the measure.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 158, I rise in strong support of this measure, which authorizes the use of the Capitol by the National League of Families for a ceremony to honor members of the armed services and civilians still imprisoned, missing and unaccounted for as a result of the Vietnam conflict. The league, which is the only national organization comprised solely of the family members of American POW/MIA's in Southeast Asia, will hold this ceremony in conjunction with the annual convention being held by the league here in Washington on July 11-14.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend the Republican leader in the House, Representative BOB MICHEL of Illinois, for sponsoring this measure. As chairman of the bipartisan House POW/MIA Task Force, I very much appreciate and welcome the continued strong support Congressman MICHEL has given to the league and his unwavering dedication to the POW/MIA issue.

Congress does care deeply about the POW/MIA issue and the families of those still missing in action. Just a couple of years ago, I was honored to join Congressman MICHEL and others in sponsoring legislation to place the POW/MIA flag in the rotunda. It will remain there as a reminder to the American people until we achieve the fullest possible accounting of those still missing in Indochina. While today's resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol is a small gesture, it does underscore our commitment to those still missing and their families and our sincere interest in helping them any way we can.

I will have the opportunity to speak to the visiting POW/MIA families directly on Friday, July 12. I know that many of my colleagues will be visited by family members who are their constituents. While I will speak with them further about recent efforts our Government has undertaken to achieve the fullest possible accounting and ensure the POW/MIA issue remains the top national priority Presidents Reagan and Bush have assigned it, I want to give them an early welcome and reconfirm my strong support for these families and their missing loved ones.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 158.

Mr. BARRETT. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 158

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the rotunda of the Capitol may be used by the National League of POW/MIA Families on July 13, 1991, from 11:00 o'clock ante meridiem until 12:00 o'clock noon, for a ceremony to honor the members of the Armed Services and civilians still imprisoned, missing and unaccounted for as a result of the Vietnam conflict. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.*

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**AUTHORIZING USE OF ROTUNDA FOR UNVEILING OF PORTRAIT BUST OF PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH**

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the unveiling of the portrait bust of President George Bush on June 27, 1991.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. BARRETT. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] for the purpose of explaining his request.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 49 authorizes the use of the rotunda by the Senate Rules Committee for unveiling of the portrait bust of President George Bush tomorrow, June 27, at 1:30 p.m.

□ 1700

The Senate has asked the House to process the resolution, and as a matter of comity, the House shall approve this resolution.

Mr. BARRETT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Madam Speaker, George Herbert Walker Bush, now our 41st President, was the 43d man to serve as Vice President, and only the 14th of our Vice Presidents to later become President of the United States. We all look forward to the unveiling of the portrait bust of President Bush, and its placement in the Senate corridors, where it will join the marble busts of the other men who served the country as Vice President and fulfilled their constitutional duty as presiding officer of the Senate.

Madam Speaker, I will not object to the request by the gentleman from Missouri and withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 49

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to use the rotunda of the Capitol for the unveiling of the portrait bust of President George Bush at 2:30 p.m. on June 27, 1991. The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board shall take such action as may be necessary with respect to physical preparations and security for the ceremony.*

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. WHITTEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2698, the bill about to be considered today, and that I be permitted to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992**

Mr. WHITTEN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2698) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair designates the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1702

**IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 2698, with Mr. GLICKMAN (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill totals \$52.6 billion, \$1.5 billion below last year, and \$9.9 million below the budget request.

The bill is within the committee's 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays.

Of the total, \$31.5 billion, or 60 percent, is for the feeding or consumer programs. Agriculture programs are \$12.7 billion; conservation programs are \$2.7 billion; Farmers Home and rural development programs are \$3 billion; foreign assistance programs, mainly Public Law 480, are \$1.7 billion, and related agencies and Food and Drug Administration is \$900 million.

Mandatory spending totals \$42.2 billion with only \$12.4 billion of the bill in discretionary spending.

Mr. Chairman, we tried to address the concerns of the Members and their sections of the country to the fullest extent possible in view of the ceilings. This year we received 1,116 written requests from Members. Thirty-two Members testified before our committee. We had a total of 382 witnesses. Our hearing record totals 6,101 pages.

May I call attention that, again, this is the 12th appropriations bill, I think in 1988 we were able to get through the appropriation bills on time, but I call attention, again, that it has not been the fault of the committee. We cooperate fully, and at each instance we have been asked by the leadership to delay consideration on the House side.

We had 2 years where we were held up because of our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. Chairman, I am on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and all the other subcommittees. I have been on Defense Appropriations since I started with the Navy panel in 1943.

**AGRICULTURE—OUR LARGEST INDUSTRY**

Mr. Chairman, American Agriculture is the envy of the world and often is described as the "Eighth Wonder of the World." It is our largest industry—larger than the auto, steel, and housing industries combined. It is our largest employer, our largest market for the products of industry and labor, and our biggest dollar earner in world trade.

Agriculture is the foundation of our Nation's entire economy. Our wealth comes primarily from the use of raw materials and natural resources which come from the Earth. It has been reliably estimated that each dollar of wealth taken from the Earth multiplies seven times as it travels through the economy.

A study of history shows that the Great Depression of the 1930's was preceded by the drastic drop in farm income, which then spread throughout the country. We did not pull out of that depression until purchasing power was restored to agriculture—our largest in-

dustry and our largest producer of new wealth.

#### WHAT IS OUR SITUATION?

Mr. Chairman, we are in a prolonged recession here at home, at a time when our Nation owes a greater debt than any nation in the history of the world—over \$3.6 trillion—but not because of discretionary appropriation bills. For our Committee on Appropriations, since 1945, has held the total of appropriations bills \$180.8 billion below the recommendations of our Presidents. It is entitlements and binding contracts, which bypass our committee's discretion, which have done us in.

Almost all of the Nation's debt occurred because of the policies and actions of our Government.

First, enactment of the 1981 Tax Act has cost us over \$2.4 trillion in Federal revenue. Second, we have sustained an increase of over \$1 trillion in our trade deficit during the last 10 years—first, because we have given away a large share of our domestic markets and, thereby, destroyed many of our farmers and businesses; and second, because we have failed to retain our normal share of foreign markets.

We are now faced with having to borrow money from foreign sources to finance our debt. Interest on that debt in fiscal year 1991 is \$197.0 billion; for fiscal year 1992 it is projected to be \$206.3 billion. This interest comes off the top of our economy. Our trade deficit has gone from \$19.3 billion in 1980 to \$152.1 billion in 1987, \$119.8 billion in 1988, \$108.6 billion in 1989, and \$101 billion in 1990. A decade in the red.

In 1986, for the first time since 1914, the United States became a debtor nation and now owes the largest debt of any nation ever throughout history.

Foreigners are buying up our country at an alarming rate. Foreign investment in our country has gone from \$8.1 billion in 1983 to \$64.6 billion in 1989. The Japanese already own most of the major buildings in Los Angeles and in many other major cities, including Honolulu. We're afraid to ask foreigners how much they own because we have to rely on them to finance our debt.

We are about to get in the situation where we are faced with doing only what our creditors will finance, if we are not already there.

#### AGRICULTURE MUST AGAIN BECOME A PARTNER

Mr. Chairman, American agriculture is not merely one of the cornerstones of our economy—agriculture, industry and labor—it is basic, the foundation on which the other two depend. Agriculture no longer gets a balanced income, since in 1981 agricultural policy was redirected from one of moving our surplus production in world markets at competitive prices to one of requiring the farmer to get his income through a check from the U.S. Treasury, while requiring him to reduce production and sell below cost. Since that time, the

Department of Agriculture has not been using the Commodity Credit Corporation and other farm programs, as authorized by law, to stimulate production, regain our normal share of world markets and enable the producer to receive a fair price from the purchaser of his products. For years we have pointed out that if we let agriculture go down, the overall economy will follow.

For 48 years farm prices were supported at a level of agricultural income sufficient to offset costs and surpluses were sold in world trade at competitive prices. Unfortunately, these sound policies were abandoned during the past decade and the farmers are now being paid not to produce, when the world needs our production and we need the income.

Agriculture, with fewer and fewer directly engaged on the farm, now depends on high priced farm equipment, fertilizer and other high priced essentials. Too often solutions are designed to help other industries; the farm banking industry; the commodity processing industry; or the retailer—ignoring the fact that the producer, who must stay in business if those industries are to survive, doesn't get equal treatment. We need to return to the system that worked for 48 years.

Since 1981 our committee has repeatedly pointed out that if farmers went under financially, the rest of the Nation would follow. They did and it has, although borrowing on credit has tended to hide the true situation until recently.

During the decade of the 1980's, due to the Government's domestic and trade policies, over 300,000 farmers went bankrupt or were forced out of business—adding to our urban problems as well as rural problems. Small towns dried up, except where they were located next to military bases or had businesses that had military contracts. What followed is the national debt of over \$3.6 trillion.

#### WHAT CAUSED OUR FARM PROBLEMS?

Mr. Chairman, for the last decade the farmer and agriculture have been unable to maintain the balance with industry and labor. Often, well meaning actions are taken by our Government that have devastating effects on those engaged in Agriculture.

In 1980 the President placed an embargo on sales to Russia because of her invasion of Afghanistan. The embargo didn't hurt Russia. The action just transferred a part of our farmers' domestic market to our competitors, to a degree, destroying our farmers financially.

In 1983 the President announced the PIK Program to reduce our production, which cost over \$12 billion. Our domestic production was reduced 11 percent, our exports were reduced 11 percent, and our competitors overseas increased their production and sales by a like percentage.

Since 1981 our agricultural exports have declined from \$43.8 billion to a low of \$26.2 billion in 1986 and back to an estimated \$38.5 billion for fiscal year 1991. Yet, adjusted for inflation, they would only be \$26.3 billion or only 60 percent of the 1981 level. Under the Department's program, the profit has gone to the exporter but the cost is charged to the farmer.

Since 1981 agricultural imports have risen from \$10.8 billion to a projected \$22.0 billion in 1991, a 100 percent increase; in many cases, these are products our own farmers could be selling.

#### FAULTY GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Mr. Chairman, for the last decade our Government has refused to use the Commodity Credit Corporation as originally intended. CCC was set up by Congress so we could compete in world trade with countries which could form government/corporation partnerships for trade. Our competitors often deal on a government-to-government basis. Under our system, we had no means to compete on equal footing so CCC was chartered by Congress. For the last decade our Government has refused to use CCC for its original purpose and, instead, gave the profits on our exports to corporations rather than to the farm producer. Today, CCC is used to fund numerous nonprice support programs, often to avoid budget ceilings.

Instead of using CCC, we have paid large international corporations, many foreign-owned, \$3.5 billion in incentives during the last 6 years alone to move our commodities in world trade, and the Department is requesting \$1.2 billion more for next year, which is attributed to the farmer through farm programs.

Instead of using CCC, we have paid U.S. corporations \$930 million in the last 6 years to promote their products, and the Department is requesting \$200 million more for next year, which is also attributed to the farmer through farm programs.

Under the budget ceilings, these costs are all charged to the farmer through the farm program, yet farmers are not the beneficiaries. When our Government refuses to use CCC and section 32 of the Triple A Act for their original purposes, we all suffer. Section 32, where 30 percent of customs receipts are set aside to buy surplus perishable commodities and put them to good use, was intended to be a companion program to CCC, but the funds have been diverted to consumer programs.

To many in Government, the farmer and agriculture are still viewed as supplier of cheap raw materials.

Government planners seem to believe that if they want more, then the solution is to pay a higher price.

If they want less, then they pay a lower price—unaware that, with fixed costs, the farmer goes broke unless he produces more units to offset the lower price.

## WHAT CAN WE DO TO CORRECT IT?

Mr. Chairman, existing law enables the Government to reinstate the farm programs which operated successfully for 48 years—a program where a fair price was received from the purchaser, both at home and abroad, where we kept our price competitive. During those 48 years, farmers were, to a degree, kept in balance with industry and labor, who are able to pass their increased costs on to the purchasers of their products.

## DROP IN TRUE DOLLAR VALUE

Since 1981 commodity prices have fallen, but when viewed in 1981 dollars, the drop has been extreme: Corn was \$2.47 and is now \$1.52 per bushel; wheat was \$3.69 and is now \$2.18 per bushel; rice was \$9.05 and is now \$5.28 per hundredweight; Soybeans were \$6.07 and are now \$3.89 per bushel; and other commodities have followed the same path.

Remember, restoring the price the farmer receives would have only a small impact on prices. A 60-cent loaf of bread contains only 5 cents worth of wheat. A \$16 cotton shirt has 43 cents worth of cotton. If we were to increase the price received by the farmer by 10 percent, it would only add a penny or two to the cost of these items if only that were passed on. Under our system, however, the retailer would charge what the traffic would bear.

## OUR GOVERNMENT MUST ACT

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of actions which should be taken to restore the farm economy to a strong and healthy condition.

We should use the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act to develop and maintain foreign markets and enable the American farmer to be competitive in such markets. We should return to a policy of offering Government-held commodities on a competitive bid basis to American exporters for export, controlling how much and when so we don't flood the market, for we live in a competitive world. The large holdings, until recently, of agricultural commodities in CCC inventories, which we had until recently, were the result of failure to sell abroad competitively—not the farm price support program.

By controlling the quantity offered and the spacing of such offerings, we can avoid dumping and use the private enterprise system to benefit the farm producer and thereby restore our Government's finances. Further, we can enable the American farmer to be competitive in world markets. Failure to do so in the past has held an umbrella over world markets and has helped to increase foreign production at the expense of American agriculture. Actually, our foreign competitors take such action now as may be required to sell and then tax their people to offset their costs. Then, by one means or another, they keep our commodities out.

On trade agreements, we get out-traded.

Our Government should maintain target prices on basic commodities at a level which will enable the farm producer to cover his costs of production, plus a profit to enable him and his family to remain on the farm. Such target prices must be at a level high enough to compensate for high U.S. labor and material costs established by other basic laws. Farmers either make costs plus enough profit to make a living like everyone else, as they did for many years prior to 1981, or they deplete the land, go broke and move to town.

We should return to those farm programs which, for many years, enabled the farmer to secure his income from the users of his products rather than from the U.S. Treasury.

Also, we should follow policies which encourage full production, since volume is as important to the farmer's income as price, and it is important to world needs. Even if a farmer is guaranteed parity prices or higher, reductions in production reduce his gross income to a level insufficient to cover his costs of production and living expenses. That has been demonstrated by the 300,000 farmers who went bankrupt during the past 10 years and had to leave farming.

## RESTORATION OF PRODUCTION PROGRAMS ESSENTIAL

Mr. Chairman, to place added emphasis on the importance of agriculture, the title of the bill has been changed to Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee. It must be realized that the best rural development program in the world is a sound farm program—a farm program that allows the farmer to pay for his land, educate his family, and purchase the products of industry and labor.

In this context the committee has strengthened the programs of the Farmers Home Administration, including the restoration of operating loans, and has not provided funds for splitting the agency into two separate agencies.

## AUTHORIZATION VERSUS BUDGET CEILINGS

The 1990 authorization bill for the Department of Agriculture, which was signed into law on November 28, 1990, authorized numerous additional costly requirements for the Department which, because of lack of regulations written, hearings as to the effects of the proposed changes—as well as ceilings imposed by the Budget Act, are not implemented at this time.

Likewise, the committee is equally concerned over the Food and Drug Administration where, in 1990 alone, 12 major new responsibilities have been assigned through various authorizing laws.

Members of the committee support many of the new programs authorized for FDA and the Department, yet budg-

et ceilings have required the committee to postpone their funding.

## SCOPE OF BILL

Mr. Chairman, the bill includes funds for all agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, except the Forest Service, which is funded in another bill. It also includes funds for certain related agencies such as the Food and Drug Administration and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. In addition, it establishes limitations on funds for the Farm Credit Administration and the Farm Credit System Assistance Board.

Title I of the bill provides funds for the Department's agricultural programs, including production and processing, research, extension, animal and plant health, food safety and marketing services. It also funds farm income stabilization—price supports—crop insurance and farm export programs.

Title II of the bill funds the conservation programs of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service and the Soil Conservation Service—programs of the Department designed to protect and preserve the soil and water resources of the Nation for future generations.

Title III includes funds for the rural development assistance programs of the Department, including the loan programs of the Farmers Home Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration. The committee has included funds to restore these programs which are so essential to farmers and rural residents.

Title IV provides funds for the Department's domestic food programs, including women, infants, and children [WIC], child nutrition, special milk, food stamps, food donations, food assistance aid to the elderly, and human nutrition information. As previously mentioned, 60 percent of the funds in this bill are for these consumer programs.

Title V provides funding for the Department's foreign assistance and related programs, including the Foreign Agricultural Service, Public Law 480, the Office of International Cooperation and Development, and export programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Title VI provides appropriations and establishes limitations for the Food and Drug Administration and other various related agencies.

Agriculture is the base on which we build, because that is where wealth comes from, and industry and labor are dependent upon the well-being of American agriculture.

I have had occasion to study, since I have been here, the Great Depression that we had. It started with a break in farm income, and it lasted until we restored the income of farming, the purchasing power of agriculture. Today we seem to have forgotten.

I am for the consumer programs that we have been so fortunate as to have,

but let me remind the Members that you have got to produce first before you can consume. We do not seem to realize that.

Let me tell you that as much as we afford the things that we enjoy, and we hope we can keep in, 60 percent of this bill is for consumer programs, and there is more and more, and we well have some arguments today about looking after rural areas.

#### HELP FOR THE INNER CITIES

Mr. Chairman, I have had some of my friends from Chicago and other places point out to me that we have places that are not rural that need help, our inner cities. In nearly every big city of this country they have areas that need help from Washington. I mention this is the report about certain sections of the country, and sooner or later we are going to have to deal with that problem.

#### JOBS BILL

Mr. Chairman, for 48 years we had a prosperous United States. We had prosperity all over the country. Then in about 1981 we started letting agriculture have what was left, and I have tried to point out that if you keep it up you are going to have a depression. Right now we are in the middle of a recession. I am not trying to be all that blue, but about 3 months ago I recognized the trend of the times.

□ 1710

I introduced the jobs bill. Not only that, but we have the savings and loan situation. All of its traces back to rural areas failing to come through because of the decline in agriculture since 1981.

In connection with that, if we look at the overall situation, our economy will not come back until we do recognize that we have to have a sound agricultural base.

#### RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

I recently talked to the chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ]. In my experience practicing law before I came to this Chamber, I had refunded a number of organizations through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a corporation set up by President Hoover during his tenure, but which was really used by Roosevelt. The difference between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and what we are doing now is that with the RFC we could run the operation until we got the money worked out of it. Today we run a real risk in giving away great assets, to get rid of them instead of holding onto them.

#### RURAL DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Chairman, later today an amendment will be offered to the bill to strike a provision related to the Rural Development Administration. As we point out in our report, there are no funds in the bill for this proposed new Agency.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert a statement from the Office of Management and Budget which also points out that there is no money in the bill for the proposed Agency.

(The statement follows:)

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT  
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, June 26, 1991.

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

[This statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies.]

H.R. 2698—AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 1992

This Statement of Administration Policy expresses the Administration's views on the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 1992, as reported by the Committee.

#### Budget and farm bill agreements

It is the Administration's view that the Committee bill would undermine several important provisions of the Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act (OBRA) and the farm bill. These laws, enacted last year, reflect agreement between the Congress and the Administration on agricultural policy and funding priorities.

The Committee bill would significantly alter sections 1201 and 1202 of OBRA. These sections prescribe loan levels for each of the next five years for both the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) insured electric and telephone loans and the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) farm ownership and operating loans. The OBRA savings from agriculture were carefully developed by the Congress and the Administration to ensure a fair and balanced distribution of reductions across agricultural programs and interests.

The Committee's recommendations would significantly undercut this balanced approach by not only exempting a major part of the agricultural community from responsibility for shouldering reductions, but by actually increasing the availability of loans over FY 1991 levels. Most importantly, this exemption would go to the most wealthy of Federal aid recipients: REA telephone borrowers, at the end of FY 1989, telephone borrowers had \$1.6 billion in cash on hand, with many holding cash in excess of twice the value of their physical assets. In FY 1990, only \$58 million in loan requests out of \$145 million in telephone loans actually granted qualified outright for highly subsidized five-percent telephone loans. Virtually all other applicants could well afford REA loans of 8.5 percent, or commercial loans.

The Committee bill would greatly increase the subsidized farm operating direct loan program by adding \$500 million more in direct loans than was authorized in OBRA, while not reducing the provision of subsidized guaranteed loans that OBRA increased to offset direct loan reductions. Subsidized guaranteed loans provide borrower financing that is just as affordable as direct loans and, in addition, help Federal borrowers establish needed relations with commercial banks.

#### Rural Development Administration

No funding is provided for the Rural Development Administration (RDA), which was authorized by the 1990 farm bill and re-

quested at a program level of \$73 million in the FY 1992 Budget. A general provision of the Committee bill (section 739) would prohibit the RDA's establishment, which would provide the first step toward better coordination of the many rural development programs throughout USDA. In the absence of the RDA, the confusion voiced by rural Americans about the purpose and availability of Federal assistance for rural development would continue. The Administration urges the House to permit the establishment of the RDA.

#### Quarantine Inspection Program

The Committee bill also undermines an OBRA and farm bill agreement (sections 1203 and 2509, respectively) for the collection of user fees to cover the cost of the Agriculture Quarantine Inspection program of the Department of Agriculture. Under the budget agreement, the Department was to recover the costs (estimated at \$82 million in FY 1992) of inspection of passengers and freight arriving at the mainland U.S. border from other countries as well as from off-shore domestic sites. The Committee bill would prohibit the use of appropriated funds to develop or operate the domestic fee program, at a cost of \$13 million in forgone revenue. OBRA and the farm bill intended to shift the burden of the inspection costs from the taxpayer to those carrying or shipping potentially dangerous animal and plant diseases and pests into the mainland.

The Administration urges the House to amend the Committee bill to conform with the national agricultural priorities already established by the farm bill and OBRA.

#### Food and Drug Administration

Instead of adopting the Administration's proposal for Food and Drug Administration (FDA) user fees to recoup industry benefits from FDA approvals, the Committee has made one-quarter of the FDA's resources dependent upon a subsequent budget request from the Executive Branch. The Administration believes that the FDA requires the full \$770 million requested in the FY 1992 Budget to protect the health and safety of the American people. The Administration would not submit an amended budget request and urges the House to make the full appropriations available upon enactment and to adopt the Administration's proposal for user fees. If the Congress provides the funding level in the Committee bill the direct and unavoidable result will be an increased health and safety risk to millions of Americans.

#### Basic research in agricultural science

The Administration urges the House to restore adequate funding for basic research in agricultural science. The Committee bill would provide only \$99 million of the \$125 million that the President requested for competitive grants. Authorized by the farm bill, the National Initiative for Research on Agriculture, Food, and Environment would enable the U.S. to maintain and build its competitive edge in agriculture by supporting the development of new food production, processing, and marketing technologies. It is the Administration's view that—with the prospect of free global farm trade ahead—this is not the time to undercut the research that will form the foundation of farming's prosperity.

#### Rural housing programs

The Committee has constrained the options available for financing low-income housing by not funding the Farmers Home Administration's (FmHA's) subsidized guaranteed home purchase loans and voucher

program for rural rental assistance. For FY 1992, the President has requested a \$317 million increase over the FY 1991 level for subsidized guarantees. Although the Committee has funded both unsubsidized direct and guaranteed loans, it has eliminated subsidized guarantees entirely. With the rural housing market in need of credit, the subsidized guaranteed loans available in FY 1991 have filled a gap for low-income home borrowers who need modest Federal assistance to qualify for commercial loans. The Administration believes that the \$190 million requested for housing vouchers should be restored. Vouchers are a proven, cost-effective alternative to providing housing assistance to rural Americans, especially those who cannot afford FmHA home purchase loans at one percent. The successful rural voucher demonstration program in FY 1988 underscored the demand for and effectiveness of vouchers in rural areas.

#### Initial scoring of bill

On the basis of OMB's initial scoring, the Administration finds that the Committee bill exceeds the House 602(b) domestic discretionary budget authority allocation by \$40 million and the domestic discretionary outlay allocation by \$51 million. The bill is within the House 602(b) allocation for international discretionary budget authority and outlays. In aggregate, the House 602(b) allocations are consistent with the statutory spending limits enacted in the Budget Enforcement Act.

#### Additional administration concerns with bill

Additional Administration concerns with the Committee-reported bill are discussed in the attachment.

#### [Additional concerns]

H.R. 2698—AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1992

#### MAJOR PROVISIONS OPPOSED BY THE ADMINISTRATION

##### A. Funding levels

##### Department of Agriculture

**Conservation Programs.**—Environmental goals of the President, echoed in the farm bill, would be seriously compromised by the Committee's action. First, the Committee bill fails to provide funds for the wetland reserve component of the Environmental Conservation Acreage Reserve Program (ECARP). The President has requested \$124 million to purchase easements on 150,000 acres of farmland, working toward a wetland reserve enrollment goal of 600,000 acres as part of the farm bill minimum enrollment goal for ECARP of 40 million acres. Wetland acres would be selected in a nationwide competition to ensure that environmental and wildlife benefits would be maximized.

In addition, by reducing the President's request by \$25 million, the Committee bill would markedly hamper the Soil Conservation Service's work with farmers to implement recently-completed conservation compliance plans.

These programs would provide a significant environmental benefit by improving the land and water resource base through farm management actions and wetland restoration and protection. At the same time that the Committee has reduced funding for the farm bill-mandated programs, it has provided an increase of \$56.8 million, or 33 percent, above the budget request for discretionary watershed and river basin programs that fail to provide broad environmental

benefits. The Administration urges the House to fund fully the important environmental initiatives addressed in the President's request.

**Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC).**—The Committee-reported bill would provide \$87 million less than requested for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund. The Administration believes that only a \$50 million reduction can be justified. The difference arises out of variance in assumptions concerning the level of reimbursement to the Fund necessary to provide for its prior-year spending for administrative expenses. These operating costs are paid out of FCIC's Administrative and Operating Expenses appropriation unless funds there are insufficient to cover the total need. Then, FCIC may use the Fund's resources to meet selected expenses. The Administration believes that \$37 million of reimbursement for FYs 1980-90 expenses is still required in the FY 1992 appropriation but agrees that the \$50 million in reimbursement originally requested for FY 1991 is not needed. The Administration urges the House to fund the necessary \$37 million.

**Food and Nutrition Service (FNS): Commodity Supplemental Food Program.**—The Committee has provided nearly \$6 million more than requested for elderly caseload despite information from FNS suggesting that carryover balances from FY 1991 would be sufficient to support the elderly. The Administration urges the House to reduce the excess funding for elderly caseload.

**FNS: Food Stamp Program.**—The Administration is pleased that the Committee has included a reasonable contingency fund for the Food Stamp Program but is concerned that the appropriations language does not include the phrase, "such sums as may be necessary," as requested in the FY 1992 Budget. Funding needs for the program have become increasingly uncertain, as the once certain relationship between unemployment and food stamp participation has broken down. "Such sums" language would ensure the continued availability of food stamp benefits to millions of participants. The Administration urges the House to include "such sums" language.

**FNS: Child Nutrition Program.**—The Administration objects to the Committee bill's doubling of the request for nutrition education and training (NET). The increase in NET funding is unwarranted and would improve neither nutritional intake nor program accountability. The Administration urges the House to reduce funding for this program to the requested level.

**Office of the Inspector General.**—The Administration supports full implementation of the CFOs Act of 1990. The Committee has not provided \$4.5 million that was requested for audits of financial statements. The Administration urges restoration of this funding to carry out implementation of the CFOs Act at the level required by law.

**Departmental Administration.**—A major objective of the Administration is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of managing agencies' programs and operations. The Committee's reduction of \$1.5 million to the request for Departmental Administration represents an 80-percent reduction in the funding requested for new programs to support improved management. The committee-approved level would hamper management of the Department's planning, coordination, review, and assessment efforts in financial management, personnel, information resources, and general operation of the Department. The Committee's rec-

ommended level would not allow appropriate implementation of important initiatives related to the preparation of financial statements and necessary integration of administrative and financial management systems. The Administration urges the House to provide full funding for this area.

#### B. Language provisions

**Micro-management: Implementation of Regulations.**—Section 714 of the Committee bill would prohibit the use of funds to implement, administer, or enforce regulations disapproved by resolution. This represents unwarranted micromanagement and is an intrusion into Executive Branch functions. The Administration urges the House to remove this section.

**Micro-management: Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) Loan Programs.**—The Committee bill includes general provisions that represent micro-management of FmHA's loan programs, including a prohibition on the use of private debt collection agencies to collect delinquent payments from FmHA borrowers (section 729). The use of debt collection agencies for seriously delinquent debt is a proven private sector debt collection tool. Federal agencies received authority to use this tool in the Debt Collection Act of 1982. Several Federal agencies have successfully used these collection services for housing, student, and business loans. In the Administration's view, there is no reason to exempt the rural sector of the country from a technique that is intended simply to supplement the efforts of agency personnel to collect problem debts. The Administration urges the House to delete this provision.

**FTE Floors.**—The Administration objects to the continuation of arbitrary personnel floors for the Food and Drug Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Soil Conservation Service. Personnel floors are an unwarranted intrusion into Executive Branch management prerogatives and can only result in the inefficient allocation of scarce Federal resources. For example, the FDA personnel floor would slow the drug-approval process and reduce the flexibility needed to respond to emergencies by tying up funds in maintaining unneeded personnel. Further, FDA would not have the flexibility to contract for non-Federal expertise or invest in developing the agency's capability to meet future challenges. The Administration urges the House to delete section 724.

**New Projects.**—The Administration objects to the section 721 requirement that not less than 20 new construction projects be initiated under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (P.L. 566), and not less than five new projects be initiated under the Flood Control Act (P.L. 534). Such requirements applied within a fixed appropriation would necessitate that funding be applied to the more expensive construction projects and would reduce funding for environmentally sensitive land treatment activities. The Administration urges the House to delete section 720.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to include in the RECORD two letters we received regarding the committee position. The first is from my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], the chairman of the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee. The second letter is from a number of rural housing organizations who also support the committee's position.

The letters follow:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE  
AND URBAN AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, June 26, 1991.

Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR JAMIE: I'm writing to offer my strong support for the Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1992 as reported by your Committee, particularly with regard to the funding of the Rural Development Administration. As I have expressed to Secretary Madigan, I am quite concerned about the effect of the creation of the RDA on the administration of the rural housing programs of the Farmers Home Administration. I can see little that can be gained by disrupting a good housing delivery system and decimating a strong and stable housing program to expend funds on a largely duplicative agency within the Department of Agriculture. The FmHA housing programs have long been hailed as the most successful housing programs serving rural areas in large part because of the loan origination and servicing by the dedicated employees of the FmHA in the existing FmHA district offices.

I do not believe that the RDA will improve the administration of rural development programs or improve services to the residents of rural America. There is a clear and inseparable relationship between community facilities and the development of housing in rural areas and I believe that funding the RDA will severely disturb that essential relationship.

As you know, we are now marking up the bank reform legislation or I would be present on the floor to express my strong support for the Committee's position. I would deeply appreciate it if you would offer this letter of support for the record.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,  
Chairman.

JUNE 26, 1991.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WHITTEN: We are writing to you as a coalition of organizations representing rural housing and community development interests, including homebuilders, developers and consumers. We are in full support of the general provision in the Agriculture Appropriation Bill which prohibits the establishment of a Rural Development Administration (RDA) within the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The RDA will not improve administration of rural development programs. At present, one federal agency, Farmers Home Administration (FmHA), is responsible for rural housing and community development programs. If the RDA is approved, local borrowers will be forced to deal with two federal agencies, rather than one.

Creation of the RDA will not result in more coordination where it counts: in rural America. In most rural areas, central facilities are necessary to improve housing. FmHA housing and community facilities programs work to improve rural areas. If the RDA is approved, community facilities programs will be separated from housing.

The RDA will not improve service to rural areas. Cost considerations make it virtually impossible to duplicate the existing system of FmHA offices which administer housing and community development programs in rural areas.

The RDA will divert resources from FmHA, thereby weakening the principal federal

rural development agency. Resources will be taken from FmHA to establish a new, unnecessary, more centralized bureaucracy which may well be less responsive to rural needs. The creation of the RDA will not result in better service to rural areas, just more rigmarole and red tape.

FmHA has changed the face of rural America. In its history, FmHA has made more than 60,000 loans and grants totalling more than \$22 billion to provide needed community facilities and economic opportunity in rural areas. Rural housing conditions have improved as FmHA has made over 2 million rural housing loans totaling more than \$57 billion. We see little reason to change a program that has worked.

We urge you to defeat any attempt to strike the general provision related to the Rural Development Administration.

Council for Rural Housing and Development, National Association of Home Builders, National Rural Housing Coalition, North Carolina Council for Rural Rental Housing, Rural Builders Council of California.

Mr. Chairman, our committee has always strongly supported rural development. We do not support efforts to split the Farmers Home Administration and set up a separate agency.

Our committee has provided funding for rural development in the Farmers Home Administration—the agency that has successfully carried out these programs for many years. A summary of activities and funds take up a full page in our report which I will include in the RECORD.

Our bill restores and increases funding for rural housing, water, and sewer grants and loans and the other essential rural development programs—programs Congress has worked hard to maintain.

Rural America can ill-afford to lose personnel and support for the programs so essential to a healthy rural economy.

Mr. Chairman, the table which I will include shows the very extensive rural developments programs we have provided under the Farmers Home Administration.

(The table follows:)

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION LOAN AND GRANT  
LEVELS  
(Dollars in thousands)

	1991 level	1992 level	1992 provisions
Rural housing insurance fund:			
Low-income housing loans (sec. 502)	\$1,226,451	\$559,000	\$1,226,451
Unsubsidized direct loans	50,000	0	50,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed loans	70,000	347,000	350,000
Subsidized guaranteed loans	30,000	347,000	0
Rural housing development loans (sec. 524)	600	0	600
Rural rental housing loans (sec. 515)	573,900	341,000	573,900
Very low income repair loans (sec. 504)	11,330	11,100	11,330
Domestic farm labor plans	16,300	16,250	16,300
Credit sales of acquired property	0	284,000	284,000
Subtotal Rural housing insurance fund	1,978,581	1,905,350	2,512,581
Self-help housing land development fund	500	0	500

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION LOAN AND GRANT  
LEVELS—Continued  
(Dollars in thousands)

	1991 level	1992 level	1992 provisions
Agricultural credit insurance fund:			
Farm ownership loans: <sup>1</sup>			
Direct	33,000	37,000	46,500
Fiscal Year 1990 Act	13,500	0	0
Unsubsidized guaranteed loans	509,000	150,000	509,000
Subsidized guaranteed loans	0	50,000	0
Soil and water loans:			
Direct	5,500	0	5,500
Guaranteed	1,500	0	1,500
Indian land acquisition	1,000	2,000	1,000
Farm operating loans: <sup>1</sup>			
Direct	900,000	410,000	900,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed loans	2,600,000	2,000,000	2,600,000
Subsidized guaranteed loans	0	564,000	0
Emergency loans	600,000	25,000	600,000
Watershed and flood prevention loans	4,000	0	4,000
Resource conservation and development loans	600	0	600
Credit sales of acquired property	0	250,000	250,000
Subtotal, Agricultural credit insurance fund	4,568,100	3,488,000	4,918,100
Rural development insurance fund:			
Water and waste disposal loans	500,000	425,000	600,000
Guaranteed	35,000	0	35,000
Community facility loans	100,000	45,700	100,000
Guaranteed	25,000	50,000	25,000
Rural industrialization loans (guaranteed)	100,000	95,000	100,000
Subtotal, Rural development insurance fund	760,000	615,700	860,000
Rural development loan fund	32,500	35,000	32,500
Rural development loan fund	32,500	35,000	32,500
Home repair grants	12,500	5,000	12,500
Rural housing for domestic farm labor	11,000	5,000	11,000
Mutual and self-help housing grants	8,750	0	8,750
Supervisory and technical assistance grants			2,500
Compensation for construction defects	500	0	500
Rural housing preservation grants	23,000	10,000	23,000
Rural rental assistance (voucher program)	0	189,928	0
State mediation grants	3,750	2,000	3,750
Water and waste disposal grants	300,000	225,000	350,000
Rural community fire protection grants	3,500	0	3,500
Rural development grants	20,750	20,000	20,750
Solid waste management grants	1,500	0	1,500
Emergency community water assistance grants	10,000	0	0
Subtotal, grants and payments	703,350	726,728	745,850
Total, loans, grants, and payments	8,631,031	6,770,778	9,069,531

<sup>1</sup> Does not reflect Public Law 101-508, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, levels.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on about this bill. I am proud of my record here, if I may say so. Our approach has been to help every section of this country, as asked of us by our colleagues, from those areas. If there was a single dissenting vote in the 59 members on the committee, it was silent when we brought this bill out. So we bring Members a good bill, a sound bill. As I say again, we are going to have to produce if we will have anything to consume. If we do not believe we need to restore the old farm bill, which makes sense, if we are not willing to do that, we will have more and more of the same. We will have more and more bankruptcies and people moving to the cities.

I am glad I introduced the jobs bill, because it becomes more and more evident that it will be necessary.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. SKEEN, the ranking member on our subcommittee, for all his help and cooperation as we developed this bill over the last 5 months.

I would like to thank our vice chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, BOB TRAXLER, who also worked long and hard on the bill. Our other members of the subcommittee are MATTHEW F. MCHUGH, WILLIAM H. NATCHER, RICHARD J. DURBIN, MARCY KAPTUR, DAVID E. PRICE, NEAL SMITH, DAVID R. OBEY, JOHN T. MYERS, VIN WEBER, and BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH.

They have all worked long and hard on the bill.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, our new full committee ranking minority member, JOE MCDADE, has been a pleasure to work with and has cooperated with us throughout the process.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank our staff who have assisted us so ably all year in the effort to bring this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat again that on our full committee, 59 members, if there was any opponent to this bill that we reported out, there was silence from the 59 members. I am proud to have that support. I hope I will have other Members' support here on the bill.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of today's deliberations, I want to compliment the chairman of our committee and subcommittee—the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]—and the other members of the subcommittee, and the staff for their hard work and untiring efforts to produce this bill.

This bill comes in at \$52.6 billion in budget authority, which is \$9.9 million below the President's budget request. However, because of the large mandated entitlement programs in the bill, such as the Food Stamp Program, only \$12.4 billion of our total budget authority is in discretionary spending.

Given all of the House Appropriations Subcommittees' tight budget allocations this year, this bill, in many ways, represents our best efforts.

While I am sure the administration will express some reservations with this bill—and I am confident our differences will be worked out along the way—Members of this distinguished body do not need to hold or heed any reservations in supporting this bill.

In drafting this legislation, I thank the chairman and his staff for their efforts to accommodate as many Member requests as possible. In most cases, the committee was able to effectively address Member requests.

This bill provides important Federal support for our farmers, consumers, and agricultural researchers.

Briefly, I would like to stress some major highlights in this bill.

On the farmer's side, this bill provides funding for several rural economic development programs and continues to assist farmers in the development and enhancement of export markets.

On the research side, this bill includes \$99 million for the President's National Research Initiative Competitive Grant Program, a proposed increase of \$26 million over last year's funding level. Major research programs in the areas of water quality, air quality, the environment, and nonpoint source pollution are also funded in the bill.

On the consumer side, this bill provides \$2.6 billion for the Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] Program, an increase of \$250 million above last year's level.

I appreciate working with the chairman and Members of the House in developing this bill, and I look forward to working with our fellow colleagues and the administration in the weeks ahead in achieving a final version of this bill which all sides can proudly support.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH].

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this appropriations bill and urge my colleagues to support it. I appreciate and value the leadership of our chairman, Mr. WHITTEN, whose contributions to American agriculture span 50 years in Congress. I also appreciate the cooperation of our ranking Republican on the subcommittee [Mr. SKEEN]. It is a privilege to serve on this subcommittee where there is genuine bipartisan support for the important programs funded by this bill.

Each year this bill appropriates what is necessary to fund the operations of the Department of Agriculture. These programs are important to both farmers and consumers. Sustaining the producers, an increasingly shrinking portion of our population, is a critical goal of the bill.

However, more than half the resources in this legislation are devoted to feeding, nutrition, public health and safety, and other programs that are of direct benefit to consumers—programs that serve some of the most vulnerable people in our society: the children, the elderly, and the poor.

This bill funds the Food and Drug Administration, rural housing programs, water and sewer systems in rural communities, and vital research to assure our ability to meet our needs for fiber and safe, wholesome food.

Mr. Chairman, there are a wide array of essential programs in this bill, but I would like to take special note of the WIC Program, the Special Supple-

mental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children. As my colleagues know, this nutrition program is targeted at pregnant women with limited incomes and their children under age 6 who are at nutritional risk. Numerous independent studies have confirmed through the years that the supplemental food packages which are provided at modest cost are extraordinarily effective in reducing infant mortality rates, preventing mental retardation, and enhancing the health of vulnerable children. These studies have also demonstrated that for every dollar invested in WIC there is a savings to taxpayers of \$3 in medical costs that would have otherwise been incurred in programs like Medicaid.

For this reason, the WIC Program has enjoyed unusually strong bipartisan support. Even during the last decade, when many domestic programs were being cut or eliminated, our committee not only protected WIC, but extended its reach to serve more women and children. In 1980, we served 2.2 million people. In this bill, we are recommending \$2.6 billion which would serve approximately 5.1 million people.

Our recommendation calls for an increase of \$250 million over fiscal year 1991. This will not only maintain current services, but provide an additional \$150 million for expansion.

If the committee were not subject to significant budget constraints, I am confident that we would be recommending even larger appropriations for WIC. It is one of the most cost-effective programs we fund, and even with the increases of the last 10 years, over \$1.2 billion, we are still reaching only 55 percent of the eligible population. I hope we can do better in the future.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that promotes the interests of American producers and consumers alike, while at the same time keeping faith with the reality of the budget limitations under which we must operate. I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1720

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE].

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New Mexico, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we are now taking up the penultimate appropriations bill, rural development and agriculture appropriations, the 12th of 13 bills to be considered on the House floor. We will get to the final bill, transportation appropriations, which has been unavoidably delayed, after the July 4 recess.

I think that we have done an excellent job in moving the bills through committee and the floor thus far. Except for the transportation bill, we are matching our 1988 pace, when we

passed all 13 appropriations bills through the House by the July 4 recess, and went on to have all the conference reports approved before the start of the 1989 fiscal year. You have to go back to 1977 to find another time when the committee moved so quickly. Now it is up to the Senate to continue the good work.

The rural development and agriculture appropriations bill is heavily weighted toward mandatory programs. Only \$12.4 billion of the \$52.6 billion total—less than one quarter of the bill—is discretionary spending. The rest primarily is made up of \$22.2 billion for food stamps and \$6.1 billion for child nutrition, \$8.45 billion for Commodity Credit Corporation reimbursements for losses, \$1.6 billion for the conservation reserve, and \$222 million for the crop insurance fund.

In both mandatory and discretionary programs the bill falls within the 602(b) limits for budget authority, and just slips in at the 602(b) limits for outlays. Overall, the bill is \$1.5 billion below the fiscal year 1991 level. The members of the Agriculture Subcommittee really stretched, pulled, twisted, and shoved to make everything fit within the limits, and as usual they did a commendable job accommodating the hundreds of requests from Members.

I want to make special note of the work that my good friend from New Mexico, the ranking Republican of the subcommittee, JOE SKEEN, did on this bill. In his first year as ranking Republican he has done an outstanding job working with Chairman WHITTEN, and keeping a keen eye out for the interests of the President and the minority, and I thank you for it, JOE.

And of course I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman JAMIE WHITTEN, for listening to all members and producing a bill that we can all support.

The bill does a number of very good things.

Once again we have allocated a hefty increase for the WIC Program, raising it by \$250 million to a total of \$2.6 billion. We have also increased funding for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program by \$9.4 million over the 1991 appropriation in order to prevent any reduction in the caseload of elderly food recipients.

I am especially appreciative of the support from Chairman WHITTEN and members of the subcommittee for the provision of \$350 million in the Farmers Home Administration section 502 housing guarantees. This proposal had the strong backing of the administration and was included in the budget request.

I introduced legislation in 1989 to extend the Farmers Home 502 Program to authorize loan guarantees for first-time low- and moderate-income rural Americans to buy or construct a modest single family residence. The bill

was a response to the concerns I had been hearing in my own congressional district that rural Americans who were trying to become first-time homeowners were not adequately served by the existing housing programs.

The Housing Subcommittee held hearings on May 16, 1989. Testimony was heard from several of my constituents who told of their difficulty in securing housing loans. The committee, under the able leadership of Chairman GONZALEZ, and my friend from Ohio CHALMERS WYLIE, added my proposal to the comprehensive housing reauthorization legislation enacted last year.

I was pleased that the fiscal year 1991 agriculture appropriations bill provided \$100 million in loan guarantees to demonstrate the program in 20 States. The program has been generating a great deal of positive interest by potential homebuyers, lending institutions, realtors and homebuilders. Fannie Mae will be announcing tomorrow that they will be providing the secondary market component for the program.

All of the elements to make this program a success are now in place. The \$350 million provided in the bill before us today will allow the program to expand nationwide. I envision that this program will be as successful in rural America as the FHA and VA Loan Guarantee Program have been in urban and suburban areas.

The bill also takes care of the Soil Conservation Service by providing a much needed \$78.7 million increase, and it continues to expand the financial resources for the Food and Drug Administration to meet its ever increasing responsibilities.

There were some difficult decisions to be made, and I know that some Members are disappointed because of what we did not do. The bill does not contain funding for a few of the new programs authorized by last year's farm bill.

Most notably, we have not funded the Rural Development Administration. While we have restored proposed cuts and even increased funding for a number of rural development programs within the Farmers Home Administration, there certainly has been some concern voiced in the subcommittee about setting up a new bureaucracy to run the same programs which Farmers Home has successfully administered for years. I understand we will have more discussion on this later from the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this bill does a good job of setting our priorities for the agriculture and food assistance programs in a fiscally responsible manner. It is a bill that deserves support, and I urge Members to vote for it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Rural Development, Agriculture and related agencies appropriations bill.

This is my first year of service on the Appropriations Committee, and I have been fortunate to have the Agriculture Subcommittee as one of my two subcommittee assignments. I am fortunate not only because of the voice this has given me on matters of critical interest to North Carolina, but also because of the chance to work with the chairman of both the full committee and the subcommittee, JAMIE WHITTEN.

The chairman's unmatched familiarity of the agencies under his purview and his mastery of the subject matter before our subcommittee has been demonstrated over and over. I can count only one or two sessions where he was unable to preside personally, and the reason was always because of other committee business. So he has set a pace that a new Member like myself is at pains to keep up with. I am grateful to him for the many courtesies he extended to me during our hearings, and I salute him in bringing to the floor, for what I understand to be the 42d time, an important, evenhanded and well-written appropriations bill.

I must also pay my respects to the professional staff at the subcommittee, who have shepherded my staff and me through the hearings this year. Bob Foster, Tim Saunders, Carol Novack, and Toni Savia do an outstanding job, and this bill mirrors their dedication and hard work.

Others have already pointed out the important jurisdiction of this subcommittee—ranging from important nutrition programs, such as food stamps, WIC, school lunch, to the consumer protection programs administered by the Food Safety and Inspection Service and the Food and Drug Administration, to the Agricultural Research Service, Agricultural Extension Service and other agencies who are taking agriculture's lessons to our constituents, to the housing and development programs of Farmers Home Administration.

Yet Chairman WHITTEN has rarely let us forget that farmers and agriculture are at the heart of these other programs that sometimes catch our attention more readily—that agriculture is our biggest dollar producer, comprises the biggest segment of our exports, remains our biggest employer and by every definition, is the mainstay of the rest of our economy. In retaining, over the years, his chairmanship of this subcommittee despite being a member of each of the 13 subcommittees, the chairman gives his personal emphasis to the importance of agriculture—an importance he reinforces to committee members, witnesses and agency officials every day. You cannot attend very many meetings of our subcommittee without hearing this lesson long

and loud, and it is one that we proclaim loud and long today.

I want to focus on several aspects of this bill today—the nutrition programs, the consumer protection programs overseen by the FDA, and one subject I know something about from my service on the Banking Committee—the rural housing programs. Let me start with rural housing.

Our committee has a long history of support for the rural housing, farm ownership, soil and water conservation, and rural business development programs overseen by the Farmers Home Administration. This support cannot be taken for granted; the President submitted a budget requesting cuts of more than \$1 billion in direct loans and subsidized loan guarantees for low income home ownership. But the committee has worked effectively to protect these vital programs.

The administration also proposed to divert housing resources, currently targeted to low income rural citizens—particularly assistance for home ownership—to those with higher incomes. This misguided attempt to channel valuable resources into subsidized guaranteed loans to which most low-income communities would be unable to gain access, was recognized and these resources were redirected. Last year some 70,000 households received assistance through home ownership or rural rental housing programs, and we continue that level of assistance in this bill. It is obvious from these administration attempts to change the traditional mission of FmHA that maintaining the integrity of these programs has never required more vigilance on the part of our committee or the House.

The Food and Nutrition Service oversees a number of important programs: Food stamps, WIC, milk, school lunch, emergency food assistance and others. The committee has always been as generous as possible within its allocation and its other important mandates in funding these programs at the highest levels possible. This year is no exception.

For child nutrition programs, the committee adds \$490 million to the fiscal year 1992 level—\$2.5 billion more than the President requested.

For WIC, one of the most cost effective programs administered by the Federal Government by virtually any standard, and an important program in fighting the high levels of infant mortality that affect many areas of the country, especially the Southeastern States: the committee increases the amount for WIC by \$250 million over fiscal year 1991—\$26.6 million over the President's budget request.

For food stamps, the committee provides an increase of \$1.6 billion over the fiscal year 1991 level.

For the Emergency Food Assistance Program, the committee provides \$23 million more than the President's budget request.

These programs were never more important than today, and they require our steadfast protection. It is our hope that these funds, especially for WIC, will leverage State efforts to expand participation and coverage. We must continue to make steady progress in attempting to cover 100 percent of our constituents who are entitled to coverage.

Finally, I turn to the Food and Drug Administration.

FDA may be the most visible, important and controversial agency in the Federal Government. That's no surprise. Their objective is simple: Consumer protection; and their jurisdiction covers what is estimated to be over 50 percent of the products in the American marketplace.

Just in the last few weeks, news stories have abounded about the actions of FDA and its new aggressive commissioner, Dr. Kessler. A simple reading of their mission will indicate FDA's heavy responsibilities: FDA sets food and product standards; evaluates the safety and efficacy of new drugs and medical devices; conducts research studies to detect health hazards; maintains surveillance over foods, drugs, medical devices and electronic products to ensure that they are safe, effective and honestly labeled; and takes the legal actions necessary to accomplish its mission.

We also know the controversies and criticisms that FDA has endured in the time it takes for approval of promising new drugs, and the level of effort needed to bring honesty and uniformity to food labels, and otherwise ensure that manufacturers stand by their product claims.

The committee has responded this year by using all its resourcefulness to give FDA the tools it needs to accomplish its mission. The committee provides \$69.4 million more than fiscal year 1991—fully \$188.8 million more than the President's budget request. This is the type of commitment FDA requires from us now and in the future to accomplish the long list of mandates that we have given it.

What we expect in return is action and improvement. Action on generic drug evaluation and enforcement—and improvement in the turnaround time for the approval of promising drugs, such as those for the treatment of AIDS and Alzheimer's disease.

Action in implementing the Nutrition and Labeling Education Act—and improvement in coordinating this responsibility with other Federal agencies who also have jurisdictions related to food labeling.

Action in educating American consumers about unsafe products—and improvement in enforcement of the laws Congress has passed through the years to protect American consumers.

I'm also pleased that the committee has recommended funding for some

promising projects that are important to North Carolina and where North Carolina has been a leader. The North Carolina Biotechnology Center in Research Triangle Park has served as a national model for nurturing innovations in biotechnology and bringing them successfully to the marketplace. USDA reported that "the range and maturity of its programs and activities make the Center unique nationwide, and offer practical strategies to answer the needs and questions of biotechnology development." So I am pleased that \$1.45 million is included in this bill to finish construction for a permanent Biotechnology Center.

In addition, the Bowman Gray School of Medicine associated with Wake Forest University in Winston-Salem, NC, has received a recommendation of \$3.65 million from the committee for their proposed Center for the Study of Nutrition and Chronic Disease. It is hoped that these Federal dollars will leverage the school's other fundraising efforts to bring this program and facility to fruition, where it can study the relationships between nutrition and chronic disease, and seek and promote solutions in agriculture and agricultural products.

And the committee recommends sustained levels of funding for the important agricultural research conducted at one of the Nation's leading research institutions—North Carolina State University—for peanuts, soybeans, sweet potatoes, food fermentation, forestry, global warming, and other initiatives related to improvements in agriculture.

In short, I urge my colleagues to support this bill enthusiastically and to give Chairman WHITTEN the mandate he needs to take the bill to conference and protect the positions, projects and priorities of the House.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this is a statement I wish I did not have to make. This is a place I would rather not be at this time. I say it with some degree of sadness in my heart, because I am going to be speaking about procedure and usurpation of prerogatives of committees.

But first, for all my colleagues, I concur with what has been said about what this bill does in a positive way. For example, there is much criticism about how much we spend for farm programs which has led to countless editorials. But let's look at the budget. Here it is graphically.

The red is the total budget. The tiny little line at the bottom, 0.63 percent of the total budget, is what we spent for agricultural programs. So let no one

point the finger. We are the best fed people in the world, in the history of the world, for the least amount of disposable income per family. And this is what the Federal Government spends. So I want to start with that premise—to look at the positive side and commend all my colleagues who have worked on this endeavor.

Then let me say, as mentioned by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], all the positive programs, the WIC and all the nutrition programs.

So that our colleagues can see, on the right, this is almost one-half, on the left, I guess as you see it, that is what we do for women and children. These are the domestic nutrition programs. There is still hunger in America, but not because we have not tried. We still have to do more.

So only this part here is commodity programs. I wanted to start from that premise—what we have done positively, what we have done together, the Agriculture Committee and my distinguished colleagues from the Appropriations Committee.

Now let me get to the point that I wish I did not have to make, but as chairman of the committee I have an obligation and I have a responsibility, and it must be said. There are many areas where all the Appropriations Committee, sometimes the subcommittees, legislate. In some, it is done probably positively, some with good intentions in their hearts, but sometimes it penalizes the authorizing committee.

And then we use the report language. For example, in this report, and this is legal, you cannot object to it, but there is an instruction basically having to do with the Farm Credit System. A Farm Credit System that works to provide funds for rural America and for farmers. The report says that the Committee on Appropriations "expects the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Jackson to submit a plan under which it will merge to form a farm credit bank for the fifth [farm credit] district."

This bypasses the regulator. This is a usurpation of power, my dear friends. Out there they may misinterpret this report as law, so it is my responsibility and my obligation as chairman of the authorizing committee to emphasize that this report language has no force of law and does not reflect the intent of Congress with regard to the statutory authorities of the Farm Credit Administration.

As chairman of the Agriculture Committee, I would urge the Farm Credit Administration to ignore this language and to implement the law as it has been approved by the Congress and signed by the President. That is one of the areas that we have concern about.

I say that if they are going to take the report as law, then what I say has the same impact in law.

Mr. Chairman, I rise, as I have in the past when the agricultural appropriations bill has been considered by this House, to reaffirm the fact that report language accompanying this bill is merely advisory in nature, does not have the force of law, and should not be interpreted to broaden, narrow, or otherwise affect the application of authorization statutes.

This year the report to accompany H.R. 2698 includes language indicating that the Committee on Appropriations expects the Farm Credit Administration, the arms-length, independent regulator for the Federal Farm Credit System, to submit to the Congress a plan for the consolidation of the 11 Federal farm credit banks. Unfortunately, the report language also states that one Farm Credit System institution, the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Jackson, should be given preferential treatment in this process by the Farm Credit Administration.

According to the report language, the Committee on Appropriations—

Expects the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Jackson to submit a plan under which it will merge to form a Farm Credit Bank for the Fifth Farm Credit District, subject to stockholder votes. The Farm Credit Administration will then include this bank in its consolidation plan.

Mr. Chairman, this report language, if heeded by the regulator, would create a dangerous precedent in the regulation of financial institutions. It implies that the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of Jackson should be able to dictate to its Federal regulator how and under what conditions it will merge to create a new farm credit bank. The language also suggests that a new farm credit bank be chartered, thus increasing the overhead costs that must be borne by Farm Credit System borrowers.

If this precedent were to be extended to other arms-length financial regulators it would allow individual banks, savings and loans, and other government-insured financial institutions to dictate to their regulators whether they should be allowed to merge with other institutions, or whether the parochial interests of individual committees of the Congress should be allowed to override the statutory requirement that these financial institutions be regulated in accordance with modern standards of safety and soundness.

In 1985, 1986, and 1987, the Congress approved legislation to provide for the consolidation of Farm Credit System institutions and to establish an independent, comprehensive, arms-length regulator for the Farm Credit System. The Department of the Treasury and the General Accounting Office agree with me that, on the whole, this modern regulatory system has worked well.

The report language I described earlier, if heeded by the regulator, would place the interests of one Farm Credit

System institution above the interests of the rest of the System and the taxpayer. This is contrary to the concept of arms-length financial regulation. This is bad public policy. It is bad regulatory policy. And the precedent it sets, if allowed to stand, does not bode well for the regulation of the Nation's financial institutions.

It is especially frustrating for me as the chairman of the authorizing committee of jurisdiction to see this happen. I regret that I must emphasize that this report language has no force of law and does not reflect the intent of Congress with regard to the statutory authorities of the Farm Credit Administration. I would urge the Farm Credit Administration to ignore this language and to implement the law as it has been approved by the Congress and signed by the President.

With regard to the broader issue of the regulation of the Farm Credit System, section 13501 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 requires the authorizing committees with jurisdiction over Government-sponsored enterprises to report legislation to ensure the financial soundness of Government-sponsored enterprises and to minimize the possibility that such enterprises might require future assistance from the Government. The Department of the Treasury, the General Accounting Office, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Farm Credit Administration have all submitted recommendations to the Committee on Agriculture in this regard. The Committee on Agriculture has held hearings on the matter. Other authorizing committees in the House have done likewise.

The report language accompanying this bill attempts to circumvent this congressionally approved process and give one financial institution a preference in determining its fate in the recommendations made to Congress by its regulator. This attempt to place parochial concerns above sound financial regulation runs contrary to the mandate that the Farm Credit Administration regulate system institutions in accordance with law.

If the report language described above had been included in the bill we are considering today, it would have been subject to a point of order for legislating on an appropriations bill. Report language seeking to achieve these ends does not have the force of law, nor does it affect current authorities. If it did, it would be subject to the same point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned, very concerned, that ad hoc mandates such as this, not properly studied by the committees of jurisdiction, could achieve an opposite result than the one sought. In the instant case, an attempt to assist one financial institution could endanger the safety and soundness of the entire Farm Credit System. If simi-

lar dictates were applied to other Federal financial regulators, similar threats to the Nation's financial system could result. That is my concern.

I have no quarrel with the distinguished chairman of the committee on Appropriations, whom I respect and admire. I know that in his heart he is always trying to do what is best.

I would hope that as we continue to work in the future, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and members of the Committee on Appropriations know and understand that we are readily available, that we are interested in cooperating with them, that we are willing to work with them in good faith on matters of mutual concern, and that there is no problem that, together, we cannot resolve for the benefit of those whom we attempt to serve.

Then over in the conservation area, the Agriculture Committee passed, approved by the House, approved by the Senate, signed by the President, a wetlands program that we hope will be able to help rural America in conservation and all the areas that we are concerned with in the environment.

The legislation says that the law shall be ignored, that there should be a study made to better define the cost benefits. It is not appropriating funds. We know and we submit to the fact that the Appropriations Committee has the sole authority to appropriate or not to appropriate. This is not our problem.

The problem is that even though this is a mandated program, the Appropriations Committee may choose not to appropriate funds. But this is basically instructing an agency not to do something which was required in the basic law. That is not right.

Then we have the Rural Development Administration that was passed by the committee, approved by the House, approved by the Senate, signed by the President, the law of the land. This bill says that no funds shall be used to implement, period, because we do not like it.

□ 1730

Well, it has been approved by the House, it has been approved by the Senate, been signed by the President. If no funds had been authorized, fine. We subject ourselves to the jurisdiction of the distinguished Committee on Appropriations. That is not our problem. But it is when you say now, "Thou shalt not implement," no funds under this bill shall be used.

Mr. Chairman, I am talking about some very sensitive matters. But these are matters, my colleagues, that have to be addressed. Maybe the system is wrong, maybe there has been lack of communication, but not from our part. We tried to work with the distinguished chairman. On this issue, we discussed a possible compromise. But

he added insult to injury. You will see later that he offered a compromise that is legislation on an appropriation bill, which is what we were objecting to.

So, my friends, we will have amendments later to the Rural Development Administration and to the wetlands issue. I say again, I say this with pain in my heart, that I have to do this, that I have to represent the interests of you, the Members, who rely on the authorizing committees to do what you think and what we collectively think is best for our Nation and for rural America.

The problems of the big cities, they begin in rural America.

What the distinguished chairman said about what is happening in rural America, that is true. I agree. But to thwart the law authorizing beyond not appropriating, I think is not right. I plead with my Members to support us on the amendments, to do things right and then all of us will be traveling in the same vehicle.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my distinguished colleagues for yielding me the time, both the gentleman from New Mexico and the distinguished chairman.

Mr. Chairman, in the Food, Agriculture and Conservation Act of 1990—the 1990 farm bill—Congress authorized funding for a targeted program to help communities facing health risks due to inadequate water or waste services.

I was pleased to play a key role in developing this program, and I was particularly proud that language was included at my urging to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to give preference to improving water and waste services for residents of colonias.

As some of my colleagues know, colonias are unincorporated subdivisions found in States along the United States-Mexico border. Living conditions in many of these colonias are quite distressing and it was our hope that Federal funding to improve basic services in these areas would be given a higher priority.

In the agriculture appropriations bill, I am pleased to see increased funding is provided to the overall Rural Water and Waste Program. I am also pleased that report language expresses the Appropriations Committee intent that Farmers Home Administration provide priority assistance to colonias.

However, I am concerned that language in the appropriations bill may be construed by the Department of Agriculture as a prohibition on grants and loans for hookups for eligible residents of areas that face severe health risks. Section 306-C of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act specifically provides authority for USDA to make grants and loans to eligible applicants for hookups, and I trust the Department will provide this much-needed assistance.

I will continue to work with the Department of Agriculture on this issue

and do everything I can to direct funding to the very real needs of the thousands of low-income people who live in the colonias along the border.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time so that I may address the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

May I say what we do about the farm credit system, they have done nothing to restore the intermediate credit bank for my section of Mississippi. They are in operation, but they have had no vote as to their own fate. The big thing is when they took the Farm Credit System out from under the supervision of the Congress, we had to bail them out with a \$4 billion line of credit. I think our Committee on Appropriations has a whole lot of interest in following anything that costs us \$4 billion. They have not spent it all as of yet, but we had to bail them out for \$4 billion.

At the time when they took it out from under reporting to the Congress, I raised the point, and sure enough it proved true.

Then when we get to the other matter, I will discuss that later. May I say that I am sorry, but the legislative committee does not have the jurisdiction to appropriate. But let me point out here again that the money appropriated has to be used for the purpose for which it was appropriated. And the best evidence, as a lawyer, of what they intended to do is the report of the committee.

So, the bill plus the report is binding.

Now, we have a little difference with what our friends on the legislative committee have said, and goodness knows we believe in the legislative committees, but they are separate from appropriations.

So I want to work with my friend, and I appreciate his statement and friendship. But I do think I should say this at this time. We are asking the intermediate credit bank to bring up a plan that would give the same service to my State as they have in some other States.

On the other thing, we will deal with that when we get to it.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this was not like the S&L issue. We did not appropriate a bailout. The money was raised by bonds in the private sector; it came from the banks. The banks will pay it back.

The only appropriated funds are some administrative funds, and also Mississippi is being served, and the matter is in court.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mississippi is not being served.

Mr. Chairman, may I say again I do not say this is the savings and loan; I

just say when you read how many folks committed suicide and that 300,000 farmers went broke, it is worse than the savings and loan if you look at the history of farming.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I do not have any disagreement to that, but it was not a bailout from taxpayers' money. It was not a bailout from taxpayers' money.

Mr. WHITTEN. When you needed it, we provided the money, so we have an interest in it.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. It was not a bailout from taxpayers' money.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER].

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from New Mexico in his first full bill as ranking member of our subcommittee. He has done an outstanding job.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman for the usual leadership that he provides us.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. The bill recommended by the committee totals \$53.6 billion in budget authority, which is \$9.9 billion below the budget request. Notwithstanding the fact that we have done our job in terms of the budget and reported the bill that meets all the targets that we were supposed to meet, it in fact exceeds them. There are very positive things in this bill, and I just want to mention them because the committee has been responsive to me and other Members of this body in trying to meet some of our requests.

We increased Agricultural Research Service funding by \$36 million to \$624 million. It is my view that if you look at the Federal Government's investment in research activity, whether it be NIH or NASA or anything else, over the last 10 to 20 years or maybe longer, you would be very hard pressed to find any place where the investment of the Federal Government in research has more directly proven out than our investment in agricultural research.

I am proud of the work that our committee has done in that regard. We increased the Extension Service budget by over \$18 million to \$417 million. This increase assists the Extension Service in providing these necessary services.

In my areas, as in most other rural areas, the Extension Service has gone through a tremendous transformation in recent years, particularly the years which we think of now and refer to as the farm crisis years. The Extension Service was an extensive social service network that reached out to troubled farm families and tried to deal with the problems of suicide, alcoholism, and emotional breakdown.

They now are involved in areas such as economic development and health care problems that afflict rural areas just as much as the rest of the country. I think that increase is very merited.

Through the Animal/Plant Health Inspection Service, I point out we have increased pseudorabies research by \$1 million to over \$7 million. This is a 10-year program, Mr. Chairman, which is very important, really of critical importance to the swine industry throughout this country. I am pleased that the committee appropriated this amount. It is minimal. We really are part of a program to eradicate pseudorabies at a savings of millions and potentially billions of dollars for the American swine industry. This is not a program where it pays in the long term to be short today.

I appreciate what the committee has done. We restored REA funding to a level \$2.5 billion. Again, I appreciate that in my part of the country where a majority of my subscribers for electricity subscribe through the REA.

We maintain level funding for the Farmers Home Administration business and industry guaranteed loan program, which we have been able to utilize in my district as a very effective rural development tool.

Finally, there is language in the report which I am appreciative of to the chairman for including, which urges the Secretary to expedite disaster assistance declarations for a number of counties throughout the upper Midwest and elsewhere that are experiencing natural disasters, whether it be due to rainfall in my part of the country or the Mississippi Delta or perhaps due to drought or other problems on the west coast.

I believe before this Congress is over we my well be considering some disaster assistance bill to deal with some of those very serious problems. About a third of my district has suffered severe losses due to excessive rainfall. I appreciate the committee's concern about this problem as I appreciate the concern of the Committee on Agriculture, which has already begun to hold hearings on the program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise, as I have, to inform the House regarding how this bill fits with regard to the budget resolution and the budget agreement. This is the 12th of 13 annual appropriation bills to be considered by the House and falls within the limitations established by the agreement.

I want to commend the chairman of the committee because this represents the second time in 14 years that the House has passed this many appropriation bills before the July 4 recess.

□ 1740

Mr. Chairman, I think in large measure it was due to the ability to get a

budget resolution adopted early and then move all the appropriations bills within the limits established by the agreement.

This bill provides \$12.384 billion in total discretionary budget authority and \$11.270 billion in total discretionary outlays, which are \$116 million below the 602(b) subdivisions for budget authority and equal to the 602(b) subdivisions for outlays, respectively, for this subcommittee.

I want to commend Chairman WHITTEN and the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. SKEEN, for the work they have done in adhering to the limits set forth in the budget agreement and the 1992 budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise for the purpose of discussing the funding level for the special supplemental food program for women, infants and children [WIC]. The WIC Program represents the best that government has to offer, it is effective and it significantly improves life outcomes for infants, children and mothers who need assistance.

Simply put WIC works. That's what five chief executive officers of major U.S. companies told us when they testified before the budget committee. They urged us to fully fund WIC by 1996. Their statement pointed out that this goal is within the power of the Congress and the executive branch and that it would represent an excellent investment in our Nation's children, its economy and its overall future.

The WIC success has been established in study after study. The national WIC evaluation released by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in 1986 found that WIC participation reduces late fetal deaths by 20 to 33 percent. A new study issued by the USDA in October 1990 found that WIC participation increases birthweight significantly, especially among premature infants.

The USDA study found that the WIC prenatal component has a positive cost-benefit ratio reflected in estimated Medicaid savings of \$1.77 to \$3.13 for each dollar invested in just the first 60 days of life. So WIC saves lives and saves money.

The House of Representatives approved a budget resolution for fiscal year 1992 which assumed a \$350 million increase for the WIC Program as a first incremental step to raise WIC participation from its current approximately 55-percent participation rate to full funding by fiscal year 1996. The recommendation for full funding is also meant to show that when we know how to really make a difference, we should not restrict it to half measures.

The House appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies includes a \$250 million increase for the WIC Program. While this is not quite at the level recommended by the CEO's and assumed in the budget resolution, it

still represents a great stride forward. We support the effort made by the Appropriations Committee and urge that in the future conference that the funding should at a minimum be the level proposed in this bill.

As chairman of the budget committee, I will continue to inform the House of the impact of all spending legislation. I have provided a "Dear Colleague" letter describing how each appropriation measure considered so far compared to the 602(b) subdivisions for that subcommittee. I will provide similar information about the conference agreements on the appropriations bills.

I look forward to working with the appropriations committee on its remaining bill and on the conference agreements with the Senate.

[Fact Sheet]

H.R. 2698, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1992 (H. REPT. 102-119)

The House Appropriations Committee reported the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for 1992 on Thursday, June 20, 1991. This bill is scheduled for floor action on Thursday, June 27, 1991.

COMPARISON TO THE 602 (b) SUBDIVISION

The bill, as reported, provides \$12,384 million in total discretionary budget authority, \$116 million below the Appropriations subdivisions for this subcommittee. The estimated discretionary outlays in the bill equal subdivision totals. Amounts are provided in the domestic and the international categories.

The bill provides \$10,983 million of domestic discretionary budget authority, \$62 million less than the Appropriations subdivision for this subcommittee. The bill provides \$10,040 million of domestic discretionary outlays, which is equal to the discretionary outlay subdivision for this subcommittee. A comparison of the bill to the spending allocations for this subcommittee follows:

COMPARISON TO DOMESTIC DISCRETIONARY SPENDING ALLOCATION

[In millions of dollars]

	Agriculture, rural development appropriations bill		Appropriations Committee 602(b) subdivision		Bill over(+)/under (-) committee 602(b) subdivision	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Discretionary	10,983	10,040	11,045	10,040	-62	...
Mandatory <sup>1</sup>	37,888	29,486	37,888	29,486	...	...
Total <sup>1</sup>	48,871	39,526	48,933	39,526	-62	...

<sup>1</sup> Conforms to budget resolution estimates of existing law.

Note: BA—New budget authority; O—Estimated outlays.

COMPARISON TO INTERNATIONAL DISCRETIONARY SPENDING ALLOCATION

The bill, as reported, provides \$1,401 million of international discretionary budget authority for P.L. 480 Food for Peace programs, \$54 million below the Appropriations subdivision for this subcommittee. The bill provides outlays equal to the subdivision total for international discretionary outlays.

	Agriculture, rural development appropriations bill		Appropriations Committee 602(b) subdivision		Bill over (+)/under (-) committee 602(b) subdivision	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Discretionary	1,401	1,230	1,455	1,230	-54	...

Note: BA—New budget authority; O—Estimated outlays.

The Appropriations Committee reported the Committee's subdivision of budget authority and outlays pursuant to Section 602(b) of the 1974 Budget Act as amended on May 29, 1991 in House Report 102-81. These subdivisions are consistent with the allocation of spending responsibility to House committees contained in House Report 102-69, the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 121, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1992, as adopted by the Congress on May 22, 1991.

The following are the major program highlights for the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1992, as reported:

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	New outlays
<b>Agriculture programs:</b>		
Commodity Credit Corporation (mandatory)	8,450	.....
Agricultural Research Service	713	523
Extension Service	417	354
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	448	370
Cooperative State Research Service	475	214
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (mandatory in part)	544	312
Food Safety and Inspection Service	474	431
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	719	719
<b>Conservation and Rural Development programs:</b>		
Rural Electrification Administration	79	32
New direct loans	(1,794)	
New loan guarantees	(234)	
Farm operation and ownership loans (ACIF)	482	413
New direct loans	(1,558)	
New loan guarantees	(3,110)	
Rural Housing (RHIF)	1,382	788
New direct loans	(1,879)	
New loan guarantees	(350)	
Rural Development Insurance Fund	174	56
New direct loans	(700)	
New loan guarantees	(160)	
Soil Conservation Service Conservation Operations	564	520
Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations	205	113
Conservation Reserve (mandatory)	1,643	1,643
<b>Nutrition Programs:</b>		
Food Stamp Program (mandatory)	21,150	19,168
Child Nutrition Programs (mandatory)	6,067	4,960
Supplemental Feeding Programs (WIC)	2,600	2,444
Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico (mandatory)	1,013	1,007
Food donations for selected groups	265	216
Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program	170	150
<b>Other Programs:</b>		
P.L. 480, Food for Peace	1,401	1,065
New direct loans	(514)	
Food and Drug Administration	762	625
Payments to the FCS Financial Assistance Corporation	113	110
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	47	41

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, this is my first year on the Appropriations Committee and it is an honor to have been assigned a seat on the Agriculture Subcommittee. It is a privilege to serve with the very distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and full committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the ranking member, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN]. I appreciate the courtesy and respect which they have shown me during our subcommittee hearings.

Their help and support has been invaluable.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a good bill and a fair one. I am pleased with the funding levels for both the Agricultural Research Service and the Cooperative State Research Service. Both provide funding for important research projects such as water quality, climate change, low-water tolerance landscaping and research in biochemistry and biology. The bill also provides \$263 million for payments under the Smith-Lever Act which governs cooperative agricultural extension work and \$26 million for payments to land-grant colleges. Also provided in the bill is \$475,000 for rangeland research.

I am also pleased with the provisions relating to the Rural Electrification Administration.

To those of us who represent rural areas, REA is a very important program. It assists rural organizations in obtaining the financing required to provide electric and telephone service in rural areas. These essential services help improve the quality of life of those who live and work in rural areas.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the committee has made the WIC Program one of its priorities. This special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children provides critical nutrition and health benefits to low-income pregnant women and young children. These benefits reduce infant mortality, avert premature births and help our needy children reach their full potential.

Mr. Chairman, a lot of hard work, on both sides, has gone into this bill and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. LONG].

Ms. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] for bringing H.R. 2698 to the floor. I want to very quickly make a point about the large reductions in farm price supports that have taken place over the last several years, and I respectfully ask that, in particular, Members of this House who are not from rural areas of our country listen to what I believe is a very important point.

Reducing the budget is becoming a way of life for the Congress, but farm price support programs cost very little and they have taken a disproportionate reduction in funding over the last several years. In fact, in 1986 total farm price supports accounted for \$26 billion of our Federal budget. In 1990, total farm price supports were just over \$6 billion—that is a 77 percent cut in farm price supports in only 5 years.

Farm programs have taken a large hit during these years of budget reductions, but these programs have continued to be successful in helping American agriculture provide consumers—not just rural Americans, but all Amer-

icans—a safe and abundant supply of food and fiber at an affordable price.

We are the best fed at the lowest cost Nation in the world. All of us should be proud of our Nation's agriculture programs and our Nation's agriculture industry in this regard.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of the Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. I would also like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WHITTEN, and the ranking member, Mr. SKEEN, for their hard work and diligence in preparing such a balanced package within a highly constrained budget.

This legislation represents what has been a long and deliberative process which meets many of today's agricultural needs, but yet reflects much needed fiscal responsibility. This legislation represents many difficult budget decisions that continue to prove that agriculture is willing to pull its fair share of the budget reduction load.

Additionally, I am also pleased to note a particular item within this appropriations measure that continues to benefit agricultural procedures across the Nation. For several years now, research on the soybean cyst nematode problem has been conducted in my district at the Delta Area Agricultural Research Center in Portageville, MO. This facility is ideally suited to conducting this research, given its extensive work in the past on the problem and the fact that many farmers in the country continue to face a serious cyst nematode problem.

By including this research as a part of the appropriations package, I believe we will be saving a number of farmers from financial ruin in the long run. As many as 25 million acres of farmland in the United States are contaminated with the cyst nematode, including all major soybean-producing counties in Missouri and several adjoining States. It has been estimated that in 1989 the soybean nematode cost our Nation's farmers over \$600 million in reduced yields. But because of the work being conducted on this problem, the Federal Government will easily save many times the \$333,000 we will spend on soybean cyst nematode research next year.

Additionally, this measure restores funding for the Rural Electrification Administration to meet the increasing needs of our Nation's rural electric systems. In the past 10 years, insured REA loan funds have declined substantially despite continued inflation. Now, through restored funding levels, rural electric insured loans can better meet growing rural development demands.

Likewise, there are many other fine projects and research efforts contained in this bill along with needed funding

for the supplemental food program for women, infants, and children and continued funding for other vital domestic food and nutrition programs. I urge my colleagues to show their support for these valuable endeavors by giving favorable approval to this appropriations measure.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY].

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the dean of our delegation, for yielding this time to me, and I thank him for a remarkable job on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Rural Development, Agriculture and Related Agencies.

Mr. Chairman, a lot of positive comments have already been made regarding this bill, the fact that it falls under the budget limits, the fact that it helps out the WIC Program, the REA, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER] talked about pseudorabies, which is also important to Mississippi. I just want to take a small bit of time to talk about a couple of other positive things that are beneficial to the environmentally sensitive Members of this body.

□ 1750

No. 1, I have consistently encouraged my colleagues to join me in the use of soybean ink for printing. Increasing the use of soybean ink benefits both our farmers and our environment. I commend the committee for providing \$500,000 for research on soybean-based ink. The committee in its report cites the environmental benefits from using a readily degradable ink and the low-rb characteristics of soybean ink as reasons for this essential research.

Also included in the bill is an increase in the appropriation to 1890 land-grant colleges, specifically Tuskegee University in Alabama. The appropriation is almost \$3 million above last year's appropriation. So I am pleased that the committee recognizes the unique mission carried out by these institutions and the quality of the programs and research that they are engaged in.

Lastly, I would also like to thank the chairman of the committee for his continued support of the Yazoo Basin Flood Control project. The gentleman is well aware of and well knows the need for this project to be completed, and I am grateful for the appropriation of the Soil Conservation Service's portion of the Yazoo Basin project, inasmuch as early this month we had about 2 million acres of land in the Mississippi Delta under water.

So, Mr. Chairman, once again I rise in strong support of this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] has 10 minutes remaining

and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill as it deals with child nutrition, with school lunches, WIC, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2698, a bill providing appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies for fiscal year 1992.

First of all, I want to once again commend and thank Chairman WHITTEN and the subcommittee's ranking minority member, Mr. SKEEN, for their continued strong support of Federal nutrition programs for our Nation's children and elderly.

I was very pleased with the bill's recommended funding level for the child nutrition account, which would provide an 8.8 percent increase over the account's current fiscal year operating level.

I was also gratified to find that the Appropriations Committee was responsive to the concerns I had shared with it regarding the Food and Nutrition Service's proposed coordinated review effort rule. As I indicated when I appeared before the Subcommittee on Rural Development and Agriculture 6 weeks ago, I believe that the audit and review system the proposed rule would establish, initially apply to school-based child nutrition programs, and subsequently extend to other program areas such as the Child and Adult Care Program, not only fails to be costeffective but is outside the intent of both section 110 and title II of Public Law 101-147, the child nutrition and WIC amendments of 1989.

Consequently, I appreciated finding that the bill's committee report directs USDA to subject the proposed audit and review system to a comprehensive examination and assessment. In particular, I was pleased that USDA was instructed to consider recommendations State food service authorities may make to further improve the audit and review system. I look forward to reviewing the findings which USDA will extract from this task, which I understand are to be shared with the appropriate committees of the Congress by no later than the end of March 1992.

The committee should also be congratulated on its steadfast support of the WIC Program and its recommended fiscal year 1992 funding level, which calls for a 11-percent increase over the current fiscal year's funding level.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend my thanks to the entire Appropriations Committee, which has continued to demonstrate its strong commitment to the nutrition programs that are so important to our Nation's children.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think that much of this legislation is very important and

needed by the Agriculture Committee and by this country, but like all legislation around here, there appears to be a lot of pork. I am well aware that one man's worthwhile project is another man's pork, so I approach this with a great deal of trepidation.

I was contemplating proposing some amendments to try to cut out some of this pork, but you cannot get at them because this is in report language in large part, so if you cut out something, you have got to cut out a specific amount of money, which may or may not get at the problem. But since I am not going to specifically be able to get at some of this pork, I would like to just mention for the edification of my colleagues some of the things that are in this legislation in report language.

There is \$94,000 for asparagus yield decline; \$200,000 for locoweed research; \$240,000 for a mechanical tomato harvester; \$300,000 for a new center for research on plant genetics at the University of Toledo; \$230,000 for tourism in New Mexico; some amount between \$250,000 and \$1 million for various projects for the Toledo Farmers Market, whatever that is; and then we have specific funds that are in report language for rice, a research center in Arkansas, \$223,000.

Then there is the Northern Regional Research Center in Illinois, \$365 million; a National Park Research Facility in Iowa, \$1 million; a Regional Poultry Research Center in Michigan, \$500,000; a National Center for Natural Products in Mississippi, \$5.175 million; a National Center for Warm Water Aquaculture in Mississippi, \$1.2 million; and a demonstration greenhouse project in Ohio, whatever that is, for \$375,000.

Mr. Chairman, we are facing a \$350 to \$400 billion deficit this year. I submit to my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee that they have done a fine job, and I would just like to say in closing that although they do a great deal of positive things on the committee, I still believe there is a great deal of pork in this legislation, and I hope in the future they will do their dead level best to eliminate it because of this huge deficit facing the country.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a big country, and all we have behind our debt of \$3.6 trillion is our country. I make no apologies for having these bills here. I have said kiddingly several times that it looks like we are going to have to give our local business, a foreign address to get money for them. I make no apology for looking after our own country.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN].

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work of the chairman of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, on balance this is a very fine bill, but I am concerned in looking through this proposal, because I see two soybean items. My colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY], mentioned them. Soybean-based ink was one of them, and the other one was soybean research. This is \$525,000 for soybean composition research and research on improved southern soybean production.

Last year in the farm bill the Congress passed a soybean promotion research program that will fund up to \$60 million out of checkoffs from soybean producers. The goal was that virtually all soybean research in the country would be done out of that voluntary checkoff. I see these two programs now in this bill, and it concerns me that we may have the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing. We see research programs here and research programs in the checkoff program, and what it means to me is that maybe all the research programs here do not have a method to their madness, or maybe they do. But all of them do not have an organizational effort to make sure that the research projects fit or that there is a mesh to them.

As chairman of the Soybean Subcommittee, I want to see as many soybeans sold in this country as possible. I just want to make sure that the research is being done sensibly. In the farm bill that we passed, we provided a great deal of greater emphasis on competitive grants and awards based on peer review. That was the heart of our research title in that farm bill, and in looking at these two projects and a few others, it appears there may be some projects in this bill that do not have peer review of any established process to them.

Mr. Chairman, I just hope that the committee that deals with this during the next couple of years looks at the broader picture and makes sure we are not overfunding some research projects as well.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2698, the Agriculture Appropriations bill for fiscal 1992. I would particularly like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the committee, under the able leadership of Chairman WHITTEN, included in this bill an important appropriation of \$175,000 which will be of tremendous help in fighting the spread of Lyme disease. This funding, for deer

tick population ecology work being conducted at New York Medical College in Valhalla, NY, offers important hope that we will be able to reverse the dramatic increase in Lyme disease.

While over the years the Congress has supported the important work of the Centers for Disease Control and the National Institutes of Health on Lyme disease, today we take an innovative step to help prevent Lyme disease by attacking the ticks which carry this painful, often devastating disease. By working through the Agriculture Department to slow the dramatic growth in populations of Lyme disease-carrying deer ticks, this research will take advantage of the extensive expertise of the Department and of the research at New York Medical College. It literally has the potential, in a very cost-effective way, to stop Lyme disease in its tracks.

I want to personally thank Mr. WHITTEN, both in his capacities as chairman of the full Appropriations Committee and the Agriculture Subcommittee, Mr. SKEEN, ranking member on the subcommittee, and my other good friends on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee for their cooperation and foresight in including these funds in the bill. My good friend and colleague from New York, Mr. MCHUGH, had a particular understanding of the impact of Lyme disease because of the extent of the problem in our own State; he was immensely helpful.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill, and wish to congratulate you, the ranking minority member, Mr. SKEEN, the other members of the subcommittee, and your outstanding staff for their performance in writing this complex and important bill.

Many Members of Congress, particularly those of us from rural areas, depend on this legislation to fund important programs and development efforts in our districts. Chairman WHITTEN, to whom I have looked for guidance and support since I came to Congress 22 years ago, must indulge many of our requests for funding every year in this bill.

He is a patient man—and a fair man—who makes every effort to honor all reasonable requests.

If ever there was a Member's Member, it is the gentleman from Mississippi, and we should take great pride in his leadership and distinguished service to Congress and the Nation for almost half a century.

Since I came to the House of Representatives in 1969, my goals have focused on efforts to harness the vast potential and resources of rural America. This legislation is among the pre-eminent vehicles for that purpose.

Through this bill, rural areas are provided assistance in building infrastruc-

ture and stimulating business development. Innovative technologies to promote new markets for farm products receive encouragement and support through the funding we will approve, are about to approve.

Today, we will enable American farmers to put food on dinner tables throughout the world. We will make sure that American children have nourishing lunches at school and that poor women and their babies have adequate food to eat and milk to drink. But we will do much more.

This is our plan for nurturing and husbanding the resources of our vast, rich country—for conserving, protecting and dedicating them to human needs and national purpose—and for ensuring that they endure for those who come after us.

Much of my congressional district is covered by the dark, rich soil of the Mississippi River Delta which bursts forth each year with a great bounty of food and produce to feed and clothe us and provide goods to trade with other countries.

The prolific abundance of the delta land belies the crushing poverty which characterizes the daily life of many of its residents. The final report of the Federally chartered Mississippi River Delta Development Commission issued a call to action—an agenda for mobilizing the human and material resources of the delta to lift it out of the endless cycles of poverty and misery. This bill begins to address some of the questions raised by the Commission report.

The committee has provided a \$500,000 rural development grant to the city of Cotton Plant, AR, to support the emergence in the delta of aquaculture—the fastest growing sector of American agriculture. There has been some criticism of Federal support of this emerging industry here in the House in recent days. Those who have this view may benefit from the following facts about aquaculture.

First, a study by Mississippi State University concluded that 220 jobs—or Federal taxpayers—are created for every 10 million pounds of catfish produced in aquaculture.

Second, warmwater aquaculture generated more than 790 million pounds in production in 1988 at a farm gate value of \$600 million.

Third, current projections indicate that production will rise to 2.2 billion pounds by the year 2000 creating 16,500 new jobs and taxpayers.

Fourth, projected increases in production will require expanded processing capacity in the delta region to support the industry.

Mr. Chairman, in a colloquy with me last year during consideration of the Agriculture, Rural Development and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1991, you agreed that careful consideration should be afforded proposals to provide aquaculture farmers with processing facilities.

This funding is yet another indication of the committee's recognition of the growing importance of aquaculture in American agriculture—and I am grateful for your support.

It has been suggested in this body that projects such as this one are pork barrel. I am here to tell you that fish is not pork—and that this funding is good public policy.

I have no doubt that it is right for the Federal Government to provide assistance to aquaculture farmers which will: Create more jobs for Americans; increase tax revenues to the Federal Treasury; and, reduce our imports of foreign fisheries products and thereby improve our balance of trade.

It is vital that this industry, which is centered in the delta have the Federal support which is crucial to its survival. This funding is an important and needed step in that process.

The Delta Commission also emphasized in its report the need to establish centers for alternative crop production and marketing to diversify and invigorate the delta economy. This bill provides a \$350,000 grant to demonstrate this concept.

The funds will be used to establish a regional farmers' market in eastern Arkansas to assist in the marketing of fresh produce which offers a higher return than traditional row crops. This project will provide small farmers with technical and managerial assistance and market access which is important to their survival.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the committee has continued funding for a number of other important programs.

The Riceland Mosquito Management Program funded through the Cooperative State Research Service has made excellent progress in identifying no methods to control one of the most persistent and difficult pests in our environment. Some people who live in Arkansas rice country believe that the recent conflict in the Persian Gulf would have been even shorter than it was if we could have managed to turn the wrath of Delta mosquitoes against the enemy.

This project enables scientists in Arkansas and several other States to continue their research to develop environmentally acceptable methods of mosquito control.

The committee has, once again, recognized the continued need to identify solutions to one of the most persistent and intractable problems facing the American farmer—declining water tables.

The 26-county east Arkansas water conservation project, which will receive continued funding of \$452,000, has confronted the challenge of the accelerated depletion of underground aquifers in the delta region of eastern Arkansas. This is a pervasive problem in other areas of the Nation such as the Great Plains region of the Midwest.

The information acquired in this study will be important to developing use and conservation methods which will assure further generations of adequate water.

This legislation supports many important research projects. Of special importance to my congressional district, which produces more rice than any State, is additional funding for the continued planning and design of a rice germplasm center to be located in Stuttgart, AR. This facility will perform important research on one of the Nation's premier export crops.

The broad sweep of this bill demonstrates the committee's continued attention to many other activities in need of support. Floodplain management, pest control, food inspection services, and special research activities are among the many other worthy and valuable pursuits to which the committee has devoted its energy and support.

Mr. Chairman, the committee and you have served this House and the Nation well by bringing such a well crafted and comprehensive bill to the floor. I have no doubt that we will pass this legislation by an overwhelming vote today.

I urge passage of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has expired.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2698, the bill providing appropriations for Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies for fiscal 1992. This bill is a very tight one, with total spending under the amount sought by the President, while readjusting specific spending recommendations to reflect the many concerns we heard during our hearings.

I want to again compliment our distinguished chairman, Mr. WHITTEN of Mississippi, for skillfully leading us through another budgetary cycle in a fashion that is mindful of the need of American agriculture within severe spending limitations. I also want to compliment our new ranking minority member, Mr. SKEEN of New Mexico, for his positive and substantial contributions to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, people all too often think that food will magically appear on their table and that farmers will always survive. That is a tremendously unfortunate and unfair view. We have the best and most plentiful food supply in the world because of our farmers, and if we fail to pay attention to their needs, every single consumer will ultimately pay the price.

The bill before us does not create any new programs. Rather it funds the many activities of the Department of Agriculture. I am very pleased with some of the increases and regret that in many cases more could not be done. We were able to address some critical needs because many of our colleagues and our citizens took the time to let us know of their needs.

I want to take some time today to mention a number of specific items covered within this

bill which I believe merit special mention. These matters range from agricultural research to providing food assistance to needy individuals regardless of age.

We have many Federal agencies that conduct research, and it is vital, particularly in times of tight budgets, that those research projects be as coordinated as possible with other efforts. Agricultural research projects need to be and are coordinated across USDA's agencies, and are increasingly coordinated with those of other agencies.

Two projects in particular within the Agriculture Research Service are for coordination with efforts outside of USDA. In providing funding for water quality and quantity research—nearly \$45 million for fiscal 1992—we expect that ARS will work in cooperation with the new Environmental Protection Agency's Great Lakes Research vessel—the *Lake Guardian*. We need to preserve our largest source of fresh water, and the water quality work being done by USDA will play a major contribution toward this effort when work is done on nonpoint source pollution control and water use matters. It is expected that the Department should be in a position to approve the placement of an ARS soil scientist within Michigan to work in cooperation with this project.

As part of the Department's participation in the global climate change initiative, we have provided funds for USDA to join with the Consortium for Earth Science Information Network to assess the Department's integration of data with that of other agencies working with CIESIN, most importantly NASA. Nine hundred thousand dollars is provided for this effort.

We deal with the problems faced by a number of specific commodities. For example, we direct the Department to maintain 2 scientist years devoted to dry bean research work in Michigan, including the redirection of those funds that may be necessary to provide for this effort.

There is also a very critical need for rehabilitating the Regional Poultry Laboratory in East Lansing, MI. This has been a project sought by ARS for some time. I am happy that we could add \$500,000 to the bill to help begin the planning for the rehabilitation work that is so important to effective and modern poultry research.

We continue a number of specific research efforts already underway, including food toxicology research, dwarf bunt research, and wheat quality research. All of these programs are important to the various producers and have been funded only after a careful review of many competing demands.

Within the Cooperative State Research Service we have provided a modest 4-percent increase in formula research funds which help to form the base of research at our land grant universities. We supplement these funds with special research grants which address targeted research needs. I know that many like to criticize these research projects, and they do a disservice with their misunderstanding. Each of these research grants have been brought to us by producers or their representatives. The research needs are critical for a targeted group who are highly dependent on specialty crops for their income. These pro-

ducers are taxpayers deserving of their nation's attention. Their needs are important.

Some suggest that these projects are not worthy because they were not selected by a competitive review process. That just is not true. I can tell you that every single university that writes the research proposal before actually receiving these funds goes through its own process of review to make sure that the research is the best possible work. Perhaps the real issue is that those who oppose these projects oppose them because they did not get to make the decisions. That is one of the consequences and benefits of a democratic society—no one has to agree with every decision, nor is unanimity required before action is taken.

There are a number of special research grants in Michigan that are in this bill. I am proud of each and every one of them. Each program has been thoughtfully reviewed by skilled researchers before coming to us. They have stated their goals and their needs, and we have attempted to meet those needs—and rarely do we provide any requestor with the full amount that they seek. We are terminating two projects that were underway because the work has reached a conclusion. The programs were important and handled in a responsible fashion, and their discontinuance is being handled in the same way.

I am happy to report that certain projects are receiving increases. We are increasing funding for the subirrigation research project to \$600,000 from \$263,000 within CSRS, while providing \$900,000, up from \$375,000, within the Soil Conservation Service. This project is a national model for subirrigation work designed to more efficiently use water resources while safeguarding water quality by reducing farm land runoff and discharges into ground water supplies.

We are increasing funding for animal waste disposal research from \$37,000 to \$150,000. This project has been described to me by the researchers at Michigan State University as one of the most critical needs of animal agriculture, and one which certainly has major environmental impacts regarding the handling and disposal of animal waste.

We continue a number of specific special grants at last year's levels, including bean and beet research, apple quality, stone fruit decline, wood utilization, and celery fusarium. Each of these projects was proposed by the farmers who benefit from them and designed by very competent research scientists.

We provide a significant increase in the competitive grant program—from \$73 to \$99 million—providing the final element in a well-rounded research program. These grants are awarded by peer review and fully funded when awarded. I remain concerned, however, that the rate of growth in this program is at a point where it will soon overshadow the foundation of our cooperative research programs—the formula funds which are provided to research institutions to use in meeting critical State and regional needs. The balance in our research programs is becoming increasingly delicate, and I urge all concerned parties to pay close attention to this balance in the years to come if they truly want to maintain a viable research program.

We are providing \$15.7 million to complete funding for the construction of a National Food

Toxicology Center at Michigan State University. That institution has more than met a 50 percent match within this project. This facility has the promise of becoming the premiere national institution for food toxicology research, and a true jewel in our food safety research efforts.

While we attempt to take steps to secure our food supply for the future, another important element of this bill is to provide meaningful food assistance to those who need it today. This portion of the bill, funding food stamps, the various school feeding programs, the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, the WIC Program, and others, comprises the majority of funding in this bill. Nearly 40 percent of the bill's total funding goes to the Food Stamp Program alone.

I want to point to certain elements of this title of the bill that deserve special mention. First, we provide an increase of \$5,915,000 over the President's budget request for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. This increase is provided for two reasons. First, it is to at least maintain the current caseload levels for both the mothers, infants, and children, and elderly components of the program. The President's budget request predicted that the funding he sought would reduce elderly participation by 24,000. Hearings revealed that the only way to achieve this reduction was to either remove people from the program's roles, or to deny services to those on waiting lists when others ended their participation in the program. Either course was felt to be totally unacceptable by our subcommittee.

The second reason for the increase is to leave open the hope of program expansion. There are major caseload increase requests from current operators, and there are others around the Nation who hope to start CSFP programs. To the extent that the increase is not needed to maintain caseloads, then it is available for program expansion. It is available to expand the program for mothers, infants, children, and the elderly. It can expand programs jointly, or it can expand participation in either component of the program by program site. However, to the extent that there are expansion dollars available, we expect to see increases in both program groups, especially in light of provisions in the farm bill which call for the allowance of elderly-only locations.

I also urge the Department to pay close attention to report directives regarding consideration of budgetary consequences of changing methods of assigning caseload to States. It can be difficult to assign merely a block to a State and allow it to split out various components of eligible participants for the program. The elderly program costs less than the mother, infants, and children program. It is not a person per person trade-off, so it is necessary to be very careful before going too far in this direction.

I am still hopeful, though, that the Department will begin to pay closer attention to the needs of program operators on a site by site basis, rather than on a statewide basis. Program operators in one area should not be affected by the operations of a program in another part of their State, and failure to recognize unit differences creates unnecessary problems.

Mr. Chairman, within the report for the Women, Infants, and Children Program, we call upon the Department to do an evaluation of allowing cereals containing raisins to be part of the WIC approved food package, so long as the cereal meets the existing 6 grams of sugar per ounce standard notwithstanding the sugar occurring naturally in fruit. The current regulations exclude raisin-containing cereals just because the natural sugar in raisins pushes the cereal over the prescribed limit. We do not attempt to change the current sugar standard, which is a separate issue. Rather, we suggest that the Department simply allow people to obtain what the Department recommends that they eat by getting it one package instead of two.

This standard is one which fails to meet common sense. When one reviews the literature given to WIC participants, raisins are often suggested as a healthy snack food. Some materials suggest the addition of fruits, including raisins, to cereals as a way to diversify a breakfast. Mr. Chairman, how in the world can USDA call raisins a healthy food and recommend its consumption, but then prohibit them from a food product?

I am told that nutritionists have objected to raisins for children under age 3 because the raisins can cause choking in a small child. No one is suggesting that we give raisin cereals to infants, nor is anyone advocating anything that would hurt small children. But there are others eligible for the program—including pregnant women—who would benefit from this food. We do not exclude infant formula because it can have harmful effects on others in the program for whom it is not intended. I have had some nutritionists tell me that many pregnant women in the WIC Program are teenagers who try to hide the fact that they are pregnant by under-eating. That is most injurious to the baby. These nutritionists believe that adding raisins to cereal will make it more likely that the young mother will eat some gain product. It will ensure some source of iron with the raisins. It will also create a greater likelihood that milk will be consumed because more people are willing to take milk as part of a cereal breakfast than drinking it alone. Anything that can be done to increase cereal consumption by pregnant women should be considered in this positive vein.

Others have objected to raisins because they believe they contribute to dental cavities in small children. That old argument about sugar and dental decay, and sticky foods being the worst has never successfully answered the simplest and most practical response: Encourage young people to brush their teeth. Good dental hygiene is essential and cures may vary, whether they be from one kind of a food or another.

I am also perplexed with the double standard used by USDA in its various feeding programs. USDA has provided raisins in the past in the Commodity Supplemental Food Program—a program which serves a similar target audience. And more significantly, USDA has no standard for cereals consumed in the school breakfast program. I am told that raisin-containing cereals are among the most popular in the school breakfast program. Obviously the value of raisins in cereals have been discovered by many.

It is true that our report calls for an evaluation of the inclusion of raisin containing cereals. I know that many are pointing to the overall reevaluation of the WIC food package, and expect that this issue can be addressed at that time. I believe it is only proper to expect that this issue be fully and fairly reviewed, that innuendo be responded to with fact, and that those concerned with the program look at a person's entire diet, and not try to impose some scientifically unjustifiable limit on one specific food product.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It is a sensible bill, I encourage all of our colleagues to vote "yes" on its passage.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the Agriculture appropriations bill. I commend the committee for the inclusion of a provision to prohibit the Department of Agriculture from imposing a \$2 agriculture inspection user fee on all persons who travel between Hawaii and the continental United States.

This fee is nothing more than an unfair tax imposed on the people of Hawaii. The tax has no statutory basis and, in fact, goes against congressional intent.

The Department of Agriculture proposed the fee in its regulations of a provision in the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 as amended by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990. However, this provision which authorizes the Department of Agriculture to collect user fees on international travel, does not include travel from Hawaii. The Congress has clearly stated that it is intended that the fee only apply to international travel.

The Congress further clarified this fact in the conference report of the Dire Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1991, yet the Department chose to once again ignore congressional intent.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot allow the Department to continue to violate the actions of this Congress. And I commend Mr. WHITTEN and the committee for the inclusion of this provision in legislative language. It is important to the people of my State, but even more, it is important to the integrity of this Congress.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2699, the bill providing appropriations in fiscal year 1992 for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies. This is a good and fair bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WHITTEN, and the ranking minority member, Mr. SKEEN, as well as their able and very fine staffs, for putting together such a balanced package. In particular, I would like to thank them for their continuing sensitivity to the somewhat unique problems of agriculture in California.

Specifically, the bill includes \$2.321 million to complete construction of the National Grape Importation Facility to be located in Davis, CA.

The immediate construction of this facility is crucial to the continued international competitiveness of the U.S. wine industry because of the critical shortage of grape quarantine facilities. The lack of quarantine facilities puts the U.S. industry at a severe disadvantage to foreign producers which have access to the latest variety releases.

The facility will provide grape quarantine services for commercial grape growers and researchers throughout the United States and will develop and implement faster methods for grape disease detection.

Imported grape stocks, on which the United States depends heavily for new wine grape varieties, must be quarantined and inspected for disease prior to being released for general use. The facility will help accelerate the inspection process and the introduction of new varieties of wine grapes.

Quicker inspection services will help the U.S. wine industry become more diverse and internationally competitive with major wine producing countries in Europe.

The bill also provides \$441,000 for design and planning work on a new Alternative Pest Management Research Facility. Increasingly, California and American growers are being called upon to reduce their use of chemicals in agricultural production. But the loss of major pesticide in the absence of alternative pest control technologies and management systems could have severe economic impacts on U.S. agriculture and result in higher food prices, increased imports, and reduced exports of our agricultural products. Thus, it is imperative that we expend and accelerate research to control exotic pests, like the Medfly, the Mexican fruit fly and the Africanized honey bee, and develop viable alternative pest control technologies and management systems.

I would also like to commend the committee for its continued support of the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children, or WIC. Over the last decade, the committee has consistently found more resources than requested by the administration for this critical program.

WIC is our first line of defense against infant mortality, low birth weight, malnutrition and other health problems associated with inadequate nutrition among American children. Studies have shown that for every dollar spent on WIC, \$3 to \$4 are saved in future health care costs.

In providing a funding increase, the committee has demonstrated its commitment to adequately funding WIC so that the largest number of nutritionally at-risk women, infants and children may continue to participate in this cost-effective and important program.

Finally, I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member for their support for efforts to encourage the Department of Agriculture to review the food packaging requirements for the WIC Food Program. In particular, the committee has expressed concern that current WIC guidelines prohibit all cereals that contain more than 6 grams of sucrose and other sugars, including those that occur naturally, per ounce of dry cereal from eligibility under the WIC Program.

These guidelines prohibit cereals that contain raisins from being eligible for purchase under the WIC Program even though raisins alone have been recommended by the Department to be included as part of a healthy diet and even though many of these cereals—without the naturally occurring sucrose from the fruit—would meet the 6-gram standard. The committee is aware of the evaluation of the food packaging guidelines that is currently un-

derway by the Department, and has appropriately indicated its expectation that this sucrose requirement will be reviewed.

Mr. Chairman, again, this is a good and balanced bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the measure.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2698, fiscal year 1992 appropriations for Rural Development, Agriculture, and Related Agencies. Within the bill's total of \$52.6 billion there is necessary funding for many programs which are extremely important to my State of West Virginia.

Housing is certainly a prominent concern in rural districts like my own. The Appropriations Committee's recommendation to continue funding for most rural housing loan and grant programs at the current fiscal year levels is a clear response to the continued housing problems in rural America. This recommendation stands in sharp contrast to the Bush administration's budget request, which was 32 percent less than the committee's proposal. H.R. 2698 appropriates \$2.5 billion for the rural housing insurance fund. This is over \$600 million more than the administration requested. Of this, \$1.22 billion is an allocation for low-income housing loans.

The committee has also recognized the importance of rural development programs to this country. This measure appropriates \$635 million for direct and guaranteed loans to help fund the construction of water and sewer systems in rural areas during fiscal year 1992. This is 49 percent more than the administration's request. The bill also appropriates \$350 million for rural water and sewer system grants, 56 percent more than the President asked for. Water and waste disposal system improvements are essential elements for increasing the quality of life in rural America. These provisions are of particular interest to my district and I strongly support them.

Other funding of note to West Virginia is the \$417 million for extension services. This appropriation will fund programs that are of vital interest to our land-grant colleges and universities.

The Soil Conservation Service watershed and flood prevention operations are also at a level higher than the President requested. Within this appropriation the committee has provided \$30 million for the emergency watershed protection program. This program is of significant importance to my district because of a landslide problem along Fourpole Creek, near Huntington, WV. I thank the committee for their interest in this problem and hope with their help it can be assuaged.

Another agency of considerable significance to rural America is the Rural Electrification Administration. ERA assists rural electric and telephone organizations in securing requisite funding for the delivery of electric and telephone service to nonurban areas. The fiscal year 1992 agriculture appropriation sets aside \$2.5 billion for REA loan authority. This is \$1.1 billion more than the administration requested.

In addition to housing and development programs, food programs are extremely important to my district. This bill provides for a total of \$22.2 billion for the Food Stamp Program; this is \$1.6 billion more than last year's appropriation.

Also, a program which I feel strongly about, the Special Supplemental Food Program for

Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] is provided \$2.6 billion in fiscal year 1992, \$27 million more than was requested by the administration. The committee recognizes the importance of targeting participation in this program to those who are at greatest nutritional risk and urges the Department of Agriculture to work with the States to this end. The Emergency Food Assistance Program [TEFAP] is funded at the same amounts as the current fiscal year to purchase commodities and to help the States store and distribute this food.

Mr. Chairman, while I sincerely wish we had more money to offer these vital programs I have highlighted, I urge the passage of H.R. 2698, and send a message to the White House that we will not forget the continued struggles of the backbone of our Nation, rural America.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2698.

The agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1992 will, at least for 1 year, correct a disturbing trend that has been occurring for over 10 years.

This bill includes restoration of the 25-percent cut in the Rural Electrification Association's insured loan levels which resulted from last year's Budget Reconciliation Act [OBRA].

This bill restores direct loan funding to the level that existed before OBRA 1990. However, it must be understood that this only incrementally offsets the numerous decreases in funding that have occurred over the past decade. The restored level of funding will still be below the level that existed 10 years ago.

The rural economies of my State, Wisconsin, and all States, rely heavily on the low-cost, REA-insured loans to provide low-cost electric power. The depletion of this loan fund has put an extreme strain on many electric cooperatives.

The electric cooperatives must incur higher costs in serving rural areas, and as a result, must typically charge higher rates than urban-oriented utilities. Therefore, the cooperatives need low-cost, REA-insured loans in order to provide low-cost electric power.

Most people do not realize the importance of the partnership that exists between rural and urban economies. Currently in Wisconsin, the economy of the entire State is being threatened because our dairy farmers are not receiving a fair price for milk. It is in the best interests of everyone for our Government to enact policies that ensure the stability of rural economies.

The country's agriculture industry, and other rural industries, cannot survive without fair costs for electrical power. Increasing REA's loan authority to levels seen in previous years is a desirable step toward providing rural areas with low-cost electric power.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for his leadership in crafting of the bill before us today. At a time when we are forced to restrain spending, at a time when a declining pot of Federal funds is pitting social programs one against the other, he has managed to bring to us a bill that recognizes the critical need for investing in programs that provide basic nourishment for impoverished infants and children. I applaud Chairman WHITTEN's diligent efforts and par-

ticularly bring to your attention the bill's provision for expanding the WIC Program. Over the past month, 84 Members have joined me in sponsoring the Freedom From Want Act, which calls for a 5-year funding plan for achieving full participation in WIC. The bill before us today includes a \$250 million increase in program spending next year—this is an important first step.

Given the current budgetary challenge, it is imperative that we build partnerships between the Federal Government and the private sector that bring more food to the tables of hungry people. Gleaning, the collection of unharvested food from farmers' fields, gives us this opportunity. I authored the gleaning clearinghouse provision in last year's farm bill and I am pleased to note that the report accompanying H.R. 2698 contains language expressing the committee's intent that the Department of Agriculture provide technical assistance to State and local agencies involved in gleaning projects. I appreciate the committee's support of this effort.

□ 1800

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2698

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes; namely:

**TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS**

**PRODUCTION, PROCESSING AND MARKETING**

**OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, and not to exceed \$50,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$2,282,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed \$8,000 of this amount shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided,* That the Secretary may transfer salaries and expenses funds sufficient to finance a total of not to exceed 50 staff years between agencies of the Department of Agriculture to meet workload requirements.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the entire 5 minutes, but I did want to take the well as we discuss agriculture appropriations, and, understanding that this is not the place for us to determine agricultural policy, I did want to say that we do need some changes in agricultural policy, and we do need to complete the task of putting our Farm Program in order, even as we fund the programs today.

Mr. Chairman, I support the efforts of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, as well as the chairman of this subcommittee. I

think the gentleman has done a marvelous job, and over the years has been one of the stalwarts in trying to fight for family farmers and put together a program that works.

I do not want the opportunity to pass, however, as we talk about how much money goes into this program, to say that another element of it is how do we distribute the money, and to question what kind of policies can we develop that provide decent price supports for family-sized farmers.

I do not want people in this country to think that statements from the former Agriculture Secretary and others—statements that say everything is just fine in the Farm Belt, that things are better out in farm country, that prices are all right, that farmers are doing fine—I do not want that to remain unchallenged, because things are not fine. We have got deep trouble, at least in my part of the country.

Mr. Chairman, we have, as I warned some years ago, now been left with a process in which we have low market price and lower support prices, and the farmers find increasing costs for their farm operations and less income with which to pay those costs.

Mr. Chairman, we must find some way of responding to that, or we will not have many family farmers left. It seems to me we must address it with a change in farm policy.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make another point, because I spoke to the chairman about this in the last couple of days. This deals with the question of barley deficiency payments of 1988 and 1989 and the repayments that farmers had to make as a result of the advanced deficiency payments.

Our barley producers were required to pay back some advanced deficiency payments. They were required to pay them back because the U.S. Department of Agriculture computed the payback and the deficiency payments, weighting the deficiency payments for barley with respect to feed grain and malting barley.

Mr. Chairman, malting barley commanded a much higher price, but the fact is 70 percent of the barley goes for feed grain. The use of high-priced malting barley in USDA's calculation denied farmers the support payment they were supposed to get. So our barley producers were forced to pay back a barley deficiency payment they should not have had to pay back.

We in the Congress last year forced the Department to recompute the deficiency payments, and they did. We granted them, but did not require them, to make it whole with the farmers. So they recomputed the deficiency payments and discovered that farmers in fact had to pay \$62 million too much back to the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, another way of putting it is that \$62 million the Federal Government now has that should be in

the pockets of farmers, because they were overcharged, in effect, on this deficiency payback, because the formula was wrong and unfair for barley growers. But the U.S. Department of Agriculture says we are not going to send the money back to the barley producers.

Mr. Chairman, I will guarantee you this: If someone owes the Federal Government money, you can be darn sure somebody is going to try to collect it, and quick. But if the Federal Government collects too much and the Federal Government owes the producer money, you would expect an obligation for the Federal Government under that recomputation of that advanced deficiency payment for barley, that that \$62 million would be paid back.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] if we could look into that. I had intended to offer an amendment on this bill, but it would be scored in a manner that would not allow me to do that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say I do not know what we can do. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] has talked to me about the situation, and I agreed we would look into it to see exactly what the situation is. I do not know what we can or cannot do, but we will try to find out what the facts are in an effort to determine what is possible.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate that. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. STALLINGS] and I, as well as others, have worked on it very hard for a long time. It is unfair to leave it this way, for the Federal Government to have \$62 million that belongs to the barley producers.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would point out we tried to mandate the repayments, and the administration insisted that it remain as a discretionary item. Of course, we have ourselves in that mess because of that right now. The gentleman is right. These people should get their money back.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am saying in North Dakota, at least, we have a lot of barley producers that believe that money is owed to them. The calculation that we mandated determines the money is owed to them, but the money is here in Washington, somewhere in the Department of Agriculture, and is not going to go back under the current circumstances. I am saying that is unfair, it is wrong, and we have a requirement to set it right.

Mr. Chairman, finally let me say, once again, one of these days, very soon, I hope, we can come back here on the floor and talk about fundamental agriculture policy, because I am telling you it does not work. Two and one-half dollar wheat does not pay the bill. Our farmers in North Dakota are not making it. This agricultural policy leaves them with the worst of all possible worlds: Lower support prices and lower market prices.

Mr. Chairman, if we want a future without family farmers, let us just keep heading where we are heading. But some of us are not content with that around here, and we will be back. When we come back, we are going to be back to try to get a better farm bill, one that helps family farmers in this country's future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

#### OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Deputy Secretary of Agriculture, including not to exceed \$25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$543,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,000 of this amount shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Deputy Secretary.

#### OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$6,149,000.

#### OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration to carry out the programs funded in this Act, \$596,000.

#### RENTAL PAYMENTS (USDA)

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92-313 for programs and activities of the Department of Agriculture which are included in this Act, \$50,808,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall be retained by the Department of Agriculture for non-recurring repairs as determined by the Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That in the event an agency within the Department of Agriculture should require modification of space needs, the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer a share of that agency's appropriation made available by this Act to this appropriation, or may transfer a share of this appropriation to that agency's appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 10 per centum of the funds made available for space rental and related costs to or from this account.

#### BUILDING OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

For the operation, maintenance, and repair of Agriculture buildings pursuant to the delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services authorized by 40 U.S.C. 486, \$25,700,000.

#### ADVISORY COMMITTEES (USDA)

For necessary expenses for activities of advisory committees of the Department of Agriculture which are included in this Act, \$1,918,000: *Provided*, That no other funds appropriated to the Department of Agriculture

in this Act shall be available to the Department of Agriculture for support of activities of advisory committees.

**HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)**

For necessary expenses of the Department of Agriculture, to comply with the requirement of section 107g of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9607g, and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6961, \$27,943,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations and funds available herein to the Department of Agriculture for hazardous waste management may be transferred to any agency of the Department for its use in meeting all requirements pursuant to the above Acts on Federal and non-Federal lands.

**DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)**

For Personnel, Finance and Management, Operations, Information Resources Management, Advocacy and Enterprise, and Administrative Law Judges and Judicial Officers, \$25,014,000; and in addition, for payment of the USDA share of the National Communications System, \$50,000; making a total of \$25,064,000 for Departmental Administration to provide for necessary expenses for management support services to offices of the Department of Agriculture and for general administration and emergency preparedness of the Department of Agriculture, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations in this Act for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551-558.

**OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR  
CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS**

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations to carry out the programs funded in this Act, \$1,307,000.

**OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS**

For necessary expenses to carry on services relating to the coordination of programs involving public affairs, and for the dissemination of agricultural information and the coordination of information, work and programs authorized by Congress in the Department, \$8,925,000, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed \$2,000,000 may be used for farmers' bulletins and not fewer than two hundred thirty-two thousand two hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture) as authorized by 44 U.S.C. 1301: *Provided*, That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225).

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS**

For necessary expenses for programs involving intergovernmental affairs and liaison within the executive branch, \$468,000.

**OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL**

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$62,786,000, including such sums as may be necessary for contracting and other arrangements with public agencies and private persons pursuant to section 6(a)(8) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and including a sum not to exceed \$50,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; and including a sum not to exceed \$95,000 for certain confidential operational expenses including the payment of informants, to be expended under the direction of the Inspector General pursuant to Public Law 95-452 and section 1337 of Public Law 97-98.

**OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL**

For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, \$24,554,000.

**OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR  
ECONOMICS**

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics to carry out the programs funded in this Act, \$580,000.

**ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE**

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service in conducting economic research and service relating to agricultural production, marketing, and distribution, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627) and other laws, including economics of marketing; analyses relating to farm prices, income and population, and demand for farm products, use of resources in agriculture, adjustments, costs and returns in farming, and farm finance; research relating to the economic and marketing aspects of farmer cooperatives; and for analysis of supply and demand for farm products in foreign countries and their effect on prospects for United States exports, progress in economic development and its relation to sales of farm products, assembly and analysis of agricultural trade statistics and analysis of international financial and monetary programs and policies as they affect the competitive position of United States farm products, \$59,125,000; of which \$500,000 shall be available for investigation, determination and finding as to the effect upon the production of food and upon the agricultural economy of any proposed action affecting such subject matter pending before the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for presentation, in the public interest, before said Administrator, other agencies or before the courts: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available to continue to gather statistics and conduct a special study on the price spread between the farmer and the consumer: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225): *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for analysis of statistics and related facts on foreign production and full and complete information on methods used by other countries to move farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis.

**NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE**

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Statistics Service in conducting statistical reporting and service work, including crop and livestock estimates, statistical coordination and improvements, and marketing surveys, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C.

1621-1627) and other laws, \$83,401,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

**WORLD AGRICULTURAL OUTLOOK BOARD**

For necessary expenses of the World Agricultural Outlook Board to coordinate and review all commodity and aggregate agricultural and food data used to develop outlook and situation material within the Department of Agriculture, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622g), \$2,367,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225).

**OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR  
SCIENCE AND EDUCATION**

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research Service, Extension Service, and National Agricultural Library, \$560,000.

**AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)**

For necessary expenses to enable the Agricultural Research Service to perform agricultural research and demonstration relating to production, utilization, marketing, and distribution (not otherwise provided for), home economics or nutrition and consumer use, and for acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed \$100, \$658,424,000: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for temporary employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$115,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein can be used to provide financial assistance to the organizers of national and international conferences, if such conferences are in support of agency programs: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed one for replacement only: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available to conduct marketing research: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of constructing any one building shall not exceed \$250,000, except for greenhouses or greenhouses which shall each be limited to \$1,000,000, and except for ten buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed \$500,000 each, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building or \$250,000, whichever is greater: *Provided further*, That the limitations on alterations contained in this Act shall not apply to modernization or replacement of existing facilities at Beltsville, Maryland: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a): *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to the purchase of land or the construction of facilities as may be necessary for the relocation of the United States Horticultural Crops Research

Laboratory at Fresno to Parlier, California, and the relocation of the laboratories at Behoust, France and Rome, Italy to Montpelier, France, including the sale or exchange at fair market value of existing land and facilities at Fresno, California and Behoust, France; and the use of proceeds from the sale, which shall be deposited in a trust fund in the United States Treasury and which shall remain available until expended, for acquisition of real property and equipment, for construction of replacement facilities, and for relocation costs; and the Agricultural Research Service may lease such existing land and facilities from the purchasers until completion of the replacement facilities: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$190,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education for the scientific review of international issues involving agricultural chemicals and food additives: *Provided further*, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or operating any research facility or research project of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

Special fund: To provide for additional labor, subprofessional, and junior scientific help to be employed under contracts and cooperative agreements to strengthen the work at Federal research installations in the field, \$2,500,000.

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the agricultural research programs of the Department of Agriculture, where not otherwise provided, \$49,473,000: *Provided*, That facilities to house Bonsai collections at the National Arboretum may be constructed with funds accepted under the provisions of Public Law 94-129 (20 U.S.C. 195) and the limitation on construction contained in the Act of August 24, 1912 (40 U.S.C. 68) shall not apply to the construction of such facilities.

#### COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

For payments to agricultural experiment stations, for cooperative forestry and other research, for facilities, and for other expenses, including \$168,785,000 to carry into effect the provisions of the Hatch Act approved March 2, 1887, as amended, including administration by the United States Department of Agriculture, penalty mail costs of agricultural experiment stations under section 6 of the Hatch Act of 1887, as amended, and payments under section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301n.); \$18,533,000 for grants for cooperative forestry research under the Act approved October 10, 1962 (16 U.S.C. 582a-582-a7), as amended, including administrative expenses, and payments under section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301n.); \$27,400,000 for payments to the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University, for research under section 1445 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222), as amended, including administration by the United States Department of Agriculture, and penalty mail costs of the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University; \$58,299,000 for contracts and grants for agricultural research under the Act of August 4, 1965, as amended (7 U.S.C. 4501); \$99,000,000 for competitive research grants, including administrative expenses; \$5,551,000 for the sup-

port of animal health and disease programs authorized by section 1433 of Public Law 95-113, including administrative expenses; \$1,168,000 for supplemental and alternative crops and products as authorized by the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319d); \$300,000 for grants for research pursuant to the Critical Agricultural Materials Act of 1984 (7 U.S.C. 178) and section 1472 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3318), to remain available until expended; \$475,000 for rangeland research grants as authorized by subtitle M of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended; not to exceed \$5,000,000 for higher education grants under section 1417 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152), including administrative expenses; \$4,000,000 for grants as authorized by section 1475 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 and other Acts; \$6,725,000 for sustainable agriculture research and education, as authorized by section 1621 of Public Law 101-624 (7 U.S.C. 5811), including administrative expenses; and \$17,650,000 for necessary expenses of Cooperative State Research Service activities, including coordination and program leadership for higher education work of the Department, administration of payments to State agricultural experiment stations, funds for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which \$8,580,000 shall be for a program of capacity building grants to colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321-326 and 328), including Tuskegee University, of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; in all, \$412,886,000.

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities and for grants to States and other eligible recipients for such purposes, as necessary to carry out the agricultural research, extension and teaching programs of the Department of Agriculture, where not otherwise provided, \$62,529,000.

#### EXTENSION SERVICE

Payments to States, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas and American Samoa: For payments for cooperative agricultural extension work under the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, to be distributed under sections 3(b) and 3(c) of said Act, for retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents and for costs of penalty mail for cooperative extension agents and State extension directors, \$262,712,000; payments for the nutrition and family education program for low-income areas under section 3(d) of the Act, \$3,557,000; payments for the pest management program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$8,950,000; payments for the farm safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$1,970,000; payments for the pesticide impact assessment program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$3,580,000; grants to upgrade 1890 land-grant college extension facilities as authorized by section 1416 of Public Law 99-198, \$9,508,000, to remain available until expended; payments for the rural development centers under section 3(d) of the Act, \$950,000; payments for extension work under section

209(c) of Public Law 93-471, \$1,031,000; payments for a ground water quality program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$12,375,000; for special grants for financially stressed farmers and dislocated farmers as authorized by Public Law 100-219, \$2,550,000; payments for youth-at-risk programs under section 3(d) of the Act, \$10,000,000; payments for a food safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$1,750,000; payments for carrying out the provisions of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978 under section 3(d) of the Act, \$2,765,000; and payments for extension work by the colleges receiving the benefits of the second Morrill Act (7 U.S.C. 321-326, 328) and Tuskegee University, \$25,755,000; in all, \$407,978,000, of which not less than \$79,400,000 is for Home Economics: *Provided*, That funds hereby appropriated pursuant to section 3(c) of the Act of June 26, 1953, and section 506 of the Act of June 23, 1972, as amended, shall not be paid to any State, Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa prior to availability of an equal sum from non-Federal sources for expenditure during the current fiscal year.

Federal administration and coordination: For administration of the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, and the Act of September 29, 1977 (7 U.S.C. 341-349), as amended, and section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301n.), and to coordinate and provide program leadership for the extension work of the Department and the several States and insular possessions, \$9,079,000, of which not less than \$2,300,000 is for Home Economics.

#### NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Library, \$17,253,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$35,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$900,000 shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements.

#### OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND INSPECTION SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Services to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Federal Grain Inspection Service, Agricultural Cooperative Service, Agricultural Marketing Service and Packers and Stockyards Administration, \$550,000.

#### ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, including those pursuant to the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended (21 U.S.C. 114b-c), necessary to prevent, control, and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases; to carry out inspection, quarantine, and regulatory activities; to discharge the authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1468; 7 U.S.C. 426-426b); and to protect the environment, as authorized by law, \$426,903,000, of which \$85,922,000 shall be derived from user fees deposited in the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection User Fee Account, and of which \$5,000,000 shall be available for the control of outbreaks of insects, plant diseases, animal diseases and for control of pest animals and birds to the ex-

tent necessary to meet emergency conditions: *Provided*, That \$500,000 of the funds for control of the fire ant shall be placed in reserve for matching purposes with States which may come into the program: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year that does not require minimum matching by the States of at least 40 per centum: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four, of which two shall be for replacement only: *Provided further*, That, in addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agricultural production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in such emergencies for the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious disease or pests of animals, poultry, or plants, and for expenses in accordance with the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, and section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944, as amended, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred for such emergency purposes in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used to develop, establish, or operate any user fee program for agricultural quarantine and inspection to prevent the movement of exotic pests and diseases from Hawaii and Puerto Rico as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 9701.

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2250, and acquisition of land as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 428a, \$21,396,000.

#### FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For necessary expenses to carry on services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, and the Poultry Products Inspection Act, as amended, \$473,512,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$75,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building.

#### FEDERAL GRAIN INSPECTION SERVICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended, and the standardization activities related to grain under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as amended, including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$20,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$11,397,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but, unless otherwise provided, the cost of altering any one building during

the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided by this Act may be used to pay the salaries of any person or persons who require, or who authorize payments from fee-supported funds to any person or persons who require nonexport, nonterminal interior elevators to maintain records not involving official inspection or official weighing in the United States under Public Law 94-582 other than those necessary to fulfill the purposes of such Act.

#### INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$39,383,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for Inspection and Weighing Services: *Provided*, That if grain export activities require additional supervision and oversight, or other uncontrollable factors occur, this limitation may be exceeded by up to 10 per centum with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

#### AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVE SERVICE

For necessary expenses to carry out the Cooperative Marketing Act of July 2, 1926 (7 U.S.C. 451-457), and for activities relating to the marketing aspects of cooperatives, including economic research and analysis and the application of economic research findings, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627), and for activities with institutions or organizations throughout the world concerning the development and operation of agricultural cooperatives (7 U.S.C. 3291), \$5,640,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$15,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

#### AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE MARKETING SERVICES

For necessary expenses to carry on services related to consumer protection, agricultural marketing and distribution, transportation, and regulatory programs as authorized by law, and for administration and coordination of payments to States; including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$90,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$56,636,000; of which not less than \$2,313,000 shall be available for the Wholesale Market Development Program for the design and development of wholesale and farmer market facilities for the major metropolitan areas of the country: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but, unless otherwise provided, the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building.

#### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$50,735,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That if crop size is understated and/or other uncontrollable events occur, the Agency may exceed this limitation by up to 10 per centum with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

#### FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY (SECTION 32)

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c) shall be used

only for commodity program expenses as authorized therein, and other related operating expenses, except for: (1) transfers to the Department of Commerce as authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Act of August 8, 1956; (2) transfers otherwise provided in this Act; and (3) not more than \$10,360,000 for formulation and administration of Marketing Agreements and Orders pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1961.

#### PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

For payments to departments of agriculture, bureaus and departments of markets, and similar agencies for marketing activities under section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623(b)), \$1,250,000.

#### MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

For expenses necessary to recapitalize Dairy Graders, \$1,250,000, and to capitalize the Laboratory Accreditation Program, \$400,000, making a total of \$1,650,000, under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623).

#### PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, as authorized by law, and for certifying procedures used to protect purchasers of farm products, including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$5,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$12,009,000.

#### FARM INCOME STABILIZATION

#### OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND COMMODITY PROGRAMS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs to administer the laws enacted by Congress for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Office of International Cooperation and Development, Foreign Agricultural Service, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, \$551,000.

#### AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative expenses of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, including expenses to formulate and carry out programs authorized by title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1301-1393); the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.); sections 7 to 15, 16(a), 16(f), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 590g-590o, 590p(a), 590p(f), and 590q); sections 1001 to 1004, 1006 to 1008, and 1010 of the Agricultural Act of 1970 as added by the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1501 to 1504, 1506 to 1508, and 1510); the Water Bank Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1301-1311); the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101); sections 202(c) and 205 of title II of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1974, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1592(c), 1595); sections 401, 402, and 404 to 406 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2201 to 2205); the United States Warehouse Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 241-273); and laws pertaining to the Commodity Credit Corporation, \$720,705,000; of which \$719,289,000 is hereby appropriated, and \$573,000 is transferred from the Public Law 480 Program Account in this

Act and \$589,000 is transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation Program Account in this Act: *Provided*, That other funds made available to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this account: *Provided further*, That these funds shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds made available under this Act shall be used (1) to influence the vote in any referendum; (2) to influence agricultural legislation, except as permitted in 18 U.S.C. 1913; or (3) for salaries or other expenses of members of county and community committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for engaging in any activities other than advisory and supervisory duties and delegated program functions prescribed in administrative regulations: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to establish or implement a wetlands reserve program as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 3837 et seq.

□ 1810

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NAGLE

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NAGLE: Page 28, beginning in line 23, strike "": *Provided*" and all that follows through line 2 on page 29.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, which is to title I, and the amendment, which is to title II, which is directly related to it, be considered en bloc so that we can get this out of the way at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserved a point of order. I now object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Chairman, I would ask Chairman WHITTEN to reconsider that objection, since I do not, when we are done, intend to offer the amendment. I intend to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if I may say so, I hate to make this objection here but, we are going to have to start using our land to produce so we can pay our debts and keep our farmers in business.

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am sorry, but the gentleman is making this more difficult than it needs to be.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to share some very deep concerns I have regarding the way in which the U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA] has implemented the conservation provisions of the 1990 farm bill and the result that appears in the Agricultural appropriations bill.

When the 1990 farm bill passed last year, everyone clamored to take credit for this "most progressive environmental farm bill ever." For the first time, provisions to protect wetlands and water quality were added to the conservation program that have been a part of farm bills since the 1930's.

Mr. Chairman, Agriculture Committee intent with regard to conservation elements of the farm program has been completely ignored and, in the end, those who participate in the farm program will suffer.

There is a greater danger which lies at the very heart of what Congress intended to accomplish through the 1990 farm bill.

In the 1990 farm bill, farmers and conservationists very carefully constructed a new approach, based on incentives for farmers to take part in conservation practices, to preserve wetlands, and to integrate their farm program to avoid water pollution.

Mr. Chairman, the greatest danger—and the greatest failure of where the administration and this bill are taking the 1990 farm bill—is the message they are sending to those concerned about the environment.

The greatest danger lies in the message this administration and this bill is sending to those who made the historic decision last year to pursue an incentive approach to conservation and environmental protection.

Having watched good incentive based conservation programs being sandbagged, conservationists and farmers will decide that incentive programs will not be vigorously pursued. As a result, what we may face in the future will be—not voluntary, incentive based conservation programs, but—mandatory controls pushed at us by people who are legitimately concerned about protecting the environment by limiting soil erosion, water pollution, and the other degradations which happen when conservation programs are not funded.

I don't think any of us want to go down that road, Mr. Chairman, but that's where this administration and this bill are taking us with what they are doing to these programs.

My amendment will transfer appropriations from within the conservation title to the Wetlands Reserve Program and the Water Quality Reserve Program. It is my intention to fight for these programs so that the future of the great compromise and more importantly, the future of the farm program can be maintained.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NAGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Let me simply say that I think that the thrust of the gentleman's amendment is along the lines of the agreement that was reached last year between environmental groups

and agricultural groups. I think that there certainly was a balance in that. It was recognized that as far as the conservation reserve program is concerned, that we needed to shift the focus and begin to take into consideration issues of water quality. I think without question that that is a very important feature.

It also needs to be understood, of course, that we want to have the maximum impact, whether it be erosion of the land or whether it be water quality. And I think that the gentleman's approach is one that certainly reflects that.

I, too, join with the gentleman in his disappointment that the appropriations bill did not seem to take that into consideration. I think it is one in which we do definitely want to promote cooperation through voluntary means, through our family farmers and making certain that the environmental concern is met.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

May I say that we operated under very strict limitations this year. We had everybody counting what we could do and this would have the effect of striking out a savings on which we had to count to stay within the budget ceilings. Our provision has the effect of saving \$231.8 million in a mandatory program. It has been scored by CBO and by the Budget Committee as a proper savings to the discretionary totals of this bill.

Under Scorekeeping Rule No. 3 of the 1990 Reconciliation Act. If the provision is struck, it will have the effect of breaking the committee's 602(b) allocation and is, therefore, in violation of section 302(f).

We would be in violation of all of our allocation. The effect would be that this would set in motion another sequestration for everything to be cut.

Members will recall last week we had a cut of thirteen ten-thousandths of a percent, it cost thousands of dollars to implement. We faced it because the Office of Management and Budget said we were over some slight amount. CBO and the General Accounting Office differed with them, but nevertheless we had that. So I insist that if this provision should be changed, it would leave us in violation not only in this bill but the effect would be across the board.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi insists on his point of order.

Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NAGLE] wish to argue in opposition to the point of order?

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to withdraw the amendment?

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman does not wish to withdraw the amendment with the point of order pending. The gentleman wishes to argue the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Chairman, this is very simple. What I did quite simply was take money that is already being spent and simply transfer it. That is all this does. It does not provide for new money. It does not take money over the cap. It takes existing money inside the bill, simply transfers it to two different programs that the committee in its wisdom and judgment chose not to fund. So it is not over the limit.

It is not an expenditure that is not already authorized. We are simply shifting money within the account.

Therefore, for that reason, the point of order of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi is not well taken.

□ 1820

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair might remind the gentleman from Iowa that his unanimous-consent request that the amendments be considered en bloc was objected to by the gentleman from Mississippi, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, so the argument is only addressed to that language at the bottom of page 28 and at the top line of 29 which, in essence, strikes the limitation contained in the bill at page 28, line 23.

Mr. NAGLE. That is correct. It spends no money.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no balancing or offset as such within the bill, because the gentleman did not secure, when he sought unanimous consent, to consolidate the two amendments en bloc.

Mr. NAGLE. The gentleman sought it, but the gentleman was denied it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was denied that by an objection by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi who had that right.

Mr. NAGLE. I am asking the Chair, and I think I have made my case, and I respectfully ask the Chair to make a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule unless the gentleman from Pennsylvania seeks recognition, and he can in his own right in opposition.

Mr. RIDGE. I do not seek recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule then that the point of order of the gentleman from Mississippi is well taken, and the Chair sustains the point of order, because striking that language under the circumstances would be scored to violate the Budget Act.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses involved in making indemnity payments to dairy farmers for milk or cows producing such milk and manufacturers of dairy products who have been directed to remove their milk or dairy prod-

ucts from commercial markets because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government, and in making indemnity payments for milk, or cows producing such milk, at a fair market value to any dairy farmer who is directed to remove his milk from commercial markets because of (1) the presence of products of nuclear radiation or fallout if such contamination is not due to the fault of the farmer, or (2) residues of chemicals or toxic substances not included under the first sentence of the Act of August 13, 1968, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450j), if such chemicals or toxic substances were not used in a manner contrary to applicable regulations or labeling instructions provided at the time of use and the contamination is not due to the fault of the farmer, \$5,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to make indemnity payments to any farmer whose milk was removed from commercial markets as a result of his willful failure to follow procedures prescribed by the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That this amount shall be transferred to the Commodity Credit Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of making dairy indemnity disbursements.

CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION  
ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATING EXPENSES

For administrative and operating expenses, as authorized by the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1516), \$322,870,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$700 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1506(i).

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

For payments as authorized by section 508(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, \$221,500,000.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

For fiscal year 1992, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained, but not previously reimbursed (estimated to be \$9,000,000,000 in the President's fiscal year 1992 Budget Request (H. Doc. 102-3)), but not to exceed \$8,450,000,000, pursuant to section 2 of the Act of August 17, 1961, as amended (15 U.S.C. 713a-11).

Such funds are appropriated to reimburse the Corporation to restore losses incurred during prior fiscal years. Such losses for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 include \$900,000,000 in connection with carrying out the Export Enhancement Program (EEP), \$200,000,000 in connection with carrying out the Market Promotion Program (MPP), formerly the Targeted Export Assistance Program (TEA), \$300,000,000 in connection with carrying out the Federal Crop Insurance Program, \$445,773,000 in connection with domestic do-

nations, \$281,605,000 in connection with export donations, and \$6,322,622,000 in connection with carrying out the commodity programs.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FOR  
HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

For fiscal year 1992, CCC shall not expend more than \$5,000,000 for expenses to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9607(g), and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6961: *Provided*, That expenses shall be for operations and maintenance costs only and that other hazardous waste management costs shall be paid for by the USDA Hazardous Waste Management appropriation.

GENERAL SALES MANAGER  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Sales Manager, \$9,103,000, of which \$5,098,000 may be transferred from Commodity Credit Corporation funds, \$2,731,000 may be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation Program Account in this Act and \$1,274,000 may be transferred from the Public Law 480 Program Account in this Act. Of these funds, up to \$4,000,000 shall be available only for the purpose of selling surplus agricultural commodities from Commodity Credit Corporation inventory in world trade at competitive prices for the purpose of regaining and retaining our normal share of world markets. The General Sales Manager shall report directly to the Secretary of Agriculture. The General Sales Manager shall obtain, assimilate, and analyze all available information on developments related to private sales, as well as those funded by the Corporation, including grade and quality as sold and as delivered, including information relating to the effectiveness of greater reliance by the General Sales Manager upon loan guarantees as contrasted to direct loans for financing commercial export sales of agricultural commodities out of private stocks on credit terms, as provided in titles I and II of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, Public Law 95-501, and shall submit quarterly reports to the appropriate committees of Congress concerning such developments.

TITLE II—CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR  
NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service, \$563,000.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-590f) including preparation of conservation plans and establishment of measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures for soil and water management as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs and to control agricultural related pollutants); operation of conservation plant materials centers; classification and mapping of soil; dissemination of information; acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed \$100; purchase and erection or alteration or improvement of permanent and temporary buildings; and operation and maintenance of aircraft,

\$564,129,000, of which not less than \$5,713,000 is for snow survey and water forecasting and not less than \$8,064,000 is for operation and establishment of the plant materials centers: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amounts not less than \$411,800,000 is for personnel compensation and benefits: *Provided further*, That except for \$2,399,000 for improvements of the plant materials centers, the cost of any permanent building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same to any such building and with the exception of buildings acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes, shall not exceed \$10,000, except for one building to be constructed at a cost not to exceed \$100,000 and eight buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed \$50,000 per building and except that alterations or improvements to other existing permanent buildings costing \$5,000 or more may be made in any fiscal year in an amount not to exceed \$2,000 per building: *Provided further*, That when buildings or other structures are erected on non-Federal land that the right to use such land is obtained as provided in 7 U.S.C. 2250a: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations under the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-590f) in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225) and not to exceed \$25,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of the Service (16 U.S.C. 590e-2).

#### RIVER BASIN SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS

For necessary expenses to conduct research, investigation, and surveys of watersheds of rivers and other waterways, in accordance with section 6 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act approved August 4, 1954, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1006-1009), \$13,251,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$60,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

#### WATERSHED PLANNING

For necessary expenses for small watershed investigations and planning, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001-1008), \$9,545,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

#### WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out preventive measures, including but not limited to research, engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, rehabilitation of existing works and changes in use of land, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act approved August 4, 1954, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001-1005, 1007-1009), the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-f), and in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, \$205,238,000 (of which \$30,091,000 shall be available for the watersheds authorized under the Flood Control Act approved June

22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701, 16 U.S.C. 1006a), as amended and supplemented): *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$30,000,000 shall be available for emergency measures as provided by sections 403-405 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2203-2205), and not to exceed \$200,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That \$4,000,000 in loans may be insured, or made to be sold and insured, under the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund of the Farmers Home Administration (7 U.S.C. 1931): *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000,000 of this appropriation is available to carry out the purposes of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-205), as amended, including cooperative efforts as contemplated by that Act to relocate endangered or threatened species to other suitable habitats as may be necessary to expedite project construction.

#### RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in planning and carrying out projects for resource conservation and development and for sound land use pursuant to the provisions of section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010-1011; 76 Stat. 607), and the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-f), and the provisions of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3451-3461), \$32,516,000: *Provided*, That \$600,000 in loans may be insured, or made to be sold and insured, under the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund of the Farmers Home Administration (7 U.S.C. 1931): *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

#### GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect a program of conservation in the Great Plains area, pursuant to section 16(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as added by the Act of August 7, 1956, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590(b)), \$25,271,000, to remain available until expended (16 U.S.C. 590(b)(7)).

#### AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

#### AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in sections 7 to 15, 16(a), 16(f), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act approved February 29, 1936, as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 590g-590o, 590p(a), 590p(f), and 590q), and sections 1001-1004, 1006-1008, and 1010 of the Agricultural Act of 1970, as added by the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1501-1504, 1506-1508, and 1510), and including not to exceed \$15,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States, \$197,935,000, to remain available until expended (16 U.S.C. 590o), for agreements, excluding administration but including technical assistance and related expenses (16 U.S.C. 590o), except that no participant in the Agricultural Conservation Program shall receive more than \$3,500 per year, except where the participants from two or more farms or ranches join to carry out approved practices designed to conserve or improve

the agricultural resources of the community, or where a participant has a long-term agreement, in which case the total payment shall not exceed the annual payment limitation multiplied by the number of years of the agreement: *Provided*, That no portion of the funds for the current year's program may be utilized to provide financial or technical assistance for drainage on wetlands now designated as Wetlands Types 3 (III) through 20 (XX) in United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Circular 39, Wetlands of the United States, 1956: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other conservation materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out approved farming practices as authorized by the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, as determined and recommended by the county committees, approved by the State committees and the Secretary, under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That such assistance will not be used for carrying out measures and practices that are primarily production-oriented or that have little or no conservation or pollution abatement benefits: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the current year's program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the Agricultural Conservation Program in the participating counties, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties, and in addition, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, not to exceed 1 per centum may be made available to any other Federal, State, or local public agency for the same purpose and under the same conditions: *Provided further*, That for the current year's program \$2,500,000 shall be available for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out rural environmental practices: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities" approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18 U.S.C. 1913 to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONTZ

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONTZ: Page 42, after line 4, insert the following:

#### AGRICULTURAL WATER QUALITY INCENTIVE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838, et seq.), \$3,000,000.

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer my two amendments en bloc. They are amendments to the same paragraph.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order and object to the en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JONTZ] for 5 minutes in support of the amendment.

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I have a pair of amendments which I will be offering separately, because of the objection of the chairman.

The first amendment would cut \$3.5 million from the appropriation for the ACP program. The bill before us would increase funds for ACP by \$7 million, so I would be cutting that appropriation in half. I would then seek to, on my second amendment, take that \$3.5 million and offer that to fund the agricultural water-quality incentive program which is a very important program to address water-quality issues that are facing agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana will withhold.

The amendment that the Clerk has at the desk is not the amendment the gentleman from Indiana is presently addressing.

I wonder if we can have that.

Mr. JONTZ. We will see that the Clerk gets the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman seek unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment pending at the desk?

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONTZ

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONTZ: Page 39, line 18, strike "\$197,935,000" and insert "\$194,435,000".

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this point that both of my amendments be offered en bloc.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JONTZ] for 5 minutes.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, there was no objection. A point of order was raised by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. He did not object to the amendments en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman objected to the

unanimous-consent request and so ordered.

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offered is one of a pair of amendments that seeks to take \$3.5 million that is in this bill for the ACP Program and use it, instead, to fund the Water Quality Incentive Program.

Mr. Chairman, the bill that the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], brought to us provides for an increase in the ACP Program of \$7 million. I am suggesting that we take half of that money and use it, instead, to provide for the Water Quality Incentive Program which is a very important part of the 1990 farm bill, to address the environmental problems which we face on the farm in this country.

Mr. Chairman, when we wrote the 1990 farm bill, we tried, rather than to impose new regulations on farmers to meet water quality goals, to use a carrot instead of a stick, and we put in the legislation the Water Quality Incentive Program which provides for payments to farmers of up to \$3,500 for various management practices which would meet improved water quality goals in areas where there is a water quality program.

I would suggest that this is a very important program, because it is targeted to those farms in those areas where ground water is at risk. If we do not fund the Water Quality Incentive Program, and there is no money in the bill before us for the Water Quality Incentive Program, I think we will run the risk of seeing new regulatory requirements imposed on producers in this country which are not necessary if we can fund incentives for producers to meet water-quality improvement goals.

There is no question that producers want to improve the job they are doing in meeting water quality improvement goals. There is no question that the Water Quality Incentive Program will help them to do it.

The program targets 3 to 5 million acres which is, I think, a very good goal. Obviously, with \$3.5 million, we would just be funding the very beginnings of this program, but it is better to fund \$3.5 million than nothing for the Water Quality Incentive Program, and, again, Mr. Chairman, this money would come from cutting in half the increase which Chairman WHITTEN has put in this legislation for the ACP Program.

□ 1830

I would not argue against an increase in the ACP Program, but I would argue if we can take half of the \$7 million which are proposed for an increase in the ACP Program and put them in the Water Quality Improvement Program we can do both, provide for the increase in the ACP Program and also provide for the Water Quality Incentive Program, at least to get it started.

We made this promise to the farmers of this Nation when we passed the farm bill last year, that we were going to provide incentives for them to improve the water quality on their farms, and we would see to it that those farmers, at their own initiative by participating in this voluntary program, could bring improvements in water quality so it would not be necessary for Members to come back at a future time and to enact regulatory requirements could be burdensome, and which could prevent farmers from making a fair profit.

I ask the support of the House for this amendment to strike this \$3.5 million out of the ACP Program. We would still be spending \$194 million on the program, a \$3.5 million cut. It would still be an increase over this last year's funding, so it would be possible for Members to, at least begin, to fund a Water Quality Incentive Program.

Last year the Water Quality Incentive Program was supported by environmental groups and supported by wildlife groups. The Water Quality Incentive Program was supported by producers' groups who want to meet water quality goals on a voluntary basis, with the carrot instead of the stick.

The farm producers of this country came to Members and said, "You help us to meet these goals and we will get the job done." Mr. Chairman, we can do that, at least getting started, with the \$3.5 million that will be provided by cutting the increase in the ACP Program from \$7 million to \$3.5 million.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to just remind the House and my colleagues that the 1990 Farm Act, with all its deficiencies and all of the problems, we had to come up with a consensus piece of legislation. The result was still the most progressive, environmental legislation that we have had from the Committee on Agriculture in the history of the Committee on Agriculture.

This is a modest attempt to try and bring some sense of balance to what we are doing. Many times American agriculture is blamed for contributing to poor water quality, for pollution, and all of the other matters related to the environment. We have been working and are continuing to work to address these concerns. But again, respectfully, our legislative intent is thwarted, and this is a very modest attempt to try and bring some additional assistance.

There is no need to study it. We know we have to have better quality of water. There is no need to study. We know we have to clean up the air. We know we have to protect the wetlands. We know all this.

This is a very modest, very simple attempt by the gentleman from Indiana, who has dedicated much time to this effort. It is an environmentally sound amendment. It is a fiscally frugal amendment. It is a very meager at-

tempt to continue our progressive attitude that has finally come to agriculture and to the Committee on Agriculture.

I ask Members to support this amendment, because it is very frugal, and yet we try and continue the pace that we have set for ourselves to clean up the environment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the amendment. The issue of agriculture lands and water quality is a major issue throughout the country. It is a very important issue in the State of California.

We are having consultations now. There is a general discussion of taking lands out of production, if we cannot deal with the issue of water quality on those lands.

I think that this effort by the Jontz amendment will have a tremendous pay-off to agriculture. If we do not start addressing these problems right away, many of the alternatives are much more difficult and expensive for the farming community. I rise in support of the amendment and join in the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I plead with my colleagues that this is not trying to undo the Committee on Appropriations. This is just trying, in a very frugal manner, to bring into place what we have legislated. We have studied it. We know we are running out of water. We know that the air in many areas is polluted. We know we need good quality water. We know that we need conservation.

This I ask my colleagues, to support the gentleman from Indiana, because it is a very minor, but yet very progressive step in where we hope to head in the future for rural America and for agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, the Agriculture Committees in both the House and Senate worked long and hard to construct a farm bill in 1990 that would set new direction for American agriculture as it prepares to enter the 21st century.

Existing programs were improved and new programs established as a foundation for strong, stable, and environmentally sound agricultural programs.

Unfortunately, the Appropriations Committee has seen fit in this bill to undo much of what we on the Committee on Agriculture, believe are important and much-needed initiatives to aid producers and all of American agriculture.

One of the cornerstones of the 1990 farm bill is the improvements that were made in agricultural conservation. Building on the accomplishments of the 1985 farm bill, the 1990 farm bill established new programs to complement the highly successful Conservation Reserve Program already in place.

These were the Wetlands Reserve Program—to provide long-term protection for

farmed wetlands—and the Water Quality Improvement Program—to provide incentives to producers to improve farming practices to reduce any negative impacts they may have on water quality.

Mr. Chairman, these three programs—the Conservation Reserve Program, the Wetlands Reserve Program, and the Water Quality Improvement Program—are like the three legs of a stool.

These three programs are the crucial framework for the important conservation efforts that the Department of Agriculture has been charged to implement. Unfortunately, this appropriations bill literally "cut our legs out from under us."

Specifically, the fiscal 1992 Agricultural appropriations bill includes a prohibition against the use of funds to establish a Wetlands Reserve Program. Instead, the Appropriations Committee provides the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service with funds to "better define the costs, benefits, and impacts" of the reserve program.

I should note that the administration, which worked closely with the House and Senate Agriculture Committees in developing the conservation measures in the farm bill, requested \$124 million for this program in fiscal year 1992.

It is important for the Members to understand, that the Wetland Reserve is a voluntary easement program to provide long-term conservation easements for the protection of farmed wetlands. Until this time, farmed wetlands were being enrolled in the CRP which affords them only limited protections for the 10-year term of the contract.

In establishing the new Wetland Reserve, Congress directed the Secretary to limit the enrollment of these wetlands into the CRP. Now ironically, should H.R. 2698 remain unchanged, there will be no program in place to provide for long-term easements to protect farmed wetlands.

Of equal significance is the Water Quality Incentive Program which is designed to provide financial incentives and technical assistance to producers to aid them in correcting water quality problems associated with their farming operation. This, too, is a voluntary program designed to help agricultural producers help themselves.

H.R. 2698 provides no funding for the water quality program. As a result, farmers will be forced to address their water quality problems in another manner or seek to enroll their lands in CRP to deal with non-point source pollution problems.

This is the wrong approach for dealing with water quality problems. As stated in the conference report on the 1990 farm bill, "[I]t is more efficient and cost-effective to alter, where possible, cropping management activities to achieve conservation goals than it is to remove environmentally sensitive lands from production and compensate the farmer for the lost economic activity."

Mr. Chairman, the provisions of H.R. 2698 eliminate two important tools for the agricultural producer to be able to farm in an environmentally sound and cost-effective way.

Rather than preparing American agriculture to move into the 21st century, this bill instead prohibits progress and promotes stagnation.

Working with the conservation community and farmers, the Agriculture Committees made great strides toward addressing environmental concerns facing American agriculture. If these farm bill programs are not implemented and the farmer is not given more tools for dealing with wetland and water quality concerns through voluntary, incentive programs, I fear what the alternative may be.

I ask my colleagues to help promote more environmentally sound farming and oppose the status quo.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. We have a situation on this committee, where we are operating under all sorts of counts and all sorts of limitations, but from the presentation made here this amendment seems to make sense. But at this time, we have received no notice, no recommendation from the Department. We do not know what will be carried out.

We are trying to live within the limits, and trying to live with our friends. I have no objection in going ahead with this amendment. The authorization act was signed on November 28.

Without any information, we have to do the best we can, but I have no objection.

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his accommodation. I will say that this, as one member of the Committee on Agriculture and I think that others would agree, we will do everything we can to work with the Department of Agriculture to see that the regulations are properly promulgated, to see that the work is done within USDA to make this program successful.

I suggest to the gentleman that starting with \$3.5 million is a modest start.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I am relying on that, but, under present conditions, to appropriate money is difficult, however, we will go along.

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I think the gentleman from Indiana is obviously doing what I tried to do, I think very successfully, but people do not realize when we speak of rural America and we think of Indiana, we think we are out there and pollution is not a problem.

However, I have towns in my district, and towns in the State of Iowa where the water supply from the community, the modern water tower, modern well, the best equipment we have out there, and people cannot drink the water because of the nitrates running off the farmland into the streams, into the rivers, and down into the aqua reservoir itself.

We have a situation in towns in our State where incredible as it may sound,

citizens can turn the faucet on to wash their clothes but they have to buy their water from the grocery store, and that is if there is an abundant supply.

It is a serious problem that will only get worse. We know there are some things we can do to help correct that. That is the whole purpose of the origins of this legislation, which was to say to farmers, do not throw that tank with the chemicals into the cart. This is a sinkhole. Do not put excessive nitrogen on the crops. Watch the run off in the livestock areas. Farmers are under tremendous pressure as the chairman of the committee is aware, because we have frozen their target price support. Farming is expected to drop 15 percent this year. At the same time, we are saying we take that land out of production.

Obviously, they are not very inclined to do that, although the conservationists are concerned. We try to put incentive in there. We said that we will actually help pay those farmers to protect the water and see that it does not pollute, that the nitrates do not run into the streams and the drinking water. We will pay those farmers.

It is a very modest program. They lose money because they take the land out of production, but we gain because they get the income back, or at least a portion of it back. That is at the heart of this. When we turn and see the Committee on Appropriations come through with absolutely not one dime for this, it was disappointing. I am glad to hear the colloquy and exchange that has taken place here, because this is an important step, and moves in the correct direction.

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NAGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and his support for the amendment. The statement on the amendment by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I think is an indication on the part of that committee that they understand the problems are very real problems that need to be dealt with.

This amendment will be a modest start toward progress in that regard.

□ 1840

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Chairman, if I can reclaim my time, I congratulate the committee for doing just that, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JONTZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONTZ

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONTZ: Page 42, after line 4, insert the following:

AGRICULTURAL WATER QUALITY INCENTIVE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838 et seq.), \$3,500,000.

Mr. JONTZ (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONTZ. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I understand this is a companion amendment, and we have no objection to it.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JONTZ]. I regret disagreeing with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee. However, I believe additional funding for the Wetlands Reserve Program, as proposed by the gentleman from Indiana, makes good sense.

The gentleman's amendment would include important funding for the new Wetlands Protection Program enacted as part of the 1990 farm bill. The program would allow individuals to enroll farmed and converted wetlands into long-term or permanent easements.

This would be one very positive and constructive way to increase protection of our Nation's wetlands without resorting to heavy-handed regulations. The whole approach recognizes that voluntary measures that respect private property rights offer a sensible way to protect our critical natural resources. It's one way that doesn't involve the controversial permitting program run by the environmental protection agency and the corps of engineers.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JONTZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do so to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, as far as I know there is only one more amendment pending, if the gentleman would in order to accommodate our colleagues and the membership be kind enough to move that the bill be considered as read in order that we might expedite the process, since there is only one more amendment to my knowledge left.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the staff advises me that there is one other amendment, so when we get through with the one other amendment, I will be glad to do that.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

FORESTRY INCENTIVES PROGRAM

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to carry out the program of forestry incentives, as authorized in the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101), including technical assistance and related expenses, \$12,446,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by that Act.

WATER BANK PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the provisions of the Water Bank Act (16 U.S.C. 1301-1311), \$18,620,000, to remain available until expended.

EMERGENCY CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in sections 401, 402, and 404 of title IV of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2201-2205), \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 2204.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROGRAM

For necessary expenses for carrying out a voluntary cooperative salinity control program pursuant to section 202(c) of title II of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1592(c)), to be used to reduce salinity in the Colorado River and to enhance the supply and quality of water available for use in the United States and the Republic of Mexico, \$14,783,000, to be used for investigations and surveys, for technical assistance in developing conservation practices and in the preparation of salinity control plans, for the establishment of on-farm irrigation management systems, including related lateral improvement measures, for making cost-share payments to agricultural landowners and operators, Indian tribes, irrigation districts and associations, local governmental and nongovernmental entities, and other landowners to aid them in carrying out approved conservation practices as determined and recommended by the county ASC committees, approved by the State ASC committees and the Secretary, and for associated costs of program planning, information and education, and program monitoring and evaluation: *Provided*, That the Soil Conservation Service shall provide technical assistance and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service shall provide administrative services for the program, including but not limited to, the negotiation and administration of agreements and the disbursement of payments: *Provided further*, That such program shall be coordinated with the regular Agricultural Conservation Program and with research programs of other agencies.

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the conservation reserve program pursuant to the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831-3845), \$1,642,760,000, to remain available until expended, to be used for Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures for cost-share assistance for the establishment of conservation practices provided for in approved conservation reserve program contracts, for annual rental payments provided in such contracts, and for technical assistance: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used to enter into new contracts that are in excess of the prevailing local rental rates for an acre of comparable land.

### TITLE III—FARMERS HOME AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

#### OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR SMALL COMMUNITY AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and rural development activities of the Department of Agriculture, \$572,000.

#### FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

##### RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to be available from funds in the Rural Housing Insurance Fund, as follows: \$1,626,451,000 for loans to section 502 borrowers, as determined by the Secretary, of which \$350,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; \$11,330,000 for section 504 housing repair loans; \$16,300,000 for section 514 farm labor housing; \$573,900,000 for section 515 rental housing; \$600,000 for site loans; and \$284,000,000 for credit sales of acquired property.

For an amount, for the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct and guaranteed loans, as follows: low-income housing section 502 loans, \$324,896,000, of which \$12,360,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; section 504 housing repair loans, \$5,280,000; section 514 farm labor housing, \$9,536,000; section 515 rental housing, \$268,585,000; and credit sales of acquired property, \$40,612,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$425,173,000.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do so again, if I might have the attention of my distinguished chairman, so that the bill be considered as read as printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of titles III, IV, and V, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to any of these sections of the bill?

The text of the remainder of titles III, IV, and V is as follows:

##### RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed pursuant to the authority under section 521(a)(2) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, \$308,100,000: *Provided*, That of this amount not more than \$11,800,000 shall be available for debt forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Act, and not to exceed \$10,000 per project for advances to nonprofit organizations or public agencies

to cover direct costs (other than purchase price) incurred in purchasing projects pursuant to section 502(c)(5)(C) of the Act: *Provided further*, That of this amount not less than \$128,158,000 is available for newly constructed units financed by section 515 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and not more than \$5,214,000 is for newly constructed units financed under sections 514 and 516 of the Housing Act of 1949: *Provided further*, That \$174,728,000 is available for expiring agreements and for servicing of existing units without agreements: *Provided further*, That agreements entered into or renewed during fiscal year 1992 shall be funded for a five-year period, although the life of any such agreement may be extended to fully utilize amounts obligated: *Provided further*, That agreements entered into or renewed during fiscal years 1988, 1989, 1990, and 1991 may also be extended beyond five years to fully utilize amounts obligated.

##### SELF-HELP HOUSING LAND DEVELOPMENT FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For direct loans pursuant to section 523(b)(1)(B) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1490c), \$500,000.

##### AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928-1929, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, as follows: farm ownership loans, \$555,500,000, of which \$509,000,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, \$3,500,000,000, of which \$2,600,000,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; \$7,000,000 for water development, use, and conservation loans, of which \$1,500,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, \$1,000,000; for emergency insured and guaranteed loans, \$600,000,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters; and for credit sales of acquired property, \$250,000,000.

For an amount, for the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct and guaranteed loans, as follows: Farm ownership loans, \$33,359,000, of which \$15,270,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, \$220,200,000, of which \$31,200,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; \$2,615,000 for water development, use, and conservation loans, of which \$30,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, \$1,000,000; for emergency insured and guaranteed loans, \$32,100,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters; for watershed, flood and resource conservation loans, \$2,162,000; and for credit sales of acquired property, \$117,500,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$230,179,000.

During fiscal year 1992 none of the funds in this Act may be used to make loans in excess of the foregoing amounts, except to the extent provided in advance in an Appropriations Act.

##### STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 502(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987, as amended (7 U.S.C. 5101-5106), \$3,750,000.

##### RURAL DEVELOPMENT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928 and 86 Stat. 661-664, as amended, to be available from funds in the

Rural Development Insurance Fund, as follows: water and sewer facility loans, \$635,000,000, of which \$35,000,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; community facility loans, \$125,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; and guaranteed industrial development loans, \$100,000,000.

For an amount, for the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct and guaranteed loans, as follows: water and sewer facility loans, \$96,840,000, of which \$840,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; community facility loans, \$14,325,000, of which \$325,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; and guaranteed industrial development loans, \$7,920,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$54,906,000.

##### RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct loans authorized by the Rural Development Loan Fund (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)), \$22,050,000: *Provided*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans of not to exceed \$32,500,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan programs, \$689,000.

##### RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL GRANTS

For grants pursuant to sections 306(a)(2) and 306(a)(6) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1926), \$350,000,000, to remain available until expended, pursuant to section 306(d) of the above Act: *Provided*, That these funds shall not be used for any purpose not specified in section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act.

##### VERY LOW-INCOME HOUSING REPAIR GRANTS

For grants to the very low-income elderly for essential repairs to dwellings pursuant to section 504 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, \$12,500,000, to remain available until expended.

##### RURAL HOUSING FOR DOMESTIC FARM LABOR

For financial assistance to eligible nonprofit organizations for housing for domestic farm labor, pursuant to section 516 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1486), \$11,000,000, to remain available until expended.

##### MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 523(b)(1)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490c), \$8,750,000.

##### SUPERVISORY AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For grants pursuant to sections 509(g)(6) and 525 of the Housing Act of 1949, \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

##### RURAL COMMUNITY FIRE PROTECTION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-313), \$3,500,000 to fund up to 50 per centum of the cost of organizing, training, and equipping rural volunteer fire departments.

##### COMPENSATION FOR CONSTRUCTION DEFECTS

For compensation for construction defects as authorized by section 509(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, \$500,000, to remain available until expended.

##### RURAL HOUSING PRESERVATION GRANTS

For grants for rural housing preservation as authorized by section 552 of the Housing

and Urban-Rural Recovery Act of 1983 (Public Law 98-181), \$23,000,000.

#### RURAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For grants authorized under section 310B(c) (7 U.S.C. 1932) to any qualified public or private nonprofit organization, \$20,750,000: *Provided*, That \$500,000 shall be available for grants to qualified nonprofit organizations to provide technical assistance and training for rural communities needing improved passenger transportation systems or facilities in order to promote economic development: *Provided further*, That, effective for fiscal year 1991 and thereafter, grants made pursuant to this appropriation shall not be subject to any dollar limitation unless such limitation is set forth in law.

#### SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT GRANTS

For grants for pollution abatement and control projects authorized under section 310B(b) (7 U.S.C. 1932) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, \$1,500,000: *Provided*, That such assistance shall include regional technical assistance for improvement of solid waste management.

#### OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, \$600,000: *Provided*, That no other funds in this Act shall be available for this Office.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Farmers Home Administration, not otherwise provided for, in administering the programs authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921-2000), as amended; title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1471-1490); the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act, approved May 3, 1950 (40 U.S.C. 440-444), for administering the loan program authorized by title III-A of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452 approved August 20, 1964), as amended, and such other programs which the Farmers Home Administration has the responsibility for administering, \$748,584,000; of which \$37,637,000 is hereby appropriated, \$425,173,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account and merged with this account, \$230,179,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account and merged with this account, \$54,906,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Development Insurance Fund Program Account and merged with this account, and \$689,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Development Loans Program Account and merged with this account: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$500,000 of this appropriation may be used for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,670,000 of this appropriation shall be available for contracting with the National Rural Water Association or other equally qualified national organization for a circuit rider program to provide technical assistance for rural water systems: *Provided further*, That, in addition to any other authority that the Secretary may have to defer principal and interest and forego foreclosure, the Secretary may permit, at the request of the borrowers, the deferral of principal and interest on any outstanding loan made, insured, or held by the Secretary under this title, or under the provisions of any other law administered by the Farmers Home Administration, and may forego foreclosure of any such loan, for such period as the Sec-

retary deems necessary upon a showing by the borrower that due to circumstances beyond the borrower's control, the borrower is temporarily unable to continue making payments of such principal and interest when due without unduly impairing the standard of living of the borrower. The Secretary may permit interest that accrues during the deferral period on any loan deferred under this section to bear no interest during or after such period: *Provided*, That, if the security instrument securing such loan is foreclosed, such interest as is included in the purchase price at such foreclosure shall become part of the principal and draw interest from the date of foreclosure at the rate prescribed by law.

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 901-950(b)), as follows:

##### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONE LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Insured loans pursuant to the authority of section 305 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), shall be made as follows: rural electrification loans, not less than \$622,050,000 nor more than \$933,075,000; and rural telephone loans, not less than \$239,250,000 nor more than \$311,025,000; to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act are in addition to these amounts but during fiscal year 1992 total commitments to guarantee loans pursuant to section 306 shall be not less than \$933,075,000 nor more than \$2,100,615,000 of contingent liability for total loan principal: *Provided further*, That loans may be modified in an amount not to exceed \$493,700,000: *Provided further*, That as a condition of approval of insured electric loans during fiscal 1992, borrowers shall obtain concurrent supplemental financing in accordance with the applicable criteria and ratios in effect as of July 15, 1982: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated in this Act may be used to deny or reduce loans or loan advances based upon a borrower's level of general funds.

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct and guaranteed loans authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), as follows: cost of direct loans, \$229,967,000, cost of loans guaranteed pursuant to section 306, \$6,531,000 and cost of the other loan guarantees, \$105,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$29,163,000.

During fiscal year 1992 none of the funds in this Act may be used to make loans in excess of the foregoing amounts, except to the extent provided in advance in an Appropriations Act.

##### RURAL TELEPHONE BANK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The Rural Telephone Bank is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available to such corporation in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its authorized programs for the current fiscal year. During fiscal year 1992 and within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans shall be not less than \$177,045,000 nor more than \$210,540,000.

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, includ-

ing the cost of modifying loans, of direct loans authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), \$11,331,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the loan programs, \$8,632,000.

##### RURAL COMMUNICATION DEVELOPMENT FUND

To reimburse the Rural Communication Development Fund for interest subsidies and losses sustained in prior years, but not previously reimbursed, in making Community Antenna Television loans and loan guarantees under sections 306 and 310B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended, \$1,264,000.

##### DISTANCE LEARNING AND MEDICAL LINK PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the programs authorized in sections 2331-2335 of Public Law 101-624, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

##### RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SUBACCOUNT

For loans authorized under section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act, for the purpose of promoting rural economic development and job creation projects, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, of direct loans, \$1,700,000.

#### OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, \$256,000: *Provided*, That no other funds in this Act shall be available for this Office.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 901-950(b)), and to administer the loan and loan guarantee programs for Community Antenna Television facilities as authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921-1995), and for which commitments were made prior to fiscal year 1992, including not to exceed \$7,000 for financial and credit reports, funds for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$103,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$37,795,000; of which \$29,163,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account and \$8,632,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Telephone Bank Program Account: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used to authorize the transfer of funds to this account from the Rural Telephone Bank: *Provided further*, That not less than \$500,000 of this appropriation shall be expended to provide community and economic development technical assistance to rural electric and telephone systems by Rural Electrification Administration employees who are located within REA and assigned to REA's Rural Development Coordinator and who may not be reassigned or relocated to the Rural Information Center or other agency or office.

#### TITLE IV—DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

##### OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND CONSUMER SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Food and Nutrition Service and the Human Nutrition Information Service, \$542,000.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE  
CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751-1769b), and the applicable provisions other than sections 3 and 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773-1785, and 1788-1789), \$6,067,386,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993, of which \$1,392,294,000 is hereby appropriated and \$4,675,092,000 shall be derived by transfer from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c): *Provided*, That funds appropriated for the purpose of section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 shall be allocated among the States but the distribution of such funds to an individual State is contingent upon that State's agreement to participate in studies and surveys of programs authorized under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, when such studies and surveys have been directed by the Congress and requested by the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that a State's administration of any program under the National School Lunch Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (other than section 17), or the regulations issued pursuant to these Acts, is seriously deficient, and the State fails to correct the deficiency within a specified period of time, the Secretary may withhold from the State some or all of the funds allocated to the State under section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and under section 13(k)(1) of the National School Lunch Act; upon a subsequent determination by the Secretary that the programs are operated in an acceptable manner some or all of the funds withheld may be allocated: *Provided further*, That only final reimbursement claims for service of meals, supplements, and milk submitted to State agencies by eligible schools, summer camps, institutions, and service institutions within sixty days following the month for which the reimbursement is claimed shall be eligible for reimbursement from funds appropriated under this Act. States may receive program funds appropriated under this Act for meals, supplements, and milk served during any month only if the final program operations report for such month is submitted to the Department within ninety days following that month. Exceptions to these claims or reports submission requirements may be made at the discretion of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That up to \$4,083,000 shall be available for independent verification of school food service claims: *Provided further*, That \$1,143,000 shall be available to operate the Food Service Management Institute.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the special milk program, as authorized by section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1772), \$23,011,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993. Only final reimbursement claims for milk submitted to State agencies within sixty days following the month for which the reimbursement is claimed shall be eligible for reimbursement from funds appropriated under this Act. States may receive program funds appropriated under this Act only if the final program operations report for such month is submitted to the Department within ninety days following that month. Exceptions to these claims or reports submission requirements may be made at the discretion of the Secretary.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For necessary expenses to carry out the special supplemental food program as authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), \$2,600,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 1993.

COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the commodity supplemental food program as authorized by section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c (note)), including not less than \$8,000,000 for the projects in Detroit, New Orleans, and Des Moines, \$91,284,000: *Provided*, That funds provided herein shall remain available through September 30, 1993: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities donated to the program.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Food Stamp Act (7 U.S.C. 2011-2029), \$22,162,975,000; of which \$1,500,000,000 shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, for a specific dollar amount, is transmitted to the Congress: *Provided*, That funds provided herein shall remain available through September 30, 1992, in accordance with section 18(a) of the Food Stamp Act: *Provided further*, That up to 5 per centum of the foregoing amount may be placed in reserve to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for use only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided further*, That funds provided herein shall be expended in accordance with section 16 of the Food Stamp Act: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be subject to any work registration or work fare requirements as may be required by law: *Provided further*, That \$345,000,000 of the funds provided herein shall be available only to the extent necessary after the Secretary has employed the regulatory and administrative methods available to him under the law to curtail fraud, waste, and abuse in the program: *Provided further*, That \$1,013,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2028; of which \$10,825,000 shall be transferred to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service for the Cattle Tick Eradication Project.

FOOD DONATIONS PROGRAMS FOR SELECTED GROUPS

For necessary expenses to carry out section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c (note)), section 4(b) of the Food Stamp Act (7 U.S.C. 2013), and section 311 of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3030a), \$233,437,000.

For necessary expenses to carry out section 110 of the Hunger Prevention Act of 1988, \$32,000,000.

THE EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983, as amended, \$50,000,000: *Provided*, That, in accordance with section 202 of Public Law 98-92, these funds shall be available only if the Secretary determines the existence of excess commodities.

For purchases of commodities to carry out the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983, as amended, \$120,000,000.

FOOD PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For necessary administrative expenses of the domestic food programs funded under

this Act, \$101,617,000; of which \$5,000,000 shall be available only for simplifying procedures, reducing overhead costs, tightening regulations, improving food stamp coupon handling, and assistance in the prevention, identification, and prosecution of fraud and other violations of law: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$150,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

HUMAN NUTRITION INFORMATION SERVICE

For necessary expenses to enable the Human Nutrition Information Service to perform applied research and demonstrations relating to human nutrition and consumer use and economics of food utilization, and nutrition monitoring, \$11,255,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225).

TITLE V—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service, including carrying out title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1761-1768), market development activities abroad, and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including not to exceed \$125,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1766), \$110,023,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available to obtain statistics and related facts on foreign production and full and complete information on methods used by other countries to move farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis.

AMERI FLORA '92 EXPOSITION

To enable the Secretary to meet any extra expenses of participating in the planning, organizing and carrying out of the Ameri Flora '92 Exposition, the first international horticulture and environment exposition to be held in the United States, \$500,000 as authorized by section 1472 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3318), to remain available until expended.

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1691, 1701-1715, 1721-1726, 1727-1727f, 1731-1736g), as follows: (1) \$513,800,000 for Public Law 480 title I credit, including Food for Progress credit; (2) \$57,000,000 is hereby appropriated for ocean freight differential costs for the shipment of agricultural commodities pursuant to title I of said Act and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended; (3) \$696,000,000 is hereby appropriated for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad pursuant to title II of said Act; and (4) \$254,959,000 is hereby appropriated for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad pursuant to title III of said Act: *Provided*, That not to exceed 10 per centum of the funds made available to carry out any title of said Act may be used to carry out any other title of said Act.

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, of direct

credit agreements as authorized by the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended, including the cost of modifying credit agreements under said Act, \$389,979,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the Public Law 480 title I credit program, and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended, to the extent funds appropriated for Public Law 480 are utilized, \$1,979,000.

#### PUBLIC LAW 480 DEBT RESTRUCTURING

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, of modifying direct loans authorized by title I and title VI of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended by section 1512 of Public Law 101-624, there is hereby appropriated not to exceed \$668,000.

#### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

##### SHORT-TERM EXPORT CREDIT

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available not less than \$5,000,000,000 in credit guarantees under its export credit guarantee program for short-term credit extended to finance the export sales of United States agricultural commodities and the products thereof, as authorized by section 211(b)(1) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641).

##### INTERMEDIATE EXPORT CREDIT

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available not less than \$500,000,000 in credit guarantees under its export guarantee program for intermediate-term credit extended to finance the export sales of United States agricultural commodities and the products thereof, as authorized by section 211(b)(2) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641).

##### EMERGING DEMOCRACIES EXPORT CREDIT

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available not less than \$200,000,000 in credit guarantees under its Export Guarantee Program for credit expended to finance the export sales of United States agricultural commodities and the products thereof to emerging democracies, as authorized by section 1542 of (Public Law 101-624).

#### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost, as defined in section 13201 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, including the cost of modifying loans, or guaranteed loans authorized by the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, as amended, \$155,524,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out CCC's Export Guarantee Program, GSM 102 and GSM 103, \$3,320,000.

#### OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of International Cooperation and Development to coordinate, plan, and direct activities involving international development, technical assistance and training, and international scientific and technical cooperation in the Department of Agriculture, including those authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3291), \$7,392,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,000 of this amount shall be available for official reception and representation expenses as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1766: *Provided further*, That in addition, funds available to the Department of Agriculture shall be available to assist an international organization in meeting the costs, including salaries, fringe benefits and other associated costs, related to the em-

ployment by the organization of Federal personnel that may transfer to the organization under the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 3581-3584, or of other well-qualified United States citizens, for the performance of activities that contribute to increased understanding of international agricultural issues, with transfer of funds for this purpose from one appropriation to another or to a single account authorized, such funds remaining available until expended: *Provided further*, That the Office may utilize advances of funds, or reimburse this appropriation for expenditures made on behalf of Federal agencies, public and private organizations and institutions under agreements executed pursuant to the agricultural food production assistance programs (7 U.S.C. 1736) and the foreign assistance programs of the International Development Cooperation Administration (22 U.S.C. 2392).

#### SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS (FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For payments in foreign currencies owed to or owned by the United States for market development research authorized by section 104(b)(1) and for agricultural and forestry research and other functions related thereto authorized by section 104(b)(3) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)(1), (3)), \$1,062,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available, in addition to other appropriations for these purposes, for payments in the foregoing currencies: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be used for payments in such foreign currencies as the Department determines are needed and can be used most effectively to carry out the purposes of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$25,000 of this appropriation shall be available for payments in foreign currencies for expenses of employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), as amended by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE VI—RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

##### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

##### FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Food and Drug Administration, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; for rental of special purpose space in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; and for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized and approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate, not to exceed \$25,000; \$725,962,000, of which \$188,858,000 shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, for a specific dollar amount, is transmitted to the Congress: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used to develop, establish, or operate any program of user fees authorized by 31 U.S.C. 9701: *Provided further*, That of the sums provided herein, not to exceed \$2,000,000 shall remain available until expended, and shall become available only to the extent necessary to meet unanticipated costs of emergency activities not provided for in budget estimates and after maximum absorption of such costs within the remainder of the account has been achieved.

##### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of or used by

the Food and Drug Administration, where not otherwise provided, \$10,350,000: *Provided*, That the Food and Drug Administration may accept donated land in Montgomery and/or Prince George's Counties, Maryland.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, again I would like to address myself to our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

I have an amendment that is on page 85. The next amendment is on page 86. Therefore, if it will be open to amendment at any point, we could facilitate the completion of this legislation, Mr. Chairman, in order to accommodate all our colleagues who have made plans otherwise.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through section 738, page 85, line 10 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill through section 738, page 85, line 10 is as follows:

##### RENTAL PAYMENTS (FDA)

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92-313 for programs and activities of the Food and Drug Administration which are included in this Act, \$25,612,000: *Provided*, That in the event the Food and Drug Administration should require modification of space needs, a share of the salaries and expenses appropriation may be transferred to this appropriation, or a share of this appropriation may be transferred to the salaries and expenses appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 10 per centum of the funds made available for rental payments (FDA) to or from this account.

##### DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

##### PAYMENTS TO THE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE CORPORATION

For necessary payments to the Farm Credit System Financial Assistance Corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury, as authorized by section 6.28(c) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended, for reimbursement of interest expenses incurred by the Financial Assistance Corporation on obligations issued through 1992, as authorized, \$112,606,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,175,000 of the assistance fund shall be available for administrative expenses of the Farm Credit System Assistance Board: *Provided further*, That officers and employees of the Farm Credit System Assistance Board shall be hired, promoted, compensated, and discharged in accordance with title 5, United States Code.

##### INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

##### COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; the rental of space (to include multiple

year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and not to exceed \$25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; \$47,300,000, including not to exceed \$700 for official reception and representation expenses.

**FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION  
LIMITATION ON REVOLVING FUND FOR  
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES**

Not to exceed \$40,290,000 (from assessments collected from farm credit institutions and from the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation) shall be available for administrative expenses as authorized under 12 U.S.C. 2249, of which not to exceed \$1,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

**TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SEC. 701. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive Order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 702. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, appropriations and authorizations made for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1992 under this Act shall be available for the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for, of not to exceed 442 passenger motor vehicles, of which 439 shall be for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles.

SEC. 703. Funds in this Act available to the Department of Agriculture shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefore as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902).

SEC. 704. Not less than \$1,500,000 of the appropriations of the Department of Agriculture in this Act for research and service work authorized by the Acts of August 14, 1946 and July 28, 1954, and (7 U.S.C. 427, 1621-1629), and by chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available for contracting in accordance with said Acts and chapter.

SEC. 705. No part of the funds contained in this Act may be used to make production or other payments to a person, persons, or corporations upon a final finding by court of competent jurisdiction that such party is guilty of growing, cultivating, harvesting, processing or storing marijuana, or other such prohibited drug-producing plants on any part of lands owned or controlled by such persons or corporations.

SEC. 706. Advances of money to chiefs of field parties from any appropriation in this Act for the Department of Agriculture may be made by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 707. The cumulative total of transfers to the Working Capital Fund for the purpose of accumulating growth capital for data services and National Finance Center operations shall not exceed \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That no funds in this Act appropriated to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without the approval of the agency administrator.

SEC. 708. New obligational authority provided for the following appropriation items in this Act shall remain available until expended: Public Law 480; Mutual and Self-Help Housing; Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations; Resource Conservation and Development; Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program; Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, \$5,000,000 for the contingency fund to meet emergency conditions,

Integrated Systems Acquisition Project, and buildings and facilities; Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, salaries and expenses funds made available to county committees; the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund; Agricultural Research Service, buildings and facilities, and up to \$10,000,000 of funds made available for construction at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center; Cooperative State Research Service, buildings and facilities; Scientific Activities Overseas (Foreign Currency Program); Dairy Indemnity Program; \$3,500,000 for higher education graduate fellowships grants under section 1417 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152); \$8,580,000 for a program of capacity building grants to colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890, including Tuskegee University; and buildings and facilities, Food and Drug Administration.

SEC. 709. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 710. Not to exceed \$50,000 of the appropriations available to the Department of Agriculture in this Act shall be available to provide appropriate orientation and language training pursuant to Public Law 94-449.

SEC. 711. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, employees of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture, including employees of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation county committees, may be utilized to provide part-time and intermittent assistance to other agencies of the Department, without reimbursement, during periods when they are not otherwise fully utilized, and ceilings on full-time equivalent staff years established for or by the Department of Agriculture shall exclude overtime as well as staff years expended as a result of carrying out programs associated with natural disasters, such as forest fires, droughts, floods, and other acts of God.

SEC. 712. Funds provided by this Act for personnel compensation and benefits shall be available for obligation for that purpose only.

SEC. 713. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be expended by any executive agency, as referred to in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), pursuant to any obligation for services by contract, unless such executive agency has awarded and entered into such contract as provided by law.

SEC. 714. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be available to implement, administer, or enforce any regulation which has been disapproved pursuant to a resolution of disapproval duly adopted in accordance with the applicable law of the United States.

SEC. 715. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to pay negotiated indirect cost rates on cooperative agreements or similar arrangements between the United States Department of Agriculture and nonprofit institutions in excess of 10 per centum of the total direct cost of the agreement when the purpose of such cooperative arrangements is to carry out programs of mutual interest between the two parties. This does not preclude appropriate payment of indirect costs on grants and contracts with such institutions when such indirect costs are computed on a similar basis for all agencies for which appropriations are provided in this Act.

SEC. 716. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to carry out any activity related to

phasing out the Resource Conservation and Development Program.

SEC. 717. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to prevent or interfere with the right and obligation of the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell surplus agricultural commodities in world trade at competitive prices as authorized by law.

SEC. 718. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, commodities acquired by the Department in connection with Commodity Credit Corporation and section 32 price support operations may be used, as authorized by law (15 U.S.C. 714c and 7 U.S.C. 612c), to provide commodities to individuals in cases of hardship as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 719. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to reimburse the General Services Administration for payment of space rental and related costs in excess of the amounts specified in this Act; nor shall this or any other provision of law require a reduction in the level of rental space or services below that of fiscal year 1991 or prohibit an expansion of rental space or services with the use of funds otherwise appropriated in this Act. Further, no agency of the Department of Agriculture, from funds otherwise available, shall reimburse the General Services Administration for payment of space rental and related costs provided to such agency at a percentage rate which is greater than is available in the case of funds appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 720. In fiscal year 1992, the Secretary of Agriculture shall initiate construction on not less than twenty new projects under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566) and not less than five new projects under the Flood Control Act (Public Law 534).

SEC. 721. Funds provided by this Act may be used for translation of publications of the Department of Agriculture into foreign languages when determined by the Secretary to be in the public interest.

SEC. 722. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to relocate the Hawaii State Office of the Farmers Home Administration from Hilo, Hawaii, to Honolulu, Hawaii.

SEC. 723. Provisions of law prohibiting or restricting personal services contracts shall not apply to veterinarians employed by the Department to take animal blood samples, test and vaccinate animals, and perform branding and tagging activities on a fee-for-service basis.

SEC. 724. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to reduce programs by establishing an end-of-year employment ceiling on full-time equivalent staff years below the level set herein for the following agencies: Food and Drug Administration, 8,259; Farmers Home Administration, 12,675; Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, 2,550; Rural Electrification Administration, 550; and Soil Conservation Service, 14,177.

SEC. 725. Funds provided in this Act may be used for one-year contracts which are to be performed in two fiscal years so long as the total amount for such contracts is obligated in the year for which the funds are appropriated.

SEC. 726. Funds appropriated by this Act shall be applied only to the objects for which appropriations were made except as otherwise provided by law, as required by 31 U.S.C. 1301.

SEC. 727. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to restrict the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to lease

space for its own use or to lease space on behalf of other agencies of the Department of Agriculture when such space will be jointly occupied.

SEC. 728. None of the funds provided in this Act may be expended to release information acquired from any handler under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided*, That this provision shall not prohibit the release of information to other Federal agencies for enforcement purposes: *Provided further*, That this provision shall not prohibit the release of aggregate statistical data used in formulating regulations pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided further*, That this provision shall not prohibit the release of information submitted by milk handlers.

SEC. 729. Unless otherwise provided in this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used by the Farmers Home Administration to employ or otherwise contract with private debt collection agencies to collect delinquent payments from Farmers Home Administration borrowers.

SEC. 730. None of the funds in this Act, or otherwise made available by this Act, shall be used to sell loans made by the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund. Further, Rural Development Insurance Fund loans offered for sale in fiscal year 1992 shall be first offered to the borrowers for prepayment.

SEC. 731. None of the funds in this Act, or otherwise made available by this Act, shall be used to regulate the order or sequence of advances of funds to a borrower under any combination of approved telephone loans from the Rural Electrification Administration, the Rural Telephone Bank or the Federal Financing Bank.

SEC. 732. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1992 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 733. When issuing statements, press releases, requests for proposals, bid solicitations, and other documents describing projects or programs funded in whole or in part with Federal money, all grantees receiving Federal funds, including but not limited to State and local governments, shall clearly state (1) the percentage of the total cost of the program or project which will be financed with Federal money, and (2) the dollar amount of Federal funds for the project or program.

SEC. 734. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay indirect costs on research grants awarded competitively by the Cooperative State Research Service that exceed 14 per centum of total direct costs under each award.

SEC. 735. None of the funds in this Act may be used to establish any new office, organization or center for which funds have not been provided in advance in Appropriations Acts, except the Department may carry out planning activities.

SEC. 736. Funds available to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) under this and subsequent appropriations shall be available for contracting with individuals for services to be performed outside of the United States, as determined by APHIS to be necessary or appropriate for carrying out programs and activities abroad. Such individuals shall not be regarded as officers or employees of the United States under any law administered by the Office of Personnel Management.

SEC. 737. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any appropriations or funds

available to the agencies of the Department of Agriculture may be used to reimburse employees for the cost of State licenses and certification fees pursuant to their Department of Agriculture position and that are necessary to comply with State laws, regulations, and requirements.

SEC. 738. Funds provided in this Act may be used for incidental expenses such as transportation, uniforms, lodging, and subsistence for volunteers serving under the authority of 7 U.S.C. 2272, when such volunteers are engaged in the work of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; and for promotional items of nominal value relating to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Volunteer Programs.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to that portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DE LA GARZA

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DE LA GARZA: Strike section 739 (page 85, lines 11 through 13) and renumber the succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I repeat, we have explained this amendment during general debate, and it is very simple.

There is in fact a prohibition in the bill that provides, and I will read it, it is very simple:

SEC. 739. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to carry out sections 2301-2303 of Public Law 101-624.

Mr. Chairman, I concede the part which says "None of the funds appropriated." That is a prerogative of the Appropriations Committee. We have no problem with that. If the committee in its wisdom decides not to appropriate, we concede that point. That is not the problem.

The problem here is "or otherwise made available by this Act". This in effect negates the law passed by this House, passed by the Senate and signed by the President.

It says that none of the funds shall be used to implement.

What if the Secretary can find funds?

The argument is that he can only use them in areas appropriated. But what if? That, Mr. Chairman, is what the issue is all about. Either we have legislative committees that authorize, or we do not. Either we have an Appropriations Committee that appropriates, that oversees, and I respectfully have to admit that they do a good job or we do not. This is why it is so very difficult for me. This is why I say this very sincerely; it is deeply felt by me. I say it with some degree of pain in my heart, but I have the responsibility, because we acted. The Committee on Agriculture acted. The House acted. The Senate committee acted. The Senate acted. The President signed it. We are ready to go.

I am not going to discuss the issue. The issue really becomes immaterial at this point.

The fact is that this says sections 2301 through 2303 of Public Law 101-624 shall not come to pass.

You know, we discussed abortion earlier. This provision of the bill would abort this important program.

It says that the Rural Development Administration shall not be. No matter why.

□ 1850

Now, to the credit of the distinguished chairman, and I appreciate it very much, and we spoke about it, he offered some compromise language. The compromise language again would have been legislating on an appropriation bill and subject to a point of order.

So I ask my colleagues in the House to support us in this measure because it has nothing to do with the gentleman from Mississippi, has nothing to do with the members of the Committee on Agriculture or the Committee on Appropriations.

It has to do with procedure, what is right and what is wrong. It is not a budget implication. This is a very frugal amendment to try to do something policywise. Policywise.

The House Committee on Agriculture makes the policy. Right or wrong, whether you agree or disagree, we are the ones charged under the rules to make policy. Section 739 of the bill will negate that policy under the guise of a restriction on an appropriation bill.

And I ask, not for me, not against the chairman, but I ask my colleagues to support the House Agriculture Committee, its integrity, its authority and its justified right to legislate and not be negated except in an appropriate and rightful manner.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, involved in this is the action of the Farmers Home Administration. One of the preceding administrator's said he was appointed for the purpose of collecting money. He refused to make a production loan unless the applicant could show that he could repay it in one year plus pay everything else he already owed.

We have had others who have not used the Commodity Credit Corporation, and in this instance here may I say that language, I agree, is surplusage.

I have in my hand the statement of administration policy from the Office of Management and Budget which I placed in the RECORD earlier which points out there is no money in this bill for Rural Development Administration.

So I have no objection to the amendment, because there is no money in this bill for the purpose of this amendment.

I expect to follow this up with a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture asking him to send up language so that we can restore rural development, and I want to emphasize restoration.

As a result of the farm policies we have had, every little town and community in the country is drying up. We have given away all of our domestic markets to our foreign competitors. We refuse to use the Commodity Credit Corporation to regain and retain our normal world markets.

I am going to ask the present Secretary of Agriculture, and I anticipate his cooperation, to send us a bill where we can strengthen the rural development work of the Farmers Home Administration, the agency that was created for this purpose. Page 84 of our report, which I had also entered into the RECORD, shows what this is about. I am accepting the amendment, because our language was surplusage, but I am going to follow up with a letter to the Secretary asking him to cooperate with us in strengthening Farmers Home.

Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to show my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. I appreciate his wisdom, his Solomon-type wisdom. We will work with him. I will join with him in sending a letter that we implement this rural development agency because I agree with everything he said. We have had people who tried to thwart his wishes and our wishes, both of our committees.

The gentleman quoted correctly former heads of the Farmers Home Administration. So this is to assure him that we will work with him and we will work together.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. ENGLISH. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas's statements. Mr. Chairman, may I say if there is anything that needs people working together, it is agriculture, and for the purpose of developing the country, it is better that we work together.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, section 735 does not apply to the establishment of the Rural Development Administration.

The Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 [FACTA 1990] was signed into law November 28, 1990.

Section 2302 of FACTA 1990 amends the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act by adding the following new section 364(a):

SEC. 364. RURAL DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department of Agriculture the Rural Development Administration, which shall be headed by an Administrator appointed by the Secretary.

The Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is further amended by adding other new sections and amending other such existing sections of the Act as of November 28, 1990. Other provisions in title 18 (criminal code), title 42 (Public Health and Welfare), title 5 (Government Organization and Employees) and title 7 (Agriculture) of the United States Code are also amended as of November 28, 1990 by inserting the words "Rural Development Administration" relating to the establishment of the Rural Development Administration on that date.

Mr. Chairman, the very bill, H.R. 2698, we consider here today carries the words "Rural Development" in its title and the amendment in FACTA 1990 in creating a Rural Development Administration gives life to what the Appropriations Committee itself did in changing the title of its subcommittee and its agriculture appropriation bills.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLISH. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to at this time say that this side accepts the amendment also. I do want to thank the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Agriculture for lending a great deal of distinction and credit to the Republican side by speaking from our side of the aisle.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to again thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico, the members of the subcommittee and the others who worked so hard on this bill. We had over 1,000 requests from Members we had to consider. We had to move things out of the bill and into the report to stay within the ceilings.

But I say to the gentleman from New Mexico, "JOE, you did a marvelous job." I want to thank the gentleman and our colleagues for the splendid help we have had all the way through.

May I say that I have pointed out for many, many years that agriculture is bigger than our three biggest industries—auto, steel, and housing combined. It is a producer of wealth. We are going to have to restore the purchasing power of agriculture or else the

country will go down. I am afraid that is in sight unless we do something to restore agriculture. But I say to the gentleman from New Mexico again, "Thank you, JOE."

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his very kind words. It has been a real pleasure working with the gentleman from Mississippi. I am a great student of the Whitten manner. I can even help interpret, in some cases.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as cosponsor of this amendment, I am delighted that the gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman WHITTEN, has accepted it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make three points. One, we are not asking for a new bureaucracy. The Rural Development Administration, No. 2, is not asking for any new money. It simply transfers functions from the Farmers Home Administration to this new agency to focus on rural development in this country, utilizing those resources.

With the adoption of this amendment, we will remove all limitations on implementing the Rural Development Administration, something that this House voted 360 to 45 a year ago.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the de la Garza-Coleman-English-Smith amendment to H.R. 2698 that will remove language prohibiting implementation of the Rural Development Administration which this Congress established in the 1990 farm bill.

This amendment is critical to the future of Federal rural development policy for small-town America and it is necessary if the will of this House—reflected in last year's overwhelming 360 to 45 vote on the Rural Development Act—is to prevail.

Mr. Chairman, because I represent one of the most diverse agricultural areas in this country, I have been a strong supporter of Federal policies aimed at insuring farmers and producers a fair return on their labor while providing our Nation a steady supply of food and fiber. But it has become very clear to me that however well our traditional commodity programs may work, their benefits often do not go much beyond the farm gate. It is clear that we must take off the blinders and find new approaches to stabilizing and strengthening the Nation's rural communities.

There is no conflict between traditional agriculture programs and rural economic development policies that will promote off-farm income for farm families. That the two must go hand in hand was recently underscored when

the Farmers Home Administration noted that the majority of the loans it now approves can cash flow only with off-farm income. Yes, we must continue to work for expanded markets for agricultural products. Yes, we must fight hard to make sure our producers are competing on a level playing field with the rest of the world. But we must also recognize that a key to the survival of our rural communities is economic diversification.

The Rural Development Administration which the Congress overwhelmingly supported in last year's farm bill is an essential first step toward a focused Federal policy to promote that critical economic diversity and development.

The RDA your vote can save today is the result of many public hearings, months of intensive work by Members and staff, and close consultation with the administration. I ask my colleagues to remember that:

RDA creates no new bureaucracy.

RDA will not require the expenditure of any new funds. We are merely shifting the current economic development programs from the Farmers Home Administration.

RDA will give USDA a single agency responsible for rural development strategy and coordinate rural development programs.

RDA will lead to greater expertise in rural development issues and to more effective, efficient program delivery.

There will be no negative impact on FmHA programs; indeed, we believe that by allowing it to focus on its traditional lending programs and allowing RDA to focus on rural development programs that both will be more effective and more efficient.

On March 22, 1990, this House voted 360 to 45 to create the Rural Development Administration for all the reasons I have mentioned. This House knew then—as I believe it knows now—that we must find new and creative ways to address the problems of rural America. The overwhelming will of the Congress of the United States must not be thwarted by the last-minute insertion of 25 words in H.R. 2698.

I am proud to stand with Chairman DE LA GARZA to urge the Members of this House to help us once more as we work to give new hope to America's rural communities and the millions of our fellow citizens who call them home.

Mr. Chairman, after so many years of hard work we are so close. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment which will make the Rural Development Administration a reality at last.

With the adoption of this amendment all limitations have been removed from the implementation of the Rural Development Administration.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise with my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee and to urge a yes vote on the amendment to strike section 739 from the 1992 agriculture and rural development appropriations bill. Section 739 would prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from establishing a Rural Development Administration within the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Certainly, I would have preferred that it not come to this. As ranking Republican authorizing subcommittee, the Conservation, Credit and Rural Development Subcommittee, I would have preferred that the Appropriations Committee work with us.

Yesterday, I spoke on the floor against another effort to bypass an authorizing committee during debate on the Interior appropriation. The reversal of statutes duly passed by this Congress and signed into law by the President by the Appropriations Committee is becoming increasingly commonplace.

Mr. Chairman, in this instance the Appropriations Committee has done this without holding a single hearing on the issue of establishing a Rural Development Administration. We cannot take these actions lightly.

I support the de la Garza-Coleman-English-Smith amendment because the matter in question is sound legislation, fully considered by the Congress and supported by USDA.

The provision in question—establishing the Rural Development Administration—was originally contained in H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act of 1989 that passed the House on March 22, 1990, by a vote of 360 to 45. The bill ultimately became a part of the 1990 farm bill and was signed by the President.

This is not frivolous legislation. It does not provide any new, direct lending or grant programs to rural communities that is not already available. But it does give direction and focus for rural development efforts that we, the authorizing committee, believe are urgently needed.

Now, the House, which has agreed to a Rural Development Administration twice in the last 12 months should be able to agree to it one more time. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentlemen from Texas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Oregon. In my opinion the Appropriations Committee made exactly the right decision in blocking the establishment of the Rural Development Administration.

Right now, rural development programs are administered quite well by the Farmers Home Administration. I believe that Farmers Home's water and sewer grants program, which would become the RDA's principal responsibility, currently does a very good job with the money that it has. In my State, Farmers Home's Bob Litton runs an excellent program which has greatly contributed to the economic development of the Commonwealth of Kentucky—especially in my eastern Kentucky district. Bob has done an amazing job with slim resources. Dividing the FmHA into two separate bureauc-

racies would increase the total overhead costs of Federal rural development programs. The end result is that even less money would be available for grants.

All of the pieces of the rural development puzzle are interdependent. Coordination among Federal rural development programs—from building affordable houses to laying affordable water and sewer lines—is essential if each scarce dollar is to have the greatest possible impact. Transferring some rural development programs out of Farmers Home would make this coordination much more difficult, if not impossible.

If the Farmers Home Administration "ain't broke"—and it isn't—then why go through all this effort to fix it? The last thing that this Congress needs to do is to take an effective agency, create a new bureaucracy, and transfer some of the first agency's programs to the second one. At best, it is a difficult exercise in standing still; at worst, we will have screwed up our rural development efforts in the name of reform.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state my opposition to this amendment. I urge all my colleagues to vote with Chairman WHITTEN and the Appropriations Committee by voting "no" on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA]. The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1900

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before we conclude discussion of this very important measure, I would like to remind my colleagues that when President Bush sent his budget to the Hill, he requested \$80 million in budget authority and \$124 million in budget outlays for the wetlands conservation research program. In my view, the Appropriation Committee's move to eliminate funding for wetlands protection could not have come at a more inappropriate time.

During debate on the 1990 farm bill, I introduced the Permanent Wetlands Agricultural Reserve Act—(H.R. 4247)—which was designed to protect 2.5 million acres of wetlands. In seeking a workable compromise, I was satisfied we did the best we could when we voted to protect 1 million acres of valuable wetlands. Now today, without the support of the administration, farmers, or wetlands conservationists or reformers, the Appropriation Committee has proposed to arbitrarily gut this valuable program.

Mr. Chairman, wetlands conservation and regulatory reform is rapidly becoming one of the leading environmental issues of the 102d Congress. The Comprehensive Wetlands Conservation and Management Act of 1991—H.R. 1330—a bill which I helped author and now vigorously support, currently has 148 cosponsors. While supporters of our legislation know the time has come for regulatory reform, we are also fighting for new resources to protect our Na-

tion's wetlands. This is no time to step back. We can protect wetlands and respect private property rights. America's farmers are willing to work with us to protect environmentally sensitive land. The USDA's wetlands conservation reserve is a rational, effective, and necessary conservation tool.

I would urge the Appropriations Committee to keep faith with the earlier commitment of the authorizing committee to protect 1 million acres of wetlands by restoring full funding for this wetlands reserve program in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 739. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to carry out sections 2301-2303 of Public Law 101-624.

SEC. 740. The Secretary shall complete the sales of Farmers Home Administration inventory farms, in accordance with the law and regulations in effect before November 28, 1990, in situations in which a County Committee, acting pursuant to section 335 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, had made its initial selection of a buyer before November 28, 1990. Such sales shall be completed as soon as the selection decision is administratively final and all terms and conditions have been agreed to. In carrying out sales of inventory property, priority shall be given to the former owner and members of the immediate family.

SEC. 741. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available for this Act shall be used to exclude from coverage under section 2244 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-624) any crop of Valencia oranges that, regardless of harvest year, was destroyed or damaged by freeze or related condition in 1990 and is otherwise covered by that section.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRANDY

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRANDY: Insert before the short title (page 86, after line 8) the following new section:

SEC. 742. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used in carrying out the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) to—

(1) deny an agricultural producer (who insured a primary crop that the producer was prevented from planting due to damaging weather or related causes but who planted a generally accepted secondary crop, such as soybeans or grain sorghum, in lieu of that primary crop) crop insurance coverage to the same extent as if the producer originally insured that secondary crop instead of the primary crop; and

(2) deny crop insurance coverage for 1991 crops of soybeans planted by a land-based air seeding method using a fertilizer boom and applying appropriate amounts of seed and herbicide or planted by broadcasting.

Mr. GRANDY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman. I reserve the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Chairman, I know the hour is late and this will be the last amendment, however I will just ask the Members' attention to this, which may sound like a parochial amendment, Mr. Chairman, but I can tell this Committee that my State of Iowa, as with many other States in this Nation, for the last 4 years has been through 2 years of drought and 1 year of the wettest weather we have ever experienced, and what that has produced is an adverse weather condition, Mr. Chairman, that has not only inconvenienced and in some cases decimated farmers, but it has caught them in an untenable position with the risk management tools that they thought they had and yet discovered, to their chagrin, they do not. Basically farmers in my area have bought crop insurance only to find that, due to weather conditions and technical provisions in the insurance contract, they are being denied coverage under those contracts for the crops they have been forced to plant.

Now I am attempting to work with the Federal Crop Insurance Commission on this to take the simple, no-cost, administrative actions outlined in this amendment that they have so far refused to do, and, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in two sections.

The first section is as follows: I ask that, if a farmer who intended to plant corn, or cotton, or another primary crop, was prevented from doing so due to adverse weather, that he be allowed to substitute a secondary crop and receive coverage. Unfortunately, due to crop insurance rules, he is prevented from doing so because the acres are attached, or the insurance, I should say, is attached, to specific acres. The farmer has been told by the crop insurance agent that he cannot get coverage, and consequently he must go bare.

I will say at this point we have been told by CBO and USDA that this will result in no added costs, and FCIC will not have a greater number of contracts than it contracted to have at the signup deadline of April 15. The bottom line here, Mr. Chairman, is no net cost to the Treasury, and we are allowing a farmer to make a prudent substitution under the available risk management tools.

The second provision, Mr. Chairman, would allow farmers with wet fields that are trying to get in, and in this case and in the case of Iowa plant soybeans where their corn was, to use a technique of allowing them to use land-based alternative means. In this case they would probably be allowed to take a large bulk fertilizer truck with bal-

loon tires and broadcast; that is to say, spray, their seed into the field. They are presently precluded from doing that because of a crop insurance rule that requires beans to be planted in rows.

Now I beg the indulgence of the Committee. This is a technical amendment, but very important to those farmers that are trying to save what possible crop they might be able to get. This amendment would allow those aerators, or air-based, or land-based, air-seeding provisions to be covered under crop insurance. Again there would be no net cost according to USDA and CBO, and the bottom line here, Mr. Chairman, is these are reasonable administrative actions.

Now I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will reserve a point of order because he will claim that this is legislation on an appropriations bill, and I have no doubt that this will be sustained. But I hope that the chairman and other members of his committee and members of the Committee on Agriculture will continue to work to make a crop insurance program that works for producers when they need it because right now we not only have in this country and under present ag policy a crop insurance program that does not work when farmers need it, we do not have a disaster program that responds when farmers need it, and I would only ask that these two provisions be made in order because we need to be more responsive to farmers' needs, and a more desirable and manageable risk management tool has to be made for our producers.

Just let me say in the time that remains, Mr. Chairman, that I want to stress that there is no net cost. We are merely allowing producers to transfer coverage from one crop to another. In most cases their yield will be less. It is their last card to play in the time that remains, and I want to stress that in my part of the country we are talking about a matter of days, if farmers are to get their crop in the field. If they are not allowed to make these changes either in this appropriations bill or administratively, we will probably lose more farmers than we need to. That will entail probably more disaster aid somewhere down the line.

I will only ask this Committee to seriously consider this amendment as a way to take preemptive action and perhaps save taxpayers' money.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] wish to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. I reserved my point of order, and I understood there was an agreement.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot hear the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. Did he say something about an agreement?

Mr. WHITTEN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY] withdraw the amendment? I understood that was what was in order.

Mr. GRANDY. I am willing to withdraw the amendment, Mr. Chairman, with the understanding that this is a problem that needs the attention of the committee of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. I hope the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY] will withdraw the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is subject to a point of order, and I think the Chair would so rule, but, if the gentleman will withdraw it, I would like to make this statement.

What the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY] presents is a true picture of much of our country. We have called, as a committee, on the President to send up recommendations on 28 disasters that he has declared. The delta section of my State, is under water and faces a similar situation as you describe. We have many situations like that around the United States. But your amendment is legislation, as it stands now. I have asked the White House to send us a recommendation on disasters so that we can deal with the supplemental so we can make this in order.

I would appreciate the gentleman withdrawing his amendment.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the concern of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and his attention to this. Iowa is not normally considered a delta State, Mr. Chairman, but under the rainfall we have had we probably qualify.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY] is withdrawn.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1992".

□ 1910

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2698, providing for agriculture, rural development, FDA, and related appropriations for fiscal year 1992. I am particularly pleased that this legislation contains \$2.6 billion for the Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC]. It is well known that the WIC Program is one of the most successful programs we have ever experienced. As the committee report states "benefits to participants of WIC are well documented, including fewer premature births, fewer late fetal deaths, better dietary benefits for the most nu-

tritionally at risk, more regular medical care, better cognitive performance in children, and savings in Medicaid costs for newborns and their mothers." The value and benefits of this program cannot be denied. Recognizing this, Congress has increased its funding and expanded the program's authority each year. This year alone the WIC Program received \$250 million more than we appropriated for fiscal year 1991.

Mr. Chairman, I will be the first to admit that I am not a nutritionist and I try not to get involved in issues about which I have limited knowledge. But, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to one element of the USDA rules governing the operations of the WIC Program that, at least on the surface, appear to produce a rather incongruous result. I refer to that regulation that makes certain nutritious cereals containing fruit ineligible to be included in the WIC Program, even though the same cereals would qualify without the fruit and the fruit would qualify without the cereal.

I call your attention to the committee report accompanying the agriculture appropriations bill. On page 114, the report states:

The Committee is aware of the WIC food package requirement which prohibits cereal from being included as an eligible purchase if it contains more than six grams of sucrose and other sugars, including those that occur naturally, per ounce of dry cereal. Cereals which contain raisins are excluded from the WIC food package because of this requirement, even though raisins alone have been recommended by the department to be included as a healthy dietary choice. The Committee is also aware that the entire WIC food package is currently under review. As part of this review, the Committee expects the Department to include an evaluation of cereals excluded from the food package because of naturally occurring sugar in fruit.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the USDA is undertaking a comprehensive review of the WIC food package. Several nutrition studies that have been brought to my attention emphasize the importance of fruit as one of the most essential elements in a balanced nutritious diet. For example, the Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee, established jointly by the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Health and Human Services recommends that "adults eat daily at least \* \* \* two servings of fruits" and that children should be encouraged to develop a similar practice. The Surgeon General's report on nutrition and health also recommends that among other foods, such as vegetables, whole grain products and cereals, people should "emphasize intake of fruits." Still another Federal Government document, entitled "Dietary Guidelines for Americans," recommends choosing a diet with plenty of vegetables, fruit, and grain products and suggests that adults and children should eat "two servings of fruit daily."

More recently, the Institute of Medicine issued a comprehensive report entitled, "Improving America's Diet and Health—From Recommendation to Action." In this report, the Institute of Medicine urges Congress to take an active role in the implementation of dietary recommendations. The report goes on to suggest that USDA regulations concerning family nutrition programs should be brought into compliance with dietary recommendations. In

fact, it explicitly urges that fruit be included in the WIC food packages whenever possible.

Mr. Chairman, I leave it to the experts. If, in fact, upon review it were determined that this change in food packages were appropriate, I am told that one of the side benefits would be to realize a 30-percent savings.

I thank my colleagues on the committee for raising this issue in their report. I look forward to the results of the USDA's review so that these questions may be addressed by Congress.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of a provision of H.R. 2698, the appropriations bill for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year 1992. This provision, contained in the appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for Extension Service, provides \$647,000 for agricultural development in the American Pacific. This program is designed to further the agricultural development of the U.S. territories in the Pacific basin in an efficient manner through the coordination of research and resources.

Mr. Chairman, the agricultural development in the American Pacific project is of considerable interest to the U.S. territories in the Pacific basin, which consist of American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the Freely Associated States of Micronesia as well as the State of Hawaii. During its first 3 years, this project has laid the groundwork for long-term, cooperative working relationships among the land grant institutions of the Pacific. At the present time, these land grant institutions are far from reaching the ultimate goal of raising their capabilities to a level where they require no special consideration.

The agricultural development in the American Pacific project is based on the premise that the region provides vital economic and strategic advantages to the United States; therefore, stability and growth of the economies in the region necessarily involve a planned and sustainable agriculture. I believe the land grant system plays a major role in assuring that the above occurs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to House Appropriations Committee Chairman, JAMIE WHITTEN of Mississippi, Representative MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio, and other distinguished Members of the Subcommittee on Rural Development, Agriculture and Related Agencies, whose support of the agricultural development in the American Pacific project has made a major difference in how the land grant system in the Pacific region has been able to respond to the critical agricultural and environmental issues.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2698, without reducing funding for this worthwhile program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs.

UNSOELD) having assumed the chair, Mr. HUGHES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2698) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 368, nays 48, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

YEAS—368

Abercrombie	Borski	Cox (IL)
Ackerman	Boucher	Coyne
Alexander	Boxer	Cramer
Allard	Brewster	Darden
Anderson	Brooks	Davis
Andrews (ME)	Browder	de la Garza
Andrews (NJ)	Brown	DeFazio
Andrews (TX)	Bruce	DeLauro
Annunzio	Bryant	DeLay
Anthony	Bustamante	Dellums
Applegate	Byron	Derrick
Atkins	Callahan	Dickinson
AuCoin	Camp	Dicks
Bacchus	Campbell (CO)	Dingell
Baker	Cardin	Dixon
Ballenger	Carper	Donnelly
Barnard	Carr	Dooley
Barrett	Chandler	Doolittle
Barton	Chapman	Dorgan (ND)
Bateman	Clement	Downey
Bennett	Clinger	Durbin
Bentley	Coble	Dwyer
Bereuter	Coleman (MO)	Dymally
Berman	Coleman (TX)	Early
Bevill	Collins (IL)	Eckart
Bilbray	Combest	Edwards (CA)
Bilirakis	Condit	Edwards (OK)
Billey	Conyers	Edwards (TX)
Boehlert	Cooper	Emerson
Boehner	Costello	Engel
Bonior	Coughlin	English

Erdreich	Lewis (GA)	Rinaldo
Espy	Lightfoot	Ritter
Evans	Lipinski	Roberts
Fascell	Livingston	Roe
Fazio	Long	Roemer
Feighan	Lowery (CA)	Rogers
Fields	Lowey (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Fish	Machtley	Rose
Flake	Manton	Rostenkowski
Foglietta	Markey	Rowland
Ford (MI)	Marlenee	Roybal
Frank (MA)	Martin	Sabo
Franks (CT)	Martinez	Sanders
Frost	Matsui	Sangmeister
Gallo	Mavroules	Sarpalius
Gaydos	Mazzoli	Savage
Gejdenson	McCandless	Sawyer
Gephardt	McCloskey	Saxton
Geren	McCrery	Schaefer
Gibbons	McCurdy	Scheuer
Gilchrest	McDade	Schiff
Gillmor	McDermott	Schulze
Gilman	McEwen	Shumer
Gingrich	McGrath	Serrano
Glickman	McHugh	Sharp
Gonzalez	McMillan (NC)	Shuster
Goodling	McMillen (MD)	Sikorski
Gordon	McNulty	Sisisky
Gradison	Meyers	Skaggs
Grandy	Mfume	Skeen
Green	Michel	Skelton
Guarini	Miller (CA)	Slattery
Gunderson	Miller (OH)	Slaughter (NY)
Hall (OH)	Miller (WA)	Slaughter (VA)
Hall (TX)	Mineta	Smith (IA)
Hamilton	Mink	Smith (NJ)
Hammerschmidt	Moakley	Smith (OR)
Harris	Molinari	Smith (TX)
Hastert	Mollohan	Snowe
Hatcher	Montgomery	Solarz
Hayes (IL)	Moody	Spence
Hefner	Moran	Spratt
Herger	Morella	Staggers
Hertel	Morrison	Stallings
Hoagland	Murphy	Stark
Hobson	Murtha	Stearns
Hochbrueckner	Myers	Stenholm
Holloway	Nagle	Stokes
Horn	Natcher	Studds
Horton	Neal (MA)	Swett
Houghton	Neal (NC)	Swift
Hoyer	Nichols	Synar
Hubbard	Nowak	Tallon
Huckaby	Nussle	Tanner
Hughes	Oakar	Tauzin
Hutto	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Hyde	Obey	Taylor (NC)
Inhofe	Olin	Thomas (CA)
Ireland	Oliver	Thomas (GA)
James	Ortiz	Thomas (WY)
Jefferson	Orton	Thornton
Jenkins	Owens (NY)	Torres
Johnson (CT)	Owens (UT)	Torricelli
Johnson (SD)	Oxley	Trafficant
Johnston	Panetta	Unsoeld
Jones (NC)	Parker	Upton
Jontz	Patterson	Valentine
Kanjorski	Paxon	Vander Jagt
Kaptur	Payne (NJ)	Vento
Kasich	Payne (VA)	Visclosky
Kennedy	Pelosi	Volkmer
Kennelly	Penny	Vucanovich
Kildee	Perkins	Walsh
Klecza	Peterson (FL)	Washington
Klug	Peterson (MN)	Waters
Kolbe	Pickett	Waxman
Kolter	Pickle	Weber
Kopetski	Porter	Weiss
Kostmayer	Poshard	Wheat
LaFalce	Price	Whitten
Lancaster	Pursell	Williams
Lantos	Quillen	Wilson
LaRocco	Rahall	Wise
Laughlin	Ramstad	Wolf
Leach	Rangel	Wolpe
Lehman (CA)	Ravenel	Wyden
Lehman (FL)	Ray	Wylie
Lent	Reed	Yates
Levin (MI)	Regula	Yatron
Levine (CA)	Richardson	Young (AK)
Lewis (CA)	Ridge	Young (FL)
Lewis (FL)	Riggs	

NAYS—48

Archer	Gekas	Pease
Armey	Goss	Petri
Bellenson	Hancock	Rohrabacher
Broomfield	Hansen	Roth
Bunning	Hefley	Roukema
Burton	Henry	Russo
Campbell (CA)	Hunter	Santorum
Cox (CA)	Jacobs	Schroeder
Crane	Johnson (TX)	Sensenbrenner
Cunningham	Kyl	Shaw
Dannemeyer	Lagomarsino	Shays
Dornan (CA)	Luken	Stump
Dreier	McCollum	Walker
Duncan	Moorhead	Weldon
Fawell	Packard	Zeliff
Galleghy	Pallone	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—16

Aspin	Hopkins	Solomon
Clay	Jones (GA)	Sundquist
Collins (MI)	Lloyd	Towns
Ford (TN)	Mrazek	Traxler
Gray	Rhodes	
Hayes (LA)	Smith (FL)	

Mrs. ROUKEMA changed her vote from "yea" to "nay".

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I take this time in order to ascertain the schedule for the week after the recess.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] to explain to Members the schedule that we may have coming back from the recess.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Obviously, today's business is finished, expeditiously, and there will not be votes on tomorrow or the next day. Of course, we are out for the week of the Fourth of July for a district work period.

On Monday, July 8, the House will not be in session. On Tuesday, July 9, the House will meet at noon to consider suspensions. Recorded votes will be postponed until Wednesday, July 10.

Wednesday, July 10, the House will meet at noon to consider three different proposals on the most-favored-nation status for China.

On Thursday, July 11, the House will again meet at noon to take up a number of different bills out of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

On Friday, July 12, the House will meet at 10 but there will not be legislative business.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. Just to reemphasize a couple of points that the gentleman has made, because there are somewhat different times than would be normal, if I understood the gentleman correctly, the House will meet at noon on Wednesday. That would be the first day we would have votes that week?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. And Members could expect possible votes on suspensions some time after noon that day; is that correct?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. And there would be then votes on the MFN bill that day?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. And then on Thursday, we would also meet at noon instead of the typical hour of 10 o'clock, and we would have votes that day on the bills of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, two, possibly three, bills; is that correct?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM JUNE 27, 1991, TO JULY 9, 1991, AND FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE FROM JUNE 28, JUNE 29, JUNE 30, JULY 1, OR JULY 2, 1991, TO JULY 8, 1991

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 175) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mrs. UNSOELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 175

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, June 27, 1991, it stand adjourned until noon on Tuesday, July 9, 1991, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Friday, June 28, 1991, Saturday, June 29, 1991, Sunday, June 30, 1991, Monday, July 1, 1991, or Tuesday, July 2, 1991, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon, or until such time as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to adjourn or recess, on Monday, July 8, 1991, or until noon on the second day after members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this resolution, whichever occurs first.*

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. GEPHARDT (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be

considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND THE MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR THE HOUSE, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, July 9, 1991, the Speaker and the minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 1991

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, July 10, 1991.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1940

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 183) to designate the second Sunday in October of 1991 as National Children's Day, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 183 to designate the second Sunday in October of 1991 as National Children's Day.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, first of all let me thank the chairman of the Census and Population Subcommittee, TOM SAWYER, and the rank-

ing minority member of the subcommittee, TOM RIDGE, for bringing this resolution to the floor today.

October 13, 1991 will mark our third observance of National Children's Day. Children's Day is a time to honor our kids, celebrate their many triumphs, listen to their hopes and concerns, and reflect for a moment on the world they are living in and the world we are leaving them.

Each year in America, we honor our mothers and fathers with special days that let them know how important their role is in this Nation and in each individual family. Children in America do not get this kind of recognition. By establishing a Children's Day, we will set aside one day a year, in the tradition of Mother's Day and Father's Day, which we place the same degree of honor on our children. During this day all children will be held up on a pedestal because of their contributions to their family and their community and because, we as a nation, truly recognize that they are our greatest natural resource. This is a day for families to spend time together. It is a day for communities and cities and States to recognize the accomplishments of children. It is also a time for us to take a closer look at how children are living in America.

Working with our Nation's Governors, we will bring young people to Washington from around the country who have participated in a variety of programs that have helped them make a difference in their lives or in the lives of others. These exceptional young people will spend a week here in Washington this October and tell their story in testimony before the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Family, in meetings at the White House and in conversations with their elected representatives in the House and the Senate. And if it's anything like the previous years, we'll learn from these kids. In the previous years, we've heard from a young girl from West Virginia who was fundraising for the homeless, a teenage boy from Boston who was volunteering his time helping the elderly and reading to preschoolers through the JFK Library Corps, and a teen mother from Alabama who graduated from high school with honors and is serving as a role model for others.

As much as I enjoy what takes place here in Washington, the real goal of National Children's Day is to have some sort of activity in every community in the country. We will be working with the 50 Governors, national school groups and national organizations like the Child Welfare League of America, the 4-H Clubs, Girl Scouts and parent-teacher organizations in hopes that every city and town will find their own way to honor their young people. This year, we are particularly fortunate to have singer and actress, Diana Ross as

the national spokesperson for 1991 National Children's Day to help us with our efforts.

The year 1991 will prove to be exciting for National Children's Day and I hope that we have the support and participation of each Member of Congress for the activities here in Washington and back in our home States. I urge my colleagues to vote for House Joint Resolution 183.

Madam Speaker, I want to again thank the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Indiana and my good friend from the State of Ohio for their help and support, and I appreciate the efforts they have made on behalf of National Children's Day.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H. J. RES. 183

Whereas the people of the United States should celebrate children as the most valuable asset of the Nation;

Whereas children represent the future, hope, and inspiration of the United States;

Whereas the children of the United States should not be allowed to feel that their ideas and dreams will be stifled because adults in the United States do not take time to listen;

Whereas many children face crises of grave proportions, especially as they enter adolescent years;

Whereas it is important for parents to spend time listening to their children on a daily basis;

Whereas modern societal and economic demands often pull the family apart;

Whereas encouragement should be given to families to set aside a special time for all family members to remain at home;

Whereas adults in the United States should have an opportunity to reminisce on their youth to recapture some of the fresh insight, innocence, and dreams that they may have lost through the years;

Whereas the designation of a day to commemorate the children of the United States will provide an opportunity to emphasize to children the importance of developing an ability to make the choices necessary to distance themselves from impropriety;

Whereas the designation of a day to commemorate the children of the Nation will emphasize to the people of the United States the importance of the role of the child within the family;

Whereas the people of the United States should emphasize to children the importance of family life, education, and spiritual qualities; and

Whereas parents, teachers, and community and religious leaders should celebrate the children of the United States, whose questions, laughter, and tears are important to the existence of the United States; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second Sunday in October of 1991 is designated as "National Children's Day", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people*

of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL AMERICAN INDIAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Services be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 182) to authorize and request the President to proclaim the month of November 1991 and thereafter as "National American Indian Heritage Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA], who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 182 designating the month of November 1991 and the month of November 1992 each as National American Indian Heritage Month.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support House Joint Resolution 182, a bill I introduced to designate the month of November as a time to honor American Indians of the past and present. National American Indian Heritage Month is a recognition to the foundation and development of America.

The bill would not be on the floor of the House today without the support of the chairman and ranking minority Members in the committee and subcommittee with jurisdiction. Chairman WILLIAM CLAY and THOMAS SAWYER and Congressman BEN GILMAN, and TOM RIDGE deserve our sincere thank you's for their continued support in honoring American Indians each year. The leadership of the Interior Committee is placing a new emphasis on issues relating to American Indians, and Chairman GEORGE MILLER and the ranking minority member, Congressman DON YOUNG, also deserve special recognition and appreciation.

I also want to thank my staff for their work in getting this bill ready for floor consideration. Miss Erlene Lesa, a junior at Brigham Young University, who worked as a summer interim out of my Washington office, has been invaluable in her thorough preparation and work in compiling lists of cosponsors. Ms. Lesa's draft of the special order I gave last night was excellent and the best I have seen from someone of her age. From my permanent staff, Ms. Merina Sunia deserves recognition for her continued administrative sup-

port, and my legislative director, Martin Yerick, for his coordination of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, House Joint Resolution 182 will not make up for the hardships suffered by the American Indians of the past or placate the Indians of the present and it does not presume to do so. As a nation, we have come to the point from which we must look past the accusations and do something more than merely acknowledge the atrocities endured by the American Indians. I believe that it is time to pay homage to a great and noble people who have contributed so much to the foundation and perpetuation of our country.

Madam Speaker, at its inception this country relied on the kindness of the native Americans to survive. We have all heard the history lesson about the assistance that the Indians gave the first Pilgrims. Once again I would like to remind my colleagues of the generous nature of the Indians in sharing their knowledge of fishing, hunting, and agriculture with the Pilgrims.

The Pilgrims celebrated and gave thanks with the Indians at the first Thanksgiving dinner. They celebrated the harvest together. Should it be so difficult for us to honor them?

Madam Speaker, the American Indians helped in America's victorious bid for freedom from Great Britain in the Revolutionary War. They used their knowledge of the terrain to help formulate tactical maneuvers and strategies. They led troops through the woodlands and forests; they brought food and medicine to the troops at Valley Forge; they taught the art of ambush that gave the American armies an extra element of surprise. The assistance of the Indians undoubtedly kept the war from being more tragic than has been recorded.

Many of the principles that this Nation is founded upon were used by the great Indian confederacies: Separation of powers, balance of powers, and government by representation were all incorporated in the Indian governments hundreds of years ago. The right to free speech and to peaceably assemble were held dear by the Indians. The Indians of the Iroquois confederacy recognized the wisdom in establishing unity and amity between five nations. They realized that strength and security came with such a union.

Madam Speaker, it is time that we give the native Americans credit for their democratic ideas. It is time that we honor them the way we honor the great thinkers of the enlightenment. It is time to credit them for having ideas parallel to the philosophies of John Locke and John Stuart Mill. Let us give them some measure of the homage we pay to the European and Greek philosophers who are hailed as the fathers of democracy.

It is time to recognize the American Indian contribution to defending these

great principles of freedom and democracy. The native Americans have answered the call to serve in defense of this Nation in countless numbers. Many of their young men have died to keep our flag flying. That flag has covered the caskets of many of our native sons who died to protect the land that once belonged to their forefathers. They died to defend the rights and freedoms that they held so dear in the hope that one day those rights and freedoms would be extended, without hesitation, to them.

Madam Speaker, I believe that now is the time to honor Indian heroes like Jack Montgomery and Ernest Childers, who were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor in Europe. It is time to honor Ira Hayes, who helped raise the flag at Iwo Jima, and Clarence Tinker, who died in the Pacific. It is time that our children learn of these American Indian heroes. It is time that they learn of the American Indian writers like Tony Hillerman, Louis Elrich, and Vine Deloria, Jr. It is time to honor their performers like dancer Maria Tallchief and actors Burt Reynolds, Bob Barker, Wayne Newton, James Garner, Jay Silverheels, and Will Rogers. It is time to honor athletes like Jim Thorpe, Sonny Sixkiller, and Billy Mills. It is time to recognize the achievements of political leaders like Charles Curtis, Larry Echohawk, and our own friend and colleague BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL.

Madam Speaker, by recognizing and honoring these native American role models we can provide the Indian youth of today with the inspiration that they need to rise out of the poverty that surrounds them. We can provide the American Indian youth with the sense of identity that they so desperately need. We can take the first step toward making this country one where our Indian brothers and sisters can feel accepted. We can create a society that is not constantly at odds with all that the Indians hold dear. It is time for us to take that step.

Through House Joint Resolution 182, a month will be set aside in each of the next 2 years specifically for the purpose of honoring not only the American Indian heroes but the American Indian people. We will be setting aside a time to show gratitude for all that we have received from them.

Madam Speaker, we can learn much from the humility of the native Americans. We would do well to emulate their reverence for life and their reverence for the Earth. Give them the chance to live in harmony with nature as they desire. Give them the chance to hope for a better future for their children. Give them the chance to save their great and noble culture that has been threatened for so many years. Give them the chance to live, secure in the knowledge that they have the same opportunities available to them that

other Americans do. We can take a step in this direction by designating a time to recognize their achievements. We can help them to hold on to their sense of pride in what they are.

The American Indian underrepresentation in institutions of higher education needs to be corrected. Their 43 percent high school graduation rate needs to change. Their 45 percent poverty rate and 35 percent unemployment rate need to be improved. We need to support and fund the tribally operated community colleges that exist now and create a university designed specifically to meet the needs of the native American youth. The American Indian plight in education is an issue that we can no longer afford to ignore.

As we approach the 500th anniversary of the arrival of Columbus in the New World, let us take this time to reflect upon our relationship with the native Americans. Let us set aside November as National American Indian Heritage Month. This year at Thanksgiving, we should do more than give thanks for all that we have. We should also give thanks to the forefathers of the American Indians for their assistance in making this country possible. We should give thanks to the native Americans for their significant part in the legacy that has become America.

Madam Speaker, we cannot let this legacy die. With our assistance the Indian Nation can once again flourish and continue to add to the richness of cultural diversity that America is so proud of.

□ 1950

Madam Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not express my deepest appreciation and gratitude to the 230 Members of this great institution who cosponsored this joint resolution. Indeed, without their support, this legislation could not have been considered today for final passage.

Madam Speaker, I also would like to thank the staff of the subcommittee of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], who has been so patient and diligent in seeing this bill does not run into any obstacle while under consideration by the House.

Madam Speaker, at this point I will submit for the RECORD a commentary written by a young senior at Annandale High School. The name of the senior is Erin Coward. It involves some of the research that Erin did concerning the American Indians. I thought it would be most provocative and certainly most interesting reading for my colleagues.

The article is as follows:

THE ADVANCEMENTS OF THE AMERICAN INDIANS

(By Ms. Erin Coward, Senior, Annandale High School)

Is it any wonder that the American Indian has more problems in today's society than any other minority? Unlike the blacks, the

Jews, and the Hispanics, the Indians have no homeland. Their homeland has been seized and turned backward by a foreign race—a race first determined to destroy the Indian culture, belief, and the very Indian way of life. Yet through determination and insurrection, many Indian cultures have regained not only their tribal lands, but also their Indian ethos.

In an effort to cloak the Indian problem, the U.S. Government set up several reservations throughout the United States, mostly in the west. The problem was not alleviated. There are presently 285 federal and state reservations in the US covering 50 million acres.<sup>1</sup> Of the 1,400,000 American Indians in America, one-half live on reservations.<sup>2</sup> The first was established in 1758 by the people of the New Jersey Colony.

Unfortunately, these reservations did nothing to help the Indian plight. Punitive laws were imposed on the already dying Indian culture in an effort to extinguish the Indian way of life forever. Even today the major problems faced by the reservation Indians are (a) lack of a well-developed economy, (b) poor living conditions with substandard and inadequate housing, (c) non-ownership of their lands and lack of freedom of self-government, and (d) schools which lack the tools and the culturally aware teachers who can help Indian children deal with the white society of today.

Through the hard work of the Indians and a newly concerned U.S. Government, reservations have been allowed to grow and to change for the better. The Indians working and living on the reservation have become a separate and industrious nation, using natural resources on which to base their economy. Most Indians on today's reservations have good farming and jewelry making skills.<sup>3</sup> Wood processing and native crafts encourage tourism. The money collected from these visitors may go to an individual person, such as a restaurant owner or jewelry maker, or to the budget to help keep up the Reservation.

Recently, the U.S. Government has also helped to improve the Indian's housing problems. During the 1960's the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) worked to help build low cost housing and to improve the living conditions on the reservation.<sup>4</sup> Mutual-help programs to help to meet the low-income needs of the Indians who desire home ownership.

The ownership of the reservation varies in different states. Some tribes have given full and complete ownership to the state they are in. Many tribes own their own reservations, but the Federal Government has a large influence over them. The government at first had the jurisdiction over crimes on the reservation due to the 1885 Major Crimes Act. This allowed the government to punish Indians for any crime committed.

EDUCATION

Education for Indian children has suffered both on and off the reservation. In racially mixed schools, the major problem is the cultural gap. Indian children hold a different set of standards and methods of reasoning from conventional Anglo ways of life. Indian parents teach their offspring to be passive, and to be true to one's own personal beliefs. Most Indian children are taught understanding through peace, thus they do not have the competitive skills necessary to succeed in the white/Indian mixed schools. Many teachers in mixed schools have had no cultural training and do not understand the Indian

way of learning. It is difficult, if not impossible for them to bridge the gap between the cultures.

The most recent advancements for Indian education have been in the mid to late '70's. In 1975 the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act facilitated the control of education programs by tribal groups. In 1978, the Indian Education Act pushed a large change in the Bureau's operation of both Bureau-operated and contact schools. This act resulted in formula funding for all Bureau-funded schools, decision making for the Indian school boards, and direct funding to the schools.

The latest great change occurred directly through the struggle of the Indians and their determined teachers. On a Yakima reservation in Washington State, disaster struck what had proven to be a beneficial educational program. In 1980, the Head Start program (a pre-school program which prepares deprived children for first grade) on the reservation came close to termination. Martha Yallup, the tribes Head Start programmer, and Sister Kathleen Ross, the academic vice president of Fort Wright College, refused to let their dream die. The two determined women fought to keep the program going—they succeeded in a matter of years. The school is now a strong success.<sup>5</sup>

The BIA has been a major funding source of education programs for Indian children three to four years old. The Bureau provides funding for supplemental educational programs. These programs include remedial tutoring, home and school coordinators, cultural enrichment, and pre-school programs. The Bureau also grants scholarships to worthy Indian students. Tribal Controlled Community Colleges are funded by the BIA if they pass the Bureau's criteria. Reservations on the Central Plains are given financial aid under a contract with the State to public schools.<sup>6</sup> Many students have problems in learning a second language, and in working and succeeding in a world so different from the one they are used to. To help conquer the problem, the Bureau has funded many Head Start programs for preschoolers to ease the transition from reservation life to the public school classroom. Students needing additional assistance or guidance enroll in a Bureau funded boarding school. Funds to aid needy public schools are funded by the BIA.

Other programs addressing the education problems of the Indians have been sporadically introduced. In 1919, a "civilization fund" was passed by Congress which appropriated \$10,000 annually to provide elementary education. All funds provided were channeled through religious and minor groups. The first Indian boarding school system was established in 1860 by the Federal Government. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 established institutions which offered help in vocational training, guidance, and financial assistance. Congressional Acts of 1896, 1897, and 1917, stopped the funds of the Federal government.<sup>7</sup>

#### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Economic Development for the Indian race has been a long, hard struggle. Only in the past 30 years has new ground been reached in improving this poorest minority in America. The major problem is that Indians reared in a total Indian environment often face employment problems caused by the juxtaposition of alien cultures.<sup>8</sup> As with education, many Indians find competing in a white society a losing battle. The Indians, taught different rules at home, are forced to play by white society's rules. The unemployment rate of the Indians stretches far beyond

that of other minorities. Most reservations lack a developed physical infrastructure including utilities, transportation and other public services. They also lack the regulatory, adjudicatory, and enforcement mechanisms needed to interact successfully with the white society.<sup>9</sup>

Fortunately, there has been much development upon the reservation. Tribes use natural resources such as timber, minerals, fishing, and energy help to spur the economic growth. Indian tribes and the nation together stand to gain from development and management of vast coal, oil, and uranium resources on the reservations. These resources can become foundations for economic development.

The BIA has repeatedly made extended efforts to alleviate Indian unemployment, through expanded programs in adult vocational education, industrial development on or near the reservations, and increased use of Indian labor. This labor includes road maintenance and instruction, repair and maintenance of buildings, and construction of buildings and utilities—all of which provided the Indians valuable construction training. Projects launched under the 1963 Accelerated Public Works Program on nearly 100 reservations provide useful work for thousands of tribal members and contribute importantly to the protection and development of timber stands and other physical resources. Together with Federal agencies, the Bureau has launched programs to step-up the pace on the economic development process on 39 Indian reservations and has waged a concentrated effort to stimulate economic and social change for the Indians. Programs for the disadvantaged, under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, have provided the Indians an opportunity to participate in and control their own programs.

#### GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Government Policies toward the Indians have improved immensely over the years. From the policies of the English colonies to the Red Power movement, the government has striven to improve the Indian problems. In 1755, the British developed an Indian policy designed to (1) protect the Indians from opportunistic traders and speculators; (2) negotiate boundary lines by treaties; (3) enlist the Indians to the side of the British in the French and Indian War; (4) exercise as much control as possible over the fur trade. These policies were primarily for the benefit of the British government, not for the protection of the Indian. The outbreak of hostilities between America and Britain caused a strenuous effort for Indian alliances by both the American and British governments. America tried to gain the much needed Indian friendship with treaties, but most tribes still supported the British. In 1775, the Continental congress named a Committee on Indian Affairs. The Indian Commissioners were given the authority to "Preserve peace and friendship with the Indians and prevent their taking part in the present commotions." During the Revolutionary War, Indian commissioners acted as diplomatic agents, trying to gain Indian allegiance.

The new American government also gave Indians mention in the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, states that the government has the power "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among several states, and with the Indian tribes."<sup>10</sup> This allowed the Indian nations to remain as separate powers, but open for treaties with the U.S. The government required treaties with Indian nations, to assist in control over public land. The 1968 Indian Bill of Rights provides that

Indian tribes exercising powers of self-government shall be subject to many of the same limitations and restraints which are imposed on Federal, State and local governments by the U.S. Constitution.<sup>11</sup>

The Federal Government has exercised power over the Indians for almost 200 years. This power is divided into three sources. First, the Constitution grants to the President and to Congress what have been construed as broad powers of authority over Indian affairs. Second, the federal courts have applied a theory of guardianship and wardship to the federal government's jurisdiction over Indian affairs. Finally, Federal authority is inherent in the Federal government's ownership of the land which Indian tribes occupy. Treaty agreements obligate the Federal government to provide social, medical, and educational services to many Indian tribes. Federal obligation also covers (1) protection of Indian trust property, (2) protection of the Indian right to self government, and (3) provision of those social, medical, and educational services for survival and advancement of Indian tribes.<sup>12</sup>

#### AMERICAN INDIANS TODAY

The Indian people themselves have made a quantum leap from the misconception of the dumb savage portrayed in the Old West. Since the 1924 American Indian Citizenship Act, Native Americans now hold federal and state offices, have the power to vote, serve in the Armed Forces, and have the right to own their own land.

Indians have the same rights as other American citizens to hold government office—many Indian men and women have held elective and appointive posts for years. Persons with Indian backgrounds were elected to Congress more than 60 years ago, and a number have served in state legislatures. Others have and presently are serving in elected or appointed positions in state judiciary systems, as well as in county and city government positions. Ben Rerfes, a Sioux Indian from South Dakota, served five terms in the House of Representatives, and Charles Curtis, a Kaw Indian, served as Vice President from 1929 to 1933.<sup>13</sup>

The Indian right to vote came slowly through each state. The voting right is on the same basis as the other American citizens of the respective state. Arizona gave the Indians the right to vote in 1948, after a long struggle and Constitutional battle. A 1953 Utah state law was only recently overturned, giving Indians the right to vote in national and state elections.

Indians follow the same laws and requirements for military services as all other citizens. In World War I more than 8,000 Indians served in the Army and Navy; 6,000 by voluntary enlistment. In World War II 25,000 Indian men and women served in the armed forces. They fought in Europe and Asia, winning a total of 71 Air Medals, 51 Silver Stars, 47 Bronze Stars, 34 Distinguished Flying Cross awards, and two Congressional Medals of Honor. The Navajo Marines used the native Navajo language as a battlefield radio communication code, unbreakable by the Japanese. Over 41,500 Indian people served in Vietnam.

Contrary to belief, Indians are not wards of the Federal Government, nor are special or automatic payments awarded persons of Indian descent. The federal government acts as a trustee of Indian property, not as a guardian. The Secretary of the Interior is required, by law, to protect the interest of minors and incompetents, but this does not confer a guardian-ward relationship. Indian tribes receive compensation for damage, for

losses which result from treaty violations, for encroachment on Indian lands, and for other wrongs. If the Indians are "treated differently" or have "special rights", these rights are based upon treaties and agreements between the United States and the Indians. The Indians have often paid a heavy price through the commission of lands to the governments for the rights they retained. These rights are part of the Indians heritage which they are entitled to keep in the same way that other peoples are entitled to keep lands or their goods which they inherit from ancestors.

Like all cultures and races, the American Indians have fought to keep all they practice and believe in. Although many of today's young Indians have developed Anglo ways, the Indian tribes have refused to give up their way of life.

In spite of the many advancements, this is still a dying culture. The American Indian problem is far from over. They are still the poorest minority in the United States. Only 43 percent of American Indians are graduating from high school. Forty-five percent live in poverty. The unemployment rate on most reservations is greater than 80 percent. While some reservations are prospering through the hard work of determined people, most consist of dirty little hovels with little or no sanitation.

As long as America pretends that the Indians are a race not deserving of our respect, their way of life will be in serious danger. These people need more help than a just a movie about one tribe, or colorful pamphlets. These people need the chance to build again, and help to defend their very existence. With the help of America, this noble race can again prosper.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> "The American Indian," *World Book Encyclopedia*, 1989, VIII, pp. 180-187

<sup>2</sup> "The American Indian," *World Book Encyclopedia*, 1989, VIII, pp. 180-187

<sup>3</sup> "The American Indian," *World Book Encyclopedia*, 1989, VIII, pp. 180-187

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Department of the Interior-Bureau of Indian Affairs, *Housing Program for Indians*, November 1979

<sup>5</sup> Ryan, Michael, "Don't Tell Us It Can't Be Done", *Parade Magazine*, 31 March 1991, pp. 18-19

<sup>6</sup> The Continental Congress named a Committee on Indian Affairs. This Committee separated the Indians into different regions of the United States.

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Department of the Interior-Bureau of Indian Affairs, *American Indian and Alaskan Education*, June 1987

<sup>8</sup> U.S. Department of the Interior-Bureau of Indian Affairs, *American Indian and Alaskan Education*, June 1987

<sup>9</sup> U.S. Department of the Interior-Bureau of Indian Affairs, *American Indian and Alaskan Education*, June 1987

<sup>10</sup> The United States Constitution

<sup>11</sup> Public Law 90-284; 25 U.S.C. et. seq.

<sup>12</sup> U.S. Department of the Interior-Bureau of Indian Affairs, *United States Commission on Civil Rights*, March 1973.

<sup>13</sup> Ross Swimmer, *The American Indian Today*, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, 1987.

Madam Speaker, I also insert at this point an article that appeared in the June 24, 1991, issue of Newsweek magazine. I commend the authors of the article and submit it at this point.

#### COLUMBUS, STAY HOME!

The executive director of the Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Jubilee Commission is picking his words carefully. "We don't call it a celebration," says James Kuhn. "We call it a commemoration." Of what? "Specifically the 500th anniversary of the voyages to the New World," he explains. Oh, Columbus' great discovery? No, says

Kuhn, "I refer to it as an 'encounter.' I may have even said discovery in the past but now I refer to it as an encounter."

With friends like these, Christopher Columbus is in for a bad year.

It didn't start out that way. The drums were in place for traditional ruffles and flourishes: replicas of the cockleshell caravels, museum exhibits, two Hollywood movies, a tide of academic books and articles. But somehow the hoopla curdled. Kuhn's Quincentenary Commission, funded partially by Congress, is trying to regroup after the resignation of its chairman and an investigation of its finances. Groups ranging from the National Council of Churches to the American Indian Movement have denounced the festivities. Museums that thought they had booked crowd-pleasing attractions now find themselves mired in controversy. When Atlanta's SciTrek museum opened an exhibit of a scale-model Niña last month, pickets paraded outside until officials agreed to add panels on the life and times of Native Americans. In Washington, the National Endowment for the Humanities took a look at a proposed television documentary, found scripts that painted the historic voyage and its aftermath as a genocidal campaign and canceled the federal funding.

In books and speeches, Columbus himself comes in for almost nothing but abuse. He is called a rapist and plunderer, a slave trader, a mass murderer comparable to Adolf Hitler and Pol Pot. Ecologist and historian Kirkpatrick Sale set the tone in his recent book on Columbus, "The Conquest of Paradise," denouncing the admiral for every sin but littering: lovelessness, avarice, duplicity, paranoia, ferocity and cruelty. Sale even accuses Columbus of being a "wretched mariner," heedless of his ships and reckless in challenging ill winds.

The problem is that Columbus did all those things—and more. "He was one of the most complicated personalities in the annals of history," says University of Georgia geographer Louis DeVorse, author of an upcoming guide to "Age of Discovery" research at the Library of Congress. In one bold stroke, Columbus changed the world, irrevocably linking the Old and the New. His were the quintessential voyages across uncharted waters, adventures that carried the imagination of Western man to the moon and beyond. The conquistadors followed in his wake; their journeys were the proximate cause of tragedy, most particularly the end of Aztec and Inca civilizations—millions died as their immune systems were overwhelmed by the diseases Europeans brought with them. The Spaniards didn't set out to wipe out the natives. Indeed their deaths were inconvenient, leading to another horror: the importing of African slaves to the Western Hemisphere.

Complicating matters further is that the attempt to assess Columbus and his proper place—shall we mourn, celebrate or both?—comes in the midst of an acrimonious debate in American intellectual life. This controversy pits those anxious to prove the evils of Eurocentric thinking and actions against those who treat all attacks on Western tradition as a threat to civilization itself. In the shorthand of the times, this is another example of the skirmishing called political correctness.

Discussion about Columbus has never been untroubled. He was a prickly character at best, enigmatic and often evasive; he spent his last years in failure and disgrace, ill and at least half mad. Within 50 years of his death, the revisionist friar Bartolomeo de las

Casas was writing eloquently of the atrocities committed under Columbus and his successors as governors. Indians were tortured and killed, hunted in the hills, fed to the white men's dogs. Millions died, mostly from smallpox, diphtheria and whooping cough. It was a cruel time.

But that's the point: even if Columbus set all that evil in motion, he can't be called the sole or even the chief villain. Latin American historian Dauril Alden of the University of Washington says that Columbus "was a product of his times." He was beastly to the Indians and beastly to his sailors. When he caught his men stealing gold, he ordered the amputation of their noses or ears. Moderns can look back at such behavior with revulsion; but applying a moral code that wasn't then in place doesn't help explain Columbus or put his actions in any sort of context. "Every generation," Alden says, "rethinks its historical past through a prism that reflects its own concerns. But I object to overloading Columbus with responsibility for everything that happened. He was interested in discovery, in wealth and prestige. He wasn't interested in genocide."

But context isn't everything; the Indians did die in appalling numbers. "He represents the worst of his era," says leading revisionist Jack Weatherford of Macalester College. "We should honor those who rise above their times." Some Native American groups have organized their own events. The newly formed 1992 Alliance has declared "The Year of the Indigenous People" beginning next January. More than 200 groups are planning native commemorations. In New York City, the Native American Council will hold a weeklong festival and sponsor an hour of silence on Oct. 12 to emphasize the environmental damage caused by Columbus's heirs. (Ecology was another cause unknown in Columbus's time.) These groups would also like to reverse the axiom that losers don't get to write history. Among other things, they're proposing model curricula, public service spots and consulting services that will carefully balance all public displays. "We don't want window dressing," says 1992 Alliance coordinator Suzan Harjo. "We want our views made prominent."

As long as a variety of views can be expressed, the debate over Columbus and his legacy may pay pedagogical dividends. Remember, this is a nation where the average eighth grader can't name the century in which the Civil War took place or find Mexico on a map with either hand. An enhanced appreciation of the multiple layers of history is a bonus. Indiana University professor Helen Nader, a past chair of the American Historical Association's Columbus committee, thinks that a good brawl will help her cause. "No cameras or reporters come when I give a lecture, but if somebody is protesting they do," she says. "The more statements, the more open discussion, the better."

In the end, we are left with the kind of question that might enliven a parlor game: is mankind better off because the Europeans settled the Americas or would things have been better if they had never come? It's 1992 and the Aztecs stand astride the hemisphere, handsome, proud and committed to their nasty habit of human sacrifice. In Europe, mature democracies might anguish over whether they should export their ideology to an indigenous people who obey totalitarian chiefs. Or maybe things would have worked out differently. It's been 500 years. Time enough to remember, as Princeton anthropologist Jorge Koor de Alva says, that

"we're descended from both sides, the conqueror and the conquered. This should be a time of great reflection." There is pride and sorrow enough for all.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the designation of November as "National Indian Heritage Month." This resolution would make November 1991 and 1992 months in which America would pause to reflect on the positive contributions of the original inhabitants of the United States.

From the time of the first contact with Europeans, the wisdom and accomplishments of American Indians have changed the world for the better. In agriculture, medicine, ecology, architecture, and government, Indian innovations contributed to the betterment of civilization. Such staples of the American diet as corn and beans were initially cultivated and harvested by tribes. Medicines including quinine were used by Indians before the coming of the Europeans. Significantly, the Iroquois Confederacy served as a model for our Federal system of government.

Such American heroes as Will Rogers and Jim Thorpe were of Indian descent and our heritage is enriched by other Indian people ranging from Black Elk, a philosopher, to Charles Bender, a baseball Hall of Fame pitcher, to Louis Ballard, a composer, to Charles Curtis, Vice President of the United States. There are so many tribes and individual Indian people who have contributed so much to this country, we certainly need to take at least a month each year to pay tribute to their contributions.

Mr. Speaker, in this body, we sometimes dwell on what is wrong in Indian country. We look at high rates of unemployment, disease, and social problems. There are problems which we must solve. However, a month in which we pay tribute to American Indians allows us to concentrate on what we have learned from these people, what they have contributed, and what is worth preserving. For those of us who deal in Indian affairs, enlightening the American people on the positive contributions of native Americans is of paramount concern. In November, we will point to what is right in Indian country and acknowledge the debt America owes to its Indian people.

It is my fondest hope that in November, Americans will consider the land under their feet, think about the Indian people who lived and died where there are now cities, and take into consideration the culture and wisdom of these great tribes. I hope that Americans will realize that these people are still here, preserving a way of life which this country once sought to destroy and should now be committed to protecting.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution and thank the gentleman from American Samoa for his hard work on this legislation.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 182

Whereas American Indians were the original inhabitants of the lands that now constitute the United States of America;

Whereas American Indians have made an essential and unique contribution to our Nation, not the least of which is contribution of most of the land which now comprises these United States.

Whereas American Indians have made essential contributions to the world, including prehistoric cultivation and harvesting of corn, squash, peppers, beans, and sweet potatoes, all of which have become mainstays of the American diet;

Whereas the people of the United States should be reminded of the assistance given to the early European visitors to North America by the ancestors of today's American Indians, including knowledge and training provided to the pilgrims in how to plant, fertilize, and cultivate corn, beans, squash, and tobacco; how and where to fish and hunt; how and where to tap maple syrup; and the location of the best routes west;

Whereas the people and Government of the United States should be reminded of the assistance given to this country's Founding Fathers by the ancestors of today's American Indians including the support the original inhabitants provided to George Washington and his troops during the winter of 1777-1778, which they spent in Valley Forge;

Whereas the people and Government of the United States should be reminded that certain concepts such as freedom of speech, the separation of powers in government, and the balance of power within government, all of which were found in the political systems of various American Indian nations, influenced the formulation of the Government of the United States of America;

Whereas the people and Government of the United States should be reminded of the advanced medicines used by American Indians prior to the arrival of Europeans, many of which are still in use today, including quinine for the cure of many ailments; hemlock and pine leaves as a source of Vitamin C to cure scurvy; coca leaves to reduce hunger, drowsiness, and thirst; curare, from the vine *Chondodendron*, as a fast-acting poison for arrow tips (now used as a muscle relaxant and for treating tetanus); and ipecac, from the root of *Cephalalis ipecacuanha*, to treat dysentery.

Whereas the people and Government of the United States should be reminded of the many words in the English language still in use today, including hickory, moose, racoon, caucus, tamarack, caribou, maize, canoe, chocolate, chill, pecan, coyote, hurricane, and possibly the expression O.K. (from the Choctaw "okeh");

Whereas the people and Government of the United States should be reminded of prominent American Indian performers, artisans and scholars, including Will Rogers, Jr., actor; Buffy Sainte-Marie, musician; Louis Ballard, composer; Black Elk, philosopher; and Vine Deloria, Jr., author.

Whereas the people and Government of the United States should be reminded of the benefits of conservation and reverence for the Earth and life practiced by American Indians for centuries and yet still disregarded many of us living today;

Whereas the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives believe that a resolution and proclamation of the nature requested in this resolution can encourage self-esteem, pride and self-awareness to young American Indians;

Whereas the approaching 500th anniversary of the arrival of Christopher Columbus to the

Western Hemisphere provides an opportunity for the people of the United States to consider and reflect on our Nation's current relationship with today's American Indians; and

Whereas the month of November concluded the traditional harvest season of the American Indians and was generally a time of celebration and giving thanks: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That beginning in 1991 and thereafter, the month of November is designated as "National American Indian Heritage Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon Federal, State, and local governments, interested groups and organizations, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SAWYER:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the month of November 1991, and the month of November 1992, are each designated as "National American Indian Heritage Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon Federal, State, and local governments, interested groups and organizations, and the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

Mr. SAWYER (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I offer an amendment to the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the preamble offered by Mr. SAWYER:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas American Indians were the original inhabitants of the lands that now constitute the United States;

Whereas American Indians have made an essential and unique contribution to our Nation, not the least of which is contribution of most of the land which now comprises the United States;

Whereas American Indians have made essential contributions to the world, including

prehistoric cultivation and harvesting of corn, squash, peppers, beans, and sweet potatoes, all of which have become mainstays of the American diet;

Whereas assistance was given to the early European visitors to North America by the ancestors of today's American Indians, including knowledge and training provided to the pilgrims in how to plant, fertilize, and cultivate corn, beans, squash, and tobacco, how and where to fish and hunt, how and where to tap maple syrup, and the location of the best routes west;

Whereas assistance given to this country's Founding Fathers by the ancestors of today's American Indians, including the support which the original inhabitants provided to George Washington and his troops during the winter of 1777-1778 in Valley Forge, and since that time American Indians have provided scouts and military service members to the United States for every major war in which the United States has fought;

Whereas certain concepts such as freedom of speech, and the separation of powers in government, both of which were found in the political systems of various American Indian nations, influenced the formation of the United States Government;

Whereas many of the advanced medicines used by American Indians prior to the arrival of Europeans are still in use today, including quinine for the cure of many ailments, hemlock and pine leaves as a source of vitamin C to cure scurvy, coca leaves to reduce hunger, drowsiness, and thirst, curare used as a fast-acting poison for arrow tips (now used as a muscle relaxant and for treating tetanus), and ipecac to treat dysentery;

Whereas many American Indian words are still in use today in the English language, including hickory, moose, racoon, caucus, tamarack, caribous, maize, canoe, chocolate, chili, pecan, coyote, hurricane, and possibly the expression O.K. (from the Choctaw "okeh");

Whereas the names of many States were derived from American Indian words, including Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Arizona, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, and Wyoming;

Whereas there are many contributions by prominent American Indian performers, artists and athletes, including Will Rogers, Jr., actor, Louis Ballard, composer, Charles A. "Chief" Bender, baseball Hall of Fame pitcher, Jim Thorpe, Olympic gold medalist in the decathlon and pentathlon and voted the greatest male athlete of the 1st half of the 20th century;

Whereas there are many American Indian scholars whose intellectual and philosophical contributions are deserving of national recognition, including Sealth, renowned chief and orator after whom the city of Seattle is named, Sequoyah, transcriber of the Cherokee language, Ella C. Deloria, anthropologist, linguist and novelist, Black Elk, philosopher, and D'Arcy McNichols, historian and anthropologist;

Whereas there were many Indians whose diverse contributions throughout history are also worthy of commendation, including Charles Curtis, 31st Vice President of the United States, Tecumseh, for his political, organizational abilities and his abilities as a military strategist, the Navaho code talkers of World War II, whose use of their native tongue and secret code words were never broken by enemy forces, Chief Joseph, as a ora-

tor and spokesman for Indian people, Sacajawea, guide and interpreter of the Lewis and Clark expedition, and Ely S. Parker, Civil War officer, military secretary to General Ulysses S. Grant, and the first Indian to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs;

Whereas the benefits of conservation and reverence for the earth and life practiced by American Indians for centuries are still important precepts in their traditional culture;

Whereas Congress believes that this joint resolution will encourage self-esteem, pride, and self-awareness in young American Indians;

Whereas the approaching 500th anniversary of the arrival of Christopher Columbus to the Western Hemisphere provides an opportunity for the people of the United States to consider and reflect on our Nation's current relationship with today's American Indians; and

Whereas the month of November concluded the traditional harvest season of the American Indians and was generally a time of celebration and giving thanks: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. SAWYER (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the preamble be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the preamble offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. SAWYER: Amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution designating the month of November 1991, and the month of November 1992, each as 'National American Indian Heritage Month'."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM MONTH

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 159) to designate the month of June 1991, as "National Forest System Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but would simply like

to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation.

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Indiana, and pause at this moment only to recognize that although virtually every sponsor of a commemorative resolution goes through a substantial process of collecting signatures for these resolutions, and in evidence of the support and extraordinary appeal throughout the House for this matter under consideration, I think it is appropriate at this time to make special recognition of the effort that was made by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. STALLINGS], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], in the course of just a very few hours, to collect the more than 218 signatures necessary for this timely legislation.

I genuinely recognize and admire the level of effort that was made on this particular resolution, and further, the broader effort that is made by every sponsor of such resolutions.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint Senate resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 159

Whereas 1991 marks the one hundredth anniversary of the National Forest System with the establishment of the first forest reserve in 1891, the Yellowstone Park Timber Land Reserve;

Whereas the establishment of this first forest reserve marked a fundamental change in United States conservation policy toward the administration of public lands;

Whereas the purpose of the National Forest System is to conserve a portion of America's forests for the people of the United States, recognizing the important environmental and economic values in holding such public lands in trust and managing them for the greatest good;

Whereas the National Forest System is one of the few examples in the world where a public effort is being made to manage natural resources in an economically efficient, environmentally sound, and socially responsible manner;

Whereas the National Forest System has introduced new ideas for sound resource management, such as multiple use, sustained yield, and preservation of both wilderness areas and wild and scenic rivers; and

Whereas the one hundred and ninety-one million acres of national forests, national grasslands, and experimental forests that now make up the National Forest System stretch from Alaska to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and from California to Maine: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the month of June 1991 is designated as "National Forest System Month", and the President is authorized

and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate activities and programs.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATIONAL LITERACY DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 259) designating July 2, 1991, as "National Literacy Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to my good friend from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], who is the chief sponsor of the resolution, designating a "National Literacy Day."

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, House Joint Resolution 259 will designate Tuesday, July 2, 1991 as "National Literacy Day". I would like to thank my colleagues for supporting this legislation for the past 5 years. Passage of this resolution will demonstrate congressional support for nationwide efforts to improve the plight of 30 million Americans who lack the basic skills to function in our society.

Illiteracy takes a painful toll, both in terms of its impact on individual lives and on our American society as a whole. The daily feelings of frustration and defeat that afflict those who cannot read signs, instructions, warning labels, or newspapers too often lead to escape through alcohol or drug abuse.

Presently, as we are struggling to remain competitive in world markets, we cannot afford the loss of productivity that the total cost of errors, accidents and missed opportunities in business has reached—a staggering \$225 billion annually.

Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate to have in our communities many dedicated volunteers and professionals who are working to remedy the problem of illiteracy. This is a chance to give them the recognition and encouragement they deserve.

As we approach the Fourth of July, Independence Day, let us also offer the hope of independence to the millions of our fellow citizens who are trapped in the prison of illiteracy. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for House Joint Resolution 259, to designate July 2, 1991, as National Literacy Day

□ 2000

We have accidents, missed opportunities in business, and it is estimated

that a staggering cost of \$225 billion annually is lost through this process.

Madam Speaker, we are fortunate to have in our communities many dedicated volunteers and professionals who are working diligently to remedy the problems of illiteracy. This is a chance to give them recognition and the encouragement that they all deserve.

As we approach the Fourth of July Independence Day, let us also offer the hope of independence to the millions of our fellow citizens who are trapped in the prisons of illiteracy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for House Joint Resolution 259, to designate July 2, 1991, as National Literacy Day.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, continuing my reservation and before I yield, I would like to yield to my colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], but before I do that, I notice that I am not among those on the bill that we are discussing as a cosponsor.

ADDITION OF NAME OF MEMBER AS SPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 259

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name added as a cosponsor of the legislation, House Joint Resolution 259, National Literacy Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, for this opportunity to rise in specific support of House Joint Resolution 259, designating July 2 as National Literacy Day.

We are no longer living in a time where a strong back and a good attitude are enough to live a secure and meaningful life and provide for one's family. Most jobs today, and many other parts of our daily lives, require us to learn and learn to use a great deal of information.

For between 30 and 75 million adults in this country, adapting to changes in the work force is simply not possible because, for a variety of reasons, they have never really mastered the basic skills. That is what functional illiteracy is: the inability to function productively using one's knowledge, and many people successfully hide this condition for their entire lives.

I believe that efforts like the resolution sponsored by my friend from New Jersey make it easier for adults who need help to make the decision to do it. Marking July 2d as National Literacy Day sends a signal that our Nation is committed to raising the literacy skills of all Americans.

I also want to let my colleagues know that the author of this resolution

has been instrumental in helping to advance my legislative proposal the National Literacy Act which passed the House in March, and will be approved by the Senate, I understand today or tomorrow.

National Literacy Day will help build awareness of what we need to do. We believe that the National Literacy Act will provide the tools we need to solve the problem by elevating the leadership role of the Federal Government, creating networks within States that will develop model literacy programs, and opening opportunities for groups at the local level to fight illiteracy in their communities. Schools, businesses, volunteers and civic leaders should combine resources, ideas, know-how, and good, old-fashioned elbow grease.

As our colleague may know, one of the 6 education goals is that every American will be literate by the year 2000, 9 years. If we are even going to approach achieving this goal, we have a lot of work to do. I appreciate the leadership on this issue provided by my colleague from New Jersey and I urge our colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 259.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I would just like to say before I withdraw my reservation of objection, that the world is getting smaller and smaller. If we are to continue to be a big factor in world economics and other areas, we are going to have to be a more literate nation, so I want to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] for his efforts in bringing this to the attention not only of this body, but to the country.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from the American Samoa.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I also would like to extend my appreciation and commendation to the gentleman from New Jersey for sponsoring this piece of legislation.

I think the question of literacy in America is certainly one of the most salient points and issues that not only is confronting Congress, but certainly all the leaders of our country.

I want to recognize the efforts of the gentleman from New Jersey for seeing that we pay more attention to this very important issue confronting the youth of America.

I just want to thank the gentleman from Indiana for giving me this time to say these words, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker I would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. PAYNE] for introducing this legislation and I would like to thank the distinguished chairman, Mr. SAWYER, the gentleman from Ohio, for his efforts in bringing this legislation to the floor.

As we all know, literacy is a vital attribute which millions of Americans are lacking. Conversely, one of our chief economic competitors, Japan, has a literacy rate of nearly 100 percent among its citizens over 17 years of age. Obviously our deprived work force is not up to par with our competitors. Billions of American dollars are lost annually due to the inability of some of our work force to read directions and solve problems which require reading and math skills. Millions of jobs cannot be attained due to a lack of these vital skills and the inability to complete application forms, one of the more significant reasons for our alarming number of unemployed citizens. It is our moral duty and obligation to emphasize and support the need for education and literacy in this country.

Too many people have lost hope for those adults who are illiterate. I have not lost hope and neither have those adults who are seeking an education. It should be the mission of this Congress to help supply those necessary tools which will enable them to find jobs.

The other half of this mission should be a preventive measure. Let us prevent the problem of illiteracy by providing and encouraging our bright, young children to start reading at an early age. Let us prevent more stories like that of Dexter Manley, the former Washington Redskin and current Phoenix Cardinal, who passed through a major university incapable of reading. But, as Mr. Manley proved, it is possible to educate the adults of this great Nation. It should be the goal of Congress to eliminate illiteracy from our vocabulary so that we never have to confront this problem again. Let us regain the edge we once possessed at all levels of our education system.

Accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation designating July 2, 1991 as "National Literacy Day." We need to create awareness of the extensiveness of the illiteracy problems and we need to emphasize the vital impact literacy can have on our lives.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 259

Whereas literacy is a necessary tool for survival in our society;

Whereas forty-two million Americans today read at a level which is less than necessary for full survival needs;

Whereas there are thirty million adults in the United States who cannot read, whose resources are left untapped, and who are unable to offer their full contribution to society;

Whereas illiteracy is growing rapidly, as two million three hundred thousand persons, including one million two hundred thousand legal and illegal immigrants, one million high school dropouts, and one hundred thousand refugees, are added to the pool of illiterates annually;

Whereas the annual cost of illiteracy to the United States in terms of welfare expenditures, crime, prison expenses, lost revenues, and industrial and military accidents has been estimated at \$225,000,000,000;

Whereas the competitiveness of the United States is eroded by the presence in the workplace of millions of Americans who are functionally or technologically illiterate;

Whereas there is a direct correlation between the number of illiterate adults unable to perform at the standard necessary for a available employment and the money allocated to child welfare and unemployment compensation;

Whereas the percentage of illiterates in proportion to population size is higher for blacks and Hispanics, resulting in increased economic and social discrimination against these minorities;

Whereas the prison population represents the single highest concentration of adult illiteracy;

Whereas one million children in the United States between the ages of twelve and seventeen cannot read above a third grade level, 13 per centum of all seventeen-year-olds are functionally illiterate, and 15 per centum of graduates of urban high schools read at less than a sixth grade level;

Whereas 85 per centum of the juveniles who appear in criminal court are functionally illiterate;

Whereas the 47 per centum illiteracy rate among black youths is expected to increase;

Whereas one-half of all heads of households cannot read past the eighth grade level and one-third of all mothers on welfare are functionally illiterate;

Whereas the cycle of illiteracy continues because the children of illiterate parents are often illiterate themselves because of the lack of support they receive from their home environment;

Whereas Federal, State, municipal, and private literacy programs have only been able to reach 5 per centum of the total illiterate population;

Whereas it is vital to call attention to the problem of illiteracy, to understand the severity of the problem and its detrimental effects on our society, and to reach those who are illiterate and unaware of the free services and help available to them; and

Whereas it is also necessary to recognize and thank the thousands of volunteers who are working to promote literacy and provide support to the millions of illiterates in need of assistance: Now, therefore, be it;

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That July 2, 1991, is designated as "National Literacy Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the several joint resolutions just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### VACATING SPECIAL ORDER, AND GRANTING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate my special order for 60 minutes that I have requested for today, and instead request 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

#### THE CIA DID NOT ASSASSINATE RAJIV GANDHI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House a very dismaying matter reported in the June 14, 1991, edition of the Washington Post. In a news analysis article, correspondent Steve Coll reported that, many in India's governing elite continue to believe—and to write in leading newspapers—that CIA agents probably organized the plot to kill Rajiv Gandhi. The article cites a bizarre Indian rationale for this fantastic theory. It refers to the views of well-educated Indians that "the CIA killed Gandhi because he was a strong leader who would have transformed India into a great world power that would have challenged the United States on the international stage." In fact, the Post report describes a lengthy article by Sudheendra Kulkarni in the Indian weekly Sunday Observer, which claims that it is "the desire of the industrialized world, particularly the United States, to ensure that India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh remain impoverished, weak, and unstable."

One hardly knows where to begin in addressing such a patently ridiculous and irresponsible assertion; however, even such ridiculous charges might be believed or be given some credibility in the absence of a denial. Therefore, the subject needs to be addressed and I will do so as a Member of the House Select Committee on Intelligence.

Resisting the obvious temptation to recommend a massive course of group psychotherapy for some of the Indian ruling elite, let me inject one or two important facts or elements for sanity into this febrile, paranoid delusion. First of all, assassination is specifically prohibited by a Presidential directive, Executive Order 12333, the primary Executive order governing U.S. intelligence activities. That absolute prohibition states:

No person employed by or acting on behalf of the United States shall engage in, or conspire to engage in, assassination.

This is not a new policy. In remarks delivered at Albany Law School on April 4, 1990, the then CIA General Counsel noted that in 1972, DCI Richard

Helms issued a policy memorandum for the Central Intelligence Agency prohibiting assassinations. Subsequently, President Ford issued Executive Order 11905, which prohibited any employee of the U.S. Government from engaging or conspiring to engage in political assassination. President Carter issued a superceding order, Executive Order 12036, which first contained the specific language currently in Executive Order 12333, issued by President Reagan and continued in force by President Bush.

Not only is this assassination ban firmly established, but covert actions, the category of intelligence activities in which any questions about assassination conceivably could arise, are carefully reviewed by compliance with law and regulation, including the assassination ban. They are reviewed within the CIA and at the sub-Cabinet and Cabinet level in the NSC review process. The President himself is usually present during the Cabinet-level NSC review. Ultimately, the President must approve every covert action because he must sign a written finding certifying that each covert action is important to the national security of the United States. So, he is required to know if any covert action raises any questions or concerns related to the assassination ban. As a result of this ban on assassinations, the executive branch of the U.S. Government does not directly or indirectly assassinate people.

Finally, the House and Senate Intelligence Committees scrupulously review each covert action authorized by the President. As a member of the House Intelligence Committee, I can assure the House that we are particularly careful to assure ourselves that these covert programs and activities do not involve assassination by direct or by any indirect means. That is why I was especially struck by the preposterous assertion in this news report that the CIA was somehow behind the tragic death of Rajiv Gandhi.

Second, the rationale cited to explain why we should want to see Mr. Gandhi dead is totally inconsistent with the facts and with rational thought. Far from wanting to destabilize India and see it perpetually locked in poverty, United States policies and programs are directed toward helping India achieve just the opposite. Both the executive branch and Congress have long supported a policy of trying to promote stability in the Indian subcontinent. In particular, we hope to see normal and stable relations between India and Pakistan to avoid another outbreak of armed conflict between the two—and to improve Indian-American relations as well. Many are concerned that such a conflict might possible witness the first exchange of nuclear weapons on the Indian subcontinent. Moreover, rather than wishing to see India poor and starving, we have long provided foreign aid to India; we want India and

its people to prosper. Since the partition of India and Pakistan, the United States has provided India with nearly \$12 billion in foreign assistance. Almost 99 percent of that has been food aid and economic development assistance.

Perhaps, regrettably, India's ruling elite will continue to ignore these facts. Perhaps, as the Washington Post reporter suggested, these absurd allegations of CIA involvement in the assassination of Mr. Gandhi are actually meant to distract the attention of the Indian people from holding their leadership elite accountable as he puts it, for "the mess India is in." In any event, I bring this matter up today because I want the people of India to know the facts behind this cynical fable and to have those assurances from a member of the House Select Committee on Intelligence.

I hope the Indian people learn these facts and this assurance, for they are the whole truth and nothing but the truth. The United States of America had no direct or indirect role in the assassination of Rajiv Gandhi. Our Government and the American people deplore this terrible act and share the grief of the people of India over this tragic and senseless act.

□ 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore, [Mrs. UNSOELD]. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Speaker, today the House passed the HHS appropriation, and I reluctantly voted for it. I did so reluctantly because I believe the programs that are so desperately needed by our most vulnerable citizens were so woefully underfunded.

Madam Speaker, over the past 10 years that I have been here I have heard about the need to provide a safety net for those Americans who, through no fault of their own, have become victims of recession or those who have fallen into poverty because of underemployment or unemployment. And a number of us have pledged support to those victims and support the programs like LIHEAP, which assists low-income Americans and our elderly, who live on minimal fixed incomes, to meet their home energy needs.

Madam Speaker, the Older Americans Act, which provides nutritional and other vital services to our hungry and isolated elderly, is another program that is worthy of our support and is dramatically underfunded.

Affordable child care programs that allow low-income parents the opportunity to become self-sufficient are in desperate need of support. Drug education and prevention programs are a vital part of gang eradication and should be a high priority for funds. The Stewart McKinney Homeless Assist-

ance Act, refugee aid, and a number of other vital services that provide support for those persons traditionally the first victims of recession—the poor—are all programs that are reaching a small percentage of the eligible populations and need additional funds.

Unfortunately, when it came time to provide sufficient dollars to fund these vital programs, we have had to rob Peter to pay Paul, having to decide which program is more vital than the other, funding one program on the back of another.

Just 4 months ago we were—and still are—celebrating our great victory over Saddam Hussein. But what about the war here in the United States? The war against poverty, drugs, teenage pregnancy, illiteracy, and unemployment. We fought Saddam Hussein because he was an oppressor. An oppressor of not only the people of Kuwait but of his own people.

Let me tell you, there is nothing more oppressive than poverty. Than despair. Than waking up each day knowing that your survival that day and the next depends on someone else's compassion and charity.

I think that those of us who just stand idly by and give lip service support for these programs, but do not stand firm on the need to provide the funds necessary to adequately serve our fellow Americans, are not being completely sincere when they speak of protection of our most vulnerable citizens.

Madam Speaker, I understand that the decisions on how to spread our limited resources have been difficult. My objection is not with the decisions made by my worthy colleagues, given the limitations that bound them. My objection is with the fact that in a world of priorities, our overall domestic budget that protects the most vulnerable in our great Nation—the youngest, the oldest, and the poorest—is not the highest priority.

I call upon my colleagues in conference to provide adequate funding for those programs that will provide self-sufficiency for the poor of our Nation and adequate funding that will break the bonds of poverty forever. And I call for all of us to make a sincere commitment to our citizens—our families and our future—especially those who need it the most—those born into poverty.

#### REMEMBER THE BATTLE OF KOSOVO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Madam Speaker, June 28 marks the 602d anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo, an armed struggle in which thousands of Serbian patriots laid down their lives rather than surrender to the Ottoman Empire.

Although these brave, Serbian fighters were overwhelmed by a larger Turkish force, they showed an unmatched determination to defend their homeland and their right to self-determination.

The battle we are commemorating today was waged on the Plain of Kosovo, in an area known as the "Field of Blackbirds." The fighting began on July 15, 1389, under the Julian calendar, when Turkish troops launched a surprise attack.

Prince Lazar, the czar of Serbia, led an army of 25,000 troops into this battle in which the Serbs endured repeated blows from Turkish forces led by Murad I. The Turks prevailed despite Lazar's skillful leadership and the determined resistance of the Serbians. The battle claimed the life of Murad, who was assassinated on the eve of the attack by the Serbian patriot, Milosh Obilich. After the battle, Lazar was executed by the Turks.

Lazar's martyrdom to the Ottoman conquerors gave rise to a national legend. According to this tradition, Lazar was visited by the prophet Ezekiel, who offered Lazar a choice between heaven or earth. Lazar sacrificed his country so that the Serbians would be rewarded in heaven. The legend of Lazar's Christian sacrifice stands as a symbol of how Serbian nationalism endured nearly five centuries of harsh, Turkish rule. The Ottoman Empire had actually begun its conquest of Serbia several years before the Battle of Kosovo, when Turkish troops attacked near the Maritsa River in 1371.

Throughout the occupation, the Serbians drew strength from the Serbian Orthodox Church, which helped them to maintain a sense of national identity amid foreign oppression. Efforts to support Serbian nationalism included yearly pilgrimages to Lazar's tomb in the main Orthodox Cathedral at Belgrade. These visits renewed the Serbians' longing for freedom by giving them an opportunity to remember the Battle of Kosovo.

In the early 1800's, a new generation of Serbian patriots rose up to remove the yoke of Turkish rule. The Serbian people finally avenged the killing fields of Kosovo and their ravaged homeland by breaking away from the Ottoman Empire in 1833.

Madam Speaker, I would like to join with the Serbian people in remembering the anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo and their struggle for freedom. I also would like to offer a special greeting to Americans of Serbian descent from the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, which I am proud to represent.

Finally, in light of Tuesday's declaration of independence by Croatia and Slovenia, I urge the people of Serbia to negotiate a peaceful settlement of their differences with these neighboring, Yugoslav republics. I pray that the Serbs will apply the same dedication to this task as they did when they fought for human rights and self-determination after the Battle of Kosovo.

MAJ. GEN. ARTHUR H. HUTTON,  
USAFR

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, over the last 7 years, there has been only one Air Force Reserve Mobilization Assistant to the Director of Legislative Liaison for the U.S. Air

Force. During that time, Maj. Gen. Arthur H. Hutton has provided superb advice and expertise on all Reserve issues. On June 30, he culminates a distinguished 37-year career as an active duty and Reserve officer of the U.S. Air Force.

I would like to take this opportunity, upon Art Hutton's retirement, to thank him for effective, dedicated, and distinguished service to his country, the Air Force, and the Air Force Reserve. General Hutton's career has spanned a diverse range of responsibilities. While on active duty, he served in the missile field at Cape Canaveral and in Germany in the 1950's. He went on to Reserve assignments in air defense, with the Judge Advocate General, with Systems Command, and finally in legislative liaison.

Art Hutton built a very successful career in civil aviation, including senior positions at Pan Am and the presidency of World Airways. He brought that management skill and aviation expertise to his Reserve assignments, enriching the organizations to which he has been assigned. His distinguished career acts as an ideal example of the benefits we derive from having outstanding, accomplished civilian leaders as strong members of our Reserve forces.

Mr. Speaker, we are entering times of great change in the Department of Defense. As a result of projected force reductions, our relative reliance on Reserve components will be greater in the future. We can be reassured about these changes when we see the kind of men and women we have in the Reserves. Certainly Art Hutton personifies the quality, dedication, and mission effectiveness we have come to expect from the Air Force Reserve.

We thank Gen. Art Hutton for his service and wish him the very best in his retirement.

□ 2020

#### STAND UP AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Old Glory celebrated her 214th birthday earlier this month and this past year has exemplified once again just how important she is to this country and to the cause of freedom around the world.

Last Friday marked the second anniversary of the controversial Supreme Court decision protecting those who would desecrate our flag and reminding us that, as grave an undertaking as it is, a constitutional amendment appears to be the only way to ensure Old Glory's protection.

For this reason I am reintroducing today my bill which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the act of desecration of the flag of the United States and to set criminal penalties for that act. I ask Congress to have faith in the American people and to pass this bill expeditiously and send it to the States for their approval.

Our flag is a stirring, vibrant reminder of all that our nation stands for

and it is certainly deserving of our protection. I trust that you, like I, envision a mental picture of Old Glory when you hear Lee Greenwood's popular lyrics:

I'm proud to be an American  
where at least I know I'm free  
And I'd like to thank the ones who died  
who gave that right to me.  
And I'd gladly stand up, next to you  
and defend her, still, today.  
There ain't no doubt, I love this land.  
God Bless the USA

Let us not let that mental picture be marred by those that would choose to denigrate this most important symbol.

#### NCAA ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS REFORMS NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, the NCAA President's Committee is concluding a 2-day meeting at which it will decide on academic reforms for student athletes. Among the proposals are an increase in initial eligibility requirements, a requirement that junior college transferees first complete 12 hours of credits at the new school before becoming eligible, and continuing eligibility requirements to ensure that the student athlete is on a track to graduate.

Last week, Madam Speaker, the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection, and Competitiveness, which I chair, began the first in a series of hearings into intercollegiate athletics. The subcommittee received testimony from the Knight Commission, a college president, coaches, and other experts in the field.

Nearly every observer of collegiate sports has found a system that is rapidly getting out of control. What began as a high-spirited complement to college academic has now become an increasingly dominating force at universities. College sports have become big business.

The victims of this transformation, Madam Speaker, are inevitably the student athletes. Athletic seasons are stretched, corners are cut, and academics take a back seat to the drive for a championship. Student athletes are under increasing pressures, recruitment and academic standards are compromised, and the result is low graduation rates, failed promises, the diminution of self-esteem and crushed hopes.

The Knight Commission, in its recent review of college sports, concluded \* \* \* that abuses, and I am quoting now—

\* \* \* are grounded in institutional indifference, presidential neglect and the growing commercialization of sport combined with the urge to win at all costs.

The saddest victims of course come from the poorest neighborhoods in our

country. Lured by dreams of being the next Michael Jordan, many leave their university after 4 or 5 years unemployable and, in many instances, without a decent education.

Madam Speaker, that has become the focus of our subcommittee's investigation: Do college athletics provide an avenue for our young people, particularly our poor children, to get a decent education at a good university, or do college athletics at this time merely exploit the athlete?

I asked one of the witnesses at our recent hearing how coaches and athletic departments view the students when they come to them. His response was that they are looked upon as meat, not as students who are to be educated, not as young people who have been placed in their care by their parents, and not even as human beings. Instead they are regarded, in the words of our witness who was in academia, as meat. What a sad, disgraceful commentary on the lack of esteem, the lack of understanding, the lack of concern, and the lack of fairness with which our young people are being regarded when they are in the sports athletic programs in these various universities.

Now the reason for this sorry state of affairs is obvious to all of us: the almighty dollar, money. There have always been alumni booster groups who put pressures on schools to win, but in the 1980's and 1990's commercial revenues from college sports place enormous new pressures upon schools to win. Presidents of schools that win get millions of dollars in endowments, and the coaches really make it big. They reap enormous benefits and pocket all kinds of dollars in endorsements. The only group that gets shortchanged at all is the student group of athletes. It is this kind of pressure on presidents and coaches that results in recruiting violations and abuses, the abandonment of academic integrity and the railroading of poor inner-city youth through the institution leaving them with few, if any, marketable skills and often with very little, if any, education.

During the 1980's, over half of all Division A schools were the subject of various NCAA sanctions, and I would ask, "Who do you think the sanctions really hurt?" Got that right; most of the time when sanctions are applied the victims are once again the innocent student.

For example, some time ago sanctions were made against UNLV's basketball team. That means that next year that school will be penalized. Those students who are going to be the athletes and playing for that school were infants when 15 years ago those infractions occurred. This after-the-fact penalizing of students, not the cheaters, occurs in schools, after school, after school.

I ask my colleagues: Is that fair? Is it fair to make a young person who is in the athletic department suffer for something that happened 15 years ago when he was 2 or 3 years old? Certainly the answer has to be no.

It is indeed ironic that the large sports contracts of recent years have not really benefited collegiate sport programs or even academic programs. Rather it appears that they have led to a host of new problems in college athletic programs, period.

Madam Speaker, at our hearing I urged university presidents to heed the advice of the Knight Commission and retake control of their schools. Our subcommittee stands ready to help that happen, and I am pleased that the NCAA presidents committee appears to be responding to the concerns that we expressed at our hearing last week, and I hope that our continuing hearings will keep up the pressure for academic reforms. Future hearings, including one next month, will review such issues as graduation rates, eligibility and academic requirements, the distribution and use of sports revenues, impacts on minority students and historically black institutions, and the treatment of women in sports. Our intention is to assist, not interfere with, efforts by university presidents to regain control of intercollegiate athletics, to eliminate cheating, and to restore universities to their function as educators, not as stables for meat.

□ 2030

#### KIMBERLY BERGALIS PATIENTS AND HEALTH PROVIDERS PROTECTION ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, for the benefit of those at the desk, I am not going to take the whole 60 minutes, so we will not be here too long. I felt compelled, since this is the last day before the break, to take just a few minutes about a very, very important issue, and a very, very important young American lady who is dying this evening named Kimberly Bergalis.

A lot of people in this country do not know who Kimberly Bergalis is, but she is the young lady who is a beautiful, vibrant young American, very pretty. I have seen pictures of her in her earlier days.

She went to her dentist, a Dr. Acer, who had known for 3 months that he was dying of AIDS. He had full-blown AIDS. He had lesions on his arms that were dripping, and yet this man continued to perform oral surgery in his practice without his patients knowing about it.

Kimberly Bergalis went to this dentist. He extracted I believe two teeth, and later on she found out, along with

four or five other patients of Dr. Acer when he died, that she had been exposed to the AIDS virus. After having been tested, she found out she in fact did have the AIDS virus.

Today, the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] sponsored a piece of legislation, of which I am co-sponsor, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] and a number of other Members, and it is called the Kimberly Bergalis Patient and Health Providers Protection Act of 1991.

That legislation would mandate that health-care professionals, doctors, dentists, and other health-care professionals who are in the business of providing for the health and protection of the people of this country, be tested, mandated to be tested on a regular basis, and, if they test positive for the AIDS virus or for hepatitis-B, they would be mandated by this law to tell their patients if they are infected so the patient can make a decision on whether or not they want that professional to work on them.

If the patient then decides, after having been warned that the health care professional has the AIDS virus, they would have to give written consent to that doctor, dentist, or health care professional, before they could be worked on by that individual.

Conversely, it also gives doctors, dentists, and other health care professionals, the right to ask a patient to be tested before they perform invasive procedures on that patient.

Madam Speaker, I think this is a commonsense approach to health care. About 5 years ago I stood in this well and started talking about the problem of AIDS being the biggest pandemic to face mankind since the 13th and 14th centuries, when the bubonic plague wiped out half of Europe.

I said at that time that we, as a body, this Congress of the United States, needed to have a comprehensive program to deal with this pandemic. We needed to have education, to be sure. But in addition, we needed to have a testing program for everybody in this country from the age of about 10 to 65. Hopefully, that would cover the spectrum of those who would be at risk.

In addition to testing, we needed to have contact tracing, to find out if people who have active AIDS and who are informed of it continue to spread the disease, thus killing innocent human beings when they know that they had the AIDS virus.

We needed to have psychological help for those who found out that they had the AIDS virus, so they could learn how to deal with it. Finally, we needed to have severe penalties, including extricating people from society who had the AIDS virus and went around spreading it, knowing they were doing it, because those people are more of a threat than a man walking into a bank

with a gun, because they are in effect killing human beings, and it is a much more horrible death than if you shoot somebody.

So I think this bill that we are sponsoring and cosponsoring today, the bill of the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER], is extremely important.

Madam Speaker, over 90 percent of Americans in a poll that was recently conducted agree. There was a poll conducted just this past week asking Americans whether or not they thought their health care provider, dentist, doctor, or health care worker, should let them know if they are infected with the AIDS virus or hepatitis-B before they work on them. Ninety-five percent said that surgeons should let them know; 94 percent said that dentists should let them know; and 90 percent said that all health care workers should let them know before they work on them.

So overwhelmingly the American people want to know if somebody working on them, doing invasive procedures, have the AIDS virus, so they can protect themselves and/or their families.

Madam Speaker, I want to read into the RECORD an article that was written by David Zeman of the Miami Herald about Kimberly Bergalis. This article ought to be read by every single American, because it is so important that they understand what we are up against.

Madam Speaker, I quote:

Here are two things you have never seen in AIDS victim Kimberly Bergalis.

Her anger: "Do I blame myself? I sure don't. . . . I blame (dentist David) Acer and every single one of you b-----. Anyone that knew Dr. Acer was infected and had full-blown AIDS and stood by not doing a damn thing about it. You are all just as guilty as he was."

Her pain: "I have lived to see my hair fall out, my body lose over 40 pounds, blisters on my sides. I've lived to go through nausea and vomiting, continual night sweats, chronic fevers of 103-104 that don't go away anymore. I have cramping and diarrhea. . . . I have lived through the torturous acne that infested my face and neck—brought on by AZT."

Bergalis, 23, is no longer the delicate but beautiful young woman who appeared on national talk shows or stood bravely on windswept beaches. That was months ago, when she was the strong, mature-beyond-her-years college grad who contracted AIDS from her dentist during a 1987 office visit.

Now she spends her days in agony, drifting in and out of consciousness. Her wasted body resembles a jumble of broken match sticks. She weighs maybe 70 pounds. She hasn't eaten solid foods in two months. She must be carried to the toilet. A rust-colored paste cakes her tongue like broken concrete on a sidewalk.

"She'd like to die," says her father, George Bergalis. "That's foremost in her mind. She just continually questions why God hasn't taken her yet. Death, as far as she's concerned, will be a relief."

"We don't pray for miracles anymore. We pray for her to pass on as quickly and as painlessly as possible."

But before she dies, she desperately wants you to see her. To see AIDS.

"People never saw the down side of her condition," says her father. "This is the real AIDS, the way people really get. It's not a pretty picture."

Kimberly can barely talk now. She makes sounds, but her mouth cannot form shapes. Her words above are from a letter she wrote April 6 to Nikki Economou, an investigator with the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services. It is an extraordinary, and bitter, account of her body's destruction. Is she glad she wrote it?

"Yes," she said Wednesday, her blue eyes sharp against her sunken face. "Very happy."

"It's the first time she came out and expressed anger," said her father. "She was keeping that inside."

In September 1987, Stuart dentist David Acer was diagnosed as having full-blown AIDS. Three months later, Bergalis, a University of Florida student, entered his office to have some molars extracted.

It would take two years before Bergalis, then 21, also was diagnosed with AIDS. Last August, she learned from the National Centers for Disease Control that Acer (who would die one month later) was the source. It was the first time a patient ever had contracted AIDS from a doctor.

Bergalis sat down with her family and attorney Bob Montgomery and charted their options. Together, they decided she would go public; she would devote the time she had left to lobby for mandatory AIDS testing for health care workers and full disclosure of AIDS status between doctors and patients.

"She's going to be in every history book written from now on," said Barbara Webb, a 65-year-old retired schoolteacher and one of the four other Acer patients who tested positive for the virus.

"She is the prime inspiration for the movement toward mandatory testing."

□ 2040

Think about how those other four people must feel, knowing that they have AIDS and are destined to die because of this doctor.

It is a movement that has drawn significant opposition from the medical establishment. In January both the American Medical Association and the American Dental Association added new guidelines asking physicians infected with AIDS virus to either stop performing invasive medical procedures or disclose their HIV status to patients.

However, neither the State nor the national organization has recommended mandatory testing or disclosure for doctors with AIDS.

"AIDS is a confidential disease," said Dr. James Howell, District Director of the AIDS program for the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services.

He said that "State regulatory boards are in the process of setting new standards for reporting infectious diseases." He declined to discuss the Bergalis letter. "It is a hell of a way to die," he said.

But they still have not come out four-square in favor of mandatory testing for health care professionals or also letting patients know about it and we, every one of us who goes to a doctor or a dentist or health care professional, have the right to know because our lives are at risk.

Kimberly Bergalis agrees. "Do you know what it is like to look at yourself in a full-

length mirror before you shower and see only a skeleton," she wrote in a letter. "Do you know what I did? I slid to the floor and I cried. Now I shower with a blanket over the mirror."

Meanwhile her family, her parents and her sisters, 19-year-old Allison and Sondra, 11, are determined to carry on as normally as possible. "We are not about to maintain a death vigil," said George Bergalis. "We are not going to gather around her bed and wait for her to die."

This is a very brave family, and she is a very brave young lady.

There was a P.S. to that letter that she wrote, and I think everybody in this country ought to know what that P.S. says. She said, "If laws are not formed to provide protection, then my suffering and death was in vain."

She knows what it is like. She knows what it means to go in to a person in whom you have confidence and get a death-dealing blow.

Dr. Acer knew that he had AIDS, not just the AIDS virus but he had active AIDS. He had lesions on his body and knew he was terminally ill, yet he continued to perform invasive procedures on patients, and he has killed five of them and there may be others that test positive down the road, we don't know.

So I commend my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER], for his legislation. I am going to work very hard to help get that passed, and I will continue to come to this well in the next few months informing my colleagues and anyone else who cares to listen about the erroneous information that is being given out through this country and by the media about there not being much of a danger to them from the AIDS virus from various modes of possible transmission.

I would like to also say that we must, as a Congress and as a Nation, come to grips with this. We need a program that is comprehensive to find out how AIDS is being spread, where it is spreading and how rapidly it is spreading.

The only way that is going to occur is for Congress to pass legislation mandating testing on a routine basis for everybody, contact tracing if people who have the disease and know it continue to spread it, education, psychological training for those who have it. And we need to protect their benefits.

We do not want to see discrimination. We need to protect their health care benefits and if possible their jobs, make sure their civil rights are not violated. We need to treat this as a health care issue, not as a civil rights issue, because the health of the Nation is at risk.

For those who continue to spread AIDS after they know they have it, like Dr. Acer, there needs to be penalties for that. They need to be extracted from society or they need to suffer severe penalties for their actions. There needs to be consequences for actions like Dr. Acer has per-

petrated upon those five individuals and particularly Kimberly Bergalis.

I would just like to end up before I yield to my colleague from California, Mr. DORNAN, by saying to Kimberly Bergalis, God bless you, young lady. Everybody in this country is thinking about you and many of us in Congress are going to work day and night to try to get the Kimberly Bergalis Patient and Health Providers Protection Act of 1991 passed so your dying will not be in vain.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Well, DANNY boy, my distinguished colleague from the great State of Indiana, you are to be honored again for taking out this special order and showing your steadfastness over the years. It is actually almost 6 years now since you and I and Mr. DANNEMEYER and maybe one or two others started to speak out regularly about what the proper health procedures were to approach this always fatal venereal disease that we predicted years ago by believing the statisticians at the Centers for Disease Control and the Institutes for National Health.

I took my wife Sally to the World Health Organization in Geneva to talk to a Dr. Jonathan Mann and Dr. James Chin, and all the statistics that they gave us, although we had a different approach as to what to do about it, they have all come through. There is going to be 15 million people die. That is 5 million more than World War I in the next 10 or 12 years.

In the United States we are going to see a million people die of this in the next 10 years.

One of the things that I have said in that well, and only you and a handful of others have even listened, let alone done anything about it, is that if a person is told by a doctor they have manifested AIDS, that the HIV virus has now kicked in, one-third of everybody told that is dead within 6 months. And it looks like Kimberly fell into that tough category.

I was planning during this July break of seeing if her dad would let me come down and see her. I was planning on calling or talking to her on the phone. It seems like only a few months ago she was on the cover of People Magazine looking very vigorous and healthy. We have seen her on talk shows. I thought she might be around for years, helping us lobby to get this bill through.

Somehow or other, until someone has manifested AIDS, and I thought she was just in the HIV carrier category, you always tend to think, because it is human nature to be an optimist, you tend to think, this person will be one of the long-time survivors. They will not be in the 60 percent that are dead within 18 months, more than 60 percent, or that one-third dead in 6 months. They

will be one of the tough ones that will be around for 5, 6, 7 years, helping us.

All of a sudden, I open up the Washington Post, our local newspaper here, a few days ago and saw this picture of her down to 65 pounds, this striking picture on the cover of the brandnew Newsweek of a doctor who looks like a concentration camp, death camp inmate, Dr. Richard Duff, who for 3 years did not tell his patients that he was not only an HIV-infected person but that he was an AIDS carrier, and that he had open, this medical word in here, weeping lesions, running sores on his arms and that his partner that he swears he never had any sexual relations with, and you have to take the man at his word, because he is dying, that he divorced his wife. And he said, "I ran around for 3 years." Then remarried his wife. What a sad story.

But his friend, it says in here, by an incredible coincidence, this Dr. Benson, is also dying of AIDS. The Benson case comes up in Minnesota, and the medical authorities there fooled around with the paperwork on this for over a year.

Now they have determined 339 of his patients were in danger of AIDS because he also had weeping, open lesions. And he was treating three or four dozen mothers, their children, touching the children's private parts, doing eye, ear, and nose examinations with weeping wounds.

Anybody who has seen this on the news racks may be enticed into buying this as the brandnew Newsweek of July 1, but when they open to the cover story "Doctors and AIDS" the first picture they will see is beautiful Kimberly Bergalis as though she is in a casket at home. Her dad, George, bathes her, carries her to bed. It tells the story of how when he says, "Good night, Hon," he says, "I will see you in the morning."

She says, "Hopefully not." She is a very religious young woman, 23 years of age. You could tell that in the talk shows.

In this jaded, sexually obsessed society, when she said, "I am a virgin, I was saving myself for my husband, I wanted to have a good marriage and children," in this cynical, sleaze-ball world of popular culture, people scoffed and jeered at her and said, "Check her out. She is probably promiscuous."

But when one, two, three, four other people making five of them and maybe more to come, if this one dentist were infected, suddenly the world had to say, "Maybe this beautiful young woman is telling the truth."

So she begins to lobby and the gentleman read that beautiful P.S. in her letter. There is a tough line in the letter that I will ask the indulgence of adults and smart children who watch the proceeding of this House, that when she says, "I blame every one of you bastards," she is not questioning anyone's parentage.

□ 2050

She is using that word "bastard" for illegitimate child in the sense that most of us use it, a rough way of meaning, "You are a rotten person, you have hurt me, you have done me dirty," and what I said at the press conference today is I do not want to be one of those people in her life, with her gone.

To tell you the truth, you and I and a handful of other people do not fit in that category anyway, because we have had somehow or other, and it sounds so self-serving to say the words "political courage," so I will fumble and figure out some way to say it in different words. We have earned our pay here to get into that well and talk about the worst public-health crisis in the 215-year history of the United States.

Out there, have you ever been to a press conference in any room in this beautiful office building, the world's greatest office building, the U.S. Capitol, or in the Rayburn Building, the Longworth Building, the Cannon Building, any one of the three Senate office buildings, have you ever been at a press conference with 15 cameras, loads of press, 3 tiers of them, and only 4 Members? It is usually the other way around, 3 or 4 cameras and 15 or 20 Members on some issue.

What makes this issue different is that very often here we screw up people's lives. We cost them more taxes. We hurt them when we are, all of us, trying to help them. Occasionally we make someone's life better and help people. A lot of times we waste time and spin our wheels.

Rarely does a piece of legislation come along where you can go home and tell your husband or your wife, "Today in the Congress of the United States I have done something that will save lives." I hope it is matched on the Senate side. I hope it survives conference. I know the President will sign it into law, and we have saved lives.

This is such legislation.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would like to interject one thing if I might. What a lot of people, what a lot of our colleagues, do not know is that there are probably 4,000 or 5,000 health care workers in this country today who are infected with the AIDS virus and who are potential spreaders of this disease to their patients today. In addition to that, we passed legislation last year which stood this whole idea on its head when we passed the Americans With Disabilities Act. There is a provision in there which says that if a person who is infected with the AIDS virus is a health care worker and they are working in a hospital and they have active AIDS and they are working on a patient, if the hospital moves them against their will to some other job so they will not infect that patient or if a doctor asks them to do some other job in the hospital so they will not infect that patient, the doctor and the hos-

pital are liable and can be sued, and they can collect. Can you imagine that?

So we have protected the right of a person who is infected with AIDS to stay there endangering these people without letting them know. We need to change that, and that is what this law does.

Mr. DORNAN of California. It is because of what we said at the press conference. It is a simple, little sentence, and it has the ring of truth to it. That is what makes it so appealing. All the words are the same except two, "health" and "relations."

This is a public health problem, not a public relations problem, not a political problem, not driven by some task force that has got a hidden agenda on sexual behavior that they are trying to protect or advance or push. This is a public health problem.

Let me get in the RECORD, just before we quit, some of the statistics from the Gallup Poll that go with this article. Question 1: Which of the following kinds of health care workers should be required to tell patients if they are infected with the AIDS virus? By the way, the CDC says it is 6,800 people, almost 7,000, and given the error on the low, conservative side, it is over 7,000 people.

Here is what Americans say.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. You say 7,000 instead of the 4,000 I said?

Mr. DORNAN of California. Seven thousand health workers of all kinds. They break it down into basically four categories: surgeons, all physicians, dentists, healthcare workers. This is a 5-percentage-point error nationwide, Gallup Poll. Corporations pay huge dollars to take Gallup Polls, and they are market based on accepting it as factually correct.

This is what America thinks, and I say this to all my doctor friends, and the AMA, by the way, has come out, and the American Dental Association, and they work this Hill pretty good, pretty good people. Their Washington, DC, people are great. They have said voluntarily all doctors should tell their patients if they are HIV carriers, if they are infected, or if they have AIDS, tell your patients, and they recommend that they get a signed release.

I am afraid that that is what they should have done 6 years ago. It is too late.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It should not be voluntary, either. It should not be voluntary.

Mr. DORNAN of California. It has got to be Federal law, and they are dragging their feet.

By the way, look, our ethics committee here in this House has not dazzled the Nation with their skill of judging one another.

I am a big fan of the police across this country, as the gentleman is, but to see my heroes, and I thought it was

the best police department in the country, the LAPD, sit around at an atrocity scene, at a beating, reminding me of Gestapo or people beating our pilots in Hanoi, and nobody says a peep when there are more than two dozen officers there. Yes, it is hard for even good organizations to police themselves.

But I am telling the medical people of this country, and you are not hostile as some people around here, trying to whip up a fever for socialized medicine, I am telling them, "Physicians, heal thyself, because you are going to make it harder if you keep resisting."

Here is what our fellow Americans think, I say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], who are not doctors: 95 percent, in the Gallup Poll, say surgeons must, not voluntarily, must by law be forced to identify that they have HIV, that they are a carrier, or that they have AIDS: 94 percent of all physicians, 1 point more for surgeons, 94 percent of all dentists; and 90 percent of all health-care workers. That is all within the 5-percent margin of error. So it is over or pushing 95 in all categories.

Then here is one other: If you knew a physician, dentist, or other health care worker treating you was infected with AIDS, what would you do? Sixty-five percent said that they would discontinue treatment immediately with that person. Now, that is their right. That is their right. Thirteen percent say they will continue, but they will exclude surgery or anything invasive. They say, "You can continue to be my doctor, but go get somebody else if there is going to be any blood or you are going to start poking around me." Fifteen percent, only, say that they would continue with stringent protective measures.

The gentleman just pointed out to me, reading this article, that this one woman said, "By the way, have you been AIDS tested?" And the doctor was so insulted he said, "Well, yes, I have." But, now, what did it say, he dresses himself like a football linebacker, or a scuba diver, or something.

Then this one says that if the following kinds of health care workers test positive for the AIDS virus, should they be forbidden to practice, forbidden to practice, taken out, not just tell the patient, and let it go option person to person, patient to patient? It says—and this is what Americans want—63 percent of all surgeons should be forbidden to practice; all physicians, 50 percent; more than half of the Americans say any physician should be stopped from practicing; dentists, 60 percent of Americans say a dentist must stop practicing. As for all other health care workers, 49 percent.

I am not that harsh, and I will bet the gentleman is not. Because, you know what I would let them do? Research or work with AIDS patients, of

which we are going to have a million soon.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me interject one thing that I think is very important.

I hope our colleagues will think about this. Doctors and dentists and health-care workers have a right to know if the patient they are working on has the AIDS virus as well.

Mr. DORNAN of California. That is next.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If they know, they will protect themselves or not perform an invasive procedure. They will make sure they are not going to be exposed to the AIDS virus, so it is going to protect them as well, and if we allow routine testing across the board for patients and doctors, eventually we will know who has this virus, and doctors will be able to protect themselves so this will not spread through the medical community, through the health-care industry, thus endangering not only them but their patients as well.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Exactly. Saturday, I went out to Space Command to the big national test facility for SDI, and I looked at my first Cray 2 computer, so much smaller than the Cray 1.

It actually has a fluid in it that Seymour Cray, this genius inventor, had in a dream one night: What cools the brain, he said, all of this energy. So it is a clear fluid that is exactly based on blood plasma.

Here are all of these hand-wired systems in this intricate Cray computer.

Now, if this Congress could not fund, and they cost \$17 million each, fund a Cray computer and put it at some American Medical Association facility, and a doctor with AIDS comes forward and says, or HIV positive, and says, "All right, help me continue working as a doctor. I want to heal. More than ever, I want to heal. My years are limited." You crank it into that, and then crank in the jobs available, my God, any doctor in this country who really is filling his shoes can go to Africa and be Dr. Schweitzer, for Pete's sake, a man with a Nobel Prize, and praise for all of the centuries to come, because Africa has 15 million people with AIDS, and it is destroying their countries, and there it is spread by heterosexual promiscuity and some—but not like the Western World—some needle abuse.

I am glad the gentleman brought this up. Because American are tough on their doctors, their nurses, their health care workers, their paramedics, their surgeons, and dentists and not tough on themselves. Get this, should patients be required to tell physicians, dentists, and other health care workers if they, the patient, are infected with the AIDS virus?

□ 2100

Ninety-seven percent of our fellow Americans say yes, we must tell the

doctor, because more doctors are in danger of patients than patients of doctors. Only 2 percent of weirdos say, "No," that you can go lie to your doctor, and while he is trying to save your life or heal the patient, they can kill him. So there are 2 percent jerks in every survey. I like to assume that they did not hear the question right.

So, Americans are being fair on this. They are getting doctors 5 to 10 percent more slack than they are giving themselves as patients to say we should give the doctor.

What it comes down to is what I heard the gentleman in the well and myself going on in late 1965 when we started getting with the program, when we believed the medical industry's own statistics on how bad this was going to get, and that is contact tracing and testing.

While we were doing that, Cap Weinberger, our former great Secretary of Defense, left a great legacy to Dick Cheney. As he put it to me, "We stick everybody in the military." Then it was about 2.1 million people. Stuck every man, woman, every old sergeant, every admiral, every general, everyone was stuck with a needle. Blood was drawn, and they were tested. We ended up with the cleanest universe of any profession in our country in the military because Cap said, "Let others argue. I will take action."

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam speaker, as we draw this to a close, let me just say that the military does test everyone. It costs about \$5 for the series of tests, including the ALIZA test, if they need a second one, and the Western Blot test. They are about 99% accurate, so the margin of error is infinitesimal. The fact is, we could test everybody in the country between the age of 10 and 65 every year for under a billion dollars, and the cost of treating one AIDS patient, from the time they get AIDS to the time they die, is about \$100 to \$150,000. So it is much more cost-effective than most people think. It will save America money in the long run, way more than it will cost, if we start a testing program. It will save a lot of lives.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Let me ask a question. The article ends on a sour note on those who met at the Seventh International AIDS Conference in Florence, Italy. It adjourned after 8 days last Sunday. They said probably it will forego a convention next year, kill it completely, and certainly not come to the United States because the United States has a policy of not accepting immigrants who are infected with this always fatal venereal disease.

Has the gentleman had any of his constituents—I have only had a few of mine aware of it—has the gentleman had any constituent talk to him about this, because the average American's reaction is stunning to me. They say, "What?" We have a disease, always

fatal, raging out of control, with 1 million infected people. That is a conservative low figure. We want to let more people in with the danger of spreading that further and faster? Are we crazy? When I ask them what about exceptions, like infected doctors who might want to come to this conference in Boston. They say, "Of course." How about visiting a friend who is very ill or dying? "Well, of course." How about getting treatment themselves? "Well, sure, anybody could be allowed in."

So again, there is the generous average American who has fought wars all over the world and liberated dozens of countries. There are always exceptions, but to let people come into this country, and the irony is, because of this politically driven AIDS crisis we are suddenly going to release the standards on gonorrhea, syphilis, leprosy, and a lot of other diseases, all to give cover to the human immunodeficiency virus, to give cover, and we will be left with tuberculosis.

How many people do we see like Kimberly Bergalis, an innocent victim, shriveled on a bed, crying to God, begging for God to take her, to take her in His arms. How many people do we see like this with tuberculosis in this country?

I did not get a chance at the press conference to say this today, but I will close on it. Every single week now, for the rest of our lives probably, more people will die of AIDS, and most of them young, in their vigorous productive years, than died in the Vietnam war. Every single week for 10 years, but the 2 weeks of the Tet offensive. Take out the first 2 weeks of February 1968, and we are losing more people to AIDS every week, with far more expense, than young GI's who were killed on the battlefield, giving the full measure of devotion. These people die slowly. Most of them, like Kimberly Bergalis, at great cost; \$40 thousand minimum. Some States up to \$100,000 a year maintenance, a tragedy ripping apart our young people. I do not see 250,000 people out there with Tom Hayden, David Dellinger, Jerry Rubin, and Abby Hoffman making fools of themselves. I do not see this. Everybody is saying, "Go away," and that syndrome has affected the Senate and the House of Representatives in this Capitol. People do not want to get at these two lecterns from both parties, and face up to the health crisis.

There is only one conclusion this Member can come to. It involves a three-letter word: s-e-x. Because it involves sex, because it involves a powerful, arrogant, homosexual, politically finely honed operation in this country of activists, people are afraid to discuss this health crisis. The result is a totally innocent, beautiful victim, like a little saint, Kimberly Bergalis, shriveled in her bed, pleading her life not be wasted, that we pass in Congress a bill

to wake up the medical profession. They ought to be on the Hill, as a few courageous ones lobby to get to Members to do this before they have totally wrecked their profession in the sense of public relations and broken their faith with the American people.

I was reading the article. At the beginning the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] said he would read the Hippocratic oath. I suggest that the gentleman do what he said at the opening, and read those words from the Hippocratic oath.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Before I read that, I would like to say that I am confident, and I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution, I am confident that the people of this country will demand a comprehensive program, including routine testing, before too long.

The problem is, every day that we wait, we condemn more people to get AIDS, and dying a very horrible death like Kimberly Bergalis.

I would like to read one section from the Hippocratic oath which every doctor takes:

I will apply dietetic measures for the benefit of the sick according to my ability and judgment; I will keep them from harm and injustice.

"I will keep them from harm and injustice." They all swear to that. I cannot believe that Dr. Acer did not know that he was violating that oath when he exposed Kimberly Bergalis and the other four people to the AIDS virus, along with his other patients.

Let me end by saying one more time to the family of Kimberly Bergalis and Kimberly Bergalis herself that I and my colleagues who are very strongly in favor of this legislation, will work tirelessly over the next few months and years to get the Kimberly Bergalis Patient and Health Providers' Protection Act of 1991 passed. God bless Kimberly Bergalis and her family.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Let me add, the rules of the House say that we have to direct everything through the Speaker, so I do this through the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if Kimberly's father, George, were so inclined, Mr. Speaker, I would hope he would call the Capitol, and if any of his friends are watching the proceedings on C-SPAN following the House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If the other four patients, some of them who still have the strength that Kimberly had a few months ago when she was walking the beach 2 months ago and speak out, if they would call here, I would invite them to come to the Congress of the United States. Mr. Speaker, walk the Halls with Members, and personally go in and lobby Members of both of these distinguished legislative bodies, and get this legislation passed, and help get this monkey off the back of medical profession, like the LAPD has to be

helped through its own travail because of the code of silence that all professionals develop among themselves.

Mr. BURTON of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SUNDQUIST (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today until 2 p.m., on account of official business.

#### 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 Members (at the request of Mr. BEREUTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEWIS of California, for 60 minutes each day, on July 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, and 18.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 60 minutes, on July 23.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCEWEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 60 minutes each day, on July 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, and 18.

Mr. DREIER of California, for 60 minutes each day, on July 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, and 18.

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

Mr. DURBIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOUCHER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. OBERSTAR, for 60 minutes, on July 10.

Mr. WISE, for 60 minutes, on June 27.  
Mr. FALCOMA, for 60 minutes, on June 27.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. PETRI and to include extraneous material notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$2863.50.

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

Mr. GRADISON.

Mr. DANNEMEYER, in two instances.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. WELDON.  
Mr. BALLENGER.  
Mr. BEREUTER.  
Mr. PORTER.  
Mr. SOLOMON.  
Mr. CRANE.  
Mr. CAMPBELL of California.  
Mr. SHAW, in two instances.  
Mr. GUNDERSON.  
Mr. BLILEY.  
Mr. EMERSON.  
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, in two instances.  
Mr. FIELDS.  
Mr. SCHULZE.  
Mr. GILMAN, in four instances.  
Mr. HORTON.  
Mr. LOWERY of California, in two instances.

Mr. SANTORUM.  
Mr. PETRI.  
Mr. CAMP.  
Mr. LEWIS of Florida.  
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FALCOMA) and to include extraneous matter:)  
Mr. RAY.  
Mr. ROWLAND.  
Mr. TORRES.  
Mr. HAMILTON.  
Mr. RAHALL in two instances.  
Mr. HERTEL in two instances.  
Mr. WOLPE.  
Mr. MONTGOMERY.  
Mr. ATKINS.  
Mr. MORAN.  
Mr. MURTHA.  
Mr. JACOBS.  
Mr. LANTOS.  
Mr. BRUCE.  
Mr. HOYER.  
Mr. CARR.  
Mr. HALL of Ohio.  
Mr. REED.  
Mr. HUBBARD.  
Mr. DINGELL.  
Mr. KILDEE.  
Mr. DYMALLY.  
Mr. NOWAK.  
Mrs. LOWEY of New York in two instances.  
Mr. CARDIN.  
Mr. KOPETSKI.  
Mr. FAZIO in two instances.  
Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.  
Mr. MORAN.  
Mr. FALCOMA.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 749. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation of land for addition to the Ocmulgee National Monument in the State of Georgia.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 909. An act to amend chapter 9 of title 17, United States Code, regarding protection extended to semiconductor chip products of foreign entities.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 27, 1991, at 11 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1634. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the physical examination requirement for members of the Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1635. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report on railroad emissions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1636. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the semiannual report of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 8E(h)(2) (102 Stat. 2525); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1637. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote international cooperation and to reduce dolphin mortalities in the purse seine fishery in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean by amending the mandatory trade embargo provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1776. A bill to authorize for fiscal year 1992 the United States Coast Guard Budget; with an amendment (Rept. 102-132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1989. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

### 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. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 2130. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for fiscal year 1992; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period ending not later than July 12, 1991, for consideration of such provisions of the amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of those committees pursuant to clause 1(n) and 1(v) of rule X, respectively. (Rept. 102-133, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

### 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 Mr. KOPETSKI (for himself and Mr. RIGGS):

H.R. 2770. A bill to limit contributions by nonparty multicandidate political committees in House of Representatives elections, to provide an income tax credit for contributions to nonincumbent candidates to such elections, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Ways and Means, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 2771. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to remove limitations on payment of attorney fees in cases in which the United States is seeking to collect an indebtedness to the United States arising out of a housing loan guaranteed or insured by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROSE:

H.R. 2772. A bill to establish in the Government Printing Office a single point of online public access to a wide range of Federal databases containing public information stored electronically; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BALLENGER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. GRANDY, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 2773. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to set standards under such title for multiple employer welfare arrangements providing health plan benefits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2774. A bill to provide that one-half of the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund be available to be used for community-based crime control programs for drug education, prevention, and demand reduction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 2775. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the application of such provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2776. A bill to designate "The Most Beautiful Lady in the World", by Helmut Christopher Calabrese and Paul L. Calabrese,

as the official anthem of the Statue of Liberty; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. ARCHER):

H.R. 2777. A bill to simplify certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 2778. A bill to amend certain Federal laws to provide the same rights and privileges to deaf or hard-of-hearing individuals who depend on hearing dogs as are provided to blind individuals who depend on guide dogs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Public Works and Transportation, and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ATKINS (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.R. 2779. A bill to make exports of cigarettes and the advertising of cigarettes abroad subject to the same restrictions on labeling and advertising of cigarettes as apply to the sale or distribution and advertising of cigarettes in the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 2780. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to increase the authority of the Commissioner on Aging; to establish the Office of Long-Term Care Ombudsman Programs and provide for the appointment of an Associate Commissioner for Ombudsman Services; to enhance State long-term care ombudsman programs; to provide financial assistance for programs relating to elder abuse, exploitation, or neglect; and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means.

By Mr. ATKINS (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.R. 2781. A bill restricting the activities of the United States regarding foreign laws regulating the marketing of tobacco products, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 2782. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide that such act does not preempt certain State laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BILLRAKIS:

H.R. 2783. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study on the feasibility and desirability of resolving medical malpractice claims in the same manner provided for resolving workmen's compensation claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOXER:

H.R. 2784. A bill to assist counties adversely affected by a base closure, change in the place of performance of a defense contract, the cancellation or failure to proceed with a defense contract, or reductions in de-

fense spending; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

H.R. 2785. A bill regarding the compliance of the People's Republic of China with certain internationally recognized standards of conduct, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of California (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. MACHTLEY):

H.R. 2786. A bill to protect the physician-patient relationship relating to Federal restrictions on abortion counseling; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado:

H.R. 2787. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an area office in Grand Junction, CO, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANNEMEYER (for himself, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 2788. A bill to amend title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of protections against certain communicable diseases for both health care providers and the patients of such providers, and to provide for certain forms of assistance for such providers and patients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 2789. A bill to amend the Star Schools Program Assistance Act to establish a program of grants for purposes of providing dissemination services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KOLBE:

H.R. 2790. A bill to withdraw certain lands located in the Coronado National Forest from the mining and mineral leasing laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOPETSKI (for himself, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 2791. A bill to authorize emergency crop loss assistance for producers of 1991 crops of cranberries who suffer crop losses due to damaging weather or related conditions in 1990 or 1991; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Mr. PORTER):

H.R. 2792. A bill to extend to the People's Republic of China renewal of nondiscriminatory (most-favored-nation) treatment until 1992 provided certain conditions are met; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTINEZ (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 2793. A bill to amend part 4 of subchapter A of the Community Economic Development Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 9814 et. seq.) and to provide assistance to community development cooperations and to increase their community development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 2794. A bill to establish the Spark M. Matsunaga Renewable Energy and Ocean Technology Center to conduct research on renewable energy and ocean resources, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 2795. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to reduce the number of prior convictions for a violent felony or a serious drug offense that are required for the imposition of enhanced penalties on persons who unlawfully ship, transport, or receive firearms or ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2796. A bill to provide that proceeds of U.S. savings bonds shall not be paid to any individual who kills the individual otherwise entitled to such payment where State law would prohibit such payment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLARZ (for himself, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JAMES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LENT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PRICE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. YATES, and Mr. WOLPE):

H.R. 2797. A bill to protect the free exercise of religion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STALLINGS (for himself, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PENNY, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 2798. A bill to provide for the coordination and implementation of national aquaculture policy for the private sector by the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SWIFT (for himself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mrs. UNSOELD):

H.R. 2799. A bill to require the revision of the land and resource management plans for the Olympic, Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie and Gifford Pinchot National Forests to implement an alternative management strategy known as high quality forestry; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 2800. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax on an employer's cost of providing medical benefits to his employees and to amend the Social Security Act to provide support for hospitals in meeting indigent care costs; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TORRES (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. COX of California, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. LAROCOCCO, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. ANNUNZIO):

H.R. 2801. A bill to authorize the minting of legal tender coins to commemorate the 1994 World Cup and to provide a financial legacy to youth and amateur soccer in the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. UNSOELD (for herself, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. KOPETSKI):

H.R. 2802. A bill to expand the existing restriction on exports of unprocessed timber originating from Federal lands in the 48 contiguous States to include unprocessed timber originating from Federal lands in the State of Alaska; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 2803. A bill to amend part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act to establish a program of formula grants to the State for improving the delivery of mental health services, to establish a program for providing comprehensive mental health services for children with serious emotional disturbances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARTINEZ:

H.R. 2804. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for grants and loans to private nonprofit corporations and associations to be used to pay operating expenses related to new and existing mass transportation services for elderly and handicapped persons; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.J. Res. 286. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for a balanced budget for the U.S. Government and for greater accountability in the enactment of tax legislation and to allow an item veto of appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By LOWERY of California (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to designate the week of July 27 through August 2, 1991, as "National Invent America Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H.J. Res. 288. Joint resolution designating October 1991 as "National School Attendance Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.J. Res. 289. Joint resolution proposing an amendment in the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the act of desecration of the flag of the United States and to set criminal penalties for that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H. Con. Res. 175. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from June 27, 1991 to July 9, 1991 and an adjournment of the Senate from June 28, 1991, June 29, 1991, June 30, 1991, July 1, 1991 or Tuesday, July 2, 1991 to July 8, 1991; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. RITTER):

H. Res. 185. Resolution concerning the United States position on environmental protection at the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Brazil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

204. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to the desecration of the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

205. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to protecting the Bill of Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

Mr. GRADISON introduced a bill (H.R. 2805) to extend the terms of the olestra patents, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

- H.R. 5: Mr. OLVER.  
 H.R. 23: Mr. ARCHER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. UPTON.  
 H.R. 46: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 47: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Ms. KAPTUR.  
 H.R. 63: Mr. DINGELL.  
 H.R. 74: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mr. COBLE.  
 H.R. 127: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. DIXON.  
 H.R. 134: Mr. PERKINS, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. MARTINEZ.  
 H.R. 200: Mr. MACTHLEY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. McGRATH.  
 H.R. 318: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. GEREN of Texas, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.  
 H.R. 338: Mr. UPTON.  
 H.R. 413: Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. ZIMMER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. JONTZ.  
 H.R. 431: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, and Mr. CONDIT.  
 H.R. 467: Mrs. MINK, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. HUBBARD.  
 H.R. 492: Mr. McNULTY.  
 H.R. 565: Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. ERDREICH.  
 H.R. 462: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BACCHUS, and Mr. SAXTON.  
 H.R. 709: Mr. BRUCE, Mr. WILSON, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.  
 H.R. 736: Mr. GREEN of New York.  
 H.R. 775: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MORAN, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WASHINGTON, and Mr. WHEAT.  
 H.R. 797: Mr. RICHARDSON.  
 H.R. 859: Mr. GUNDERSON.  
 H.R. 941: Mrs. MORELLA.  
 H.R. 967: Mr. GEREN of Texas.  
 H.R. 978: Mr. ANNUNZIO.  
 H.R. 993: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. MACTHLEY.  
 H.R. 994: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 1004: Mr. GUNDERSON.  
 H.R. 1048: Mr. DICKINSON.  
 H.R. 1063: Mr. TORRES, Mr. PEASE, and Mr. DIXON.  
 H.R. 1069: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. RANGEL.  
 H.R. 1076: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FISH, and Mr. RAHALL.  
 H.R. 1079: Mr. SANGMEISTER.  
 H.R. 1108: Mr. SUNDQUIST.  
 H.R. 1126: Mr. MILLER of California.  
 H.R. 1130: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.  
 H.R. 1189: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.  
 H.R. 1192: Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STARK, and Mr. TORRES.  
 H.R. 1237: Mrs. BYRON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. KASICH, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. WISE.  
 H.R. 1257: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. FISH, and Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 1270: Mr. PORTER and Mr. TAUZIN.  
 H.R. 1293: Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. RANGEL.  
 H.R. 1300: Mr. RAVENEL and Mr. WEISS.  
 H.R. 1322: Mr. ECKART, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. SCHEUMER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. HOAGLAND.  
 H.R. 1330: Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. IRELAND.  
 H.R. 1405: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. BONIOR.  
 H.R. 1406: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ROSE, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. SOLARZ.  
 H.R. 1407: Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina and Mr. COX of California.  
 H.R. 1411: Mr. BAKER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. RAVENEL.  
 H.R. 1439: Mr. DUNCAN.  
 H.R. 1468: Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. HANSEN.  
 H.R. 1472: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 1473: Mr. MINETA and Mr. BAKER.  
 H.R. 1482: Mr. WISE, Ms. LONG, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. FISH, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MILLER of Washington, and Mr. PETERSON of Florida.  
 H.R. 1495: Mr. WEBER, Mr. AUCOIN, and Mr. SANDERS.  
 H.R. 1523: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. HENRY.  
 H.R. 1572: Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. SAXTON.  
 H.R. 1579: Mr. JONTZ and Mr. FAZIO.  
 H.R. 1598: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. OBEY.  
 H.R. 1618: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WISE, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. ROSE.  
 H.R. 1628: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. FROST, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey,

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MARLENEE, and Mr. MURPHY.  
 H.R. 1655: Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
 H.R. 1662: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 1733: Mr. SIKORSKI.  
 H.R. 1754: Mr. RAHALL.  
 H.R. 1755: Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 1790: Mr. CARR and Mr. GEJDENSON.  
 H.R. 1841: Mr. BAKER.  
 H.R. 1842: Mr. BAKER.  
 H.R. 1860: Mr. SPENCE.  
 H.R. 1864: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. LENT, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
 H.R. 1870: Mr. SAVAGE.  
 H.R. 2027: Mr. FAZIO.  
 H.R. 2074: Mr. KOLBE.  
 H.R. 2089: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. OWENS of Utah.  
 H.R. 2125: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. ROE, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
 H.R. 2202: Mr. ARMEY.  
 H.R. 2212: Mr. KASICH.  
 H.R. 2215: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. PALLONE.  
 H.R. 2232: Mr. ROSE, Mr. WISE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. ESPY.  
 H.R. 2236: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. ROSE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. ESPY.  
 H.R. 2238: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ROSE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. ESPY.  
 H.R. 2245: Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. PENNY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. DORNAN of California.  
 H.R. 2248: Mr. DONNELLY.  
 H.R. 2267: Mr. WILSON, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 2268: Mr. MCCLOSKEY and Mr. EVANS.  
 H.R. 2290: Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. STEARNS.  
 H.R. 2299: Mr. HORTON and Mr. ROYBAL.  
 H.R. 2323: Mr. DURBIN.  
 H.R. 2324: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.  
 H.R. 2327: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. UPTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. STENHOLM.  
 H.R. 2361: Mr. DAVIS and Mr. WASHINGTON.  
 H.R. 2383: Mr. HORTON and Mr. COSTELLO.  
 H.R. 2389: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. TOWNS.  
 H.R. 2401: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. ECKART, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BEREUTER, and Ms. KAPTUR.  
 H.R. 2452: Mr. GORDON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. EVANS.  
 H.R. 2453: Mr. STEARNS.  
 H.R. 2455: Mr. LANCASTER and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 2464: Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. FROST, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ERDREICH, and Mr. VOLKMER.  
 H.R. 2518: Ms. NORTON and Mr. ACKERMAN.  
 H.R. 2542: Ms. NORTON and Mr. MARTINEZ.  
 H.R. 2553: Mr. MAZZOLI and Mr. JONTZ.  
 H.R. 2561: Mr. POSHARD, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. FRANK of Massachu-

sets, Mr. TORRES, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REED, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. CARR, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SABO, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. PERKINS.  
 H.R. 2566: Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. SPRATT.  
 H.R. 2568: Mr. MCCANDLESS.  
 H.R. 2579: Mr. LAGOMARSINO.  
 H.R. 2595: Mr. DANNEMEYER.  
 H.R. 2624: Mr. CARDIN and Ms. KAPTUR.  
 H.R. 2628: Mr. TRAFICANT.  
 H.R. 2632: Mr. JONTZ.  
 H.R. 2634: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. REED, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 2641: Mr. ANTHONY.  
 H.R. 2693: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. SCHIFF.  
 H.J. Res. 9: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.J. Res. 67: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HORTON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. McGRATH, and Mr. CARPER.  
 H.J. Res. 70: Mr. PACKARD.  
 H.J. Res. 140: Mr. PORTER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. WEBER, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. SABO, Mr. BAKER, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. JEFFERSON.  
 H.J. Res. 142: Mrs. MINK, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. LONG, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. DREIER of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. SERRANO.  
 H.J. Res. 181: Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. PRICE.  
 H.J. Res. 191: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. REED, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Ms. LONG, Mrs. MINK, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. McDADE, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.  
 H.J. Res. 226: Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. McDADE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WILSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. QUIL-

LEN, Mr. ESPY, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. TALLON, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WISE, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SISISKY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. YATES, Mr. SHARP, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DE LUGO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ROEMER, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. RAY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. PRICE, Mr. TANNER, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. JONTZ, Mr.

COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. STENHOLM, Ms. LONG, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SWETT, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. REGULA, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. RITTER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. ORTON and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

H.J. Res. 237: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. HORTON, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FROST, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HAYES of Illi-

nois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. ESPY.

H.J. Res. 238: Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 252: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GALLO, Mr. WELDON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. TALLON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. MOODY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MFUME, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. BROWDER.

H.J. Res. 259: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. BARNARD and Mr. SOLARZ.

H. Con. Res. 101: Mr. ESPY and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H. Con. Res. 130: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H. Con. Res. 171: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BEILENSEN, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H. Res. 130: Mr. JONTZ, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. SHAYS.

H. Res. 141: Mr. MACHTLEY.