

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 9, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

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

From the rising of the Sun until the going down of the same, we are aware, O God, of power in the universe, whether it be in the power of nature, or the power of the armies, or the power of any might. Teach us also, gracious God, to sense the power of the spirit—a power that transforms lives and makes all things new. As You have blessed each of us with all good gifts and have breathed into us the very breath of life, so too may we become aware of the gift of Your spirit in our lives—a spirit that enlightens, that strengthens, that heals, that gives the peace, and reconciliation that can transform our lives and the lives of others. In Your name, we pray. 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. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BALLENGER 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 with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1455. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for intelligence activities of the United States Government, the Intelligence Community Staff, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 1455) entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for intelligence activities of the U.S. Government, the Intelligence Community Staff, and the Central In-

telligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints from the Select Committee on Intelligence: Mr. BOREN, Mr. NUNN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. GLENN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WARNER, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. GORTON, and Mr. CHAFEE; from the Committee on Armed Services: Mr. EXON and Mr. THURMOND; to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on the Budget.

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 22, 1991.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Effective close of business on June 30, 1991, I hereby resign my position on the House Budget Committee.

Sincerely,

DICK ARMEY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 188) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 188

Resolved, That Representative Paxon of New York be and is hereby elected to the Committee on the Budget.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 8, 1991.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the

Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following messages from the Secretary of the Senate:

1. Received at 9:40 a.m. on Friday, June 28, 1991: That the Senate passed without amendment, H.J. Res. 259.

2. Received at 7:00 p.m. on Friday, June 28, 1991: That the Senate passed without amendment, H.R. 2332.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions on Friday, June 28, 1991:

S. 674. An act to designate the building in Monterey, TN, which houses the primary operations of the U.S. Postal Service as the "J.E. (Eddie) Russell Post Office Building", and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to designate December 7, 1991, as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day";

H.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution designating the week beginning July 21, 1991, as "Lyme Disease Awareness Week";

H.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution designating March 1991 as "Women's History Month"; and

H.J. Res. 259. Joint resolution designating July 2, 1991, as "National Literacy Day."

The following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker pro tempore on Monday, July 1, 1991:

H.R. 2332. An act to amend the Immigration Act of 1990 to extend for 4 months the application deadline for special temporary protected status for Salvadorans.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTER-GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3(a) of Public Law 86-380, and the order of the House of June 26, 1991, empowering the Speaker to make appointments authorized by law or by the House, the Chair on June 28, 1991, did appoint to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on the part of the House the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

□ 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.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 1, 1991.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As the result of a recently diagnosed illness, I regretfully find myself unable to continue to serve the people of the Seventh Congressional District at the necessary level of personal commitment they expect and deserve. Therefore, on advice of my personal physician and after consultation with my family, I have today notified the Honorable Lawrence Douglas Wilder, Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, of my resignation as the Representative of the Commonwealth of Virginia in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States for the Seventh Congressional District effective November 5, 1991.

This decision has been an extremely difficult one for me to make. I have spent a good portion of my life serving the citizens of the Commonwealth, first as a Member of the General Assembly for twenty years, then as a Member of the House for more than six years. While it has been a great privilege and honor to serve in this House, I have reluctantly concluded that the recent impairment to my health prevents me from continuing my service. I thank the people of the Commonwealth and the Seventh Congressional District for placing their trust in me. I hope that I have served them well.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely,

D. FRENCH SLAUGHTER, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 1, 1991.

Hon. L. DOUGLAS WILDER,
Governor, Commonwealth of Virginia, Office of
the Governor, Richmond, VA.

DEAR GOVERNOR WILDER: As the result of a recently diagnosed illness, I regretfully find myself unable to continue to serve the people of the Seventh Congressional District at the necessary level of personal commitment they expect and deserve. Therefore, on advice of my personal physician and after consultation with my family, I hereby announce my resignation as the Representative of the Commonwealth of Virginia in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States for the Seventh Congressional District effective November 5, 1991.

I tender my resignation as of the stated date so that the citizens of the Seventh Congressional District will continue to be represented until a successor can be timely elected. I have also consciously followed this schedule in order to permit a Special Election at the time of the regularly scheduled November 5, 1991, General Election in order to avoid any undue expense to the Commonwealth and the localities within the Seventh Congressional District in the conduct of the Special Election.

This decision has been an extremely difficult one for me to make. I have spent a good portion of my life serving the citizens of the Commonwealth, first as a Member of the General Assembly for twenty years, then as a Member of Congress for more than six years. While it has been a great privilege and honor to serve, I have reluctantly concluded that the recent impairment to my health prevents me from continuing my service. I thank the people of the Commonwealth and the Seventh Congressional District for placing their trust in me. I hope that I have served them well.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely,

D. FRENCH SLAUGHTER, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 28, 1991.

Hon. THOMAS FOLEY,
Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Due to my recent appointment to the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I am writing to resign as a member of the House Small Business Committee.

During my two and a half years on the Small Business Committee, it has explored and addressed many interesting matters affecting the small business community. I have found my work on the committee exciting and challenging.

I have enjoyed the opportunity to serve under the able leadership of Chairman LaFalce. I look forward to working with Chairman Brown and all of my colleagues on the important issues facing the 102nd Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection,
the resignation is accepted.
There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1455, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1991

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1455) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for intelligence activities of the U.S. Government, the Intelligence Community Staff, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees and, without objection, reserves the right to appoint additional conferees:

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. WILSON, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Messrs. GLICKMAN, MAVROULES, RICHARDSON, SOLARZ, DICKS, DELLUMS, BONIOR, SABO, OWENS of Utah, SHUSTER, COMBEST, BEREUTER, DORNAN of California, YOUNG of Florida, MARTIN and GEKAS.

From the Committee on Armed Services, for the consideration of Department of Defense tactical intelligence and related activities and section 505 of both the House bill and the Senate

amendment: Messrs. ASPIN, SKELTON, and DICKINSON.

There was no objection.

THANKS TO RESIDENTS OF GUAM, AND RECONSIDER NEED FOR BASES IN PHILIPPINES

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise with two things to talk about this morning: No. 1, I think everyone in this body owes a tremendous debt of gratitude to the wonderful residents of Guam, U.S.A. We do not think about that territory very often, but they have just executed the largest peacetime evacuation in the history of the planet. They have taken care of over 19,000 people coming out of the Philippines, 1,300 pets, and all sorts of other things.

Mr. Speaker, they did it with incredible, incredible grace and style. I think we all want to sincerely thank them.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that from the photographs and things we are seeing in the Philippines, I think we ought to send a very clear message: That this body, with its budget constraints, with the lessening threat in the Pacific, with so many bases having been closed domestically, is not going to be willing to run out and spend billions of dollars to clean up bases, when we have absolutely no idea if the volcano will go off again and will restart the whole cycle.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a great tragedy and people have reacted very well, but I think we want to send a real monetary message, that there is not a lot of money in the kitty, it is running out, and I think it is time that we probably put a close to that chapter.

□ 1210

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER HONORED FOR HIS COMMITMENT TO 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. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon Small Business Administrator Patricia Saiki will dedicate the conference room at the new SBA headquarters in memory of President Dwight D. Eisenhower. She will be accompanied at the dedication by the late President's granddaughter, Susan Eisenhower.

Mr. Speaker, of all the many tributes paid President Eisenhower over the years, this is surely one of the most deserving, for it was Dwight D. Eisenhower who created the Small Business Administration. When the House-passed legislation authorizing the SBA

started to languish in the Senate he sent word that he wanted the bill passed immediately. As a result, the Senate took up and passed by voice vote the amended House version. On July 30, 1953, President Eisenhower signed the bill and the Small Business Administration was born.

President Eisenhower did not just say he was for small business; he acted on his convictions. My colleagues, all of us in Congress can learn from his example. It's easy to say we're for small business, but it's how we vote that really counts.

SWEARING IN THE KENTUCKIANA MARINE PLATOON

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, over the years I have had a chance to take part in many ceremonies, ceremonies of graduation, ceremonies of retirement, ceremonies of installation, ceremonies of investiture. But I have never had the opportunity until Thursday, the Fourth of July, to take part in the ceremony of induction.

I had the pleasure of swearing in 55 young recruits, from Kentucky and southern Indiana, into the Marine Corps in Cardinal Stadium back home in Louisville.

It was a moving ceremony. I had the chance, both before and after the ceremony, to speak with these young recruits, to shake their hands and to talk with them. And of course, one can tell a great deal about human beings from the eyes. The eyes are said to be the window of the soul.

The eyes of these 55 recruits tell me they will be good Marines and they will be great Americans.

I would like to salute Maj. David Breen, who is the commandant of the Marine recruiting station in Louisville, and the two sergeants, Sgt. Steve Grimes and Drew Milburn, who were so helpful in setting up the ceremony.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our Armed Forces are in good shape with young recruits like the ones I was privileged to swear into the Marine Corps last Thursday.

SOAK THE RICH LUXURY TAX SHOULD BE REPEALED

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the 10 percent soak the rich luxury tax incorporated in last year's budget reconciliation bill is having a devastating impact on many of this Nation's workers. No business has been harder hit than the boating industry.

Comparing first quarter large boat sales in 1990 and 1991 reveals an 85 per-

cent sales decrease. Since these boats are traditionally recession-proof, only a slight portion of this decline can be attributed to a sluggish economy. Furthermore, over the same time period, sales of pleasure boats under \$100,000 have only dropped 20 percent. Obviously, the new luxury tax is to blame for this huge sales decrease.

This dramatic sales loss has cost thousands of workers their jobs by forcing drastic production cutbacks or outright closings of boatyards from Maine to Florida. For example, Hatteras Yachts has closed 4 of 6 production lines at their High Point, NC plant, causing almost 300 workers to lose their jobs.

Related industries have been deeply hurt as well. As a result of a drop in demand, 275 employees who produced fiberglass for yachts at the PPG plant in Shelby, NC, have found themselves out of work.

Instead of soaking the rich, Congress has only forced many hard-working American citizens to draw unemployment checks. Hopefully, we can work for tax fairness by repealing these detrimental taxes.

ISOLATING CHINA IS NOT THE ANSWER: CONTINUE MFN STATUS

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, after careful consideration of this difficult policy question, I have concluded that we should approve continued most-favored-nation status to the People's Republic of China. I do not stand here today to defend the actions of the People's Republic of China. We all have been outraged by China's deplorable human rights abuses, their indiscriminate sales of nuclear weapons and technology, and their violations of international trade practices.

I stand to defend Americans, Americans whose jobs and businesses depend on continued trade with China. Americans who have invested their effort and resources into encouraging economic and political reform within China. Quite honestly, I stand to defend all Americans, for certainly every one of us will benefit from improved relations with a nation of over a billion people.

China's human rights abuses, whether against pro-democracy activists in Tiananmen Square or Tibet, have been well documented. While China's actions have been unquestionably deplorable, we must determine if revoking most-favored-nation status will correct their policies. I submit that manipulation of MFN is an inappropriate instrument with which to address these concerns. There are other, more exact means available to express our disapproval of China's policies. We cannot realistically expect to encourage

change in China by severing our relations with them. In fact, history clearly illustrates that isolating China and imposing economic self-sufficiency upon her people has led to brutal periods of government repression.

I do not, however, advocate turning a blind eye to China's abuses. The United States immediately condemned and sanctioned the horrors of Tiananmen Square, and more than 2 years later we remain the only Western democracy still imposing such sanctions. We could also become the only country to rescind MFN status to China, but without international support for our position, substantive changes in Chinese policies would be unlikely. I strongly urge that we use our influence to promote tolerance and peaceful dissent within China.

Western influence has already initiated free-market-oriented reforms in the coastal provinces neighboring Hong Kong. Discontinuing most-favored-nation status would severely hurt those regions of the country that promise to lead the way for China's reform. The continued free flow of products, information, and ideas from the West is critical to any hopes the Chinese people have for peacefully modernizing their country.

This debate boils down to one very basic question: What approach promises the best chance to alter China's behavior? I believe extending MFN status, while not a perfect solution, does offer us the best opportunity to promote meaningful reforms in China, while continuing to advance our own national interests.

AS WE APPROACH JULY 26

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, in Cuba these days, Fidel Castro is most likely busily preparing for his annual verbal assault on the Free World, his infamous marathon speech on July 26. But today we read that Castro is also busily continuing his assault on the Cuban people, reportedly cashing in on their misery on the order of a million dollars a week. It seems that Castro—the Western Hemisphere's last Marxist dictator—is selling the only commodity he's got left that's worth anything, his own people.

Today and everyday in Miami, Cuban immigrants, desperate for a way out of the black hole that Castro has made of their country, are scraping together the minimum \$500 worth of ransom, defined in Cuba as a visa fee, and heading on a 1-way trip to America. They start off by paying Castro's price for a tourist visa, and some predict as many as 30,000 a year will never go back. There is an additional, troubling aspect to the current situation, especially for

Florida. We would like to be able to offer housing, schooling, medical care, and jobs, but Florida cannot and should not be expected to shoulder the burden alone.

EXTEND MFN TO CHINA WITHOUT CONDITIONS

(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 debate on renewing most-favored-nation trade status to the Peoples Republic of China has focused on two options: placing conditions on MFN, or rejecting MFN altogether.

After a careful review of this issue, I have come to the firm conclusion that we must renew MFN to China without conditions.

While I detest the crackdown by the Chinese Government on prodemocracy forces, I am unconvinced that placing conditions, or rejecting MFN, will help the forces of democracy in China effect change. Indeed, I fear that placing conditions on MFN may place harmful and counterproductive conditions on those striving for democracy in China.

Many claim the human rights abuses being committed by the Communist government deserve a response by our Government; I agree. But our reply should be one that will effect a positive change in China. That can be best accomplished by extending most-favored-nation trade status without conditions.

HOUSE BILL 2595, PLACING CEILING ON NUMBER OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of weeks we have seen an awful lot of activity going on among States and cities with respect to employees and laying off employees, having to put furloughs on employees. It has been a very difficult situation in a number of States and cities.

I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues House bill 2595, which was introduced by myself and 12 others about 2 weeks ago, which would have the effect of putting a ceiling on the number of Federal employees at this year's Presidential budget of 2.9 million employees.

The purpose of this bill is twofold: One is to add another important leg to the efforts to control Federal spending. One is a line-item veto. The second is a balanced budget amendment, and I think the third is to put some limitation on Federal employees.

□ 1220

The other is to protect our good Federal employees who do such a great job

for all of us by trying to avoid this business of having to lay people off when there are too many employees and not enough money.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to take a look at this as another one of those steps that would cause us to be able to treat the employees as they should be treated as Federal employees for the great job they do and yet do something about reducing the Federal budget. I would ask you to take a look at H.R. 2595.

OUR DRUG WAR IS FAR FROM OVER

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have been informed by our drug agencies that our efforts in the war on drugs have resulted in a decrease in both cocaine use and overall drug addiction nationwide. Despite this encouraging news, our drug war is far from over. Recent projections for heroin supply indicates an alarming increase over the next few years.

Worldwide production of heroin has doubled since 1986 and at the same time heroin purity has increased eightfold along the east coast. The booming supply of heroin leads to lower prices and greater availability.

The consequences of increased drug abuse are grave. Besides the potential for overdosing, there is the resultant dramatic increase in the spread of AIDS and hepatitis B due to the use of dirty needles by drug users. Along with the hazards confronting users themselves, our Nation's innocent citizens face a great deal of danger. The FBI has recently reported that murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault have increased 10 percent nationwide between 1986 and 1990. This dramatic increase is mostly attributed to drug use and trafficking. As I have reported in the past, 85 percent of those arrested for violent crimes in this country test positive for drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned and so are our constituents throughout the Nation. Fighting this scourge must be our highest priority. We must help our communities become drug free and we must give our Nation's police officers and drug enforcement agents the necessary resources to fight our war on drugs and crime.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on

which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken on Wednesday, July 10, 1991.

EMERGING TELECOMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES ACT OF 1991

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 531) to establish procedures to improve the allocation and assignment to the electromagnetic spectrum, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 531

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Emerging Telecommunications Technologies Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal Government currently reserves for its own use, or has priority of access to, approximately 40 percent of the electromagnetic spectrum that is assigned for use pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934;

(2) many of such frequencies are underutilized by Federal Government licensees;

(3) the public interest requires that many of such frequencies be utilized more efficiently by Federal Government and non-Federal licensees;

(4) additional frequencies are assigned for services that could be obtained more efficiently from commercial carriers or other vendors;

(5) scarcity of assignable frequencies for licensing by the Commission can and will—

(A) impede the development and commercialization of new telecommunications products and services;

(B) limit the capacity and efficiency of the United States telecommunications systems;

(C) prevent some State and local police, fire, and emergency services from obtaining urgently needed radio channels; and

(D) adversely affect the productive capacity and international competitiveness of the United States economy;

(6) a reassignment of these frequencies can produce significant economic returns; and

(7) the Secretary of Commerce, the President, and the Federal Communications Commission should be directed to take appropriate steps to correct these deficiencies.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL SPECTRUM PLANNING.

(a) *PLANNING ACTIVITIES.*—The Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information and the Chairman of the Commission shall meet, at least biannually, to conduct joint spectrum planning with respect to the following issues—

(1) the future spectrum requirements for public and private uses, including State and local government public safety agencies;

(2) the spectrum allocation actions necessary to accommodate those uses; and

(3) actions necessary to promote the efficient use of the spectrum, including spectrum management techniques to promote increased shared use of the spectrum that does not cause harmful interference as a means of increasing commercial access.

(b) *REPORTS.*—The Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information and the Chairman of the Commission shall submit a joint annual report to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the

Secretary, and the Commission on the joint spectrum planning activities conducted under subsection (a) and recommendations for action developed pursuant to such activities.

(c) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—The first annual report submitted after the date of the report by the advisory committee under section 4(d)(4) shall—

(1) include an analysis of and response to that committee report; and

(2) include an analysis of the effect on spectrum efficiency and the cost of equipment to Federal spectrum users of maintaining separate allocations for Federal Government and non-Federal Government licensees for the same or similar services.

SEC. 4. IDENTIFICATION OF REALLOCABLE FREQUENCIES.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION REQUIRED.**—The Secretary shall, within 24 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, prepare and submit to the President and the Congress a report identifying bands of frequencies that—

(1) are allocated on a primary basis for Federal Government use and eligible for licensing pursuant to section 305(a) of the Act (47 U.S.C. 305(a));

(2) are not required for the present or identifiable future needs of the Federal Government;

(3) can feasibly be made available, as of the date of submission of the report or at any time during the next 15 years, for use under the Act (other than for Federal Government stations under such section 305);

(4) will not result in costs to the Federal Government, or losses of services or benefits to the public, that are excessive in relation to the benefits that may be obtained by non-Federal licensees; and

(5) are most likely to have the greatest potential for productive uses and public benefits under the Act.

(b) **MINIMUM AMOUNT OF SPECTRUM RECOMMENDED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Based on the report required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall recommend for reallocation, for use other than by Federal Government stations under section 305 of the Act (47 U.S.C. 305), bands of frequencies that span a total of not less than 200 megahertz, that are located below 6 gigahertz, and that meet the criteria specified in paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a). The Secretary may not include, in such 200 megahertz, bands of frequencies that span more than 20 megahertz and that are located between 5 and 6 gigahertz. If the report identifies (as meeting such criteria) bands of frequencies spanning more than 200 megahertz, the report shall identify and recommend for reallocation those bands (spanning not less than 200 megahertz) that meet the criteria specified in paragraph (5) of such subsection.

(2) **MIXED USES PERMITTED TO BE COUNTED.**—Bands of frequencies which the Secretary's report recommends be partially retained for use by Federal Government stations, but which are also recommended to be reallocated to be made available under the Act for use by non-Federal stations, may be counted toward the minimum spectrum required by paragraph (1) of this subsection, except that—

(A) the bands of frequencies counted under this paragraph may not count toward more than one-half of the minimum required by paragraph (1) of this subsection;

(B) a band of frequencies may not be counted under this paragraph unless the assignments of the band to Federal Government stations under section 305 of the Act (47 U.S.C. 305) are limited by geographic area, by time, or by other means so as to guarantee that the potential use to be made by such Federal Government stations is substantially less (as measured by geographic

area, time, or otherwise) than the potential use to be made by non-Federal stations; and

(C) the operational sharing permitted under this paragraph shall be subject to coordination procedures which the Commission shall establish and implement to ensure against harmful interference.

(c) **CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFICATION.**—

(1) **NEEDS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.**—In determining whether a band of frequencies meets the criteria specified in subsection (a)(2), the Secretary shall—

(A) consider whether the band of frequencies is used to provide a communications service that is or could be available from a commercial carrier or other vendor;

(B) seek to promote—

(i) the maximum practicable reliance on commercially available substitutes;

(ii) the sharing of frequencies (as permitted under subsection (b)(2));

(iii) the development and use of new communications technologies; and

(iv) the use of nonradiating communications systems where practicable; and

(C) seek to avoid—

(i) serious degradation of Federal Government services and operations; and

(ii) excessive costs to the Federal Government and users of Federal Government services.

(2) **FEASIBILITY OF USE.**—In determining whether a frequency band meets the criteria specified in subsection (a)(3), the Secretary shall—

(A) assume such frequencies will be assigned by the Commission under section 303 of the Act (47 U.S.C. 303) over the course of not less than 15 years;

(B) assume reasonable rates of scientific progress and growth of demand for telecommunications services;

(C) determine the extent to which the reallocation or reassignment will relieve actual or potential scarcity of frequencies available for licensing by the Commission for non-Federal use;

(D) seek to include frequencies which can be used to stimulate the development of new technologies; and

(E) consider the immediate and recurring costs to reestablish services displaced by the reallocation of spectrum.

(3) **COMMERCIAL USE.**—In determining whether a band of frequencies meets the criteria specified in subsection (a)(4), the Secretary shall consider—

(A) the extent to which equipment is available that is capable of utilizing the band;

(B) the proximity of frequencies that are already assigned for commercial or other non-Federal use; and

(C) the activities of foreign governments in making frequencies available for experimentation or commercial assignments in order to support their domestic manufacturers of equipment.

(4) **POWER AGENCY FREQUENCIES.**—

(A) **ELIGIBLE FOR MIXED USE ONLY.**—The frequencies assigned to any Federal power agency may only be eligible for mixed use under subsection (b)(2) in geographically separate areas and shall not be recommended for the purposes of withdrawing that assignment. In any case where a frequency is to be shared by an affected Federal power agency and a non-Federal user, such use by the non-Federal user shall, consistent with the procedures established under subsection (b)(2)(C), not cause harmful interference to the affected Federal power agency or adversely affect the reliability of its power system.

(B) **DEFINITION.**—As used in this paragraph, the term "Federal power agency" means the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Western Area Power

Administration, or the Southwestern Power Administration.

(d) **PROCEDURE FOR IDENTIFICATION OF REALLOCABLE BANDS OF FREQUENCIES.**—

(1) **SUBMISSION OF PRELIMINARY IDENTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.**—Within 12 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report which makes a preliminary identification of reallocable bands of frequencies which meet the criteria established by this section.

(2) **CONVENING OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—Not later than the date the Secretary submits the report required by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall convene an advisory committee to—

(A) review the bands of frequencies identified in such report;

(B) advise the Secretary with respect to (i) the bands of frequencies which should be included in the final report required by subsection (a), and (ii) the effective dates which should be established under subsection (e) with respect to such frequencies;

(C) receive public comment on the Secretary's report and on the final report; and

(D) prepare and submit the report required by paragraph (4).

The advisory committee shall meet at least monthly until each of the actions required by section 5(a) have taken place.

(3) **COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEE; CHAIRMAN.**—The advisory committee shall include—

(A) the Chairman of the Commission and the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information; and one other representative of the Federal Government as designated by the Secretary; and

(B) representatives of—

(i) United States manufacturers of spectrum-dependent telecommunications equipment;

(ii) commercial carriers;

(iii) other users of the electromagnetic spectrum, including radio and television broadcast licensees, State and local public safety agencies, and the aviation industry; and

(iv) other interested members of the public who are knowledgeable about the uses of the electromagnetic spectrum.

A majority of the members of the committee shall be members described in subparagraph (B), and one of such members shall be designated as chairman by the Secretary.

(4) **RECOMMENDATIONS ON SPECTRUM ALLOCATION PROCEDURES.**—The advisory committee shall, not later than 36 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Secretary, the Commission, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate, a report containing such recommendations as the advisory committee considers appropriate for the reform of the process of allocating the electromagnetic spectrum between Federal and non-Federal use, and any dissenting views thereon.

(e) **TIMETABLE FOR REALLOCATION AND LIMITATION.**—

(1) **TIMETABLE REQUIRED.**—The Secretary shall, as part of the report required by subsection (a), include a timetable that recommends immediate and delayed effective dates by which the President shall withdraw or limit assignments on the frequencies specified in the report.

(2) **EXPEDITED REALLOCATION OF INITIAL 30 MHZ PERMITTED.**—The Secretary may prepare and submit to the President a report which specifically identifies an initial 30 megahertz of spectrum that meets the criteria described in subsection (a) and that can be made available for reallocation immediately upon issuance of the report required by this section.

(3) **DELAYED EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The recommended delayed effective dates shall—

(A) permit the earliest possible reallocation of the frequency bands, taking into account the requirements of section 6(1);

(B) be based on the useful remaining life of equipment that has been purchased or contracted for to operate on identified frequencies;

(C) be based on the need to coordinate frequency use with other nations; and

(D) take into account the relationship between the costs to the Federal Government of changing to different frequencies and the benefits that may be obtained from commercial and other non-Federal uses of the reassigned frequencies.

SEC. 5. WITHDRAWAL OF ASSIGNMENT TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT STATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President shall—

(1) within 6 months after receipt of the Secretary's report under section 4(a), withdraw the assignment to a Federal Government station of any frequency which the report recommends for immediate reallocation;

(2) within such 6-month period, limit the assignment to a Federal Government station of any frequency which the report recommends be made immediately available for mixed use under section 4(b)(2);

(3) by the delayed effective date recommended by the Secretary under section 4(e) (except as provided in subsection (b)(4) of this section), withdraw or limit the assignment to a Federal Government station of any frequency which the report recommends be reallocated or made available for mixed use on such delayed effective date;

(4) assign or reassign other frequencies to Federal Government stations as necessary to adjust to such withdrawal or limitation of assignments; and

(5) transmit a notice and description to the Commission and each House of Congress of the actions taken under this subsection.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY TO SUBSTITUTE.**—If the President determines that a circumstance described in paragraph (2) exists, the President—

(A) may substitute an alternative frequency or band of frequencies for the frequency or band that is subject to such determination and withdraw (or limit) the assignment of that alternative frequency or band in the manner required by subsection (a); and

(B) shall submit a statement of the reasons for taking the action described in subparagraph (A) to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(2) **GROUND FOR SUBSTITUTION.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), the following circumstances are described in this paragraph:

(A) the reassignment would seriously jeopardize the national defense interests of the United States;

(B) the frequency proposed for reassignment is uniquely suited to meeting important governmental needs;

(C) the reassignment would seriously jeopardize public health or safety; or

(D) the reassignment will result in costs to the Federal Government that are excessive in relation to the benefits that may be obtained from commercial or other non-Federal uses of the reassigned frequency.

(3) **CRITERIA FOR SUBSTITUTED FREQUENCIES.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), a frequency may not be substituted for a frequency identified by the report of the Secretary under section 4(a) unless the substituted frequency also meets each of the criteria specified by section 4(a).

(4) **DELAYS IN IMPLEMENTATION.**—If the President determines that any action cannot be completed by the delayed effective date recommended by the Secretary pursuant to section 4(e), or that such an action by such date would result in a frequency being unused as a consequence of the Commission's plan under section 6, the President may—

(A) withdraw or limit the assignment to Federal Government stations on a later date that is consistent with such plan, except that the President shall notify each committee specified in paragraph (1)(B) and the Commission of the reason that withdrawal or limitation at a later date is required; or

(B) substitute alternative frequencies pursuant to the provisions of this subsection.

(c) **LIMITATION ON DELEGATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorities and duties established by this section may not be delegated.

SEC. 6. DISTRIBUTION OF FREQUENCIES BY THE COMMISSION.

Not later than 1 year after the President notifies the Commission pursuant to section 5(a)(5), the Commission shall prepare, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information when necessary, and submit to the President and the Congress, a plan for the distribution under the Act of the frequency bands reallocated pursuant to the requirements of this Act. Such plan shall—

(1) not propose the immediate distribution of all such frequencies, but, taking into account the timetable recommended by the Secretary pursuant to section 4(e), shall propose—

(A) gradually to distribute the frequencies remaining, after making the reservation required by subparagraph (B), over the course of a period of not less than 10 years beginning on the date of submission of such plan; and

(B) to reserve a significant portion of such frequencies for distribution beginning after the end of such 10-year period;

(2) contain appropriate provisions to ensure—

(A) the availability of frequencies for new technologies and services in accordance with the policies of section 7 of the Act (47 U.S.C. 157); and

(B) the availability of frequencies to stimulate the development of such technologies;

(3) address (A) the feasibility of reallocating spectrum from current commercial and other non-Federal uses to provide for more efficient use of the spectrum, and (B) innovation and marketplace developments that may affect the relative efficiencies of different spectrum allocations; and

(4) not prevent the Commission from allocating bands of frequencies for specific uses in future rulemaking proceedings.

SEC. 7. AUTHORITY TO RECOVER REASSIGNED FREQUENCIES.

(a) **AUTHORITY OF PRESIDENT.**—Subsequent to the withdrawal of assignment to Federal Government stations pursuant to section 5, the President may reclaim reassigned frequencies for reassignment to Federal Government stations in accordance with this section.

(b) **PROCEDURE FOR RECLAIMING FREQUENCIES.**—

(1) **UNALLOCATED FREQUENCIES.**—If the frequencies to be reclaimed have not been allocated or assigned by the Commission pursuant to the Act, the President shall follow the procedures for substitution of frequencies established by section 5(b) of this Act.

(2) **ALLOCATED FREQUENCIES.**—If the frequencies to be reclaimed have been allocated or assigned by the Commission, the President shall follow the procedures for substitution of frequencies established by section 5(b) of this Act, except that the notification required by section 5(b)(1)(A) shall include—

(A) a timetable to accommodate an orderly transition for licensees to obtain new frequencies and equipment necessary for its utilization; and

(B) an estimate of the cost of displacing spectrum users licensed by the Commission.

(c) **COSTS OF RECLAIMING FREQUENCIES; APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED.**—The Federal Gov-

ernment shall bear all costs of reclaiming frequencies pursuant to this section, including the cost of equipment which is rendered unusable, the cost of relocating operations to a different frequency band, and any other costs that are directly attributable to the reclaiming of the frequency pursuant to this section. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE OF RECLAIMED FREQUENCIES.**—The Commission shall not withdraw licenses for any reclaimed frequencies until the end of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the President's notification is received.

(e) **EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or otherwise affect the authority of the President under sections 305 and 706 of the Act (47 U.S.C. 606).

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) The term "allocation" means an entry in the National Table of Frequency Allocations of a given frequency band for the purpose of its use by one or more radiocommunication services.

(2) The term "assignment" means an authorization given to a station licensee to use specific frequencies or channels.

(3) The term "commercial carrier" means any entity that uses a facility licensed by the Federal Communications Commission pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934 for hire or for its own use, but does not include Federal Government stations licensed pursuant to section 305 of the Act (47 U.S.C. 305).

(4) The term "Commission" means the Federal Communications Commission.

(5) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

(6) The term "the Act" means the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RINALDO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 531, the Emerging Telecommunications Technologies Act of 1991 which would require the Secretary of Commerce to identify and transfer 200 MHz of radio frequency spectrum, currently assigned to the Federal Government users, for reallocation to our Nation's commercial sector. I want to commend Chairman DINGELL for his leadership and insight in shaping this critical piece of legislation—legislation that will serve as a cornerstone for future growth in the U.S. telecommunications industry and economy.

All across the country, telecommunications technologies are changing the face of the business landscape and are creating exciting new opportunities for the American consumer. The radio frequency spectrum or airwaves, constitutes the medium through which these new technologies carry information. Industries which rely on the spectrum—from television and radio broadcasting and cellular phones to satellite transmissions and garage door openers—together generate more than \$100 billion in annual revenues.

As wireless technologies develop however, their commercial viability is increasingly threatened by the lack of available radio spectrum. This piece of legislation proposes a realistic and pragmatic means of effectively identifying spectrum presently underutilized by the Federal Government and transferring it to the FCC for reallocation to the private sector. This will then create much needed breathing room in which new technologies can make it to market and flourish.

One example of a technological innovation envisioned by the bill would enable people using laptop and note-book sized computers to communicate with each other, wherever they are located and to connect with files and databases anywhere in the world. While there are a number of proposals for expanded personal communications services [PCS], to date, policymakers have not yet made adequate provision for the coming revolution in personal productivity represented by the communicating PC's. Presently there are no adequate frequencies assigned in the United States for this sort of technology, and it will not exist but for a new allocation of spectrum. Apple Computer, IBM, NCR, Tandy, and Compaq among other companies, have supported a spectrum allocation for data-PC's technology.

The benefits of the increased productivity in U.S. education and industry that will result from this one new technology alone have inherent value; this allocation would create the environment for virtually unlimited access to the power of computing for students, business people, professionals, public servants, and consumers in every walk of life. The development of the new technology also will significantly affect U.S. competitiveness in the world economy. With adequate spectrum resources, U.S. computer and information industries are in a position to become the world leader in the development and use of wireless PC networks and, as a result, set the international standards for hardware, frequencies, and software protocols on a de facto basis.

The proposal for allocation of frequencies for data-PC's is thus an example of the type of spectrum use that scores high in the bill's criteria uniqueness, necessity, productivity, and competitiveness, and is indicative of the type of exciting technological development that this bill will foster.

As the Commission considers new technologies, such as personal communications services [PCS] which will become an element of our Nation's telecommunications infrastructure, we must adopt policies that promote competition among diverse providers while not excluding viable competitors.

It is vitally important that we adopt policies now to make this limited natural resource, the radio airwaves, more

available. Our international competitors have already begun the process of reallocating radio frequencies and establishing spectrum reserves. As a nation, we simply cannot delay any longer if we hope to take advantage of the opportunities these new technologies offer.

H.R. 531 is a public policy blueprint that creates these exciting new opportunities. It enables technology to spur robust economic growth and to improve our way of life. This legislation requires the Federal Government to employ more efficient spectrum management techniques so that it can transfer some of its unused and underutilized spectrum for reassignment to emerging commercial technologies. H.R. 531 proposes a realistic and pragmatic means of effectively reallocating at least 200 megahertz of the radio frequency spectrum from the Federal Government to the private sector and the public safety community.

H.R. 531 is the foundation for our efforts to achieve this objective and help our Nation fulfill its technological and economic future. Without passage of H.R. 531 many of tomorrow's new technologies and services may forever remain a gleam in the eyes of their inventors and investors. The concepts embodied in this bill will truly lay the groundwork for new frontiers in telecommunications, perhaps bringing us to the day when Dick Tracy two-way video wristwatches become as common as congressional beepers around here. This legislation represents more than a shifting of frequencies from the present to the future however, it represents the replenishment of a vital resource, a renewing of our Nation's commitment to technological preeminence and the distinction of having the best telecommunications infrastructure in the world.

In the last session of Congress, this legislation was unanimously accepted by the committee and the full House. With the bill ready for passage on the floor of the U.S. Senate, it was held hostage to peripheral budgetary wrangling. This effectively prevented the Nation from moving forward, from taking the first step of identifying and transferring spectrum. This year again, efforts were made to delay passage of this bill until fiscal and assignment issues unrelated to this first step were resolved.

I agree with the administration and with Mr. RITTER and my other colleagues that reform of the assignment process is necessary and that our review should consider the administration's proposals to have a revenue-raising element in the spectrum assignment process. I am committed to working with my colleague from Pennsylvania and the administration to develop a consensus solution to these important assignment issues. As part of that effort, the subcommittee will hold a

hearing in mid-September, where Secretary Mosbacher will have an opportunity to articulate the administration's policy. I look forward to working with Mr. RITTER and my other colleagues on their separate legislative proposal. Today's passage of H.R. 531 will in no way prejudice our deliberations on the much-needed legislative reform of the FCC's flawed assignment process.

I would again like to commend Chairman DINGELL and his excellent staff, David Leach and Jack Clough, for their leadership on this issue and thank Mr. LENT, Mr. RINALDO, as well as Mike Regan of the minority staff for their steadfast support and cooperation.

I urge my colleagues' support for this legislation.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank on my staff for his work over the past year, John Kinney, who is leaving to start law school at De Paul University as a scholarship student in August. This will be his last piece of legislation on the floor. I would like to thank him for his effort, and would like to also thank the minority counsel as well.

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

Mr. Speaker, the primary role of Congress in the communications field is to preserve and promote competition and innovation wherever possible. This is particularly important now in the emerging and fiercely competitive global telecommunications market.

To promote American competitiveness in the field of telecommunications, we must make our scarce radio spectrum resources available for as many different uses as possible and ensure that it is used efficiently.

Presently, the radio spectrum—the very lifeblood of the communications industry—is overcrowded. This not only stifles existing users of spectrum, but potential new users of that spectrum as well. These promising new users include high definition television [HDTV], digital audio broadcasting [DAB], and personal communications networks [PCN], the next generation of portable telephones. With the expected deployment of these systems in the near future, this Nation faces the threat of a spectrum crisis.

H.R. 531 takes a commonsense approach to addressing this crisis: It promotes efficient spectrum use, encourages greater Government coordination, and makes much needed spectrum available for commercial users. The legislation will also stimulate technological innovation within our domestic telecommunications industry.

For years, the Government has championed policies designed to promote efficient spectrum use. This bill requires the Government to practice what it preaches and turn over the

spectrum it doesn't need for private use wherever possible. No more, no less.

We recognize that the Government has a multitude of legitimate spectrum uses that we must continue to provide for, but, like all spectrum users, the Government should be required to justify spectrum needs.

H.R. 531 puts this process in motion by requiring the National Telecommunications and Information Administration [NTIA], the spectrum coordinator for the Government, to review current Government spectrum use and select, within 2 years, 200 megahertz for reallocation to commercial users. To meet our most pressing needs, the bill provides for the expedited identification and reallocation of 30 megahertz of spectrum.

The FCC would then take responsibility for determining how best to allocate the newly available spectrum to existing and new technologies. H.R. 531 mandates that the FCC carefully weigh the benefits and costs to the public of any proposed reallocation.

We all know that the commercial potential of new communications technologies will be essential to our economy as we move into the next century. Without new spectrum allocation and assignment policies like H.R. 531, our communications infrastructure will become even more congested and will be frozen into obsolete technologies.

Finally, I want to commend the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. DINGELL, for his leadership on this important issue. Both he and the chairman of the Telecommunications Subcommittee, Mr. MARKEY, should be commended for the time and effort they have put into this issue, which is one of the most important long-range issues we face. I hope and believe that this bill will make a positive contribution to America's competitive position in the years to come.

I urge all Members of the House to support H.R. 531.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not commend the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], for his leadership on this important issue. Both the chairman and the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], should be commended for the time and effort they have put into this issue, which is one of the most important long-range issues we face. I think the proposal of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], which was enunciated on the floor, for handling the other problems allocated with spectrum allocation, are very noteworthy and to the point. I hope and believe this bill will make a positive contribution to America's competitive position in the years to come.

Once again, I want to acknowledge the hard work of the subcommittee members, the subcommittee staff, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], and on this side, in particular, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY], as well as on the other side, the gentleman from Louisiana. [Mr. TAUZIN].

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 531, the Emerging Telecommunications Technologies Act of 1991.

I want to commend our colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] for his leadership in this area, as well as the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], and the subcommittee for staying on top of these opportunities which present itself, so that America can fulfill the potential in this burgeoning area of telecommunications.

This bill gives the way, as we have heard, for 200 megahertz of spectrum to be reallocated from Government use to private use.

As we have heard, as well, there is no doubt we are running out of room in the usable radio spectrum, and there is tremendous opportunity out there in the private sector to take advantage of spectrum. Private industry is doing its best to implement spectrum management techniques. However, Government users have not been forced to use the spectrum as efficiently as they should. By moving 200 megahertz of spectrum from the Government to the private sector, I think we will begin to force the Government to be as efficient as the private industry counterparts.

However, I do feel we are missing a great opportunity here. With this particular bill, the spectrum we made available will be handed out free of charge.

In the past, this had meant that speculators, with no particular communications skill or knowledge, but with enough luck to hold the "winning" number in a Federal Communications Commission lottery, these speculators receive the license. Now, the recent cellular license winner in Cape Cod is a good example.

□ 1240

The applicant's goal is often just to turn around and sell the license for a huge windfall profit. That is what happened here, not to construct the communications system for which the license has been awarded. In such diverse publications as the Washington Post, the New York Times and The Economist, articles and editorials have appeared questioning why the Government gives away these valuable licenses of a public good radio spectrum

for free. Is it not about time we ought to put an end to the process?

I have authored H.R. 1407, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] and my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN]. This is a bill to mandate that spectrum be reallocated on a competitive bidding basis, where the public is the recipient of the bid. Competitive bidding for spectrum makes sense. The Government uses competitive bidding for oil and natural gas leases. Why not somewhat similar systems for spectrum licenses?

Some people argue that only the deep pockets will be able to play the bidding game. Well, the news is that only the deep pockets can play the game today.

Today there is no requirement that the lottery winner take into account such principles as minority ownership, diversity, or the needs of innovative small business; but if the FCC manages the bidding process, the Government can make sure that all these principles are taken into account.

Spectrum bidding is a taxpayer relief concept. That is why the National Taxpayers Union supports competitive bidding. I am also confident that a competitive bidding mechanism can be developed that insures that those with legitimate spectrum needs can be accommodated in the years to come. Again, the FCC manages it. It is not straight flat out bidding exposure to the highest bidder.

Furthermore, we could target at least some or all of that revenue perhaps for telecommunications infrastructure improvement. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] just spoke eloquently on the need to provide the basis for telecommunications improvements over the years. Infrastructure is important. Perhaps this could serve as an important source of revenue for enhancing telecommunications infrastructure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. RITTER. America's economic competitiveness depends on an advanced telecommunications and information network. Fiber optics is one particular example. Perhaps this money from spectrum bidding could be used to further America's investment in fiber optic networks. It is really imperative that Congress promote policies for telecommunications infrastructure development; otherwise we risk allowing others to surpass us in an information economy based on global telecommunications now into the next century.

Getting back to the bill before us, I support H.R. 531. It is a good first step. It has the potential of opening up additional spectrum for telecommunications technologies.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] and I have discussed the issue of competitive bidding and he has acceded to holding a hearing in September. I look forward to that hearing. I appreciate the chairman's willingness to work with me on this extremely important issue.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, Chairman DINGELL, for his continued efforts to establish a broad framework for promoting the efficient use of the radio spectrum.

H.R. 531 introduces 200 megahertz of new spectrum to the marketplace, the purpose of which is to promote the growth of our telecommunications industry. As we approach the dawn of a new century, advances in telecommunications technologies are spurring economic growth and enhancing our quality of life. Many of these advances depend on the use of the radio spectrum, and passage of H.R. 531 represents a step toward ensuring that the spectrum needs of these emerging telecommunications technologies can be met.

While H.R. 531 represents a significant step in the right direction, I believe that we have an opportunity to realize even greater gains. My colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. RITTER, and I have introduced a bill, H.R. 1407, which would distribute new spectrum by competitive bidding. The spectrum is a valuable public resource, and the American public should realize the financial, as well as the technological, benefits generated by this resource.

Hearings on H.R. 1407 will commence in September with testimony from Secretary of Commerce Robert Mosbacher. I am hopeful that the many benefits of this legislation will become apparent, as I believe it is good public policy.

Auctioning spectrum space makes sense, and there are four reasons why H.R. 1407 is good public policy. Auctions would produce more innovative uses of spectrum space. Auctions would lead to more efficient allocation of a limited amount of spectrum space. Auctions would produce revenues which could be used to reduce the Federal budget deficit. And finally, auctions would bring spectrum allocation in line with other fee-for-use programs.

By supporting H.R. 1407, we have an opportunity to truly give the public its money's worth, and that's good public policy.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have no other Members who are seeking recognition, but I would like to say this to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] and to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] that I am going to work with

them through the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RINALDO] to fashion legislation. We will begin with the hearing with Mr. Mosbacher testifying.

Step one then will be the passage of this legislation which will begin the process of identifying and recapturing 200 megahertz spectrum, and then a reform process put on the books for its dissemination back out into the commercial marketplace, with some set asides for the public service, for public safety and other areas that we will have to deal with in a subsequent piece of legislation; so we will work with the gentleman. This is our foundation and we will move forward, and I thank the gentleman for his cooperation.

Again in conclusion, I would like to thank the ranking minority member of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT].

I would like to thank Gerry Salemme of the staff, and I would like to thank Colin Crowell of my staff and again my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RINALDO].

Mr. Speaker, I urge full support of the House for this legislation. It is a critically important piece of long-term competitiveness for our country.

Let me once again restate that the Japanese are targeting 20 to 22 percent of their Gross National Product that will be telecommunications hardware or software by the year 2000. Our country has to have a plan, we have to have a strategy and this piece of legislation is a critical part of that strategy.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, during the last decade, we have seen a profound and beneficial change in our daily lives. The telecommunications technologies that have emerged in that time—fax machines, cellular phones, and even the pagers that Members of Congress use—all are now so common that we take them for granted.

The benefits of these then-new technologies came about in part because we gave them room to grow. The FCC allocated part of the radio frequency spectrum to the pagers and the cellular phones. We invested that scarce resource in the private sector and have since reaped a large reward.

Unfortunately, this decade may not repeat the success of the last. The reason? The spectrum is jammed; most of the space is taken. Promising new technologies, such as high definition television [HDTV], may suffocate if we do not make more spectrum available.

H.R. 531 does just that. This bill takes government frequencies that might be put to a better use and turns them over to the private sector. Under H.R. 531, the Commerce Department would coordinate and consolidate government spectrum usage in an effort to make it more efficient.

This process should free up approximately 200 megahertz of spectrum, or the equivalent of 33 TV channels, for private use. This investment will have a handsome payoff in the next 10 years as existing and future technologies, such as personal communications networks [PCN] and HDTV, use the frequencies that H.R. 531 makes available.

I want to commend the full committee chairman, Mr. DINGELL, for his leadership on this important issue. I also want to commend the subcommittee chairman, Mr. MARKEY, and the ranking Republican member, Mr. RINALDO, for the considerable effort that they have devoted to this issue in the subcommittee. Together they have forged a bill that promises an enormous return on the small investment it makes.

I urge all the Members of the House to support H.R. 531, the Emerging Telecommunications Technologies Act of 1991.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 531, the Emerging Telecommunications Technologies Act. I would like to commend Mr. MARKEY, the chairman of the Subcommittee of Telecommunications and Finance, for bringing this bill before the House so expeditiously. I would also like to commend him for compiling a hearing record in support of this legislation that will serve as a resource for years to come.

In many ways, H.R. 531 is an obscure piece of legislation. Congress seldom legislates on spectrum issues. Indeed, prior to the hearings held by our Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, the last comprehensive set of hearings that were held on the Government's procedures for making decisions on its own spectrum use took place in 1959. However, H.R. 531 has generated considerable attention, and spectrum management issues have become a much higher priority for the telecommunications industries and those in Government who oversee them.

Although they may be obscure, spectrum management decisions made in the next few years will have a profound effect on the way Americans work, relax, and live their daily lives well into the next century. A wide variety of new technologies can bring innovative services to the market—but only if the necessary spectrum is made available.

Therein lies the problem. The Federal Communications Commission has no vacant frequencies available to license for new technologies or services, no matter how desirable they may be. Under the most optimistic scenario, the introduction of new technologies will be delayed for a considerable period of time while the Commission attempts to take frequencies away from an existing user. More than likely, however, is that a great many technologies will never be introduced at all, due to the lack of available spectrum. Neither is an acceptable alternative as we enter the 21st century.

The adverse effect of the spectrum shortage is not limited to the introduction of new technologies. When corporate decisionmakers are deciding to allocate their research dollars, it is unlikely that they will invest in research and development of spectrum-dependent technologies, knowing that there are no available frequencies. The likelihood of ever recovering those investments is slight. And, if a lengthy regulatory fight at the FCC is a precondition of obtaining an allocation, the combination of uncertainty, cost, and risk will have the effect of steering research funds into other areas where a payoff is more likely.

Our Asian and European competitors are not so constrained. Americans use more spectrum than any other nation, and thus our spectrum shortage is far more acute and poses

problems that are unique to the United States. This is not an indictment—the American people have access to more radio and television signals, and more mobile radio technologies, than the citizens of any other nation. But the effect of our unique problems will be to see leadership in wireless technologies migrate to Japan, Europe, and other countries.

H.R. 531 was drafted so that we might avoid losing our lead in wireless technologies, and help assure that the benefits of the technological revolution are not lost to the American people. While there are a variety of problems that are unaddressed by the legislation, it will go a long way toward assuring that the FCC will be able to provide for our future spectrum needs.

In my view, the spectrum shortage we currently face is, in large part, the result of decisions made in the early part of the 20th Century. At that time, radio was in its infancy. The driving force that brought the Federal Government into the act was the need to prevent interference, as unlicensed and unregulated operators used the airwaves without restraint.

Authority to regulate spectrum use—by Government and non-Government users—was vested in the Commerce Department, under then-Secretary Herbert Hoover. In 1922, Secretary Hoover created the Interagency Radio Advisory Committee, to provide him with advice on the spectrum needs of the Federal Government. This unified control over all spectrum use enabled him to make informed decisions that would prevent interference between commercial and Government users.

For the next 5 years, this structure made sense. But in 1927, Congress created the Federal Radio Commission, and relieved the Secretary of Commerce of his responsibility to regulate the use of the spectrum by non-Government users. In 1934, the authorities vested in the FRC were transferred to the newly formed FCC, which has had the responsibility ever since.

Although both the regulatory structure and the amount of use of the spectrum have changed since 1922, the IRAC lives on. It continues to advise the Secretary of the Government's spectrum needs, and does an admirable job. But the tasks facing spectrum managers have grown considerably more complex since 1922.

Instead of merely regulating spectrum use to prevent interference, today's spectrum managers must weigh a host of competing demands. Today, their task is dominated by the need to apportion a scarce resource among competing—and in most cases, deserving—claimants.

But the regulatory structure established in 1922, and modified in 1927 and 1934, does not lend itself to the efficient management of a scarce resource. It is as if we had two landlords, operating independently, renting space in the same building.

Moreover, the internal procedures utilized by the IRAC do not lend themselves to the efficient management of the Government's portion of the spectrum. Meetings are held behind closed doors. No public input is sought. Decisions are seldom announced to the public, even after repeated inquiries are made. While the current Administrator of the National Telecommunications and Information Administra-

tion has set in motion a series of reforms designed to open the process to public scrutiny, which are commendable, we are still left with the legacy of nearly 70 years of closed-door decision-making.

The hearing record compiled by the Telecommunications Subcommittee leaves no doubt that these inefficient procedures have resulted in inefficient use of this scarce resource. Technologies such as trunking—long utilized by commercial operators—are still in the experimental phase for Government users. It is clear that the rigors of the FCC's procedures have resulted in more efficient spectrum use by non-Government users than by the Government.

H.R. 531 is designed to remedy this problem. It will require that the Commerce Department and the FCC conduct joint planning activities, so as to ensure greater levels of coordination and cooperation. Specifically, the legislation requires that these activities address: the future spectrum requirements for public and private uses, the allocation actions necessary to accommodate those uses, and actions necessary to promote the efficient use of the spectrum, including spectrum management techniques to promote increased shared use of the spectrum that does not cause harmful interference as a means of increasing commercial access.

This last point is extremely important. The Government currently has exclusive access to frequencies that are utilized in rural areas. Some of these uses are classified, and concern Defense Department programs for weapons testing—which is, as a general practice, conducted in remote areas. Other applications involve remote sensing to warn of rising water in rivers and reservoirs, which could result in flooding. I have no quarrel with these uses. But I see no reason why a prudent sharing arrangement cannot be worked out, whereby these same frequencies can be reused in urban areas, and help relieve congestion.

In addition to addressing the problems caused by 70 years of bifurcated management, the legislation contains other provisions as well. It requires that the Commerce Department identify 200 MHz of spectrum used or allocated to Government users that, over time, will be transferred to the FCC for licensing to non-Government users. It will increase reliance on services provided by private sector vendors, such as system operators or common carriers, for the provision of services the Government currently provides for itself. In short, H.R. 531 will have a substantial effect on the efficiency of Government spectrum use, now and in the future.

By requiring that 200 MHz of spectrum be freed up for non-Government uses, the legislation will also result in the availability of blocks of frequencies that the FCC will be able to allocate for new technologies. Innovators and entrepreneurs will be able to conduct research with the knowledge that they at least have a fighting chance to obtain an allocation of spectrum. American companies can make investment decisions to engage in research and development of spectrum-dependent technologies in the United States, and not migrate off shore. American users will continue to have access to cutting edge technologies that will help us to compete internationally.

H.R. 531 is not a panacea for all that ails us. But its beneficial effects will be virtually immediate and long lasting. Its passage by Congress should not be held hostage to theories about spectrum auctions or other problems that involve the Commission's licensing practices. Those problems need to be addressed—but first we must make sure that the Commission has something to license.

It is my hope that the passage of H.R. 531, and its implementation by the executive branch, will create a new environment for spectrum managers. The current ad hoc approach to allocation decisions can be replaced with a more rational approach. For example, local public safety agencies utilize frequencies at 200, 400 and 800 MHz. That means that each police cruiser needs to have three radios in its trunk—an expensive proposition for local taxpayers. Not only is this an inefficient use of taxpayer dollars, it is an inefficient use of spectrum as well. Over time, the freedom that H.R. 531 gives to spectrum managers will enable them to create common blocks of frequencies for public safety and other users, reducing their costs and increasing spectrum efficiency simultaneously.

The Emerging Telecommunications Technologies Act is a bill whose time has come. Unless this landmark legislation is passed and signed into law, American manufacturing companies will lose their lead in bringing new wireless technologies to U.S. users. Americans have developed an appreciation for the benefits that spectrum-dependent technologies can bring. They deserve to benefit from new radio technologies well into the next century.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. It has been endorsed by a wide variety of spectrum users—in fact, I am not aware of a single organization that opposes H.R. 531. Among those supporting the bill is a group known as APCO [the Association of Public Safety Communications Officers]. APCO's support is due to the need for additional frequencies for public safety use, by local police and fire departments. Unless H.R. 531 is passed, local public safety officers will not have access to the spectrum they need and deserve, and will continue to encounter delays that are simply intolerable.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 531 was reported by unanimous voice vote by the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, and by the Committee on Energy and Commerce. It is substantially similar to H.R. 2965, which passed the House a year ago by unanimous voice vote. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislative initiative, which I regard as one of the most important to come before this House this year.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 531, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. 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. 531, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

STRIPED BASS ACT OF 1991

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2387) to authorize appropriations for certain programs for the conservation of striped bass, and for other purposes as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2387

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Striped Bass Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. ATLANTIC STRIPED BASS CONSERVATION ACT ENFORCEMENT, REAUTHORIZATION, AND EXTENSION.

(a) ENFORCEMENT OF MORATORIUM ON ATLANTIC STRIPED BASS FISHING.—Section 5(e) of the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 note) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by inserting "(1)" before "The Secretaries"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(2) ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.—A person authorized by the Secretaries may take any action to enforce a moratorium declared under section 4(b) that an officer authorized by the Secretary under section 311(b) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act may take to enforce that Act.

"(3) REGULATIONS.—The Secretaries may issue regulations to implement this subsection."

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Section 7 of the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 note) is amended—

(1) by inserting before "For each" the following: "(a) AUTHORIZATION.—";

(2) by striking "and 1991," and inserting "1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994,";

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretaries may enter into cooperative agreements with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission for the purpose of using amounts appropriated pursuant to this section to provide financial assistance to the Commission for carrying out its functions under this Act."; and

(4) in the heading for the section by inserting before the period at the end the following: "COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS".

(c) EXTENSION OF EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—Section 9 of the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 1851 note) is amended by striking "1991." and inserting "1994."

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF STRIPED BASS STUDIES UNDER ANADROMOUS FISH CONSERVATION ACT.

(a) CONDUCT AND SCOPE OF STUDIES.—Section 7(a) of the Anadromous Fish Conserva-

tion Act (16 U.S.C. 757g(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) CONDUCT AND SCOPE OF STUDIES.—The Secretary shall cooperate with States and other non-Federal interests in conducting scientific studies of the anadromous stocks of Atlantic striped bass. These studies shall include, but not be limited to—

"(1) estimates of recruitment, spawning potential, mortality rates, stock composition of coastal fisheries, and other population parameters;

"(2) investigations of factors affecting abundance of striped bass, including analyses of the extent and causes of mortality at successive life stages; and

"(3) monitoring population abundance and age and sex composition of striped bass stocks on fishery-dependent and fishery-independent data."

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 7(d) of the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 757g(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking "1988, 1989, 1990, and 1991," and inserting "1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994."; and

(2) by striking the third sentence.

SEC. 4. FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN ON STRIPED BASS.

Section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations to carry out the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act for fiscal years 1989 through 1991, and for other purposes", approved November 3, 1988 (Public Law 100-589), is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (c);

(2) in subsection (d) by striking "or (c)"; and

(3) by striking subsection (f).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2387, the Striped Bass Act of 1991 modifies and extends the Striped Bass Conservation Act of 1984 and the Federal Striped Bass Study for an additional 3 years.

On May 30, the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment held a hearing on the bill, and every witness, including the administration, testified in support of the legislation. At our subcommittee markup on June 20, we added three minor amendments that reflected suggestions we received at our hearing. The following week, the bill was unanimously approved by the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, the Striped Bass Act of 1984 was passed in response to a dramatic decline in the striped bass populations along the east coast in the 1970's and early 1980's. The act, along with sound management, State and regional cooperation, and strong support from the commercial and sports fishermen, have all contributed to the recovery of the striper.

The stripers' comeback, Mr. Speaker, is no less miraculous than the efforts of Jim Palmer and Jimmy Connors.

But in order to avoid the same outcome as the efforts of those two great athletes, we need to maintain sound conservation practices for the striped bass. H.R. 2387 will ensure the full recovery of the striper, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2387, the Striped Bass Act of 1991, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Even though the migratory range of the Atlantic striped bass does not extend to the coast of Alaska, I fully support the reauthorization efforts of the committee. I am pleased to hear that the numbers of the stripers are apparently getting stronger, and the management plan in contributing to the full restoration of the species.

However, I would like to state that I am extremely hesitant to interfere further with State management programs, even if the range of the stock extends beyond a single State's waters. States should be encouraged to work together for joint management of fish stocks.

H.R. 2387 is simply a reauthorization, with a few minor adjustments, mainly for clarification purposes. Again, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me first congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] for bringing this bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to speak on behalf of the striped bass.

As a fisherman I recognize the value of our domestic fish population for the recreational pleasure of the American public.

I do not think we have an opportunity often to speak up on behalf of the bass population of this Nation.

Now, it is true that Bill Westmoreland loves small-mouthed bass and there is no doubt that Bill Dance loves large-mouthed bass most of all. But my heart goes out for the striped bass.

This is an enormous, wonderful recreational fish; a good fighter and a good contestant at any time that you manage to snag one.

Not only should we enjoy the striped bass, but we should recognize that he does on our behalf a wonderful gesture when he takes our bait; and we should play with him, we should enjoy the contest, and we should then do the fair thing, put him back in his home to provide recreation for yet another dedicated angler.

We should introduce our children to the striped bass and to others of the species.

Mr. Speaker, I live with an abiding faith that a youngster who spends his idle time plotting and scheming for that time in which he is going to catch the biggest bass in the lake is a youngster who will not go astray.

Now, a parent, a mother or a father who spends their time on the lake or on the shore with the youngster helping that youngster to develop these skills, this sense of sportsmanship, this sense of fair play to catch the wonderful striped bass, and then release him home for others to enjoy is a youngster who will be taught by that parent all the best merits of sportsmanship, good conduct, and good manners and a youngster that is not likely to go astray.

So I applaud the gentleman for bringing this legislation forward, and I applaud the Congress for what I am sure will be their unqualified support on behalf of the bass that will provide for our children an inspiration for greater, more responsible citizenship in the future.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to confess I was unprepared for this outburst of enthusiasm and perspective and humanity and just general understanding of life from Texas. I am deeply appreciative, as I know the striper is remarkable. I want to commend—we have to commend one another, as you know, here and apparently it is part of the rules.

The preceding bill, I think, broke some record with respect to Members commending one another any number of times. But the gentleman from Alaska, notwithstanding the fact that he slipped for a moment and referred to this as a rockfish, we appreciate the understanding of the gentleman from Texas, almost as far distant, that its real name is striper.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, just to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

It is a striped bass in Massachusetts and in the Chesapeake Bay and in California, but as I mentioned before, it does not come to Alaska. We can only say "salmon," and we will address that issue in the next bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2387, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENCOURAGING THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION TO BAN LARGE-SCALE DRIFT-NET FISHING

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 182) to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of State should encourage the European Commission to vote to ban all large-scale drift-net fishing by all European Community fishing fleets, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 182

"Whereas United Nations Resolution 44/225 specifically calls for the immediate cessation of expansion of large-scale driftnet fishing on the high seas;

"Whereas the European Community co-sponsored United Nations Resolution 45/197, which reaffirms United Nations Resolution 44/225;

"Whereas the damage caused by the use of large-scale driftnets on the high seas can be crippling to efforts to conserve fisheries within the exclusive economic zones of coastal States;

"Whereas there are currently no effective conservation and management measures that will make large-scale driftnet fishing an acceptable fishing technology;

"Whereas votes in the European Community and other regional fora to ban large-scale driftnet fishing are critical to the global effort to accomplish that goal;

"Whereas the expansion of large-scale driftnet fishing on the high seas by certain European Community fishing fleets is in contravention of United Nations Resolutions 44/225 and 45/197; and

"Whereas approval by the Fishery Council of the European Community of a proposal to ban large-scale driftnet fishing, which is scheduled to be voted on by the European Commission in the near future, is critical to the success of the global fight to ban large-scale driftnet fishing, and is therefore of extreme importance to the United States Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Congress and other Federal agencies with competence regarding large-scale driftnet fishing, should communicate to members of the European Community the support of the United States to obtain an immediate ban on all large-scale driftnet fishing by European Community fishing fleets, including all fishing using one driftnet, or a combination of driftnets, having a total length greater than 2.5 kilometers."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 182 is a simple resolution with a powerful

message to the European Community to act now to ban large-scale drift net fishing by its member fleets.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee recently learned that the European Community is about to consider the issue of large-scale driftnet fishing. The Fishery Council of the Community is expected to vote in the very near future on whether to ban the use of large-scale drift nets. House Resolution 182 is intended to put the House of Representatives on record as favoring such a ban.

Most Members are probably aware of the destructive large-scale drift net fishing that occurs in the Pacific Ocean by fishermen from Japan, Taiwan, and Korea. Driftnets up to 40 miles long are used to catch salmon, squid, and tuna, but in the process also slaughter thousands of seabirds, whales, dolphins, and sea turtles. In response to this tragic situation the United Nations has passed resolutions prohibiting any further expansion of large-scale drift net fishing and calling for a complete moratorium on the use of these killer nets on the high seas by June 30, 1992.

Last year this Congress prohibited U.S. fishermen from using large-scale drift nets—nets over one and one-half miles long. This resolution encourages the European Community to do the same and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of both drift net resolutions that the House will be considering today, and I urge each of my colleagues to do the same.

The large-scale drift net issue is of particular concern to me. This gear type has stripped the ocean of numerous target and nontarget marine resources, including those which support Alaskan fisheries.

Taiwanese, Korean, and Japanese fishing fleets set thousands of miles of this monofilament net each day. Each net can be as long as 60 kilometers. These nets drift with the tide entangling anything on the surface or in the water. Victims of this gear include whales, dolphins, turtles, sea birds, and salmon, just to name a few. Perhaps some of my colleagues are not aware but many of these same critters are protected, and the directed or incidental killing of some species is in violation of marine mammal protection laws.

The impacts to the fishing industry in Alaska from the incidental catch and directed taking of salmon on the high seas is unacceptable. The Japanese fisheries in the North Pacific are notorious for a high salmon by-catch, and many believe the illegal directed taking of salmon on the high seas.

I have just returned from Alaska, where just last week the fishermen

were protesting. The contentious issue was the price they were being offered by processing plants, which are mainly Japanese owned. The price was more than 50 percent below that of 1 year ago. The reasons given were that there was so much salmon on the market. Why? Well, that is what everyone is asking. Clearly, there has been an increase in the legitimate supplies of salmon on the world market. But what portion of the salmon glut is due to the illegal high seas fishing. What kind of gear are they using? Large-scale drift nets. One way to combat this particular source of salmon to the benefit of the Alaskan fishermen is to stand behind the ban on the use of large-scale driftnets. This is just one more reason for my support of this measure.

However, the jury is still out on whether or not there really is a glut of salmon on the market, of if the Japanese-owned processing plants were simply getting together and offering one, very low price. Regardless of the market price for salmon, the processors would have taken a large chunk of profit, by offering such a low price. I am concerned for the Alaskan fishermen and have taken steps to see that they are not taken advantage of. I have asked the General Accounting Office to look into the possibility that the processors have engaged in price fixing to the detriment of the fishermen. I sincerely hope that no such price fixing has occurred, but regardless of the findings we are doing something positive today, by taking steps to eliminate an illegal and harmful supply of salmon.

The 1990 statistics from observer data on the directed taking and by-catch using large-scale drift nets show extraordinary numbers. These statistics reinforce my opinion that the losses due to this gear type are extensive and unacceptable. To make matters worse, these data are from only 10 percent of the Japanese fleet. The numbers do not include the other 90 percent or any of the other foreign fishing fleets.

Up until recently, the Pacific Ocean was the center of United States concern of drift net activities. More than 800 driftnet vessels from Japan, Taiwan, and Korea fish in the Pacific, mainly for squid, tuna, and billfish. However, it has been reportedly that vessels carry this gear type have been recently spotted in the Caribbean. We are concerned that the use of this gear may continue to spread.

The United Nations has attempted to take a firm stand on the issue of large-scale drift nets by calling for a moratorium on the use of this gear by the end of June 1992, unless scientific evidence indicates that the negative impacts from using this gear is insignificant.

The first of the two drift net resolutions encourages the European Commission to vote to ban the use of large-scale driftnets by all European Community fishing fleets. House Resolu-

tion 182 resolves that the U.S. Department of State, in consultation with the Congress and other Federal agencies, should communicate to members of the European Commission that the United States supports an immediate ban on the use of this gear type by all European Community fishing craft.

The scientists do not yet know the impacts on fish populations from stripping the oceans. There is a great deal of speculation on the impacts of marine mammal populations, and the health of the entire marine ecosystem.

Let me make another stand behind the ban on the use of large-scale driftnets before we no longer need expert scientists to tell us how badly damaged the oceans are. I once again encourage my colleagues to support both resolutions banning the use of this gear.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, it does not take a Jacques Cousteau to understand the devastating impact the use of large-scale drift nets has on the marine environment. It is rather elementary—toss a few miles of invisible monofilament netting into the sea in hopes of targeting 1 or 2 fisheries, perhaps tuna or squid, and you are bound to entangle at least 50 other marine species that happen to be in the wrong place at the wrong time. I cannot think of a quicker and more efficient way to depopulate the sea.

I would not go so far as to say the United States has a perfect record in this area, but we can take credit for recognizing the problem and trying to do something about it. We took the first step toward reducing the mortality rates of dolphins, turtles, sea birds, and other marine creatures last year when we passed the Dolphin Protection Consumer Information Act. Today we will advance one step farther in our quest to protect the bountiful sea by passing House Concurrent Resolution 113 and House Resolution 182.

Recently my office received a report of the observations of the Japanese high seas squid drift net fishery in the North Pacific Ocean. I was angered by the findings, but I have to say that I was not surprised. Images of dolphins, loggerheads, rays, sailfish, puffers, and fur seals being trapped, drowned, and crushed for no good reason were haunting.

The United States is not the only nation aware of the devastating toll this method of fishing has taken on the sea. No nation can plead ignorance. That is why I find it unconscionable that any nation would allow its fishing industry to continue such practices. The time has come to make large-scale drift-net fishing a method of the past.

You might say I am particularly sensitive to this issue because I am par-

ticularly sensitive to the plight of the dolphin. At my home in Florida, it is not uncommon to look out my window and see dolphins frolicking. Unfortunately we have lost a large number of the dolphin population in the Gulf of Mexico over the past few years due to a number of events. To the average Floridan, dolphins are one of the most cherished natural resources; one dead dolphin is one too many.

Sometimes it seems the rest of the world does not feel the same way about dolphins, or for that matter, for any of the other wonderful marine creatures God has placed on this Earth. The world is a little careless, it seems.

T.S. Eliot once said, "The Seas has many voices." I am afraid that is something is not done soon to stop this method of fishing—a method that is virtually the equivalent of strip-mining the ocean—those voices may be lost forever.

We are not suggesting that commercial fishing is out of bounds. We are rather advocating wise use of our natural resources, so we will continue to have natural resources to use in the future.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and wish him well in his effort to introduce poetry to the floor of the House. It is a challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise and associate myself with the remarks of the previous speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and commend our chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], for his foresight in bringing this resolution before this body.

Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity to participate in a gathering of Members of the Parliament or Congress from Japan, from the European Community, from the United States and from the Soviet Union. Unanimously they support the concept that the drift nets are a menace to any environmentally sustainable use of our natural resources from the oceans and that we should do all we can to ban their use.

I urge this body and the European Community to take these steps now.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I speak in support of the immediate ban on the use of large-scale drift nets by international fishing fleets, House Concurrent Resolution 113. Drift-net fishing anywhere in the world can threaten the viability of marine species and ecosystems for entire regions.

I also support H.R. 182 which calls for an immediate ban on the use of large-scale drift nets by European community fishing fleets.

This resolution defines large-scale drift nets as one or a combination of nets that are more than 1.5 miles long. These plastic nets, which stretch for miles to catch fish below the ocean's surface, indiscriminately kill hundreds of thousands of marine mammals, endangered sea turtles, seabirds and millions of nontarget fish.

□ 1310

Numerous organizations have worked to prevent the widespread damage that large-scale drift nets inflict upon mammals and nontarget species of fish. U.N. General Assembly Resolution 44-225, which was unanimously approved, calls for a moratorium on this practice by June 30, 1992. The Magnuson fishery conservation reauthorization—Public Law 101-627—prohibited the use of large-scale drift nets in U.S. waters, banned their use by U.S. fishing fleets anywhere in the world and urged the administration to negotiate a worldwide ban of these drift nets. As the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] stated earlier. The Global Legislators Organization for a Balanced Environment [GLOBE], an organization of 59 parliamentarians from the European Parliament, the United States Congress and the Diet of Japan supports all initiatives prohibiting the use of large-scale drift nets. I am a member of a GLOBE U.S.A., as is the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD], which met just last week in Tokyo with GLOBE International—GLOBE EC, GLOBE U.S.A., GLOBE Japan, and GLOBE U.S.S.R.—strongly supported implementation of U.N. Resolution 44/225. Mrs. UNSOELD was instrumental in working out compromises with the Japanese Diet, and I commend her for that.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to communicate to the State and Commerce Departments to submit to Congress recommendations of actions, including sanctions, for the United States to implement the international moratorium and the United States ban of large-scale drift nets. It will emphasize to the international community the U.S. support for a moratorium on large-scale drift nets and end the unintended damage to our precious environment.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Alaska, the gentlewoman from Washington, the gentleman from Oregon, the gentleman from Florida, and the gentlewoman from Maryland, as well as any other Member even remotely associated with this issue, in the strongest possible terms.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind Members that this issue has been before Congress before. We voted, along with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], and in fact passed a more restrictive piece of legislation over to the Senate, which would have given the President the ability to impose sanctions on countries. That was rejected by another committee in this House and was stripped from the Senate bill, and that is actually an amendment to the Pell amendment, which I have offered, and has been introduced this year also. Hopefully the committee, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], will see the wisdom to pass that piece of legislation. Because with all the rhetoric one hears today, and I compliment everyone for this effort, it still is not going to be enough, until those countries that we have no treaty with, have no observers on their vessels, primarily Taiwan, are going to continue to use these nets.

Mr. Speaker, we have identified Japan in this resolution, and we have identified some other countries, but the real problem is Taiwan. Until we can address that issue, we are not going to accomplish our goal.

As many previous Members mentioned, how any country can condone this activity, I cannot understand. But we are also one of the largest importers of their products. Taiwan hats, Taiwan fireworks, Taiwan this, Taiwan that. Check your shelves as you go into your home, Mr. Speaker, and you will find out we are the biggest importer from Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to be able to leverage that buying of their products into having them stop this terrible crime they are committing at sea. That is the important factor here.

Mr. Speaker, these are two positive steps, but they are not strong enough yet. We have to make sure that if we do not see immediate action, if there is no action by 1992, we must impose sanctions on those countries that are using this terrible, terrible tactic to catch immature fish and all the marine mammals on the high seas. Mr. Speaker, that is very, very important.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in strong support for House Resolution 182, which calls for the United States to encourage the European Commission to ban large-scale drift net fishing by all EC fishing fleets.

It should be self-evident that a drift net fishing ban is in the interest of the European Community and its member nations. Indeed, such a ban is in everyone's interest. Drift nets are quite simply death machines, and have already wreaked incalculable damage in both the South Pacific and the North Pacific. Were drift nets to become common in the North Atlantic—where the fishing fleets of the EC member nations operate—these rich and productive waters could soon be stripped nearly bare.

The European Commission will soon consider whether to permit the use of 10-kilometer

long drift nets, as some EC members have proposed. Drift nets of this length simply cannot be made safe, and would inevitably entangle countless incidental fish, marine mammals, turtles, and pelagic birds. Moreover, an European Commission decision to permit 10-kilometer drift nets would be in direct contravention of the U.N. resolutions that call for an end to large-scale drift net fishing.

While it is possible that the EC may seek to permit large-scale drift nets, it is also possible that the European Commission may follow the lead of the United States and ban drift net fishing entirely. It is this Member's sincere hope that the European Commission will adopt such a ban. House Resolution 182 sends a very strong message to that effect, and this Member commends the author of this resolution, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], for his leadership in delivering that message.

Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Foreign Affairs subcommittee with jurisdiction over international environmental matters, this Member would note that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will also monitor the issue of drift net fishing very closely. It is an issue that demands the attention of us all. This Member urges the swift adoption of House Resolution 182.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 182, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read:

A resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of State should encourage the European Community to vote to ban all large-scale drift-net fishing by all European Community fishing fleets.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL MORATORIUM ON THE USE OF LARGE-SCALE DRIFT NETS

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 113) to express the sense of the Congress that the President should seek an international moratorium on the use of large-scale drift nets called for in U.N. Resolution 44-225, while working to achieve the U.S. policy of a permanent ban on large-scale drift nets, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 113

Whereas large-scale driftnets are nearly invisible, miles-long monofilament nets that are fished just below the surface on the open

seas for the purpose of entangling fish and squid in the webbing;

Whereas the best available scientific data indicates large-scale driftnets incidentally kill thousands of endangered sea turtles, hundreds-of-thousands of marine mammals and millions of nontarget fishes;

Whereas continued large-scale driftnet fishing to collect further scientific information is unacceptable because it will undermine efforts to responsibly harvest and conserve pelagic and anadromous marine resources;

Whereas United Nations Resolution 44-225 provides a strong statement of concern by the global community regarding the impacts of large-scale driftnet fishing and calls for a moratorium on the use of these nets beyond the exclusive economic zone of any nation by June 30, 1992;

Whereas unless a joint assessment of scientifically sound data by all members of the international community concludes that there is no reasonable expectation of unacceptable impacts by large-scale driftnet fisheries, the conditions for relief from the moratorium recommended in United Nations Resolution 44-225 are not met; and

Whereas the Fishery Conservation Amendments of 1990 (Public Law 101-627) declares the use of large-scale driftnets beyond the exclusive economic zone of any nations to be an indiscriminate and wasteful fishing method, contains directives in support of the moratorium called for in United Nations Resolution 44-225, and establishes a new national policy of securing a permanent ban on the use of this fishing technique: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) that the President—

(A) should coordinate efforts between Federal agencies, affected coastal States, the Congress, the commercial fishing industry, and the conservation community to secure a moratorium on large-scale driftnet fishing by June, 1992, as called for in United Nations Resolution 44-225, and

(B) while seeking that moratorium, should work to achieve the United States policy of a permanent ban on large-scale driftnet fishing, as set forth in the Fishery Conservation Amendments of 1990 (Public Law 101-627); and

(2) that the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce should submit to the Congress by not later than 90 days after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution recommendations and evaluation of appropriate steps, measures, policies, and changes in laws, including sanctions, which should be undertaken by the United States Government to implement the moratorium referred to in paragraph (1)(A) and to secure a ban on large-scale pelagic driftnets.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 113 seeks a permanent worldwide ban on the highly indiscriminate and wasteful practice of large-scale drift-net fishing.

House Concurrent Resolution 113 was introduced by Representative UNSOELD this past April and approved by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on June 27, 1991. The resolution is important because it states, once and for all, that the policy of this country is to seek a permanent, global ban on large-scale drift-net fishing.

House Concurrent Resolution 113 is good fisheries policy, good environmental policy, and good economic policy. It enjoys the board support of the fishing industry and environmentalists. It makes sense and I urge Members to support it. But before I yield to my colleague from Washington to more fully explain her resolution, I want to commend her for leadership in fighting for a worldwide ban on large-scale drift-net fishing. This fight must be fought and with warriors like JOLENE UNSOELD on our side, I have no doubt about the outcome.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to give our President and his administration still another push—to tell them once again that this wasteful and destructive fishing practice of large-scale drift-net fishing is wanton massacre on the high seas and has no place in the civilized world. This resolution will give us more leverage to use against drift-net pirate nations such as Taiwan, Japan, and South Korea.

Large-scale drift-net fishing is probably the single most destructive human activity disrupting marine life throughout the world. These nets—which stretch up to 30 miles in length—are awesomely efficient killing machines, causing death to endangered sea turtles, hundreds of thousands of seabirds, tens of thousands of marine mammals, and millions of nontarget fish. Japanese officials acknowledge up to a 70-percent bycatch rate—that's 70 percent of the catch being killed by mistake.

Worldwide concern over these fisheries has led to the U.N. General Assembly adopting Resolution 44/225, calling for a moratorium on all large-scale drift-net fishing on the high seas by June 30, 1992, unless an adequate conservation program can be agreed to by all parties. Congress formally supported the U.N. moratorium and established a U.S. policy of seeking a permanent ban on this wasteful and destructive fishing practice in last year's Fishery Conservation Act amendments.

With both Congress and the United Nations denouncing these fisheries, one would think that the drift-netting nations would be well on their way to ending these fisheries. Instead, drift-net fleets are expanding their destruction to new oceans, and drift-netting nations are arguing that conservation

programs short of a moratorium can be developed.

Last week, I was in Japan to meet with members of the Japanese Diet and the director of the Japanese Fisheries Agency. I heard arguments that we need more studies on the impact of drift nets, and I learned that Japan believes these studies will show they will be in compliance with the U.N. resolution.

We don't need more studies. Large-scale drift-net fishing is a biologically and environmentally devastating fishing practice that makes sustainable use of our resources impossible—devastating to our fish, our economy, our jobs, and our marine environment.

As we see more and more data documenting the unsustainable rate of bycatch, as we cite more and more violations of international drift-net agreements and as we begin to uncover highly organized smuggling operations in southeast Asia, we know it's time to stop this destructive madness. It is time to implement the U.S. policy of a permanent, worldwide ban on large-scale drift-nets. And the first step is the moratorium under U.N. Resolution 44/225.

Before I conclude I want to thank the distinguished chairmen of our full committee and subcommittee for their efforts in bringing this resolution before this body today.

I also want to thank the ranking minority member of our fisheries subcommittee for all of his efforts over many years to bring these pirate driftnet fleets under control. The gentleman from Alaska has an excellent proposal that would expand the President's embargo authority against nations that violate international agreements—such as drift nets. Currently, the President only has authority to embargo fishery products—among the few products for which the United States has a trade surplus with these nations. Representative YOUNG's bill would allow the President to embargo or threaten to embargo other products, such as electronics—products that contribute nearly \$31 billion annually to our trade deficit.

The use of trade as a lever to encourage conservation is well established in U.S. law. The threat of sanctions has led to improved enforcement of the ban on commercial whaling and to improved fishery conservation off both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

We can debate the merits of Representative YOUNG's proposal at a later date. I mention it now because, despite last year's legislation and a U.N. resolution opposing large-scale drift nets, the slaughter on the high seas continues—and, in all likelihood, will continue until we are ready to take serious action. The first step toward making the high seas safer for marine life is the moratorium on large-scale drift-net fishing called for in U.N. Resolu-

tion 44/225. But the most meaningful and final step should be implementing the U.S. policy of a permanent ban on these curtains of death.

I look forward to continuing to work with our committee leadership on this issue, and I urge support for the resolution calling for adoption of the U.N. moratorium on large-scale drift nets.

□ 1320

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to compliment the previous speaker, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] for her leadership in this role. This is a joint effort between the State of Washington and the State of Alaska to try to stop this terrible crime on the high seas. I do strongly support this legislation, and I urge its adoption with the other resolution.

As the gentlewoman mentioned, and I mentioned previously, we need to have a strong and stronger position to be able to implement the 1992 restriction, the U.N. resolution, and we shall have to do that, I am afraid, because these resolutions, good as they are, as the gentlewoman mentioned, last year we passed one in a reauthorization, and they have not followed the mandate of that legislation itself.

I have to say, in all respects, that the sea is one area that we must continue to protect and not only protect environmentally, we must continue to protect it from the taking of all species.

Mr. Speaker, these are nets that would go, for instance, from Washington, DC, to Baltimore. They are nets that are approximately a half mile deep. If they lose one from the back of a vessel, it continues to patrol and prowl the sea. No one ever really harvests from them, and they catch and destroy and catch and destroy.

When they are actually taken in or have not been lost, they are catching immature fish. A salmon that is caught at high seas only is one-third grown, and when he arrives on shore or the proximity of the shore, he weighs as high as 14 pounds. but at high seas he may weigh 3½ to 4 pounds. What a wasteful fishery. And why these countries are continuing to do it, I do not know.

It is not a profitable fishery. It destroys the market. And what they are doing is catching one-third of the fish, when it is immature, when they could have the whole fish closer to shore.

It not only affects Alaska, it affects all our coastal communities. If we do not put a stop to this now, it is going to go around the world. It will not be in the North Pacific. It will be in the Caribbean. It will be on the east coast. It will be all around the world. And we will have ruined our seas and those mammals and species of mammals and fish that live in it.

I again compliment the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] and I encourage my colleagues, let us go forth and give the President the power so we can stop these countries who are not listening to the Congress today.

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN].

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution because it tells the administration something important. It tells the administration to get off its hands and enforce the international moratorium on illegal high seas drift-net fishing.

The destruction caused by ocean drift-net pirates, particularly from Asian nations, is absolutely horrifying, as my colleagues today have testified to. Countless thousands of marine mammals, sea turtles, sharks, tuna, and sea birds are trapped and killed because of this pernicious practice.

In the North Pacific alone, as many as 125,000 marine mammals and a quarter of a million sea birds are slaughtered each year from foreign high seas drift-nets.

Unless we stop the slaughter, and it is a slaughter, the North Pacific could become a biological desert devoid of these populations.

Especially critical to my region are the salmon whose numbers have fallen so drastically in recent years that some species have now been proposed to be listed under the Endangered Species Act. This may mean in my region major changes in hydropower generation, in navigation, in irrigation, and utility rates for the people of the Pacific Northwest. That is very difficult to accept. But what makes it even more difficult, Mr. Speaker, is watching that happen and then to see these foreign fleets criminally responsible for up to 30,000 metric tons of North Pacific salmon and steelhead being taken illegally from the North Pacific each year.

Several years ago, Mr. Speaker, representatives of the Northwest Steelheaders came to me with their concerns about this matter, the environmental and economic damage caused by large-scale high seas drift nets. I was outraged, as my colleagues who have spoken today are, and I have worked with commercial fishermen, environmental organizations, and constituents in Oregon, in my district and elsewhere, to develop legislation banning the practice of drift netting and to allocate the financial resources needed to enforce the law.

Enforcement is as important as the legislation banning the practice. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have worked over the past several years to secure over a \$1 billion in additional funding for the U.S. Coast Guard for enforcement of laws banning

large-scale drift-net fishing. This funding had led to a dramatic increase in cutter patrols, surveillance flights, boardings, and seizures of those high seas pirates in recent years. Working with Northwest representatives and National Marine Fishery Service, we passed an amendment last year allowing the NMFS to use seized assets for further surveillance and prosecution of the illegal drift nets.

This was an important and highly effective step toward providing resources needed to enforce drift-net law. Illegal drift-net fishing is an international outrage. We must not ignore it. We must bring it to a stop.

The laws in place today are a step in the right direction, but we do need enforcement. And just as I cannot understand, as the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] expressed it, how foreigners can engage in this practice, I must also say I cannot personally understand why our own administration does not get tougher with these Asian nations who are condoning these practices on the high seas.

This resolution is merely a sense-of-the-Congress resolution. It is not nearly as strong as the legislation introduced by my friend, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] which should be passed. But at least it is a signal not only to the Asian nations who perpetuate these fleets and condone them, it is a signal to the administration also that we want strong executive action. And this Congress demands it. And if the administration wants to avoid economic sanctions being passed by the Congress, a good way to do that would be to pay heed to the voice of the Congress expressed in this resolution today.

I compliment my colleagues who have shown their leadership on this issue.

□ 1330

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is time to put an end to the strip mining of fishery resources—the use of high seas drift nets.

We have discovered that the vastness of the ocean does not guarantee that fisheries will last forever. Runs can be overfished, inland habitats can be destroyed by bad forestry or water diversions, weakened fishing populations can be wiped out by disease.

These are problems generally faced by only one or two species at a time. But the use of high seas drift nets threatens an entire range of marine life.

Korean, Japanese, and Taiwanese fishermen who scour the oceans with their drift nets catch more than one target species. Their 40-mile-long nets entrap marine life from one end of the food chain to the other. The nets do

not discriminate between juveniles and adults. They snare federally protected sea going mammals, birds, even endangered species, such as sea turtles.

On California's north coast, which I represent, several runs of salmon and steelhead are on the threshold of extinction. If they disappear, much of our fishing industry will go with them.

High seas gill nets are perhaps not the most immediate threat to north coast salmon, but their threat is real. For gill nets shred the fabric of life in the oceans. They destroy not only salmon, but the fish they feed upon, and the fish those fish feed upon.

My State has already put restrictions on the use of drift nets within our U.S. waters. But fish do not know international boundaries. I ask you to support the Studds bill—House Concurrent Resolution 113—and end environmental piracy on the high seas.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the issue of the use of drift nets is not a new issue. Regrettably, in recent years this body has all too much experience with the lethal and destructive effects of drift-net fishing.

It is no secret that drift nets wreak unimaginable damage upon the ocean's ecosystem. Plastic filament nets that are 30 feet deep and up to 40 or 50 miles long, drift nets kill practically everything they gather. This practice quite literally amounts to strip mining the ocean.

The numbers of incidental killings are simply staggering. For example, monitoring on 32 Japanese boats during the last 6 months of 1989 showed that drift-net fishing incurred the following incidental killings: Over 58,000 blue sharks, 914 dolphins, 141 porpoises, 52 seals, 25 puffins, 22 marine turtles, 539 albatrosses, and almost 9,000 other pelagic birds. Incredibly, this terrible toll was exacted by a mere 4 percent of the Japanese North Pacific drift-net fishing fleet. This Member would also note that Japan has additional drift-net fishing fleets, and that several other nations are engaged in drift-net fishing. The message is clear—drift nets are killing our oceans.

Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, which has jurisdiction over international environmental matters and where this Member serves as ranking Republican, held a hearing last year on the deadly impact of drift-net fishing. It was an important and enlightening hearing. One of the most disturbing facts brought to light during that hearing was that drift nets entangle and kill 1 marine mammal for every 10 harvestable fish. For every 10 tuna that a drift net captures, a whale is killed, or a dolphin, or a seal. And this does not include the massive killings of birds, turtles, and nonedible fish. In short, Mr. Speaker, the wanton destruction boggles the mind.

This Member would also note that drift nets which are lost or abandoned, the so-called ghost nets, continue their destruction long after they have been forgotten and replaced by their owners. Hundreds of thousands of marine animals become entangled in these castaway nets each year, dying from man's neglect.

Fortunately the U.N. General Assembly has unanimously approved a resolution calling for a worldwide moratorium on the use of large-scale drift nets by June 30, 1992. While some might argue that a worldwide moratorium is unrealistic or overly ambitious, this Member believes it is a matter of basic self-interest demands that we work toward the elimination of drift nets. If we do not put a stop to drift-net fishing, the oceans will most assuredly die. An international moratorium is a worthy goal, one that the United States should actively support. House Concurrent Resolution 113 simply calls upon the President to seek such an international moratorium on drift-net fishing.

Mr. Speaker, this Member's home State of Nebraska does not border the ocean. On the contrary, it is as far from the ocean as any State in the Nation. So I cannot claim any parochial interest in this matter. But the protection of the oceans should not—indeed must not—be viewed as a parochial matter. On this matter; this Member is motivated to speak and act by the appalling environmental damage caused by drift nets. Therefore; this Member rises in the strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 113 and to urge its swift and unanimous adoption.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, out in the oceans there is a menace large and sinister, lurking just below the surface of the water. It stretches for literally hundreds of miles across the open sea, bringing death to millions of creatures that inhabit the undersea world. It is the single most destructive tool of open ocean fishing—the drift net.

Imagine a single net three times as long as Constitution Avenue snaring every manner of fish, seagoing mammal such as dolphins, sea lions, and whales, and even seabirds unfortunate enough to be ensnared while simply alighting midsea. This is the reality of a fishing practice that is far too widespread, far too indiscriminate, and growing by the day.

Drift-net fishing is a lucrative technique for fishing companies. Though the countries most known for using this technique are Korea, Taiwan, and Japan in the Pacific, in the past 2 years, it has gained popularity among the fleets of France, Great Britain, and Ireland in the Atlantic.

Drift nets threaten not just the balance, but the very existence of our ocean ecosystems. With estimates that the world's oceans can only produce a total of 100 million tons of fish a year, and with present estimates at over 85 million tons, it may not be long before we could see an irreversible decline in marine life.

As a Representative of the island State of Hawaii, I fully appreciate the harm that can be done by these massive and destructive nets. Our tradition in the islands is to respect the ocean, take only what we need and can use, and leave the rest for another day. Preserving our most precious sources of life and sustenance on land and sea is a heritage too often forgotten by modern societies.

But the United States and other nations have recognized the problem, and the United Nations has called for a moratorium on the use of large scale drift nets through Resolution 44-225. Still more pressure must be placed on enforcement and more support must be given to efforts to stop the devastation of our oceans natural resources by nonabiding nations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my fellow Members of Congress to support House Concurrent Resolution 113, introduced by my distinguished colleague Representative JOLENE UNSOELD, which calls upon the President to seek an international moratorium on large scale drift nets, and work to achieve a permanent ban on this insidious and wasteful practice.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 113, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the three measures just passed and agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 1991, AND THURSDAY, JULY 11, 1991

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, July 10, 1991, and that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, July 10, it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday, July 11, 1991.

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

There was no objection.

IMPORTANCE OF ADULT EDUCATION

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 279) to declare it to be the policy of the United States that there should be a renewed and sustained commitment by the Federal Government and the American people to the importance of adult education.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 279

Whereas a well educated citizenry is the foundation of democracy, the people of all

ages should use every means available to gain knowledge and skills;

Whereas the Adult Education Act offers educational opportunities for out-of-school adults age 16 and older who lack the literacy levels needed for effective citizenship and productive employment;

Whereas the Adult Education Act serves adults who need to acquire basic life skills, to continue their education through secondary school, and to attain literacy levels required to secure employment or occupational training;

Whereas the Adult Education Act puts special emphasis on such adult populations as the incarcerated, individuals of limited English proficiency, adults with disabilities, adult immigrants, the chronically unemployed, homeless adults, the institutionalized, and minorities;

Whereas the Adult Education Act has provided adult basic, adult secondary, and English-as-a-Second-Language instruction to over 40,000,000 men and women since 1966;

Whereas the Adult Education Act has initiated programs located throughout the 57 States and territories, in urban, suburban, and rural settings;

Whereas the Adult Education Act encourages the participation of over 94,000 volunteers who selflessly devote their time to educating adults in need of literacy instruction;

Whereas the Adult Education Act supports the national goal that every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skill necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship;

Whereas the Adult Education Act reinforces the principle that we are a nation of students and recognizes that learning is a lifelong process;

Whereas on November 3, 1966, the Adult Education Act was signed into law; and

Whereas the Congress supports the Adult Education Act's goal of educating adults so that they can lead fulfilling, more productive lives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the policy of the United States that—

(1) the 25th anniversary of Federal aid to improve the basic and literacy skills of adults through the Adult Education Act should be recognized and observed by the Nation; and

(2) there should be a continued commitment to Federal aid for educating adults through the Adult Education Act in order to increase adult literacy and assure a productive workforce and a competitive America in the 21st century.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

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

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 279 was introduced by my colleague on the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. TOM COLEMAN, to recognize the 25th anniversary of the Adult Education Act and to reaffirm Congress' support for providing education services to the adult population.

The Adult Education Act has served over 40 million adults since its enact-

ment in 1966, enabling those individuals, Mr. Speaker, to be full participants in society.

Additionally, the Adult Education Act plays a critical role in developing the kind of skilled work force needed for America to compete economically on a global basis.

I commend Mr. COLEMAN for introducing the resolution and urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this joint resolution introduced by Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri and Mr. KILDEE, which recognizes the importance of adult education. The Adult Education Act will celebrate its 25th anniversary this November. It is fitting that we acknowledge the benefits that have been accrued as a result of this act.

Not only does the Adult Education Act provide instruction for the many adults in our society who are at risk due to their lack of basic skills and literacy, but it affords adults the opportunity to gain the knowledge necessary to pass the general education development test or to receive their adult high school diplomas. Instruction is provided by over 66,000 full and part-time teachers, and over 90,000 literacy volunteers participate in the program mostly as tutors.

House Joint Resolution 279 is a fitting honor to this worthwhile program. As we look for solutions to the critical education issues facing us, we should not forget those programs that have served us well. I urge my colleagues to indicate their support of this program through their support of this resolution today.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for Joint Resolution 279 which declares it to be the policy of the United States that there should be a renewed and sustained commitment by the Federal Government and the American people to support adult education because of its importance to our Nation's economy.

Mr. Speaker, all too often we think of education only in terms of our children. We look to programs such as Head Start in the hope that if our young students get the proper beginning to their education they will be better able to benefit from academic pursuits and thereby achieve productive and fulfilling lives.

Just as I firmly believe in the importance of childhood education, I also believe that it is never too late for any citizen of this country to benefit from learning.

When, for whatever reason, an American man or woman has gone on through life without reaping the benefits of our education system, they are nonetheless a valuable resource, but there will come a time when they will feel the need to go back to school to meet the challenges of the future.

Adult education is an investment in our untapped human potential. Fulfilling the educational needs of an adult helps to build our

work force in greater productivity. It means one more person who can perhaps educate others. And very importantly for mothers and fathers who seek adult education, it means that their children will benefit from learning support at home as well as in school.

Adult education may also be one of our very best means of addressing the needs of America's homeless families. Households that are headed by individuals who survived before with little vocational skills and education are often thrust out onto the street when the only jobs they knew dried up. Their lack of expertise cripples their chances of being hired and prevents them from escaping the economic hardships that keep them homeless and without hope.

It is more important than ever, in these tough economic times, that we encourage adult education, adult literacy, and job skills generally. We must redouble our efforts to help adults and in that way help families, so that our people can become more productive, better able to meet the challenges that face them and contribute to the strength of this country.

An individual is never too old to learn and we must strive to do what we can to promote greater educational opportunities for America's adults. I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and hope for its speedy consideration by the other body. This resolution publicly states our continued support of and commitment to the Adult Education Act as we approach its 25th anniversary this November.

We all know the costs of illiteracy to this Nation. In the workplace alone many injuries occur as a result of individuals being unable to read basic safety signs. Many workers are unable to advance in their jobs because of a lack of literacy, and productivity in the workplace lags because of a lack of basic literacy skills. Moreover, it has been estimated that due to errors, accidents and turnovers, the cost of workplace illiteracy is \$20 billion annually. This is just a sample of how critical programs that foster basic literacy training are to this Nation.

The Adult Education Act is such a program. Over the course of its 25 year existence it has served hundreds of thousands of adults, enabling them to increase their literacy skills, increase their self esteem and become more productive in the workplace. Instruction focuses on basic skills, English as a second language, and high school equivalency activities. Through participation in adult education programs, many have passed the general education development test and others have received adult high school diplomas. Further, many participants have become U.S. citizens, and others have left the unemployment or welfare roles. Clearly, out investment in Adult Education Act programs has yielded significant results for the individuals involved as well as for the Nation as a whole.

The Adult Education Act is the cornerstone of Federal assistance to adults lacking basic education and literacy skills. At a time when we are hoping to raise the overall literacy rate in this country, and when the President is calling for every adult to become a lifelong learner, it is fitting to renew our commitment to the

Adult Education Act and recognize the 25th anniversary of this worthwhile program, as we do through this joint resolution. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the activities operated through this program by accepting this resolution today.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 279.

This joint resolution is a statement of policy that there should be a renewed and sustained commitment by the Federal Government and the American people to adult education.

On November 3, 1991, it will be 25 years since Federal assistance for adult education and literacy programs were authorized through the Adult Education Act [AEA]. This joint resolution which we are addressing today is a much needed renewed commitment by the Federal Government offering educational opportunities for out-of-school adults age 16 and older who lack the literacy levels needed for effective citizenship and productive employment.

Many reports continue to show widespread illiteracy among adults who may not be able to read, write, speak, or otherwise communicate effectively enough to meet the demands of modern society. Illiteracy in the Nation's work force implies losses through low productivity, accidents, employee errors, and extra training programs. There is no agreement on the costs of illiteracy, but some estimates are over \$200 billion annually.

The U.S. Department of Education estimate of the adult illiteracy rate is 13 percent—17 to 21 million persons. Other estimates of illiteracy range from 5 percent to more than 50 percent of the adult population.

Mr. Speaker, although the Federal Government has recognized the illiteracy problem for many years and has authorized Federal assistance for 25 years, the problem of educating America's adult population remains pervasive. It has also been cited in reports that one of the problems in the area of literacy has been the lack of a universal definition. Consequently, in 1988, Congress required in the adult education amendments that the Department of Education submit a report to Congress on the definition of literacy and then to estimate the extent of adult literacy in the Nation. Although we have received a report regarding the definition, we have not yet received an accurate estimate of the number of Americans affected.

We must renew our commitment on the eve of the 25th anniversary of the Adult Education Act to our adult population by providing educational opportunities in order that all Americans may have a more productive and higher quality of life.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 279.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 279, the joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CHILD ABUSE PROGRAMS, ADOPTION OPPORTUNITIES, AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION EXTENSION ACT OF 1991

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2720) to extend for 1 year the authorizations of appropriations for the programs under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act and the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, and for certain programs relating to adoption opportunities, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2720

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Child Abuse Programs, Adoption Opportunities, and Family Violence Prevention Extension Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS UNDER CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT ACT.

(a) GENERAL PROGRAM.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 114(a) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106h(a)) is amended in the first sentence—

(A) by striking "and" after "1990,"; and

(B) by inserting before the period the following: ", and 1992".

(2) SEPARATE AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADVISORY BOARD ON CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT.—Section 102 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5102) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—If the amount appropriated under section 114(a) for fiscal year 1992 exceeds the amount appropriated under that section for fiscal year 1991, there is authorized to be appropriated for carrying out this section \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 1992."

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANTS WITH RESPECT TO ENCOURAGING STATES TO MAINTAIN CERTAIN FUNDING MECHANISMS.—Section 203(c) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5116b(c)) is amended by striking "1991," and all that follows and inserting "1992."

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS RELATING TO ADOPTION OPPORTUNITIES.

Section 205 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act of

1978 (42 U.S.C. 5115) is amended in subsections (a) and (b) by striking "and 1991" each place such term appears and inserting "1991, and 1992".

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS UNDER FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND SERVICES ACT.

Section 310(a) of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10409(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" after "1990,"; and

(2) by inserting ", and 1992" before the period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 2720, the Child Abuse Programs, Adoption Opportunities, and Family Violence Prevention Extension Act of 1991, which extends for 1 year the authorization of appropriations for the programs under this act.

In a recent hearing before the Subcommittee on Select Education, both the U.S. Advisory Board and the General Accounting Office noted serious problems in the implementation of Federal policy in the area of child abuse and neglect. Based on their recommendation, we have decided to extend the act for 1 year.

In 1974, there were approximately 60,000 cases of reported child abuse and 1.1 million by the end of 1979. During the 1980's the number of cases had more than doubled to 2.4 million. This dramatic rise in the incidence of child abuse and neglect, together with an insufficient response to the deepening crisis, has meant that the National Center for Child Abuse and Neglect [NCCAN] is inadequately prepared to meet the challenges facing the Nation. The Advisory Board points out that the child protection system is without the resources to cope with the scale of the current crisis.

In the coming months, we look forward to working in a bipartisan fashion with the U.S. Child Abuse Advisory Board, the GAO, and other groups in taking a comprehensive look at what the Federal role should be in this area. With good will on all sides, and a desire to respond honestly and boldly to the crisis we face, we stand an excellent chance, by early next year, of crafting significant legislation that will be responsive to the realities of the 1990's. I commend Mr. KLUG and Mr. BALLENGER, the Republican members of the Subcommittee on Select Education, for supporting H.R. 2720. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 2720 and to urge its prompt adoption. A 1-year extension of the Child Abuse, Adoption Opportunities, and Family Violence programs will authorize continuation of important research and demonstration projects on child protection and allow Congress sufficient time to consider the findings and recommendations of a recent study conducted by the U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect.

Over the past two decades we have all become more aware of the magnitude of child abuse and neglect in this country. Our subcommittee recently heard testimony from experts in this field that each year over 1 million children are abused or neglected and over 1,000 children die as a result of abuse. These numbers refer only to those cases that have been substantiated. There is much evidence to suggest they are just a fraction of the actual incidence of abuse and neglect, much of which goes unreported.

I believe we all share a sense of urgency about the need to better protect children and families from incidents of abuse, neglect and domestic violence. The three programs that H.R. 2720 would extend are directed at finding ways to prevent such violence and to treat the special needs of children who are victims of abuse. The grants authorized by these programs assist States in identifying families who are most at risk and providing them with prevention and treatment services at the earliest possible opportunities.

Although these grant programs are relatively small in resource levels, the research findings and model interventions they generate have the potential to reduce the burgeoning human and financial costs of child abuse and neglect. Each year billions are spent at the Federal, State, and local levels on law enforcement, juvenile courts, foster care and residential facilities, and treatment of adults who were mistreated as children. The yearly cost of out-of-home placement and treatment for a single child is as high as \$50,000 in some communities. Only by focusing on prevention can we hope to reduce the tremendous social costs of these human tragedies.

In amending the Child Abuse Act of 1988, Congress created the U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect and directed it to evaluate the Nation's efforts to deal with maltreatment of children. In its first report, recently submitted to Congress, the Board concluded that child abuse and neglect in the United States now represents a national emergency. The Board also found that the system the Nation has devised to respond to the problem is failing. Most important, the Board developed a series of specific policy recommendations to reform the current system of fragmented services. To-

gether, these recommendations comprise a new strategy for protection of our Nation's children.

The coming year will provide us with an opportunity to study the Board's findings and to develop and consider specific legislative proposals based on its recommendations. The 1-year extension provided for in H.R. 2720 will allow us to conduct those deliberations in the context of programs we have in place and to strengthen those programs in a manner consistent with a new strategy for prevention and treatment of child abuse.

In closing, I would like to recognize and thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Education, Mr. OWENS, for his leadership on these issues and for continuing the Congress' bipartisan support for these programs.

□ 1340

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those who are not familiar with this act, I would like to read a summary statement.

Originally enacted in 1974, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act Public Law 93-247 established several service programs and administrative and research offices to combat problems relating to child abuse and neglect. The act has been extended and amended several times with its programs being extended through fiscal year 1991 by the Child Abuse Prevention, Adoption, and Family Services Act of 1988, Public Law 100-294. Most recently, the act was amended in the 101st Congress—Public Law 101-226—to specifically authorize services for children whose parents are substance abusers. The Child Abuse Act requires that States have in place mandatory child abuse and neglect reporting systems in order to receive money. The programs under this act are administered by the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect [NCCAN], Administration for Children, Youth, and Families [ACYF], Office of Human Development Services [OHDS], Department of Health and Human Services [DHHS].

Currently, the act authorizes six grant programs.

Grants to States for child abuse and neglect prevention and treatment programs—with money earmarked for States to develop and use mechanisms to respond to reports of medical neglect of children, including cases of withholding treatment from disabled infants with life-threatening conditions, and to improve services for these children.

Demonstration grants to public or private nonprofit organizations designed to prevent, identify, and treat child abuse and neglect—including the identification, prevention, and treatment of child sexual abuse.

Grants to States for programs relating to the investigation and prosecution of child abuse cases, and in particular those involving child sexual abuse.

Training and technical assistance grants to, among other things, assist States in developing programs to meet the requirements relating to reporting of medical neglect.

Child abuse challenge grants intended to encourage States to establish and maintain children's trust funds to support child abuse and neglect prevention activities.

Emergency child abuse prevention services grants to State and local child abuse agencies, community and mental health agencies, and nonprofit youth-serving organizations, for children whose parents are substance abusers.

In addition, NCCAN oversees research, collects data, and studies the incidence of child abuse and neglect. NCCAN also funds a national information clearinghouse for maintaining and disseminating information on effective programs in the field. The act also authorizes a U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect, an Inter-Agency Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect, and a Presidential Commission on Child and Youth Deaths—which has never been funded. In fiscal year 1991 the components of the child abuse act have received a total appropriation of \$59 million. Funds for the State grants relating to investigating and prosecuting child abuse cases are provided for under the Victims of Crime Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this act.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the vital child abuse programs that this Congress has wisely funded, the extension of authorization for the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act and the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, and especially the 2½ million children and 6 million women who were victims of abuse this past year.

The numbers are frightening. Each statistic represents a child or a spouse for whom home has become a dangerous place to live, and for many thousands of women and children this abuse leads to their death.

Since 1974, when the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act became law, Congress has recognized its responsibility to protect the welfare of our Nation's children. In the 16 years of the act's existence it has been amended to address the needs of at risk children. The 101st Congress amended the act to take into account children whose parents are substance abusers.

I believe we have two important goals.

First, we must do everything in our power to stop the abuse and neglect of America's children and provide treatment for both the physical and emotional harm that has been done to them.

Second, we must support and encourage ways to prevent abuse from occurring in order to break the cycle of violence that is all too often passed on from parent to child.

We know that abuse impacts practically every area of a child's life. They often have trouble in school, it becomes harder for the child to develop emotionally, and the effect of the child's self esteem could very well last a lifetime.

With regard to family violence, we have only recently begun to understand the size and severity of spouse abuse in our country. Add to that our growing understanding of elderly abuse, and we can begin to appreciate the terrible problems facing State and local agencies. Congress has done much to encourage program development and promote the establishment of shelters for victims of family violence.

And also of importance, the Federal Government has assisted in compiling more accurate estimates of how many people are victims of family violence. With better information about the number of families affected, States can better allocate their efforts and establish greater priorities for family violence prevention programs. Even still, we know far too many cases of family violence, as well as child abuse, go unreported.

Mr. Speaker, with instances of abuse on the rise, I feel strongly that now, more than ever, Congress must express its support of the efforts across our Nation to deal with these devastating problems. I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 2720 and the continued authorization of our child abuse and family violence prevention programs.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my support for H.R. 2720, the extension of Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act. I believe that a 1-year extension of the bill will allow us the time we need to focus on ways to improve the child protection system for children and families at risk. The Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect has done a thorough job evaluating the system we now have in place and identifying the weaknesses in that system. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the subcommittee over the next year to follow up on the commission's findings with specific legislative changes.

Finally, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, SCOTT KLUG, for taking a leadership role within the subcommittee on these issues. As you know, the agenda for our Subcommittee on Select Education has an ambitious agenda this year, and I am delighted that SCOTT has been willing to share responsibility with me for handling these important issues.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2720, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2720, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION, A BILL, AND A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RELATING TO MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. MOAKLEY from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-145) on the resolution (H. Res. 189) providing for the consideration of a joint resolution, a bill, and a concurrent resolution relating to most-favored-nation treatment for the People's Republic of China, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, AMENDING THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT AND THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is to notify members of the House of the Rules Committee's plans regarding H.R. 5, legislation to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prevent discrimination based on participation in labor disputes. The committee is planning to meet on Tuesday, July 16, 1991, to take testimony on the bill. In order to assure timely consideration of the bill on the floor, the Rules Committee is considering a rule that may limit the offering of amendments.

Any Member who is contemplating an amendment to H.R. 5 should submit, to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol, 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation of the amendment no later than 5 p.m. on July 15, 1991.

We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in this effort to be fair and orderly in granting a rule for H.R. 5.

TRIBUTE TO COUNTRY MUSIC LEGEND ROY ACUFF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join President Bush and Americans everywhere in paying tribute to country music legend Roy C. Acuff, who today was awarded one of the

1991 National Medal of Arts, the Nation's highest commendation to artists and patrons of the arts.

As Tennesseans and country music fans know everywhere, Roy Acuff is truly deserving of this prestigious award. The award is given by the President of the United States to those individuals or groups who, in his judgment, are deserving of special recognition by reason of their outstanding contributions to the excellence, growth, support, and availability of the arts in the United States. Those qualities fit Roy Acuff to a tee.

Born in Maynardville, TN, September 15, 1903, Roy Acuff is the first living artist to be elected to the Country Music Hall of Fame. He became the best-known country music singer of the World War II era and has remained a leading country artist as well as mentor and adviser to many younger country musicians. His personal popularity has helped to make the Grand Ole Opry the leading country music radio and stage show and make country music one of the most loved forms of American music anywhere.

After a stint in the early 1930's as a fiddler and singer with a medicine show, Roy Acuff formed a band named the Tennessee Crackerjacks and appeared on local Knoxville radio stations. By the time the American Record Co. invited them to cut several records, they were one of the most popular groups in Tennessee and had changed their name to the Crazy Tennesseans. One of the songs with which he is most strongly identified, "The Great Speckled Bird," was on their first recording. Also from their first recording session came "The Wabash Cannonball," which Acuff has used as a signature song.

The band's statewide popularity proved helpful in getting an invitation in early 1938 to substitute on the Grand Ole Opry. According to Roy, he and the band set out for Nashville, they still argued among themselves about what material to perform. After two songs in which Roy characterized his performance as "awful," he turned to "The Great Speckled Bird," which the band had urged him not to use.

Acuff recalls that for 2 weeks after the show the band didn't hear anything. He says:

Out of the blue I received a telegram asking me if I would come and take a regular job. The mail had come in tremendous—bushel baskets full—and they sent them on to me in Knoxville. That night "The Great Speckled Bird" changed my life.

Soon, however, Acuff would change the Opry by becoming its first singing star, beginning the trend away from emphasis on the old string bands.

During 1939 the name of the band changed to the Smoky Mountain Boys. And throughout the 1940's, Roy and the band's records were top country sellers. Their top sellers included "Wreck on the Highway," "Fireball Mail," "Night Train to Memphis," "Low and Lonely," "Pins and Needles (In My Heart)," "Beneath the Lonely Mound of Clay," and "Precious Jewel."

In 1942, Acuff joined with Fred Rose to form Acuff-Rose Publishing Co., which became a major force in country music and helped establish Nashville as its center. One of the company's first stars was Hank Williams and

among the famous titles it published were "Tennessee Waltz," "Jambalaya," and "Your Cheatin' Heart." At one time, writers under contract had written twice as many top 10 country and No. 1 hits than the next most successful publisher of country music.

During the 1940's and 1950's, Acuff became the best-known country singer in the Nation. His records sold by the millions all over the world. His name became synonymous with the Grand Ole Opry. And his repertory, heavily weighted with sacred and traditional melodies, hasn't changed much since his first Opry appearance. Writes one historian of music:

When Roy Acuff raised his voice in his mournful, mountain style, he seemed to suggest all the virtues for which Americans were fighting: Home, mother, and God.

During World War II Ernie Pyle corroborated Acuff's international fame in a report filed during the battle of Okinawa. On attacking a position held by the Marines, Pyle claimed, a Japanese banzai battalion employed a battle cry which it believed the zenith of insults: "To hell with Roosevelt, to hell with Babe Ruth, to hell with Roy Acuff."

Acuff's film appearances have also helped to popularize country music. In the 1940 Republic film "Grand Ole Opry," Acuff was considered the star of the movie even though other longtime Opry stars and luminaries were featured. His other films have included "Hi Neighbor," 1942 Republic Pictures; "O My Darling Clementine," 1943 Republic Pictures; "Cowboy Canteen," 1944 Columbia Pictures; "Sing Neighbor Sing," 1944 Republic Pictures; "Night Train to Memphis," 1946 Republic Pictures; "Smoky Mountain Melody," 1948 Columbia Pictures; and "Home in San Antonio," 1949 Columbia Pictures.

While Acuff's recordings since the late 1950's have not penetrated the top of the single's charts, he has remained a fans' favorite on the Grand Ole Opry and on the road. He continued to tour extensively until he was nearly 70 years old. And, starting in 1949, when the Russians blockaded Berlin, and ending in 1971, Acuff and his band performed annually in USO shows for U.S. Armed Forces overseas. Acuff still hosts half-hour segments on the Opry several nights each week, where he sings, introduces other artists, and extols the down-homeness of country music and country living.

Roy Acuff is not only a favorite of fans, he is a favorite of his colleagues. He is respected for his musical style and his efforts to popularize country music, as evidenced by his election in 1962 to the Country Music Hall of Fame, the first living artist so honored. More important, he is beloved for his untiring encouragement of and advice to younger artists.

The title "King of Country Music" was bestowed on Roy Acuff by baseball great and long-time friend Dizzy Dean. It is hard to imagine any other individual who can wear that crown with such distinction, warmth, and generosity as Roy Acuff.

As George D. Hay, the solemn Old Judge and founder of the Grand Ole Opry said in 1945:

For many years our biggest drawing card was Uncle Dave Macon. However, from the Smoky Mountains of East Tennessee there descended upon us in 1937 a young man who

was destined to become a leader in his field of entertainment. His head and heart joined the fingers which handled his fiddle and bow and it was not long before he started to burn up the countryside like a forest fire.

That fire still burns in Roy Acuff. And in recognition of him and his lifelong contribution to this uniquely American form of music, it is most appropriate that the Nation bestow on him a National Medal of Arts.

Congratulations Roy, and thank you.

[Encyclopedia of Folk, Country and Western Music, 2d Ed., 1983]

ROY ACUFF

Acuff, Roy: Singer, fiddler, band leader (Crazy Tennesseans; Smoky Mountain Boys), emcee, songwriter, record and music industry executive. Born Maynardsville, Tennessee, September 15, 1903. First living member of the Country Music Hall of Fame, elected in 1962.

Few would argue with Dizzy Dean's designation of Roy Acuff as "The King of Country Music." Embodying the soul and symbol of the Grand Ole Opry in the 1940s, Roy Claxton Acuff remained its most charismatic figure over the ensuing decades.

Giving little evidence of having must interest in a music career until he was in his late twenties, Roy, as a child, excelled in athletics. His talent was impressive: he won thirteen athletic letters in high school. While not starring on the playing field, he was holding the center of the stage. He recalled that he "acted in every play they [the high school] had."

After high school, Acuff played semi-pro baseball and had hopes of having a successful tryout for a major league baseball team when disaster struck. Playing in a game in Knoxville on July 7, 1929, he suffered a sunstroke and collapsed in the dugout. After a week, another fainting spell came and, following three months of rest, still another. When a fourth attack hit him during a round of golf, he was so ill he had to spend most of his time indoors for almost two years. Slowly he recovered his strength, and as he noted, "I had to pick me out a new career."

His father's collection of country records helped point the way. Roy spent many hours at home listening to the fiddling tunes of Fiddlin' John Carson and Gid Tanner and the Skiller Lickers, trying to emulate the masters.

By 1932, he seemed in excellent health again. But if it were not for a neighbor named Dr. Hauer, a patent medicine man, Roy might not have gone into music. He asked Roy to join his show, to sell something call "Moc-A-Tan." As Roy told Douglas B. Green of the Country Music Foundation, "There was three of us that got to do all the entertainment, and I got to play every type of character: the blackface, the little girl's part, the old woman's part, plus play the fiddle and sing. And I'd sing real loud on the med show, sing where they could hear me a long ways. Yes, I got a world of training."

The tour lasted from spring to early fall. When it was over, Roy formed a band, the "Tennessee Crackerjacks." In a relatively short time, they had a following in the Knoxville region and soon were being featured on local stations KNOX and WROL. By the time they were approached by American Record Company to cut some sides, they were one of the most popular groups in Tennessee and had changed their name to the Crazy Tennesseans. Their first session, which included an odd type of gospel song called "The Great Speckled Bird," took place in Chicago on October 26, 1936.

Even prior to that, Acuff had yearned to join the Grand Ole Opry. Several inquiries had received little encouragement. But in early 1938, star Opry performer Arthur Smith, a favorite fiddler with program fans, got into an argument with the show and was suspended. A replacement was needed in a hurry. Someone thought of Acuff and, on the rainy night of February 19, 1938, he and the band set out for Nashville, arguing among themselves about what material to offer.

The matter still wasn't settled when Roy opened their set on the Dixie Tabernacle stage in East Nashville with the fiddle tune "The Old Hen Cackled and the Rooster's Going to Crow." He was so nervous, he told Green, "I did an awful poor job of fiddling. I played back of the bridge about as much as I played in front of it." Then he turned to dobro player Clell Summey and told him to start "The Great Speckled Bird," a number the band had urged him not to use. Again he felt he wasn't at his best. When the band left for their next engagement everyone thought they'd ruined their big chance.

Acuff recalled, "I didn't hear anything for two weeks after we returned to Knoxville. Out of the blue I received a telegram from David Stone asking me if I would come and take a regular job. The mail had come in tremendous—bushel baskets full—and they sent them on to me in Knoxville. That night 'The Great Speckled Bird' really changed my life."

Before 1938 was over, Acuff had begun to make his mark on the Opry and on country fans across the country. His single of the old Carter Family success, "Wabash Cannonball," was one of the most popular releases of 1938. He caught the fancy of Opry fans so rapidly that within a year's time he had replaced Uncle Dave Macon, the original superstar of the show, as the top performer. In the 1940 Republic film Grand Ole Opry, Acuff was considered the star of the movie, although Uncle Dave and other longtime luminaries were featured. Acuff also held center stage in 1940 on the "Prince Albert" broadcast, the most prestigious portion of the Opry program.

During 1939, at the urging of Opry management, the name of Roy's band was changed to the Smoky Mountain Boys, a name that stayed with the band. Although early members like Clell Summey and bassist Ed Jones departed to be replaced by other musicians as the 1940s went by, the band makeup in the mid-1940s remained together for many years: Howard "Howdy" Forrester, Jimmie Riddle on harmonica and accordion, Pete Kirby (better known as Bashful Brother Oswald) on dobro, banjo, and vocals. Other members in the 1940s were Lonnie "Pap" Wilson, Jess Easterday, and Tommy Magness. By the 1970s, Forrester, Kirby, and Riddle still were in the fold, along with Gene Martin, Charlie Collins, and Onie Wheeler.

Roy's records were top country sellers almost every month throughout the 1940s. His top sellers of the period included "Wreck on the Highway" and "Fireball Mail" in 1942, and "Night Train to Memphis" "Low and Lonely," and "Pins and Needles (In My Heart)" in 1943. Things were going so well for him in the early 1940s that he expanded his activities into the publishing field, joining forces with Fred Rose to form Acuff-Rose Publishing in 1942. The company became a major force in country music development over the decades, and its staff of contract writers provided not only some of the finest country songs but many of the top-ranked performers as well.

During the 1940s and early 1950s, Acuff made dozens of singles and albums that were

issued on the Vocalion, Okeh, or Columbia labels (Columbia bought out the American Record Company). Some of his Vocalion singles were "Steamboat Whistle Blues," "New Greenback Dollar," "Steel Guitar Chimes," "Wabash Cannonball," "The Beautiful Picture," "The Great Shining Light," and "The Rising Sun." His output on Okeh included "Vagabond's Dream," "Haven of Dreams," "Beautiful Brown Eyes," "Living on the Mountain," "Baby Mine," "Ida Red," "Smoky Mountain Rag," "Will the Circle Be Unbroken," "When I Lay My Burden Down," "Streamline Cannonball," "Weary River," "Just to Ease My Worried Mind," "The Broken Heart," "The Precious Jewel," "Worried Mind," "Lyn' Women Blues," "Are You Thinking of Me Darling," "Wreck on the Highway," "Night Train to Memphis," "Don't Make Me Go to Bed and I'll Be Good," and "It's Too Late to Worry Any more."

Roy's recordings for Columbia those years were even greater in number than his combined total of Vocalion and Okeh. His Columbia list included many of the songs listed above, plus some others as "Beneath That Precious Mound of Clay," "It Won't Be Long," "Branded Wherever I Go," "Do You Wonder Why," "The Devil's Train," "The Songbirds Are Singing in Heaven," "I Saw the Light," "Unloved and Unclaimed," "Mule Skinner Blues," "Not a Word from Home," "Waiting for My Call to Glory," "I Called and Nobody Answered," "Golden Treasure," "Heartaches and Flowers," "Tennessee Waltz," "Sweeter than the Flowers," "Polk Country Breakdown," "I'll Always Care," and "Black Mountain Rag."

Since childhood, Roy had harbored thoughts of emulating his father's legal career. In the 1940's he ran for governor of Tennessee on the Republican ticket, both in 1944 and in 1948. Had Tennessee been a state less dominated by the Democratic Party, things might have been different. As it was, though, Acuff lost both times and stuck to his musical career thereafter.

During the 1950's and first part of the 1960, Roy was no longer able to penetrate the upper segments of the singles charts, but remained a fans' favorite on the Opry as well as on the county fair, rodeo, and concert circuits. Even if Roy himself wasn't dominating the charts, the output of Acuff-Rose was. Through 1967, that company's writers turned out 108 songs that made the top 10, including fifteen number-one records. That was more than twice as many top-10 successes as the next publisher, Hill and Range. During those years, Roy also diversified into other enterprises, operating Roy Acuff Hobby Exhibits, Dunbar Cave Park and Recreation Center near Clarksville Tennessee. He also helped Fred Rose start Hickory Records and became a member of the Hickory recording roster in 1957. (His association with Columbia ended in 1952 and was followed by brief stays with Decca, MGM, and Capitol, before the Hickory alignment.)

Most of his album work from 1957 was for Hickory. Some earlier material was reissued on various labels in the 1960s, such as Capitol's Best of Roy Acuff in 1963, Great Roy Acuff in 1964, and Voice of Roy Acuff in 1965, and MGM's Hymn Time in 1962 and Smoky Mountain Boys in 1956. He was represented on Pickwick in the 1960s by the album How Beautiful Heaven Must Be. Decca also issued material by Roy in a series of seven albums titled All Time Country & Western Hits issued at intervals from July 1960 to August 1966. His name also graced several Harmony Record LPs, such as Roy Acuff (3/58), That

Glory Bound Train (7/61), and Great Roy Acuff (7/65).

His Hickory LPs of the 1960s included American Folk Songs, Gospel Songs, King of Country Music, Once More, Songs of the Grand Ole Opry, The World Is His Stage, all issued or reissued in July 1964; Great Train Songs, Hall of Fame, Sings Hank Williams (1/67); Treasury of Hits (7/69). Harmony issued the LPs Waiting for My Call in August 1969 and Night Train to Memphis in July 1970. Hickory issued Roy Acuff Time in 1970. Also released about that time was the Columbia album Roy Acuff's Greatest Hits, and on Hilltop, Roy Acuff Country.

Like most country stars during their heyday, Roy was on the road hundreds of days each year. His schedules included long overseas trips to entertain the U.S. armed forces. His first such effort was to Berlin during the 1949 Russian blockade and continued with shows in Korea in the 1950s and the Dominican Republic and Vietnam in the 1960s. Roy and the Smoky Mountain Boys also were featured in concerts in many European countries. The intensive tour grind came to a halt, though, on July 10, 1965, in an automobile accident that injured Roy and several band members. He returned to action on the Opry three weeks later, but cut back sharply on the road work, pruning his schedule to almost nothing by 1972, when he was nearly seventy years old. Roy continued to be a mainstay of the Opry, however, delighting countless fans throughout the decade of the 1970s. On the occasional Opry specials telecast on PBS, the show often included segments showing Roy happily presiding over impromptu jam sessions by Opry greats in his dressing room.

During the 1960s and 1970s, Roy's recorded output included a sizable number of remakes of earlier hits on Hickory. But he also included new numbers, such as his single "Back in the Country" in 1974. Many of those recordings, old and new, were included in the two-record Roy Acuff's Greatest Hits, Volume 1, issued by Elektra in 1978. In 1979, Elektra issued Volume 2.

Roy was nominated for the Country Music Hall of Fame in 1961 and his plaque was unveiled there the following year. It read, in part, "The Smoky Mountain Boy . . . fiddle[d] and sang his way into the hearts of millions the world over, often times bringing country music to areas where it had never been before. 'The King of Country Music' . . . has carried his troupe of performers overseas to entertain his country's armed forces at Christmas time for more than 20 years. Many successful artists credit their success to a helping hand and encouraging words from Roy Acuff."

VICTIMS OF THE NOTCH INEQUITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I begin this special order with many of my colleagues who may or may not have the opportunity to be here because of the holiday schedule and coming back. This special order is to once again discuss the notch victim scenario and try and explain the historical facts that occurred, and explain the consensus bill that has been filed here in the House where there will be a press con-

ference tomorrow to try and get more of our colleagues to join.

The first question is obviously raised by the issue of notch, and as I discuss this, I am sure there are Members who have had a great deal more experience, who have listened to these arguments, who have sat and heard the various explanations made, who are saying, "Not again, I thought we resolved this issue."

Frankly, when I first heard of the notch, I thought perhaps it was an issue of fairness, which has been clearly thought out, one which has been articulated, and one which did not need a resolution. However, as I began to review the scenario, as I looked at the record, I looked at what had happened and what had been intended, and it became clear to me, at the urging of my parents who are both notch victims, that what happened is unintended, and what has occurred is clear discrimination based on nothing more than fortuitous births.

The first question one might ask, how many people are really affected by this notch inequity and the Social Security payment system? The estimate is that some 7 million people were born between the year 1917 and 1921. An additional 5 million were born in the years 1921 through 1926. There are some who try and characterize the notch years as a very distinctive category of years between 1917 and 1921.

As the charts will show, it actually extends beyond 1921, out to 1926 through the transition formulas. In 1972 Congress increased the Social Security benefits by 20 percent to assure the retirees in the Nation that they would have a standard of living which was increasing with rising wages and rising inflation.

□ 1350

At the same time, Congress provided for automatic future increases based upon changes in wages. This 1972 law in effect had automatic changes for wages and price adjustments. Automatic adjustments after 1972 were to become effective in 1975.

In the interim, Congress provided for an 11 percent increase in 1974.

In 1975, the Social Security Advisory Council warned that the formula could become too generous in the next century, and in fact some said that the replacement to those who were retiring in the next century could in fact exceed their replacement rate contribution.

It was also intended that the replacement rate, which is a term of art which is used when discussing Social Security benefits, would approximate 42 to 45 percent.

In 1976, it became clear that it was increasing at the rate which then in 1977 was 54 percent.

In 1976, President Gerald Ford proposed that the benefit formula be revised to slow the increase in benefits

over the long-term period. He did this by suggesting there should be a 10-year transition period.

In 1977, President Carter incorporated President Ford's benefit proposal into the Social Security reform package he sent to Congress.

Here in Congress, after nearly a year of debate, we passed a 10-year proposal, and the Senate passed a measure calling for a smaller 5-year phasing.

The final bill drafted in conference committee incorporated the Senate's shorter 5-year phase-in and increased the benefits based on the House proposal.

In 1978, the Social Security Administration in its monthly research bulletin published an article by its chief actuary warning that a technical amendment may be necessary to provide a smoother transition. In particular, he said the drop in replacement rates for age 65 retirees will be about double what Congress anticipated. Congress anticipated that during this transition period of time for those people who were born from 1917 through 1921 that the transition reduction would be approximately 5 to 6 percent. This is a very complex formula which was used prior to 1977 and is frankly a complex formula which was used for the transitional period, but what was intended was clearly not to create such a drop in anticipated earnings that those people who would retire at age 62 and 65 would see an unexpected or precipitous drop in their incomes; but what happened was precisely what was not intended. In fact, in 1920 for people who were born then, their income is decreased 20 percent over what they would have received had they fortuitously been born in 1960.

This chart which I have here I think very clearly shows the average monthly benefits for those who were going to retire at age 65. Here is what we would have had in this blue line under the 1972 law. You can see it was increasing at a much faster rate than was probably possible to fund.

Congress, both the Senate and the House, had anticipated in 1977 that they would have a gradual transition below the 1972 law, but certainly not what this red line reflects the actual drop.

If you look at this and you see the 1917-22, et cetera, you see this precipitous drop. This was the final year for those born in 1960 and then it began to drop.

The people who are least affected were those who were 62 because this happened to be the set of facts that Congress had used for those who were 62 and retired before this transition rule went into effect, but what Congress forgot to look at is what happens to those people who were 65 and retired during this transition period.

This next chart I think shows it clearly. The purple is the average bene-

fit of what was actually being received. You can note from 1910 up through 1917, again the precipitous increase in benefits based upon the replacement rate formula which was used.

In 1977, a new formula was introduced and they said we are going to reduce it by 5 percent; but note the difference between this blue line and this blue line, and then between this blue line and compare that with what would have been received had the person been born in 1915 or 1916.

Finally, when you get down here to 1920, as I indicated earlier, there is a full 19.5 percent reduction below what was anticipated.

What you see here in the red I will discuss in a few moments. That was what was anticipated. They wanted to have a smooth curve, one which would easily transition into the new formula; but because of the reduction in replacement rates which went not down to 43 percent from a high of about 54 percent in 1976, but what went down in fact in the year 1940 to 40.3 percent. That was totally unexpected and unplanned for.

The House Ways and Means Committee in 1979 held numerous hearings to try to determine was this anticipated, was this to be corrected, or were they merely to permit this to continue to occur?

In 1983, Dear Abby announced to the Nation through perhaps a very innocent column and a letter that this was in fact discrimination. Many people began to ask questions about why they were receiving less money because of the fortuitousness of their birth date.

In fact, if you say, well, how much is really involved here, if you took the average worker who was born in the period of 1917 through 1926, if you took an average wage earner during this period of time who retired at age 65, that person, male or female, would receive an average of \$912 less per year than someone who was born fortuitously either before 1917 or after 1927, so we are talking about a substantial amount of money.

When you look at just the year 1920, the actual reduction in their receipts is substantially higher than the average of \$912.

If you took a person who was 62 on their retirement, the difference between what they would have received during this period of time and the average of what they would have received prior to 1916 and after 1927 is \$456, still a very substantial sum.

The period 1920, let us look at that one year for those who are so unfortunate to have been born in that year when they go to their post office and accept their Social Security check. Their difference is \$1,992, based upon the average receipts for Social Security beneficiaries different than had they been born in 1916, in 1917 or beyond; so we are talking about a substantial amount of money here.

What makes this even more critical is that these people who were born during this period of 1917 on out through 1927, who are now our senior citizens, are the least able to go back into the work force and to earn additional income. Frankly, we even penalize them for what they have paid into the Social Security system. If they go back into the work force we are telling them we are going to reduce their receipts based upon their earnings beyond a certain limit.

Frankly, I feel that is discrimination in and of itself, and if we are going to want to encourage people to work, we need to remove that earnings test completely, but that is a story for another day.

Today we are just talking about this inequity, this discrimination, this unintended consequence which we now have, and which affects 12 million people.

In my home State alone, Rhode Island, 63,000 people are affected by this unintended consequence.

You may say, well, it is not that important, it is relatively small when you break it down in a monthly check. The difference, though, that \$83, that \$125 a month, may be the difference between having an adequate nutritious meal, being able to pay for your rent, paying for your heat in the winter, that is what it means to our elderly. These are the same people, also, who went through the Depression, who raised my year group—the baby boomers—who wanted to make sure that we got a college education and in many cases had a better opportunity than they had, who fought during World War II, who established the preeminence of this country in the world, and who now are asking not for something which is more than they are entitled to; what they are asking for is equity.

□ 1400

Our system of government has always relied upon this concept of fairness and equity. When you look at the facts, when you consider the difference in payment, based upon unintended consequences and based upon fortuitousness of birth, you find a situation which is totally unacceptable.

Now, why has something not been done? People have talked. Many of the people have said, "Let's not get involved. We can not in fact afford to replace the difference in cost." While we talk, unfortunately, people who were born between the years 1917 and 1927 are dying daily. These are our senior citizens, there are many of them still paying taxes, in many cases, those who are helping their grandchildren; but they are waiting, waiting for some resolution.

In the past Congress we had 10 bills, as I indicated when I started. Many of my colleagues have been fighting this issue since the very beginning of the

recognition of the mistake which was made.

Congressman ROYBAL, Congressman RINALDO, Congressman FRED GRANDY, and in the other body many of the Senators have been leaders, have been outspoken and have looked at this and have crafted unique, different, and, I think, very positive potential resolutions. But we had 10 bills in the last Congress. Though we had many, many cosponsors on these bills, we also found that we could not get everyone to agree on a possible resolution.

There were some who said, "Let's go back in time to the period in which these people were discriminated against, and let's give them money for their past discrimination."

There were those who said, "Let's give them what was anticipated. Let's go back to the old pre-1977 formula. Let's give them what they should have gotten under the 1972 formula."

I think it is fair to say that under the 1972 formula there are those who got what we can call the bonanza. If we have what is referred to as notch victims, we have prior to 1917 bonanza beneficiaries and we cannot go back. I think it would be generally considered an inappropriate act to say: "Let's go back and change the formula and take away the money which these people," who are often those who, if you look at those who are living in poverty in this country, it is our senior citizens, particularly the senior woman who has survived her spouse, who is living off his social security. It would be totally unconscionable to go back and take away her benefits.

So we have those who said, "We can't continue this increase in benefits. We can't in fact give them what they should have received under the pre-1977 law." But I think there is a better approach, one which gives the equitable resolution which people are asking, and that is what has been discussed and put into language—not yet law; we hope it soon will be law—under the House bill which has been drafted as H.R. 917.

What this House bill says is, there is a recognition that an inequity, an inequitable scenario developed. We cannot go back, because we may not be able to afford it and pay for what they should have or could have received had they been born prior to 1917.

But what we might be able to do is fill in the pothole, look at what has been referred to as the notch, and we ought to be able to do what was anticipated, what was intended. Reduce it by a 5- or 10-percent figure over the 1926. You can see in 1928 the formula begins to increase for those beneficiaries who were born after 1928. So that the years that we need to figure out a transition for are the years 1917 through 1927, that same, coincidental 10-year period which President Ford and President Carter wanted in their original resolution.

The way that is proposed in the bill, H.R. 917, to correct this is to look at what the person would have received under the pre-1977 bill, figure out what his or her benefits were, and then we take the new formula under the post-1977 benefits, and we compute what they would have received under that scenario. We subtract the two, and we get a delta, the difference between pre-1972, if it had been under this, and what it had been under this (indicating).

So the difference between these two is the delta. We then have a multiplier that we use for each year because you can see that for each year from 1917 through 1927 there is a difference in what was or what is being received under this replacement value.

The difference is a multiplier. We multiply the difference between pre-1977 and 1972 formula, the 1977 formula by the delta, and then we add that to what is now the replacement rate under the 1977 formula.

That gives us what you see, the benefits by year based on birth, which was anticipated.

The monthly benefits increases for a worker who is retiring at age 65, who was born in 1918, would be \$64; the wage increase here for an average worker—and again please do not misunderstand an average for every worker, because it is the equivalent of looking at a swimming pool; one end may be 3 feet deep and on the other end it may be 9 feet deep, or even 12 feet deep. The average is somewhere in between.

So you have to look at your specifics.

But if you look at the average worker in this period of time, in 1917, you would add \$46 per month onto their existing check. When you get down to 1920, the largest discriminatory factor, you would add \$88; 1921, it would be \$72; \$59, \$47, \$30, \$15, and finally out in 1926 it would be \$16.

That would give you a smooth transitional curve which would in fact, I think correct this inequity. The obvious question that comes up is if this is so simple, "Why don't we do it?"

The argument that has been raised time and time again is that it costs money. I think that is a fair argument. But let us look at the facts.

The Social Security system has been increasing at a fairly remarkable pace. In fact, there are those in Congress and out in the media who would suggest it is increasing at such a rapid rate that we should reduce or do away with some of the Social Security payments which the middle income has to pay and, therefore, it will reduce their tax burden. This increase in rates is increasing over 1991, on this chart, through 1999. By 1999, at the current rate—and there is no reason to expect that during the next 9 years we will have a different increase—you can see that we anticipate that we would have about \$1.123 trillion in the Social Security surplus. Even in 1977, when they had the hearings and

testimony on what was going to amass in this system, it was always anticipated that in the years 1997 through 1999, some place in this scenario we would have this amount of surplus.

Now, frankly, looking at this amount of surplus, I am doing so from a very personal standpoint because once you get beyond here into the year 2010, then my generation—the baby-boomers, the post-World War II baby-boomers—we are going to need all of that surplus in order to pay our benefits because the number of workers, the number of small children in this country, has been drastically decreasing.

What would it cost? It is estimated in 1992, if we fill in the pothole, it would cost \$4.6 billion. That is a lot of money. But if you look at it in relationship to how many billions of dollars we have in the trust reserve, it is merely a small, small fraction. In each of these years out through 1995, you can see that we never go over \$4.9 billion, never go over \$5 billion per year. Now, one can say that if you took this out beyond the year 2000 and added \$5 billion, times the number of years that we have, which is 10, for instance, that would be \$50 billion and that is an excessive sum of money.

I think when you put it in relationship to what the current reserve is in the trust fund, no one will know the difference between giving to those people who ought to receive the money because it is not new taxes that are needed, it is not additional revenue that is needed, it is merely taking out of the reserve fund and helping those who definitely—as a result of their inability to have this money—recognize the loss of this additional sum of money.

To the woman who is living on a fixed income, \$83 a month means a great deal. To the country, which has a surplus of \$1.1 trillion in the Social Security system in 1999, \$83 may not mean a great deal of money.

□ 1410

However, Mr. Speaker, we do have, as indicated in here, sufficient moneys, and so that argument is not there, and I think it is time that we explain this, and I think there are frankly arguments in Congress that sometimes miss the mark. But I think here, clearly, we have a situation which is again discriminatory, but we also have a very reasonable way of paying for it and ending this discrimination.

We now have about 234 cosponsors on H.R. 917. This is a bill which I think is affordable and which, in fact, tells other senior citizens that we have not forgotten them, that we recognize what was unintended and that we intend to correct it before they die off. Clearly, once we start getting beyond 1999 and go into the next decade, there will be fewer of these notch victims available or alive because of the natural life cycle, and so, when we go beyond here,

this amount of money will actually start to decrease, and it will no longer be a reduction in the surplus which has been accumulating in the Social Security system.

Mr. Speaker, it is an important issue, and it is important because it is affecting our senior citizens. They never asked for more than they are entitled to. Often these are people, our parents who are at home, who are our neighbors and friends. They ask only for what they think is fair.

I have yet to see a senior citizen who knows that his grandchild is expecting to live in a country as wealthy, as fortunate, and as a leader in the world, who is asking for their grandchild's inheritance. What I hear is senior citizens who are asking for what is due them because of a fortuitous circumstance of their birth, and I have heard this, as I am sure other Congressmen have.

Mr. Speaker, this is a box of 5,000 of my constituents who have written in saying, "We are affected, and we feel so strongly about this that we want you to do something. We want you to speak out and try and correct this inequitable scenario. We want you to try to convince your colleagues that this needs to be changed." Five thousand voters, 5,000 senior citizens, 5,000 human beings, are being affected to the point where they will sit down, write, put a stamp on it, and mail it to their Congressman. That tells me these people understand the inequitable situation which is occurring.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to a distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] who has been a leader on this issue.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY], very much for yielding, and I want to commend the Congressman from the Ocean State for doing such a fabulous job of explaining where we are and why we are there on this subject.

It is often said that there are two things certain in life; death and taxes. Well, I can tell my colleagues that there is more than that: death, taxes, and letters on the notch baby, as we have just seen.

I say to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY] "For your 5,000, I'll match you and raise you two, and then we'll keep counting."

Mr. Speaker, in my area of Florida alone I believe we have something like 893,178 people affected in the State of Florida. I believe a good share of them must be from my district. I personally know many of them, and I have corresponded with just about all of them it seems. The reason is because this is unfair, as the gentleman has said so eloquently.

Some might wonder and say, "My gosh! Why is it that, while you've done this brilliant exposition here today, we

don't have more than those 234 colleagues available right now?" The point is that much of the business of this body is done in committee and in hard-working groups, and then it comes to the floor, and we have opportunities like this to discuss these things and to update each other on what is happening and to recognize the progress that has been made, and I suspect that, as we all go through the vagaries of the scheduling program here, that some days it is hard to know exactly what time we are going to do what piece of business. But this piece of business' time is coming, and it is coming because people like the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY] are making it happen, and I commend him for the people in Florida who are thankful for his leadership on this at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I sometimes think when we talk about the fairness issue, I think of my own family. I have four kids, and I have made arrangements with them for certain chores. They get certain allowances, and, if I tried to say at the end of the month, "Well, I seem to think I might run out of money, so I'm going to pick one of you four children not to get your allowance this month," I would expect to hear something about fairness, and I suspect some of the things I have tried to teach my children about fairness and some of the values that we try and teach as leaders about fairness in this Nation would come home to roost.

Mr. Speaker, I do think there is a very critical fairness issue here. I say, "You can't ignore 12 million people who are affected because of an arithmetical formula. They have needs, as I believe it has been beautifully pointed out by Congressman MACHTLEY, and there are varying degrees of dollars involved. It may be a hundred dollars a month, it may be a little more, it may be a little less, but it means a lot to retirees on fixed incomes, an awful lot to retirees on fixed incomes, and we have a great many of them, I suspect, in the Congressman's district in Rhode Island and certainly in my district in Florida."

I think the last point I would like to make on this now is: Will this go away if Congress does nothing about it? Inevitably, statistically, arithmetically, it has to go away. Despite the marvels of the medical profession we are not all going to live forever, so inevitably this will pass. But is that right? And the answer is clearly: No, this is not right, it is not fair, it is not American to ignore it, and we have got to do something about it.

Perhaps the people of our Nation are going to do something about it before we do. I hope not because we are supposed to be leading.

I would like to share with my colleagues, if I may, a very brief statement which explains how the feeling

runs in our district. There is an author named Martha Parnell from Fort Meyers who wrote a book called "Bye Bye Poverty, Ola Mexico." It is a true story about a, quote, very broke notch baby trying to survive financially on our Social Security. The dedication on this book reads:

I dedicate this book to all you notch babies, wherever you are, and, if Congress has not corrected that big fat mistake by the time you read this, I suggest we vote the (expletive) out of office.

That is a very subtle statement about the fact that patience is running out, and I am just delighted to be able to be here today to share with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY] the good news that we now have 234 sponsors on this bill, and that we are making progress, and there is good stuff ahead with people like the gentleman from Rhode Island leading.

□ 1420

Mr. Speaker, it is now my distinct privilege and pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], who has 330,000 constituents who are victims of this Notch Act.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed the chance to work with the gentleman from Rhode Island on a number of issues. Since our districts join, we are often working together on matters involving the economy, the banking situation, and the environment. I thank him for the leadership he is showing here because he knows, Mr. Speaker, that the unfairness of the Notch Act has been a particularly sore point to many people in that part of New England that he and I represent, Rhode Island and the southeastern part of Massachusetts. It is an area where there are a large number of people who care a great deal about American values. Some of them are recent immigrants. More are the children of immigrants or the grandchildren of immigrants. Some, of course, are people whose families have been here longer. But they are people for whom American ideals are very real. They are people, on the whole, who have worked very hard.

The Notch Act is not a subject of great interest to the very wealthy. People concerned about the loss of \$50 or \$125 a month on Social Security payments are not the people who are living off their investments, they are not the people who are living off their great wealth, they are hard-working men and women who did what they were told they were supposed to do in America. They went to work, many of them at an early age. Of the current victims of the Notch Act, I do not think there are many we are talking about who are college graduates. We are talking about people who were children in the Depression and who left to go to work

soon after high school, if they were lucky enough to finish, in many cases. They went to work to bring in money to support their families. They are people who have worked 30 or more likely 40, sometimes 50 years at hard jobs, in textile factories, in the mills, in other manufacturing industries, and in service industries, making deliveries, making repairs, being available to others. They worked hard. They earned money, and they put their children through school. They gave to their children the benefits they could not have themselves. They built homes, and they bought homes. They are people who contributed mightily to this country, and they are particularly, when we look at the numbers of people born in 1917 and after, the generation that fought World War II and saved civilization from the greatest threat it has known in modern history, Adolph Hitler.

What they are saying is very simple. They are saying, "Please do not deprive us of money based on an accident of when we were born."

We have a great deficit in this country that we all want to reduce. My friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island, myself, and others are not here asking to increase the deficit in any meaningful way, because what we are talking about, as the gentleman from Rhode Island has literally and graphically made clear, is surpluses. We are talking about taking a small part of a growing, enduring surplus and making it available to people who suffer because of when they were born.

We are not asking to repeal the entire act that brought about this situation. Yes, there was an error that came about in the 1970's in that people were being overcompensated for inflation after retiring as a result of legislation adopted in the early 1970's. The part of the bill that became law in the 1970's that reduced that is not at issue. What is at issue is how we reduce it, what discriminatory impact we allow. What can we do for those people who were caught by that accident of birth?

We have had countless examples of people who worked side-by-side at the same job for the same wages for years and years and years, and then on their retirement found that one was getting \$75 or \$100 a month more than the other because one was born 2 or 3 years earlier. That is not in compliance with the American ideals these people put forward.

I want to see the deficit reduced, Mr. Speaker. I see the chart that my friends has exhibited there. Let me ask the gentleman again so that I may be sure: What are we talking about as an actual rate of expenditure in our legislation?

Mr. MACHTLEY. This would be, beginning in 1992, \$4.6 billion out of an increased surplus of \$350 billion.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Let me make one other point about the \$4.6 billion we are talking about. It is less than the amount that the United States spends to subsidize the defense of Japan. The United States taxpayers pay more to keep troops in Japan than we are asking to be put in the notch. The United States taxpayers pay infinitely more to continue to deter an attack that is not coming in Europe by the Warsaw Pact that we are asking here.

Yes, we should be saving money. We should be providing greater efficiency to the greatest extent that we can. We could be cutting back in areas such as in defense and elsewhere. But to say to 72-year-old men and women who have worked hard all their lives that they would get less than others identical to them in every respect except a couple of years difference in age is not worthy of the greatest country in the world.

What we have here is a compromise. It is far less than everything people are asking for, but it is a significant amount. We are talking about hard-working people who are living day-to-day and month-to-month on their social security in many cases, people who have earned better from this country than they are receiving.

So I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Rhode Island in this effort. We have a lot of people coming together on this, including the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL], who chairs the Select Committee on Aging. It is bipartisan, it is national in scope, it is fair, and I hope the leadership of the House will take the simple step of allowing us to vote on this.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman defer to me for just a moment?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Yes, of course.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, one thing I think that is so important to point out to our colleagues who may be concerned about where we are to get the money based upon our budget agreement which we passed is that the money is there. We are not asking for a new appropriation of money. What we are asking is to take it out of reserves that are increasing.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for pointing that out.

When people say, "Oh, we would like to maybe do that, but we can't because of the budget agreement," we have to remind people that the budget agreement was not imposed by Brazil or the budget agreement was not enforced against us by India. The budget agreement is an act of Congress, and if we have a perfectly sensible thing we want to do that requires a small amendment to the budget agreement, we can do it.

What we are saying is that we have huge surpluses that are building up in Social Security, and let us make those surpluses a little less big. Everybody acknowledges this, and we ought to be clear as to why we have this big surplus.

In 1980 the panic set in and everybody was afraid that Social Security was going to wind up, because we had, in the late 1970's and the early 1980's, because of the oil shock and other things, very high inflation, double-digit inflation, and then we had a bad recession, and we did projections and we assumed that the payroll tax was not going to be able to bring in what we needed to make those high-digit payouts. But inflation subsided for a variety of reasons, the recession ended, and we have in fact had a higher level of employment than we thought we would. So we brought in much more Social Security trust fund money than had been anticipated, and we did that, by the way, people should understand, not profligately. We raised the Social Security taxes on working people, and we cut the benefits. In 1983 Congress and the President put through legislation which cut the cost of living in half. I voted against it, but let me point out my two colleagues were not here at the time, so we are able to discuss it fairly freely. But the fact is that we raised the taxes and they cut the benefit. That is why we have a big surplus.

So we are saying that for the American people, having been taxed more for Social Security and the cost-of-living increases having been in effect cut in half because the payment date for the cost-of-living increases was pushed back from July 1 to January 1, that is the same as cutting it in half every year—or it is cutting it in half every year—and we are saying that we should take some of the enormous surplus we are building up as a result of that and distribute a very small amount of it among people who are being discriminated against because of their age.

I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island for giving us the chance to voice our support for this. If people want to know, is this why we support it in Congress, the answer is, "Of course," or else it would have been on the floor, and if people do not like this and they could beat it, they would not vote it out here. But I am ready to stand up and say, yes, I understand what I am doing. I am reducing a large surplus. It is in the amount of several billions of dollars, and given the size of the surplus, it does not represent a significant fiscal impact. It is within the margin of error in estimating by far on the annual deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 1430

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachu-

setts [Mr. FRANK] for not only participating in this special order, but last year when we had this special order, I was reminded before I came over here that when we did this special order on this issue last year, we had more Members join us than in any previous special order for the whole year. While we probably have fewer Members here today, I think there are more Members who are becoming aware of this scenario in Congress and who want to make a change.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we ought to point out that today is a day on which there are no votes being taken in Congress, so many Members are in their districts being available to their constituents. That is why there are fewer Members here physically participating.

Mr. Speaker, that is certainly no sign of diminished interest. We have a majority of Members of the House cosponsoring this bill for the first time. People expecting this to fade away should look at the increasing number of cosponsors and realize their expectations.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] knows, if we tried to put a discharge petition through, we now have 234 sponsors of this bill. If every one of them signed a discharge petition, it is certainly possible we could get this bill on the floor. I think it is important that we all, in a bipartisan fashion, work to find a resolution to this. It may be tangentially important or connected, but I think when you look at what is happening in this country in health care today, people who are the least able to pay for their plan 65 coverage, their additional prescription drugs, the people who are most impacted by the inflation in health care, are the senior citizens. If you can put \$50 to \$100 a month into the hands of senior citizens, people like Carl Stockman in Patuxent, Lucy Castro, Nellie Zerva, and Caesar Pina, all of these are people who have written me saying, as Yvonne Nolan says, "I am 70 years young, and I lost my husband a year ago. I need that extra money to help me live."

These are not people going on vacation. These are people who are trying to make ends meet on very limited budgets with inflation eating away at their buying power.

As the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], who has been so active on these issues, as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] know, those States who have large senior populations, we witness on a regular daily basis people coming to our office, who are not looking for enormous amounts nor extreme assistance. What they are looking for are basic substances of life, the ability to pay their rent, their heat, their food, and maybe, just maybe, enough money so that they can

give their kids a gift on one of their birthdays or the holidays.

One of the things I wanted to point out for Members and staff and others who may be watching, when the question comes up, who will be affected by H.R. 917, the answer is that retirees who were born after January 1, 1917, and before January 2, 1927, and their dependents, retired workers are first eligible for benefits on their 62d birthday. The second category are survivors of workers born after January 1, 1917, and before January 2, 1927, if the worker dies on or after the year of his or her 62d birthday.

The third category are workers which are often forgotten when we talk about Social Security benefits, and those are the disabled. We are talking about disability beneficiaries for those born after January 1, 1917, and before January 2, 1927, beginning with the month they attain age 65, and are reclassified as retired workers.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue. As I indicated, there will be a press conference tomorrow at 10 o'clock. The intent of this special order is to make people aware of the issue, to make staffs and Members of Congress aware that there is a consensus bill, one bill in Congress, which can clearly and equitably create a scenario that is financially possible, and will take care of an inequitable situation which is discriminating against our senior citizens, our parents, like Ken and Mary Machtley, who have worked hard to make sure I can get an education to be here today.

Mr. Speaker, we must as Members of Congress recognize an obligation to represent their interests, as well as those of young Americans and middle aged Americans. Our Nation is diverse ethnically as well as from an age standpoint.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation as Members of Congress to represent all strata of our constituents. None have such little importance that we should overlook them. Every classification, every age group in our constituency, needs to have a voice.

Often senior citizens are unable to come to Washington, unable to write or speak out. So today I am pleased and proud to be here in the well of this distinguished body to talk about an issue which I think is unfair, and which ought to be corrected. I greatly appreciate the support of Members. We will have more special orders. We will talk about this issue until such time as it is corrected.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. 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 matter, on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OLIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. EMERSON, for 60 minutes, on July 18.

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today and July 10.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLEMENT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS of New York, for 60 minutes each day, on July 29, 30, and 31 and on August 1 and 2.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in two instances.

Mr. MACHTLEY.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. DORNAN of California.

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

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mrs. LLOYD in five instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in 10 instances.

Mr. DE LUGO.

Mr. SERRANO in two instances.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. YATES.

Ms. LONG in two instances.

Mr. RANGEL in two instances.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. LUKEN.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint res-

olutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2332. An act to amend the Immigration Act of 1990 to extend for 4 months the application deadline for special temporary protected status for Salvadorans;

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to designate December 7, 1991, as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day";

H.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution designating the week beginning July 21, 1991, as "Lyme Disease Awareness Week";

H.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution designating March 1992 as "Women's History Month";

H.J. Res. 259. Joint resolution designating July 2, 1991, as "National Literacy Day."

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 674. An act to designate the building in Monterey, TN, which houses the primary operations of the U.S. Postal Service as the "J.E. (Eddie) Russell Post Office Building," and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 1, 1991:

H.R. 2332. An act to amend the Immigration Act of 1991 to extend for 4 months the application deadline for special temporary protected status for Salvadorans;

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to designate December 7, 1991, as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day";

H.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution designating the week beginning July 21, 1991, as "Lyme Disease Awareness Week";

H.J. Res. 149. Joint resolution designating March 1991 and March 1992 both as "Women's History Month"; and

H.J. Res. 259. Joint resolution designating July 2, 1991, as "National Literacy Day."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 10, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1642. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the fiscal year 1991 and fiscal year 1992 requests for appropriations for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of De-

fense, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 102-107); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1643. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two proposed rescissions, and two revised deferrals of budget authority, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 683(a)(1) (H. Doc. No. 102-108); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1644. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of D.C. Act 9-50, "District of Columbia Public Hall Regulation Temporary Amendment Act of 1991," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1645. A letter from the Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's 1990 annual report on missing children, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5773(a); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1646. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1647. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to transfer defense articles to member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in accord with the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1648. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Labor, transmitting the semi-annual report of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1990 through March 31, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1649. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1650. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1651. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1652. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1653. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Government Losses in Shipment Act to provide a permanent indefinite appropriation for the replacement of valuables, or the value thereof, lost, destroyed, or damaged in the course of shipment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1654. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a new position at the

Assistant Secretary level at the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1655. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revoke the withdrawal of certain public lands in Multnomah County, OR, to remove land from the Cibola and Havasu National Wildlife Refuges, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1656. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the report on the costs of domestic and international emergencies and on the threats posed by the Kuwaiti oil fires, pursuant to Public Law 102-55, chapter III (105 Stat. 293); jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations, Agriculture, and Public Works and Transportation.

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:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on June 26, 1991, the following report was filed on June 28, 1991]

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2507. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Pursuant to the order of the House on June 26, 1991, the following report was filed on July 2, 1991]

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on Government Operations. Report on strengthening the export licensing system (Rept. 102-137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Pursuant to the order of the House on June 26, 1991, the following report was filed on July 3, 1991]

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1096. A bill to authorize appropriations for programs, functions, and activities of the Bureau of Land Management for fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995; to improve the management of the public lands; and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on Government Operations. Report on Bureau of Prisons halfway houses: Contracting out responsibility (Rept. 102-139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted July 9, 1991]

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 263. Joint resolution disapproving the extension of non-discriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China (Rept. 102-140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2212. A bill regarding the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; with amend-

ments (Rept. 102-141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. House Concurrent Resolution 174. Concurrent resolution concerning relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China (Rept. 102-142, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 174. Concurrent resolution concerning relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China; with amendments (Rept. 102-142, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on Government Operations. Report on testing fraud and other Northrop improprieties in the Harrier II jet and cruise missile programs underscore need for additional procurement safeguards (Rept. 102-143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 2387. A bill to authorize appropriations for certain programs for the conservation of striped bass, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FROST: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 189. Resolution providing for the consideration of a joint resolution, a bill, and a concurrent resolution relating to most-favored-nation treatment for the People's Republic of China (Rept. 102-145). Referred to the House Calendar.

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:

[Omitted from the Record of June 26, 1991]

By Mr. STENHOLM (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SNOWE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. FISH, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. RAY, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr.

ECKART, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JAMES, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLUG, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KYL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LIVINGTON, Mrs. LLOYD, Ms. LONG, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ORTON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. PRICE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SWETT, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VANDERJAGT, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WYLLIE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.J. Res. 290. 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; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.J. Res. 291. Joint resolution to designate the weeks of October 27, 1991 through November 2, 1991, and October 11, 1992 through October 17, 1992, each separately as "National Job Skills Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

[Submitted July 9, 1991]

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2828. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to remove the limitation on the authorization of appropriations for the Office of Government Ethics; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SWIFT:

H.R. 2829. A bill to strengthen the authority of the Federal Trade Commission regarding fraud and consumer abuse committed in connection with sales made with a telephone and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LONG (for herself, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SLATTERY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. FROST, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

H.R. 2830. A bill to ensure that whenever the annual adjustment in General Schedule pay rates is reduced or foregone, the annual pay adjustment for Members of Congress, justices and judges of the United States, and certain senior officials in the executive branch shall likewise be reduced or foregone, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, the Judiciary, and House Administration.

By Mr. DAVIS (for himself and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 2831. A bill to minimize the adverse effects on local communities caused by the closure of military installations; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Government Operations.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 2832. A bill to amend Public Law 97-360; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 2833. A bill to permit States in certain cases to waive application of the requirements of the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1986 with respect to a vehicle which is being operated for the purpose of removing snow or ice from a roadway by plowing, sanding, or salting; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. RITTER (by request):

H.R. 2834. A bill to amend the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SABO:

H.R. 2835. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a program to promote and facilitate the implementation of Intelligent Vehicle-Highway Systems as a component of the Nation's surface transportation systems, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SHARP (for himself, Mr. MINETA (both by request), Mr. MOORHEAD and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 2836. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, as amended, and the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of

1979, as amended, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. STENHOLM:

H.R. 2837. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to improve the milk price support program and to establish a milk inventory management program to operate during calendar years in which purchases of milk and milk products by the Commodity Credit Corporation are estimated to exceed 5 billion pounds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEISS (for himself, Mr. YATRON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding human rights violations in the Islamic Republic of Mauritania; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. YATRON (for himself and Mr. BEREUTER):

H. Con. Res. 177. Concurrent resolution calling for a U.S. policy of strengthening and maintaining indefinitely the current International Whaling Commission moratorium on the commercial killing of whales, and otherwise expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to conserving and protecting the world's whale, dolphin, and porpoise populations; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Res. 188. Resolution electing Representative Paxon of New York to the Committee on Budget. Considered and agreed to.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

208. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to lead content levels; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

209. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to enactment of a POW/MIA truth bill; to the Committee on Government Operations.

210. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to grazing fees; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

211. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

212. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to unemployment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 46: Mr. LANCASTER.
H.R. 53: Mr. EVANS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 110: Mr. GEJDENSON.
H.R. 203: Mr. WOLPE.
H.R. 252: Mrs. SCHROEDER.
H.R. 381: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. KLUG, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 421: Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

H.R. 573: Mr. FISH and Mr. DIXON.
H.R. 576: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 602: Mr. BALLENGER.
H.R. 710: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 776: Mr. SWETT.
H.R. 793: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 814: Mr. PORTER, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 830: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 845: Mr. BOEHNER.
H.R. 870: Mr. AUCOIN and Mr. WISE.
H.R. 871: Mr. AUCOIN and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 872: Mr. AUCOIN and Mr. WISE.
H.R. 873: Mr. AUCOIN and Mr. WISE.
H.R. 961: Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 967: Mr. BACCHUS and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1048: Mr. HAYES of Illinois.
H.R. 1111: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1124: Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 1195: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. FALCOMA VEGA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. REED, and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 1200: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mrs. MINK, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LUKE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. GORDON, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROWLAND, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SARPALUIS, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 1288: Mr. MCCLOSKEY.
H.R. 1334: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1335: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 1385: Mr. POSHARD, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. FUSTER.

H.R. 1432: Mr. CALLAHAN.
H.R. 1497: Mr. BAKER and Mr. WILSON.
H.R. 1502: Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 1527: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. HUBBARD.

H.R. 1531: Mr. WOLF, Mr. ERDREICH, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1545: Mr. RAY and Mr. IRELAND.
H.R. 1601: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1648: Mr. SANTORUM and Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 1663: Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 1669: Mr. PERKINS, Mr. STUDDS, and Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 1708: Mr. FROST, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 1771: Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. HOYER, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 1774: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1883: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 2001: Mr. BALLENGER.
H.R. 2027: Mr. EMERSON.
H.R. 2029: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 2049: Mr. FIELDS.
H.R. 2070: Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 2082: Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 2083: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. YATES, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.R. 2089: Mr. EVANS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 2115: Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. BACCHUS, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 2185: Mr. RITTER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DELAY, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 2188: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. EVANS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 2210: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BILBRAY, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2234: Mr. WEBER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 2248: Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 2279: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. BEILENSEN.

H.R. 2303: Mr. KOSTMAYER.
H.R. 2333: Mr. HATCHER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 2342: Mr. SIKORSKI.
H.R. 2355: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BEILENSEN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. YATES, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 2371: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 2440: Mr. EVANS, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. ESPY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 2484: Mr. WEBER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2511: Mr. LEVINE of California and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 2540: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 2541: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WELDON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. GILCHRIST.

H.R. 2559: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BEILENSEN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 2560: Mr. HAMILTON and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 2566: Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. OLIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 2567: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2579: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 2584: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 2620: Mr. RITTER.
H.R. 2632: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 2670: Mr. WASHINGTON and Mr. JONTZ.
H.R. 2786: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. HORTON.

H.J. Res. 67: Mr. PETERSON of Florida.
H.J. Res. 107: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ZELIFF, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ROEMER, and Mr. FROST.

H.J. Res. 180: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. ROEMER, and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.J. Res. 188: Mr. FROST.

H.J. Res. 217: Mr. COOPER, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GALLO, Mr. WISE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. TALLON, Mr.

PURSELL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. YATRON, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. SHARP, Mr. RHODES, Mr. KASICH, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.J. Res. 244: Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUARINI, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.J. Res. 263: Mr. FROST, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SKAGGS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.J. Res. 264: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. FROST, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. GORDON.

H.J. Res. 270: Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.J. Res. 273: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. LONG, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SHARP, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. ESPY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. YATES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 168: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HORTON, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H. Res. 40: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H. Res. 42: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H. Res. 115: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. REED, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr.

SHARP, Mr. FROST, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WASHINGTON, and Mr. ROE.

H. Res. 164: Mr. ESPY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FROST, and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Res. 167: Mr. MRAZEK, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. FALBOMAVEGA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H. Res. 168: Mr. FORD of Tennessee and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Res. 184: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ESPY, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. GUNDERSON.