

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, July 15, 1991

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 15, 1991.

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

THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### PRAYER

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

We are grateful, O God, for the warmth and support we can experience when we know the love of those near and dear to us. For families and friends and for all those for whom we care, we express our joy and our appreciation. And just as we think of ourselves, we remember others who are separated from those they love. We specially recall in this our prayer the hostages and their families as we think about the anxiety and separation they face each day. May Your blessing that is with us in all the moments of life surround them and keep them this day and every day. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. HUTTO 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.

### SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were

communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution 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.

### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF NATIONAL COUNCIL ON EDUCATION STANDARDS AND TESTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of section 406(a) of Public Law 102-62, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of Ms. Eva L. Baker of Sherman Oaks, CA, to the National Council of Education Standards and Testing on the part of the House.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 11, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House at 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, July 11, 1991 and said to contain a message from the President, whereby he transmits the First and Second Reports on Employee Sanctions.

With great respect, I am  
Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,  
Clerk, House of Representatives.

### IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPACT OF EMPLOYER SANCTIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

(For message see proceedings of the Senate of Thursday, July 11, 1991, at page 18085.)

### THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RECYCLING

(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, from its inception, my office, both here in Washington and back home in Kentucky, has cooperated with the recycling program in which we in the office separate our newspapers and aluminum and plastic bottles and glass bottles. I am proud to say that my community, my district in Louisville, Jefferson County, has instituted and is implementing a voluntary program of recycling at the curbside in which we place our material for recycling out front and it is separated and collected.

I am also pleased to note that while we will, as a community, move toward a garbage-to-steam program for getting rid of our garbage, that program is not incompatible with curbside recycling.

In the last analysis, Mr. Speaker, the success in recycling is a matter of psychology. To the extent that we can psychologically reach the point of guilt, if one wants to call it that, at throwing material away which can be recycled, then I think we will have a successful program. I have already noted in my own situation and that of my family that there is a little bit of guilt now if we tend to throw something away that we could save.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, we are on the verge of a nationwide program that will save our planet much of the degradation which it has experienced in the recent past.

### PEOPLE OF BURMA SUFFER TYRANNICAL GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Burma continue to languish under one of the world's worst tyrannies. They are murdering their people. They are hunting down their opposition. They torture innocent citizens who do nothing more than speak up, as is every citizen's right to do, in complaining about government policies.

This military dictatorship in Burma is selling off the resources of the Na-

□ 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.

tion, robbing future generations of Burmese their rightful legacy, the gems, the oil, and most importantly, the beautiful rain forests of Burma are being destroyed and being sold off to foreign exploiters for a quick profit for this gangster regime in Rangoon.

This is indeed the quintessential gangster regime of the world. We as the people of the United States, as freedom-loving Americans, should be unmistakably on the side of democracy and reform in Burma and against this horrible oppressive tyranny.

We should make sure that the United States stands for economic, political, and military isolation of this gangster regime. The regime in Burma should be made the pariah among all free nations and decent people. We should, instead of cooperating with the Burmese regime on areas like drug interdiction and drug enforcement, we should instead be seeking to install and to support the democratic reformers in Burma who will be on the side of decent people because we can trust that they will indeed be trying to stamp out the drug menace that flows from the triangle in the northern part of Burma.

Today, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget those people who languish under tyranny in Burma. Let us always be on the side of democratic reform and let the people of Burma know that they are not alone and they are not forgotten.

#### PHILIPPINE MILITARY BASES

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

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon is closing domestic military bases and reducing its active and civilian work force. Within this context, it's becoming difficult to justify sinking billions of dollars into a blackhole that could literally go up in smoke and ash at anytime. The eruptions of Mount Pinatubo have clouded the already uncertain issue of our military bases in the Philippines since previous negotiations with the Filipino Government, which asked for unreasonably high payments to renew the leases for Clark Air Base and Subic Bay Naval Base, failed to reach a settlement. Now, with the volcanic damage so extensive, I believe it's time for the United States to begin contemplating other options. There's no doubt about the strategic power projection value of the Philippines. But in these times of scarce resources, we have to ask ourselves if it's in our best interest to keep the bases open or move them elsewhere. The attitude of the Filipino Government and the cost to repair our bases could mean that we need another location as a place to project American security interests and influence in that region of

the world. Clearly, now is the time to consider other possibilities.

□ 1210

#### INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING COLORADO METROPOLITAN WILDLIFE REFUGE

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced an important piece of legislation for the State of Colorado and for the Federal Government.

Today I have introduced legislation which will establish the Colorado Metropolitan National Wildlife Refuge. This legislation proposes to create a National Wildlife Refuge at the site of the Rocky Mountain Arsenal.

As many of my colleagues may know, this is a Superfund cleanup site. Due to years of toxic waste and chemical waste disposal at the arsenal, small portions of this site are considered to be among the most polluted spots on earth. Yet, on most of this 27 square mile site there is a thriving, unique wildlife system. More than 130 different species of wildlife are found here, including the winter nesting grounds for several pairs of bald eagles.

What I and many other members of the Colorado delegation propose is to make the very best of a bad situation. We propose to mitigate the environmental damage done these many years at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal by protecting and showcasing the ample wildlife that exists at the site.

The Rocky Mountain Arsenal can become symbolic of how we can proactively offset the negativism associated with a Superfund site. The Rocky Mountain Arsenal can become the largest and perhaps only urban wildlife refuge.

The legislation Congress is considering proposes to convert some 16,500 acres of the existing arsenal, 95 percent, and converting its use to a wildlife refuge; allowing for habitat for eagles, burrowing owls, prairie dogs, coyotes, migratory water fowl, and many other species of fish and wildlife.

We have the chance to do something special for an area that has, and will, suffer from the stigma associated with our former ignorance of proper chemical disposal techniques. Together we have the chance to change the negative image and create a "pearl on the prairie."

By establishing a wildlife refuge next to a metropolitan area we will create an educational emphasis both on wildlife and our environment. It will become, as it already has, a prime educational and research tool for us to teach visitors about the natural habitat on the Great Plains and its ecological evolution.

We will also be able to teach something else. Unfortunately, but perhaps most importantly, we will also be able to teach the consequences of man's ability to negatively impact the environment. The evidence of the contamination and subsequent cleanup will never be erased and will serve as a reminder to all who visit this wildlife refuge of what once was and can be again if we do not use our knowledge and foresight.

There are many people who deserve credit for this proposal. All more so than me, who was simply fortunate to be the vehicle by which this proposal is delivered for your consideration. I cannot begin to thank all those who helped in making this legislation possible. But in advance of the first hearing on this proposal I would especially like to thank the other members of the Colorado delegation who are helping further this proposal. The commitment and cooperation of Congresswoman SCHROEDER and Congressmen HEFLEY, SCHAEFER, and CAMPBELL is deeply appreciated.

I am also happy to report that the same bill is being introduced in the Senate, and will be jointly sponsored by Senators BROWN and WIRTH.

In summary, I am extremely excited about this particular piece of legislation. It has strong local support. It has the support of the Colorado delegation, it has the support of many citizens of the State of Colorado.

I hope and believe that it will earn the support of Congress as well.

#### 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 Tuesday, July 16, 1991.

#### OSCAR GARCIA RIVERA POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2014) to designate the U.S. Post Office Building located at 153 East 110th Street, New York, NY, as the "Oscar Garcia Rivera Post Office Building."

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2014

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

**SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF UNITED STATES POST OFFICE BUILDING LOCATED AT 153 EAST 110TH STREET, NEW YORK, NEW YORK.**

The United States Post Office Building located at 153 East 110th Street, New York,

New York, is designated as the "Oscar Garcia Rivera Post Office Building". Any reference to such building in any law, rule, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the "Oscar Garcia Rivera Post Office Building".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2014 will designate the U.S. Post Office Building located at 153 East 110th Street, New York, NY, as the "Oscar Garcia Rivera Post Office Building."

There are a few of us here today who might remember the unexpected difficulties we experienced in the 100th Congress after we passed a similar bill, which was introduced by former Congressman Garcia. This bill was derailed by an unrelated amendment in the other body. I want to thank my colleague from New York [Mr. SERRANO] for pursuing this very worthwhile matter.

Oscar Garcia Rivera carved a place in history as the first Puerto Rican elected to public office in the continental United States. As a representative in the New York State Legislature from Harlem, NY, Mr. Rivera quickly gained the reputation as a Latino civil rights activist, and was instrumental in the passage of the New York antidiscrimination legislation which prohibited discrimination on the basis of national origin, race, or creed, against persons who applied for State jobs.

It seems quite appropriate to honor Mr. Rivera by naming a post office after him in the district where he first started as a labor organizer with the U.S. postal clerks union. He will be remembered for having spent a successful career fighting for and protecting the rights of the underprivileged and minorities in the State of New York.

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2014 to designate a postal facility in New York, NY, as the Oscar Garcia Rivera Post Office Building. I am pleased that my good friend, a member of the New York delegation, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], has introduced this measure to pay tribute to Oscar Garcia Rivera, a dedicated public servant.

Mr. Rivera was elected to the New York State Assembly in 1937 and became the first Puerto Rican elected in the United States.

Mr. Rivera was also a successful union organizer and practiced law in

New York until 1967. Oscar Garcia Rivera was an outstanding individual who championed many issues long before they were politically popular and, I might add, in the early 1930's was an active organizer for the Postal Clerks Union.

I urge my colleagues to support this designation.

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

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues' support of H.R. 2014, a bill that would designate the U.S. Post Office Building located at 153 East 110th Street, New York, NY, as the "Oscar Garcia Rivera Post Office Building."

Mr. Oscar Garcia Rivera, Esquire, was elected assemblyman in the State of New York by the 14th District, at that time Harlem, on March 7, 1937.

Born in Mayaguez, PR, November 6, 1900, Oscar Garcia Rivera was raised on a coffee plantation. After graduation from high school, Garcia came to the mainland and began working part time in a factory in Brooklyn, while he continued to take courses to reach his goal of becoming a lawyer. He applied for a job at the U.S. Postal Service, obtained high recommendations, and was assigned to the post office in city hall. He quickly became very involved in union issues, and later encouraged the establishment of the Association of Puerto Rican and Hispanic Employees within the U.S. Postal Service.

Garcia Rivera attended law school at St. John's University, and he graduated in 1930. Dedicated and committed to the struggles of pioneer Puerto Ricans and Hispanics in East Harlem, he announced publicly in 1937 that he would seek a seat in the New York State Assembly.

In March of the same year, he made history by becoming the first Puerto Rican elected to public office in the continental United States. He won reelection the following year and continued in this post until 1940.

During the short time that he served in the assembly, Oscar Garcia Rivera initiated legislation that offered valuable and lasting contributions to his Puerto Rican community, the labor movement, and to the working class. He introduced a bill guaranteeing safeguards against unemployment; this revolutionary piece of legislation was enacted into law in February of 1939. Garcia Rivera defended minimum wage laws, fought for regulated hours of labor, worked to establish tariff agreements, and most importantly, he was committed to protecting the rights of manual laborers and encouraged workers to organize themselves into active unions. He also supported the cam-

paign which established a law which punished lynching throughout the United States.

The anniversary of Oscar Garcia Rivera's election as the first Puerto Rican who attained a public office marks a proud moment in our history. Despite his brief career as assemblyman, Oscar Garcia Rivera became a great leader in his community, creating a role model for young people, and establishing hope for his people that they could achieve their dreams in the United States. His actions transformed the Puerto Rican community, and improved working conditions in the State of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the passage of this bill and the dedication of this building to this great leader would serve as an inspiration to the future generations of Puerto Rican and Hispanic leaders in New York, and throughout the United States. Please join me in strong support of H.R. 2014.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. 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 Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2014.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CARL O. HYDE GENERAL MAIL FACILITY

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2347) to redesignate the Midland General Mail Facility in Midland, TX, as the "Carl O. Hyde General Mail Facility," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2347

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

#### SECTION 1. REDESIGNATION OF MAIL FACILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Midland General Mail Facility, located at 10000 Sloan Field Boulevard, in Midland, Texas, is redesignated as the "Carl O. Hyde General Mail Facility".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, rule, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the Midland General Mail Facility in Midland, Texas, is deemed to be a reference to the "Carl O. Hyde General Mail Facility".

#### SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 5307 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (a) as subsection (a)(1);

(2) in subsection (a)(1) (as so redesignated) by striking "cause to the" and inserting "cause the";

(3) by inserting after subsection (a)(1) (as so redesignated) the following:

"(2) This section shall not apply to any payment under—

"(A) subchapter III or VII of chapter 55 or section 5596;

"(B) chapter 57 (other than section 5753, 5754, or 5755); or

"(C) chapter 59 (other than section 5925, 5928, 5941(a)(2), or 5948)."; and

(4) in subsection (b) by striking paragraph (3).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY].

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

Mr. Speaker, today I ask for your support for H.R. 2347, a bill to redesignate the Midland General Mail Facility in Midland, TX, in honor of a distinguished 46-year employee of the U.S. Postal Service, Carl O. Hyde.

Many of you might remember back to the 101st Congress when this House passed a similar bill, introduced by our colleague from Texas [Mr. SMITH]. The Senate added some unrelated amendments to the House-passed version and that bill was not enacted.

During Mr. Hyde's service with the Postal Service he oversaw the construction and maintenance requirements for 63 postal facilities. One of his last projects in his 46-year tenure with the U.S. Postal Service was to oversee the construction of the new Midland General Mail Facility, the postal facility the Midland community would now like to bear his name.

Section 2 of the bill amends section 5307 of title 5, United States Code, which was enacted last year as part of the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act of 1990. This amendment, suggested by the Office of Personnel Management, merely clarifies the types of payments that are subject to the aggregate limitation on compensation payable to a Federal employee during any calendar year. As a general rule, reimbursements for necessary expenses are not subject to the aggregate limitation.

□ 1220

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2347 to designate a postal facility in Midland, TX, as the Carl O. Hyde General Mail Facility.

This legislation was introduced by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LAMAR SMITH, and will designate the General Mail Facility in Midland, TX, for a dedicated and respected former postal employee, Carl O. Hyde.

Carl Hyde served as an employee of the Postal Service for 46 years. I am informed that this change is supported by the Midland City Council, the cham-

ber of commerce, and many of Mr. Hyde's friends and coworkers in Midland, TX.

As a senior postal operations specialist, he oversaw the construction and maintenance requirements for 63 west Texas post offices. One of the last projects that he worked on is the one we are renaming here today. I believe it is a fitting tribute to Carl O. Hyde for his years of service.

The second part of this bill is the amendment which includes technical changes to the Federal Employee Pay Comparability Act of 1990 and is supported by the Office of Personnel Management. The amendment is necessary as a number of agencies in the executive branch have interpreted the pay cap of executive level 1 as applying to nonemployee pay items such as expenses, allowances, travel, and other necessary reimbursement items. This amendment merely indicates congressional intent that these items should not be considered when determining whether an employee's salary exceeds the applicable pay cap.

I urge the adoption of H.R. 2347.

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

Mr. HORTON. 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 Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2347, 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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to redesignate the Midland General Mail Facility in Midland, TX, as the 'Carl O. Hyde General Mail Facility,' and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JOHN RICHARD HAYDEL POST OFFICE

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 998) to redesignate the Vacherie Post Office located at 2747 Highway 20 in Vacherie, LA, as the John Richard Haydel Post Office, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 998

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the building in Vacherie, Louisiana, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service (as determined by the Postmaster General) shall be known and designated as the "John Richard Haydel Post Office Building", and any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to such building shall be*

deemed to be a reference to the John Richard Haydel Post Office Building.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HOLLOWAY], for bringing this matter to our attention.

Mr. Haydel began his service with the U.S. Postal Service in 1934, at the age of 18, and 6 short years later worked his way up to become the postmaster of the Vacherie postal facility in Vacherie, LA.

During his 47 years with the Postal Service, Mr. Haydel was credited with the renovation and building of three post offices and was presented the superior accomplishment award for his contribution to outstanding economy, efficiency, and improved service in the Postal Service.

I think my colleagues would agree that after 47 years of dedicated service to the Postal Service, a fitting tribute to a valued employee would be for the new post office in the community, where Mr. Haydel spent so many dedicated years, to bear his name.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 998, to redesignate a postal facility in Vacherie, LA, as the John Richard Haydel Post Office.

This legislation was introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HOLLOWAY]. H.R. 998 would designate a post office in Vacherie, LA, as the John Richard Haydel Post Office.

Mr. Haydel began employment with the Postal Service at the age of 18. In 1961 Mr. Haydel was selected to serve as a postmaster counselor for the Dallas region, which included Texas and Louisiana. In 1967 Mr. Haydel received the superior accomplishment award in recognition for notable performance contributing to outstanding economy, efficiency, and improved services.

Mr. Haydel also served his country in the Navy during World War II. He was honored with many awards during his services including the American Campaign Medal.

Mr. Haydel retired from the Postal Service in 1981 following 47 years of service. I urge the adoption of this legislation as a tribute to John Richard Haydel, his family, and the citizens of Vacherie, LA.

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

Mr. HORTON. 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 Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 998, 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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the building in Vacherie, LA, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service as the 'John Richard Haydel Post Office Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CLIFFORD G. WATTS POST OFFICE

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 157) to name the Post Office building located at 200 3d Street, SW., in Taylorsville, NC, as the "Clifford G. Watts Post Office," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 157

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

#### SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Post Office building located at 200 3d Street, S.W., in Taylorsville, North Carolina, shall be known and designated as the "Clifford G. Watts Post Office Building".

#### SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Post Office building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Clifford G. Watts Post Office Building".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 157, a bill to name the post office building located at 200 3d Street SW., in Taylorsville, NC, as the "Clifford G. Watts Post Office."

Mr. Watts served 17 years as postmaster of the Taylorsville, NC, postal facility until his death in 1978.

"The chewing gum man," as he was commonly referred to by local children in the community, spent most of his life in the Taylorsville area. He is remembered as a member of the first football team at Taylorsville High School, deacon of the First Baptist Church, and manager of his family's department store. The distinguished sponsor of this bill, Mr. NEAL, along with the town of Taylorsville which he represents, would now like to honor this cherished friend by naming the

new postal facility in Taylorsville, NC, after Mr. Watts.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 157, to designate the post office in Taylorsville, NC, as the "Clifford G. Watts Post Office."

Mr. Watts served as postmaster in Taylorsville for 18 years until his death in 1978 and was an active member of his community. He was a veteran of World War II, a deacon in the First Baptist Church, a member of the American Legion, the VFW, Rotary Club, and the Chamber of Commerce.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this measure.

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

Mr. HORTON. 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 Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 157, 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.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "A bill to name the post office building located at 200 3d Street SW., in Taylorsville, NC, as the 'Clifford G. Watts Post Office Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ZORA LEAH S. THOMAS POST OFFICE

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 158) to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located on Highway 64 East in Hiddenite, NC, as the "Zora Leah S. Thomas Post Office," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 158

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the building in Hiddenite, North Carolina, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service (as designated by the Postmaster General) shall be known and designated as the "Zora Leah S. Thomas Post Office Building", and any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to such building shall be deemed to be a reference to the Zora Leah S. Thomas Post Office Building.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. NEAL] for bringing this matter to our attention.

Mrs. Thomas was born on August 15, 1907, on a farm just north of Hiddenite, NC, into a family with a long history of service with the U.S. Post Office.

At the age of 28, she left her career in education and started working as a clerk for the post office. Two short years later she succeeded her father as postmaster for the Hiddenite Post Office, a position she would hold for the next 42 years.

The town of Hiddenite remembers Mrs. Thomas as a community leader and life-long public servant and would like to pay tribute to her by having the postal facility located on Highway 64 east in Hiddenite, NC, bear her name. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1230

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. The bill would designate the post office in Hiddenite, NC, as the "Zora Leah S. Thomas Post Office."

Mrs. Thomas served as postmaster in Hiddenite for 42 years, succeeding her father in that position in 1935. She retired as postmaster in 1977. A lifelong resident of the community she was a valued and active citizen.

Mrs. Thomas passed away in 1990 and I believe that this designation is fitting to recognize her extraordinary 42 years of service to the Postal Service and the people of North Carolina.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 158, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. 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 Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 158, 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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the building in Hiddenite, NC, which houses the primary operations of the United States Postal Service as the 'Zora Leah S. Thomas Post Office Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 2014, H.R. 157, H.R. 158, H.R. 2347, and H.R. 998, the bills just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKE-SHORE ACCESS AND ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1216) to modify the boundaries of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1216

*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 "Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Access and Enhancement Act."

##### SEC. 2. BOUNDARIES.

The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes", approved November 5, 1966 (16 U.S.C. 460u), is amended by striking out "October 1986, and numbered 626-80,033-B" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1991, and numbered 80,039".

##### SEC. 3. CRESCENT DUNE.

Section 12 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes", approved November 5, 1966 (16 U.S.C. 460u-12), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. The Secretary is authorized to acquire the area on the map referred to in the first section of this Act as area III-B."

##### SEC. 4. STUDIES AND PLANS.

Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes", approved November 5, 1966 (16 U.S.C. 460u-1), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c)(1) Within 2 years following the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall complete a study of the Deep River Corridor. The area to be studied shall include (A) the segment from the abandoned Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad right-of-way south of the existing Deep River County Park to the confluence of Deep River, (B) that portion of the Little Calumet River from Lake Michigan west to Martin Luther King Drive in Gary, Indiana, and (C) the Lake George Segment of the Deep River Corridor, including an area known as the Hobart Prairie Grove on the northwest side of Lake George. The study shall include an inventory of the area's natural, cultural and recreational values and features; recommendations for the provisions of public access for the purposes of fishing, canoeing, hiking and other public activities; and recommendations regarding the State, local, or Federal agencies or jurisdictions recommended to administer these lands.

"(2) The Secretary shall submit the results of the studies prepared under this subsection

to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate."

##### SEC. 5. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.

The Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes", approved November 5, 1966 (16 U.S.C. 460u and following), is amended by adding the following new section after section 25:

##### "SEC. 26. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.

"In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to enter into a cooperative agreement with the city of Gary, Indiana, pursuant to which the Secretary may provide technical assistance in interpretation, planning, and resource management for programs and developments in the city of Gary's Marquette Park and Lake Street Beach."

##### SEC. 6. GREENBELT.

Section 18 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes", approved November 5, 1966 (16 U.S.C. 460u-18), is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" after SEC. 18."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: "(b) The Secretary shall enter into a memorandum of agreement with Northern Indiana Public Service Company (hereafter in this section referred to as NIPSCO) which shall provide for the following with respect to the area referred to as Unit II-A on the map referenced in the first section of this Act:

"(1) NIPSCO will provide the National Park Service with access through the Greenbelt and across the dike for purposes of a public hiking trail.

"(2) The National Park Service shall continue to have rights of assessment, resource management, and interpretation of the Greenbelt area.

"(3) NIPSCO will continue to preserve the Greenbelt in its natural state. If NIPSCO utilizes the Greenbelt temporarily for projects involving pollution mitigation or construction on its adjacent facilities, it will continue to restore the utilized area to its natural state.

"(4) NIPSCO will notify the National Park Service, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate if NIPSCO proposes a different use for this property. No changes in the use of the property will take place for three years following such notification."

##### SEC. 7. IMPROVED PROPERTY; RETENTION OF RIGHTS.

(a) ADDITIONAL AREAS.—The table in section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes", approved November 5, 1966 (16 U.S.C. 460u-3), is amended to read as follows:

| Property Within Boundaries of Map     | Construction Began Before |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Dated March 1990, #80,038A.           | March 1, 1991             |
| Dated October 1986, #626-80,033-B.    | February 1, 1986          |
| Dated December 1980, #626-91014.      | January 1, 1981           |
| Dated September 1976, #626-91007.     | February 1, 1973          |
| Dated September 1966, #LNPNE-1008-ID. | January 4, 1965."         |

(b) RETENTION OF RIGHTS.—Section 5(a) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 460u-5) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking "subparagraph (A)" and inserting "subparagraph (A)(ii)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(3)(A) In the case of improved property included within the boundaries of the lakeshore after March 1, 1991, which was not included within such boundaries before that date, any individual who is an owner of record of such property as of that date may retain a right of use and occupancy of such improved property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term ending at either of the following:

"(i) A fixed term not to exceed March 1, 2020, or

"(ii) A term ending at the death of such owner or of the owner's spouse, whichever occurs last.

The owner or owners shall elect the term to be reserved.

"(B) The provisions of subparagraph (A)(ii) shall apply only to improved property owned by an individual who (i) was an owner of record of the property as of March 1, 1991, (ii) had attained the age of majority as of that date, and (iii) makes a bona fide written offer not later than July 1, 1994, to sell such property to the Secretary."

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 5(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking the period after "626-91014" and inserting a comma.

##### SEC. 8. VISITOR CENTER.

In order to commemorate the vision, dedication, and work of Dorothy Buell in saving the Indiana Dunes, the National Park Service visitor center at the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore is hereby designated as the "Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center".

##### SEC. 9. UNIT VII-D.

The Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes", approved November 5, 1966 (16 U.S.C. 460u and following), is amended by adding the following new section after section 26:

##### "SEC. 27. UNIT I-M AND VII-D.

"(a) UNIT I-M.—Before acquiring lands or interests in lands in Unit I-M (as designated on the map referred to in the first section of this Act) the Secretary shall consult with the Commissioner of the Indiana Department of Transportation to determine what lands or interests in lands are required by the State of Indiana for improvements to State Road 49 and reconstruction and relocation of the interchange with State Road 49 and U.S. 20 so that the acquisition by the Secretary of lands or interests in lands in Unit I-M will not interfere with planned improvements to such interchange and State Road 49 in the area.

"(b) UNIT VII-D.—Before acquiring lands or interests in lands in Unit VII-D (as designated on the map referred to in the first section of this Act) the Secretary shall consult with the Commissioner of the Indiana Department of Transportation to determine what lands or interests in lands are required by the State of Indiana for improvements to Old Hobart Road and reconstruction and relocation of the intersection of Old Hobart Road and State Road 51 so that the acquisition by the Secretary of lands or interests in lands in Unit VII-D will not interfere with planned improvements to such interchange and Old Hobart Road in the area."

##### SEC. 10. ROAD RIGHTS-OF-WAY.

The Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes", approved November 5, 1966 (16 U.S.C. 460u and following), is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 25. (a) Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary

shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report identifying road rights-of-way within the boundaries of the lakeshore that have been abandoned and could be relinquished to the National Park Service, as well as any actions taken to date to effectuate the relinquishment of such rights-of-way and a summary of any impediments there may be to each relinquishment. The Secretary shall take such action as he deems necessary to notify Federal, State, and local transportation authorities of road rights-of-way so identified.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to reimburse the appropriate political subdivision for reasonable administrative costs associated with vacating each road right-of-way within the boundaries of the lakeshore."

#### SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 9 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes", approved November 5, 1966 (16 U.S.C. 460u-9), is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 9";

(2) by striking so much of the first sentence as precedes the proviso and inserting "There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for acquisition of lands and interests in lands and for development:"; and

(3) by striking the last sentence and inserting:

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on H.R. 1216, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1216, introduced by Representative PETER VISCLOSKEY, is a bill to expand the boundaries of Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

First proposed as a national park 75 years ago, Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore was authorized by Congress in 1966 and established in 1972. The lakeshore contains approximately 12,800 acres and includes 15 miles of shoreline along Lake Michigan. Extensive sand beaches, dunes, marshes, woodlands, and prairie vegetation are found in the National Lakeshore. This unique national area is located just 35 miles east of Chicago in the middle of one of our Nation's most populated and

industrialized areas. Because of the park's close proximity to major population centers, the lakeshore is visited extensively, with nearly 2 million people visiting the park last year.

H.R. 1216 would add 10 parcels totaling 1,034 acres to the existing Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore in order to enhance park resources, improve access and promote efficient management while minimizing potential conflicts with adjacent landowners. It would also authorize several cooperative agreements and a study on lands related to the National Lakeshore. It is a scaled back version of legislation which passed the House of Representatives last year.

The Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands held a hearing on H.R. 1216 and on a related measure in late May. At this hearing, the subcommittee received extensive testimony on present and past management and resource protection issues associated with Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. At the hearing and subcommittee markup, concerns were raised about the need for protection of the Salt Creek corridor, a stream which flows into the lakeshore. Although H.R. 1216 does not contain provisions relating to the Salt Creek corridor, the committee report does state the importance of the corridor to the dunes ecosystem and the expectation that the stream can and should be protected by local efforts.

During consideration of the bill, the Interior Committee adopted an amendment which makes several technical changes to the bill. These changes were developed in consultation with the author of the bill and the administration and reflect changes sought by the administration.

H.R. 1216 is a meritorious bill which represents what every measure ever enacted relating to Indiana Dunes has represented: Compromise. Undoubtedly this bill contains too much for some and too little for others. On the whole, it is a balanced bill which adds some significant parcels to the lakeshore while being mindful of needs and concerns of landowners of the area. I urge the passage of the bill as amended.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1216, a bill to expand Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore along the southern shore of Lake Michigan. I know that the gentleman from Indiana has worked long and hard on this measure and attempted to bring a responsible measure to the floor, but the measure we have before us today is not one which deserves the support of this body.

Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore was one of the first urban park areas designated as a unit of the National Park System. Overall this is a good

concept and one which I support. A major problem at this park is the unplanned park expansion which has resulted in a very disjointed and difficult to manage park area. Twenty-five years ago, Congress passed a measure to ensure that persons from the northern Indiana area would have public access to the beach and that the shoreline would be preserved. Originally, the American public was told that Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore would be an 8,000-acre park consisting of lands along the Lake Michigan shoreline which would cost about \$28 million.

Due to the continual pressure of local environmental groups, the park has grown into a 13,000-acre park and cost the taxpayer over \$70 million. Along the way, over 700 private homes have been taken. The park now consist of isolated tracts of land as far as 10 miles from the lakeshore.

As can be expected, this continual threat of park expansion, evidenced by the introduction of Indiana Dunes expansion bills in 7 of the last 10 Congresses, has deeply divided local persons into fierce park protagonists and antagonists. The bill before us only exacerbates that situation and continues the controversy. The measure contains many tracts of land owned by the environmental groups who are the main supporters of this bill. We heard testimony at our hearing how these groups intend to recycle their profits from Federal acquisition of their lands to acquire other lands for future addition to the park. In one case, one of these groups acquired a tract for about \$2,000 which they later sold to the Federal Government for over \$100,000.

If the bill before us really lived up to its title of providing for increased access to the lakeshore, it would deserve support from Members of this body. Beach access is a major problem which needs to be addressed by the NPS [National Park System]. However, only 2 of the 11 tracts in this bill are related to beach access. The rest are isolated tracts which are unrelated to the primary purposes for which the area was established, have limited resource values or little or no visitor use potential.

I would just like to illustrate my concerns by describing one of the more costly and unnecessary acquisitions proposed in this bill. The Inland Manor tract consists of about 95 relatively low cost housing units which are proposed for acquisition at a total cost of \$4.5 million. This area has no known resource value, no visitor development potential, and is strongly opposed by the administration. Proponents of this provision state that these houses should be acquired because they will be an island of development within the park and that their existing septic systems are polluting park resources.

However, this park, like all other NPS urban parks, already has a number of islands of development, includ-

ing everything from housing areas to steel mills. I don't believe we should purchase these steel mills just because they are impacting the park.

It is time to set aside the piecemeal approach which has characterized expansion proposals for Indiana Dunes. We need a comprehensive and final solution to boundary and management problems faced by this park. This bill is destined to lead to future legislative proposals for expansion at Indiana Dunes.

Congressional micromanagement will not be successful in resolution of these difficult boundary issues. Congress must instead depend on locally developed solutions.

Mr. Speaker, because this bill will result in millions of dollars of unnecessary park acquisitions for an area which is clearly unable to manage all the lands and visitors it has today, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

□ 1240

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. PETER VISCLOSKY, a gentleman who has worked very hard on this matter for the last 4 years.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I must take this opportunity to thank Chairman MILLER, Subcommittee Chairman VENTO and the other members of the Committee on Interior for their assistance with H.R. 1216. Many of the issues addressed in the legislation have not been without controversy and, as a result, have occupied much of their time over the past several years. I also extend my gratitude to both Richard Healy and Sandy Scott of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands staff for their invaluable assistance and advice, as well as Diane Newberg of my staff.

H.R. 1216, the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Access and Enhancement Act, will recapture over 1,030 acres of Indiana's dunelands for the people of the United States of America. The legislation, much smaller in scope than a similar bill passed by the House of Representatives in the last Congress, strikes a delicate balance between differing local interests and the needs of the National Park Service and the American public.

I began to formulate this legislation in December 1988 due to my concern about the growing demands placed on the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. Park visitorship grew from 264,000 in 1977 to nearly 1.9 million in 1990. The National Park Service reports that, to date, 1991 visitation figures suggest that more than 2 million people will come to enjoy the national lakeshore this year. All signs indicate that this growth trend will not subside. As visi-

tor demand grows, internal and external challenges on the park also grow—these challenges must be met. The Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Access and Enhancement Act addresses many of these challenges.

Throughout the process of drafting this bill, I have been in constant contact with community leaders, concerned individuals and property owners as well as local environmental groups. I am pleased that most of the controversy surrounding the legislation has dissipated as a result of compromise on the part of all involved. I believe that we bring to the floor today, the best possible bill for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

In a State where only 3 percent of all land is in public ownership, very little land is available for outdoor recreation. We must take great care of public lands we have. The Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Access and Enhancement Act does just that. It offers visitors new opportunities and provides the park with additional room to maneuver. Now is the time to accept the challenges faced by this national park. For as the national lakeshore has improved the lives of park visitors and local residents, so too must we continue to improve the lakeshore.

I would like to take this opportunity to briefly describe the various parcels and provisions of the bill and state my reasoning behind their inclusion.

The lakeview facility parking addition: This 1 acre parcel along the northeast side of Broadway will allow for a small scale parking lot to alleviate pressure at the park's lakeview facility. The Federal Government invested over \$500,000 in this beautiful facility on Lake Michigan's lakefront. The facility is underutilized, however, because of inadequate parking. It is a shame that this asset is unavailable to the public. The 1 acre addition would allow for 40 new spaces to accommodate visitors—without overloading the facility.

As an aside, I do not support inclusion of this parcel for use as a sewage treatment plant, nor do I support the construction of a septic system on the land. I have included it in my bill with the understanding that the National Park Service has no intention of putting either on the site.

The old University of Chicago property: Strategically located, these 13 acres will be advantageous to the lakeshore for purposes of both preservation and increasing options for connecting the east and west units of the park. In his testimony before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands on May 28, 1991, James Ridenour, Director of the National Park Service, described this parcel as "a critical link in the trail route now being planned \* \* \* to facilitate the connection of the east and west units of the National Lakeshore."

The State Road 49 green corridor: This stretch of roadway is often referred to as the most frequently used entrance and exist to the State and national parks. In an effort to maintain the attractive and natural status of this entrance, a 33-acre corridor surrounding the area is designated in the legislation. In recent years, the corridor has been threatened by development. Development proposals have ranged from a hotel to a "mini-Mayo" medical clinic with lodging for patient's families. While current zoning boards have not supported these proposals, I am extremely concerned that future boards may not be able to resist the pressures to develop the corridor.

Language regarding this plat allows the State to enhance and upgrade the antiquated interchange of State Road 49 and U.S. 20.

The Cohen property: This parcel abuts the entrance to the national lakeshore's heavily visited west beach. The lands, which are currently vacant, are slated for multifamily residential development. Acquisition would serve both to enhance road and trail access to west beach as well as protect the values of the existing lakeshore setting.

Inland Manor/Woodlake Dune Savannah: The western portion of this parcel contains a residential community of approximately 90 homes—several of which are abandoned. The area's high water table has contributed to sanitation problems associated with poor drainage. The eastern portion of the unit, known as the Woodlake Dunes, is a phenomenal natural area containing a mixture of wooded stabilized dunes, open savannah and extensive wetlands of considerable resource value. The Woodlake Dune Savannah is of significant natural value and would constitute a worthy addition to the lakeshore.

The Fadell Dune: This elongated parcel on the north side of U.S. Highway 20 contains five species of special vegetation, three of which are listed by the State of Indiana as rare and two of which are considered threatened. While the dune has been degraded by illegal use of three wheel all terrain vehicles, it is expected to regenerate over a short time. Furthermore, the dune has been zoned for sandmining, which is planned if it is not procured by the national lakeshore.

Located along the general management plan's preferred west unit access route, the flat eastern end of the Fadell parcel could easily be used for satellite parking for west beach—where parking is inadequate during the summer months.

Gaylord Butterfly Prairie: Providing a habitat unlike any other in either the national lakeshore or the Indiana State park system, this 173-acre dry sand prairie is home to several unusual plants and rare butterflies. The little

blue stem and Indiana grasses, blazing stars, and sweet fern provide food for several butterflies found at no other location in Indiana. While the Gaylord Butterfly parcel is proposed for inclusion in the national lakeshore, in the future, the parcel will be transferred to Indiana's Department of Natural Resources.

**The Calumet Prairie:** 140 acres of this 173 acre plat are currently managed by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources. It contains a high quality example of wet sand prairie, unlike any found within the lakeshore's current boundaries. The prairie provides a habitat for several rare plant and animal species. In addition, the significant stretch of the Little Calumet riverbank within the parcel will be a great asset to the national lakeshore. This addition will provide many recreational opportunities, including fishing and canoeing.

**The Hobart Prairie Grove:** This is a high quality natural area adjacent to Lake George along Deep River. It is composed of a tallgrass savannah—an open hickory woodland with many prairie plants—a habitat that is nearly extinct today. The parcel is home to many rare plant species and extensive wetlands.

The legislation also contains several studies and cooperative agreements as well as directives for the treatment of homeowners affected by the bill. I would like to take this opportunity to explain the remaining provisions of the legislation.

**Homeowner provisions:** Section VII of the legislation provides two options for those homeowners whose lands are placed within the lakeshore after February 1, 1991. The first option would permit the homeowner to enter into a 29-year leaseback agreement with the National Park Service to retain non-commercial use of their home through the year 2020.

The second option would allow the homeowner to enter into a "life estate" agreement with the National Park Service to retain the noncommercial use of their home until both the primary owner and his or her spouse die.

**Crescent Dune:** Section III of the bill will remove all restrictions in the existing law which prevent the National Park Service from acquiring this 33-acre parcel. Crescent Dune is one of the few remaining areas of undeveloped shoreline. It is currently slated for development of an exclusive 200 unit townhouse development. To lose this rare parcel, which is already located within the authorized boundary of the national lakeshore, to development would be a tragedy.

**Studies:** Section IV of the legislation directs the National Park Service to perform two studies. The first study, of the Deep River corridor, would focus on the river corridor's recreational and

natural values. The study will provide specific recommendations for improving public access, fishing, canoeing, and hiking within the corridor. It is to be completed within 2 years and will recommend the most appropriate governmental agency or agencies to administer these areas—with an emphasis on local government. The study does not authorize any acquisition by the Federal Government.

The second study, found in section X, mandates that the national lakeshore inventory abandoned roadways located within the park's boundaries. These roadways have been causing problems for some time. In terms of preservation, the unused roads spoil the natural characteristics of the landscape. However, they also pose management problems. Young people have been found drinking on the secluded roadways which are difficult to monitor. Illegal dumping has also been a problem. This provision would authorize the Park Service to study the problems associated with abandoned roads and recommended solutions.

Under existing law, the Federal Government cannot purchase publicly owned roadways. This deters local governments from reverting the right-of-way to the park. As written, section X would permit the National Park Service to reimburse the affected local government for the cost of transferring the rights-of-way of abandoned roads located within the boundaries of the national lakeshore.

**Cooperative agreement—Gary's Marquette Park:** Section V of H.R. 1216 would permit the Park Service and the city of Gary to enter into a cooperative agreement to improve Gary's Marquette Park. The proposed agreement would allow the Park Service to provide Gary with technical assistance for park improvements. The national lakeshore will benefit from the agreement because Marquette Park is designed to handle much larger crowds than the national lakeshore's nearby west beach. West beach often suffers from over crowding during the summer months. Through the proposed agreement, Gary's lakefront usage can be better coordinated with the national lakeshore.

**NIPSCO greenbelt:** Section VI of the legislation would require the Northern Indiana Public Service Co. [NIPSCO] to maintain the natural state of the existing greenbelt which serves as a buffer zone between the park and the powerplant. This provision would call upon NIPSCO to warn Congress 3 years prior to changing any characteristics of the property. Furthermore, NIPSCO would continue to allow the National Park Service to manage the natural resources of the land. Trails within the greenbelt that are now open to visitors are to remain open.

**Dorothy Buell Visitor Center:** In commemoration and celebration of

Dorothy Buell, founder and first president of the Save the Dunes Council, section VIII of H.R. 1216 would rename the lakeshore's visitor center in her honor. Ms. Buell dedicated her life to preserving the natural beauty of Indiana's lakeshore. She worked diligently for years to ensure that the Indiana dunes were protected and played a crucial role in the national lakeshore's establishment in 1966.

**Roadway improvements:** Section IX permits the Indiana Department of Transportation to make roadway improvements affecting the Calumet Prairie and the 49 corridor.

**Authorization of appropriations:** The legislation would authorize "such sums as are necessary" to carry out its directives. Annual funding would still be subject to strict scrutiny by relevant Appropriations Committees.

In conclusion, I reiterate the need for increased public access to the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. Approximately 8 million people live within easy commuting distance of the park. The national lakeshore provides them, and many national visitors, with greatly needed beaches, picnic areas, trails for biking and hiking, seasonal festivals and educational facilities.

The Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Access and Enhancement Act represents the best policy for this national park. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1216. For, as the national lakeshore has improved the lives of its many visitors, so too must we continue to improve the national lakeshore.

H.R. 1216 represents the best policy for the national park, and I would urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most extensively used national park units in the system. That, as I said, is an important consideration.

It was late in development, there was a 75-year history in which it was proposed for development. So, clearly, it is not everything that everyone would want to make it and it is really, I think, the subject of a great deal of compromise.

But nevertheless, it does and has been recognized as being nationally significant and having the various characteristics that are associated with national lakeshores.

It is a very important recreational resource, not just for the people of northern Indiana but for people in the Midwest, especially in the Chicago region. In fact, the leading advocates of this at various times have been the Senators. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS from Illinois is one, so this is part of his work. I do not know who else should get credit for it, but I do know that I have heard his name associated with it so often that his name springs to mind whenever we look at it.

Insofar as the additions to this park in this measure before us, I have re-

viewed those recommendations from the administration. Frankly, out of the 11 recommendations for additions here, they support 8 of them. They sort of support the ninth, and then there are two that they do not favor. One, of course, is the parking area to provide access. They did not favor that, and inasmuch as the gentleman from Wyoming I note stated his concern about the access question, a very important question; they did not support the type of solution proposed here, as a solution.

The other one the gentleman mentioned, of course, is the Inland Manor, which has some 90 homes. They do support the Woodland Dune Savannah. With that added, the 90 homes become completely surrounded by National Park Service land.

Not only that, but these 90 homes are a willing-seller/willing-buyer basis. The majority of the residents in that area strongly support this because they are in really what is the marsh or water area. The homes are older; they have been there for a long time.

So I would be happy to point out on the map to the gentleman how it is completely surrounded by that.

Most of these homes, all of them are contiguous to the national seashore. There are several large areas which are not. The administration was strongly supportive because based on professional study and judgment of the Park Service, these were key areas that add to the enhancement and enjoyment of the public which uses this particular resource.

So I want the gentleman to understand that the chairman, the members of the committee—and I know the gentleman works very hard on the committee—but there may be just a few points here I would like to emphasize on why we did what we did. It did not take, and I do not take these issues lightly, as the gentleman must be aware now from his service with me on the subcommittee. I would just say the gentleman's summary comment—and I would be happy to the gentleman because I know that he has yielded back his time—was to the effect that with the additional units, of course, comes the sort of stretching of resources beyond where they should be stretched. In fact, I think the director of the Park Service has taken to referring to this as the "thinning of the blood" of the Park Service.

While I would just say to the gentleman from Wyoming and to the director of the Park Service and others that might get that notion that if we had taken that advice initially when it was offered in 1916, we would have approximately some 70 units in the National Park System today, we would have about 70 units. The gentleman knows we have in excess of 350 to 360 units by the time we get done with this congress-

sional year and perhaps many more beyond that.

That is simply, I think, a recognition to some extent of the expanded mission of the Park Service in terms of its preservation of cultural resources and some of the resources that were demanded by the Department of Defense, monuments, memorials, and many additions to the new parks, some of which I have had a hand in working on.

The national lakeshore concept was not even in place in 1916.

So I would just suggest that as we grow as a population and look to the reduced numbers of recreational natural resources preservation and conservation that takes place in our Nation, it becomes fitting, I think, to address the question of expansion of the Park System because there is de facto areas that exist in the great State of Wyoming that the gentleman hails from and in my great State of Minnesota that are, frankly, under siege, they are disappearing. I think we have to look at which properly can be cared for and placed in the mission of the National Park Service because of the natural qualities that justify their preservation for recreational resources, cultural resources, that the Park Service is so eminently and, I think, ideally suited to execute.

The thinning of the blood, the lack of too many resources, you know, anemia, the lack of sufficient blood can come from a lot of different factors. It can come from a lack of food, that is the dollars that we put in the system.

I think during the decades of the seventies and eighties we have denied the proper care, the proper resources to the National Park Service to carry out their mission.

□ 1250

It can come from a lack of direction in terms of how we care for the professionals in the Park Service, given the authority to do their job.

All I am pointing out to the gentleman is we certainly need to be mindful, was we add units, to also add resources and let the professionals do the job that we expect them to carry out written into law.

But I just think that to begin to terminate, to say that the Park System is filled out, I know that the administration, while they kindly give us these recommendations against or for things, and in this case clearly they are in favor of this particular measure on a broad basis, they are in favor of this measure, as I have indicated, not perfectly.

I mean, we do think in Congress that from time to time that we have something to add to this system, as I know my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISLOSKY] has worked mightily hard on this bill.

So, I think we have a responsibility to show some direction in terms of pol-

icy, but I would just point out further that the administration, even in all its concerns about expanding the system and the effect of that, has any number of proposals before the subcommittee in which they are asking for expansion, asking for resources, asking for dollars, and that apparently is what we will do. We will do it when we think it is appropriate.

For instance, they have a recommendation for the Forest Service to add, and we passed it in this session; I hope it passed the Senate, a thousand miles of wild and scenic river in the upper Peninsula of Michigan. I think that was a very significant action, and I am proud that the Forest Service and administration supported that type of designation, although in a different agency. They have any number of proposals to add studies and other work, and we are going to act on those things on professional basis and a nonpartisan basis.

So, I would hope that we would look at that. We can always look to where we may have differences where something is not in our area or district, and of course we fight often about differences in policy. But I would hope we would recognize and try to do the best we can, but not, I think, to terminate. I do not think the answer is putting the Park Service out of business because of these particular issues.

So, I hope that we would respond.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. Speaker, certainly I recognize, and I think most everyone else in this Congress recognizes, the work that the chairman of the subcommittee has done with regard to parks and scenic rivers, and I congratulate him. No one is a more effective advocate for that point of view than the chairman, and I appreciate that, and most everyone would agree with his observations, I think, and his theology with respect to these kinds of issues, the expansion of opportunities for recreation.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are some facts of life. One of them is the administration. The Park Service has indicated they are nearly \$400 million short this year in operating funds.

I happen to live next to a park, and I do not know that my park is not the only park in the world, but it is the Yellowstone Park, and I can tell the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that it is desperately in need of some funds for things as basic as highways, and how one is going to get there.

I spoke with someone yesterday in Wyoming who had recently been to Poland, and he thought the Polish roads were better than those in Yellowstone Park. Well, that is a reality of life.

The theology of doing more and more parks is a great one, and I appreciate that. But there is indeed some realism involved here, and one of them is dollars, and one of them is that it does take upkeep to keep these parks going, particularly the ones visited heavily.

The fact of the matter is that the Dunes Park is a disjointed venture. It is one that, when one looks at the map, they find pieces that are way out that have nothing to do with access to the lake.

So, those are the kinds of tough choices I think this Congress needs to make, and it is clear that we all urge to have projects in our own area, and I understand that, and that is how advocacy is part of this business. But we have to have also a certain amount of judgment in where we spend the dough we have, and I am suggesting to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that there are places that perhaps could be developed and be more effective than the one that is here.

But let me tell the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that I appreciate very much what he is saying. I certainly agree with it in general, and I appreciate his efforts. I also disagree with him on this particular issue.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] is a key member of the committee, and he obviously provides a lot of good, positive, critical thinking in terms of this.

I just want to point out that, as the gentleman knows, Wyoming, Montana, and the other Western States of Yellowstone; obviously it is a great resource for all Americans, and it was really the first park that was established even before the park system was set up, and I appreciate what he is saying. We want to work with him and others to make sure the Park Service has adequate resources so it can address roads. I know road construction is important, but this is to the people of northern Indiana in the Midwest, this is one of their parks. This is their Yellowstone. This is the Yellowstone that the people from Chicago maybe have a chance to get over there and get introduced to that great concept and recreate.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. I was just going to say that a week ago I happened to be—well, I did not happen to be there. I went specifically for the 100th birthday of the Forest Service, which, of course, is a similar kind of thing, and it was a wonderful experience, and I say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that we have all gained a great deal from the thoughtfulness that took place. Wyoming had the first park, Wyoming also had the first forest reserve, Wyoming

has the first monument, and so we are particular—we also have 50 percent of our State in Federal ownership, as the gentleman knows.

So, we do have to find some ways in which, I think, to transfer some of these resources so that they will be most useful to the most people and the most effective use of our bucks, so I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] for his insight and for attending those important events in Wyoming.

Wyoming got in very early in the process. Indiana continues to try to improve its resources and its park, and I commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKEY] for doing so, and the Park Service for by and large supporting this measure before us, and I would ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, 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 Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1216, 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.

PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF HUNGARY CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 102-114)

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

*To the Congress of the United States:*

On April 16, 1991, I transmitted to the Congress the unsigned text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the United States of America and the Republic of Hungary Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, along with copies of other documents relating to that agreement.

I am pleased now to submit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)), the signed text of this proposed agreement, signed in Vienna, Austria, on June 10, 1991, by representatives of the United States of America and the Re-

public of Hungary. I also submit copies of my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the agreement; the memorandum of the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement concerning the agreement; and the joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, which includes a summary of the provisions of the agreement and various other attachments, including agency views.

The Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees as provided for in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

Because this agreement meets all applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, for agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation, I am transmitting it to the Congress without exempting it from any requirement contained in section 123 a. of that Act. I urge that the Congress give this proposed agreement favorable consideration.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 15, 1991.

PROPOSED AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND GOVERNMENT OF THE CZECH AND SLOVAK FEDERAL REPUBLIC CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 102-113)

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

*To the Congress of the United States:*

On April 16, 1991, I transmitted to the Congress the unsigned text of a proposed Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic on Cooperation in Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, along with copies of other documents relating to that agreement.

I am pleased now to submit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)), the signed text of this proposed amendment, signed in Vienna, Austria, on June 13, 1991, by representatives of the United States of America and the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic. I

also submit copies of my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the agreement; the memorandum of the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement concerning the agreement; and the joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, which includes a summary of the provisions of the agreement and various other attachments, including agency views.

The Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees as provided for in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

Because this agreement meets all applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, for agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation, I am transmitting it to the Congress without exempting it from any requirement contained in section 123 a. of that Act. I urge that the Congress give this proposed agreement favorable consideration.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 15, 1991.

#### BILL TO DIRECT MILITARY ASSISTANCE IN ENFORCEMENT AGAINST ILLEGAL HIGH SEAS DRIFT NETTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, we have just received astounding evidence of the lengths to which drift-net pirates will go to pilfer United States and Soviet fish. Some 50 Taiwanese drift-net vessels have sailed for forbidden areas of the North Pacific, lied about their whereabouts, and snared enough salmon and steelhead to reap a \$750,000 profit per boat trip, about \$37.5 million in profit for the fleet.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, I am herewith attaching a translation from news stories:

For the fishermen who have watched a glut of salmon drastically drive down the world market price, let's hope so, but the fact is that the Taiwanese government seems to have no control over a group of fishermen that is making a mockery out of our current enforcement efforts! And Taiwanese officials don't deny it! The existence of these pirates is why we need more observers—not fewer, as our own negotiations requested.

For more than a year President Bush has had the authority to place sanctions on Taiwan. For more than a year, the administration has been sitting on its hands, watching the destruction of our marine environment

and our economic base continue unabated. We have no excuse for not sanctioning Taiwan now. We have no excuse for not giving our Navy and our military the chance to assist the one—yes, one—high-endurance Coast Guard cutter that is responsible for enforcement of the vast North Pacific.

While our fishermen watch a glut of salmon drive down prices and while Northwest lawmakers fight the administration tooth and nail to get funding for hatcheries, Taiwanese drift-net pirates make a mockery out of our enforcement efforts, their own government, and the United States negotiators who actually suggested we could get by with fewer observers this year than we had a year ago.

I am introducing a bill to give our Coast Guard some military assistance in combatting these drift-net pirates, and I am hoping this administration will realize the time for sanctions, action, and a ban on this destructive fishing practice is now.

Mr. Speaker, getting our military involved in drift-net enforcement is not some luxury; it is a necessity.

TRANSLATED SUMMARIES OF TAIWANESE NEWSPAPER STORIES DETAILING DRIFT-NET PIRACY ON THE HIGH SEAS (OBTAINED BY THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF TAIWAN)

(United Daily News, Kaohsiung edition, by Tsao Min-Chi, "Fifty Taiwan Driftnet Fishing Boats Operate in Off-Limits Areas to Make More Money"—July 2, 1991.)

Local fisheries businessmen pointed out that some fifty Taiwan driftnet fishing vessels have sailed for the North Pacific and operated in areas where fishing is forbidden in order to make more money this year. Some fishing boats have returned to Taiwan with salmon and trout on board. Fresh salmon can even be bought in the markets of Kaohsiung.

Reportedly, in view of the global ban on driftnetting in July 1992, fishermen belonging to the same group plan to make a great deal of money first and have ordered their driftnet fishing boats to catch salmon and trout in the North Pacific off-limits areas. These 50 fishing boats, the highest number ever, applied to operate in the Indian Ocean and have lied about their operating locations since they sailed for the North Pacific in an attempt to evade the control and examination of the fisheries administration.

Because the U.S. Coast Guard would usually appear east of the fishing-forbidden areas, the Taiwan fishing boats tried to keep themselves operating in the west side near Soviet waters. The Soviet Navy reportedly has taken the drastic actions (sic) of detaining these fishing boats. It has been confirmed that three local fishing boats were detained and one of them has been released.

Local fishermen said a fishing vessel can earn a net value of NTD20 million (approximately \$750,000) from one trip catching salmon and trout. No wonder local fishermen take such risks.

Most of the salmon caught by these fishing boats was sold to canneries in Thailand, and some of it was taken back and sold in Taiwan. Reportedly, several days ago, some fishing boats unloaded salmon caught in the North Pacific at Kaohsiung's Chin Cheng Fishing Harbor, but the government did not know about it.

(United Daily News, Kaohsiung edition, July 2.)

Kaohsiung Fisheries Administration Director Huang Sheng-wei said yesterday that it is unfortunate that some local fishing boats have been illegally catching salmon and trout with driftnets. It is a shame to hear that some local fishing boats even flew mainland (Peoples Republic of China) flags when catching salmon and trout, Huang added.

According to Huang, the government has repeatedly demanded that the fishermen abide by fisheries regulation and not illegally catch salmon and trout. The three major countries which use driftnets, Taiwan, Korea and Japan, have also tried to collect information and improve their driftnets in order to prove that such devices are not walls of death. But the illegal acts of some fishermen have totally ruined the efforts of the three countries' scientists.

Huang noted that the government originally hoped we could still retain the right to catch squid with driftnets next year. But the illegal conduct of our fishing boats have (sic) made this impossible. Owners of the offending driftnet vessels ought to be held responsible for this, Huang said.

#### AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY RECOVERY IS KEY TO ECONOMIC REBOUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the auto industry plays an important role in our economy. As of 1987, nearly 12.7 million American workers were employed in motor vehicle and related industries. This figure represents nearly 15 percent of total U.S. employment. A significant sector, with significant influence on our economy.

Before 1987, personal interest on car loans was fully deductible on individual income taxes. The Tax Reform Act of 1986 phased out the deductibility of consumer interest on car loans and removed an incentive for consumers to take out a loan to finance a car purchase. Although it was designed to accomplish certain savings rate objectives, a side effect has been the subsequent collapse of the automobile industry.

Cars have become more expensive for the consumer. Automobile companies have experienced far fewer sales. From 1982 to 1986, automobile sales grew 41.8 percent. From 1987 to 1990 automobile sales grew only 9.2 percent.

Fewer sales have hurt auto company profits and decreased tax revenues for the Federal Government. From 1984 to 1986 automobile manufacturers made an average of \$7.1 billion in taxable income. From 1987 to 1989, directly after the Tax Reform Act, their taxable income had dropped to an average of \$1.4 billion. In 1991, first quarter losses for the big three of General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler were \$2.75 billion.

Although actual tax figures for automobile companies are closely guarded secrets, a simple illustration using approximate figures shows how the Government has lost money after the tax change in 1986. General Motors, for instance, had domestic sales of \$5.2 billion in 1985. With the Federal Government's corporate tax rate of 46 percent, such sales result

in \$2.4 billion in tax revenue for the Government. In 1987, the year after the tax change, GM had domestic sales of \$2.5 billion. Taxed at the 46-percent rate, such sales result in \$1.2 billion in tax revenue for the Government, a decrease of \$1.2 billion for the Government. Last year, GM lost some \$6.5 billion in domestic sales. The Government is not expected to get much tax revenue from such a loss.

The trend is clear. After the change in consumer interest deductibility, auto sales dropped sharply and Government tax revenues showed a similar decline.

As we all know, the economy runs in cycles, and these cycles are consumer driven. If a consumer buys a car, a chain reaction begins that affects many individuals and corporations. The car dealer receives money to support his family, pay his taxes, maintain his dealership, purchase necessities, and pay his employees. His dealership, purchase necessities, and pay his employees. His employees have money to support their families, pay their taxes, purchase necessities and so on. A great deal of economic activity is generated from a single purchase. Along the way jobs are created and many people benefit.

By effectively reducing the ability of consumers to buy a car, this chain reaction has broken down, negatively impacting millions of Americans. Clearly we are now in a recession. In 1989, when consumer spending on new cars dropped by \$100 billion, not only were the 12.7 million American workers in the motor vehicle industry affected, but so was the rest of the economy. Over 108,000 automobile workers lost their jobs in 1 week in March of this year. One thousand automobile dealerships closed in the past year. The effect is not only felt on the families of the workers, but on the local grocery store, convenience store, retail store, and so on. The community loses and the American standard of living drops.

Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of the automobile sector in our economy, the car industry must improve if our economy is to rebound. By restoring the consumer deductibility of personal interest on car loans, we will increase automobile purchases and start the chain reaction back in the proper direction.

The increased economic activity will increase Government revenues because of gains in consumer and corporate taxes from sales, profits, and property. As the automobile companies recover, they will rehire their laid off workers. Greater employment will increase Government revenues by decreasing Government expenditures to unemployment compensation recipients.

Therefore, today I am introducing a bill which will correct the entire situation. My bill will amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction of personal interest on consumer car loans. It will provide the impetus necessary to get the economy moving again. Mr. Speaker, with this bill, the economy will improve.

#### LEGISLATION NEEDED TO REVERSE UNREASONABLE DRUG PRICE HIKES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, in October of 1990, Congress passed and the President signed into law the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 [OBRA 90]. Section 4401 of that act, reimbursement for prescribed drugs, established as of January 1, 1991, a mechanism aimed at providing State Medicaid programs with the same discounts for prescription drugs as negotiated by other purchasers. This provision was an outgrowth of legislation proposed earlier in the session to control skyrocketing Medicaid pharmaceutical expenditures. The law requires that manufacturers either discount the drug to the Medicaid buyer by a stated percentage or be required to match the best price, that is, lowest price, on the market. The legislation was anticipated to save the Federal Government \$3.4 billion over the next 5 years.

#### IMPACT ON VA

The effect of this law, however, has been harsh. Since the law did not anchor the best prices it hoped to transport to Medicaid, pharmaceutical manufacturers moved defensively to increase those prices. While Medicaid has not benefited to the extent intended, other Federal programs have been hurt. The Department of Veterans Affairs [VA] has taken the deepest hits. This is ironic and tragic since VA had been among the most successful and innovative in negotiating low costs with pharmaceutical manufacturers. The approximately \$700 million VA spent on pharmaceuticals in fiscal year 1990 is indicative of its stature in the market as the largest single purchaser of certain pharmaceuticals. As such, VA traditionally has used the leverage of high volume buying and centralized negotiating to obtain the lowest or among the lowest prices in the marketplace.

VA uses several different avenues to procure and distribute pharmaceuticals to its medical centers. The first, the depot system, is primarily for high-use pharmaceuticals. When VA chooses products for depot purchase and distribution, it negotiates a price, guaranteeing a nationwide purchase volume, and the product is delivered to VA-owned and operated depot sites. From there, VA is responsible for distribution to VA medical centers. The second, single award contracts, are contracts entered into by VA and a manufacturer, for the manufacturer to become VA's single supplier of an extensively used pharmaceutical product. In this way, VA, using the competitive bidding process, is able to obtain dramatically lowered prices for selected pharmaceutical products. A third avenue by which VA medical centers purchase pharmaceuticals is through the Federal supply schedule [FSS]. This is a published price list of all drugs available to VA medical centers from manufacturers, as negotiated by VA authorities. In addition to VA, the Department of Defense [DOD], Public Health Service, and Indian Health Service all have authority to purchase through FSS contracts and regularly do so, since the negotiated prices have been significantly lower than are available elsewhere. In addition to VA's purchases in excess of \$300 million of its pharmaceutical products through the FSS contracts annually, sales of FSS pharmaceuticals to DOD total approximately \$225 million annu-

ally. Last, for select drugs not available to them through any of the usual sources, VA medical centers are permitted to purchase items on the open market. As would be expected, the cost of purchasing low volumes on the open market is significantly higher than purchasing through one of VA's prenegotiated avenues.

Some of the VA-negotiated prices—those associated with their depot distribution system and with their single award contracts—are exempted from the best price formula to which Medicaid rebates are tied. However, VA-negotiated prices published on the Federal supply schedule, which represent nearly 50 percent of VA's annual pharmaceutical procurement volume, are subject to the best price formula and thus have been a target for industry price hikes.

Once OBRA was enacted, drug manufacturers imposed sweeping price increases on an array of FSS pharmaceuticals which, prior to OBRA, VA had procured at substantial discounts based on high volume. These price hikes to VA, DOD and other Federal entities, which amount to cost shifting, have resulted in sudden, unbudgeted increases in those Department's pharmaceutical costs. Despite a temporary grace period for VA in which some manufacturers voluntarily maintained last year's prices for the first quarter of 1991, the FSS contract pharmaceutical prices that VA, DOD, and other Federal agencies are reportedly now paying average an unprecedented 40 percent more this year than last. While inflation in drug prices has historically been high and could account for some 8 percent of these price increases, it is inescapable that the enactment of OBRA has been the primary catalyst to the shocking price increases VA is facing.

#### EFFORTS TO RESOLVE THE PROBLEM ADMINISTRATIVELY

Efforts to resolve the dilemma VA is facing have not borne fruit. By way of example, early this year, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs wrote to the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services asking that he exercise his authority to exclude FSS from the definitions of best price in writing the regulations for the new law. The Secretary responded, in essence, that under the Department's reading of the law, he lacked authority to do so. The committee also appealed to the Office of Management and Budget [OMB], predicting the sweeping price increases. In so writing, the committee assumed that surely OMB would not support, nor was it Congress' intent to attempt to achieve, Medicaid savings at the expense of VA, DOD, and other Federal agencies. OMB's response, 4 months later offered no solution.

#### NEED FOR LEGISLATION

OBRA 90 was clearly not intended to penalize VA for its success in the pharmaceutical marketplace. An unforeseen effect of OBRA, however, has been a dramatic increase in costs for pharmaceuticals to Federal agencies, primarily VA and DOD. It is apparent that industry is engaged in cost shifting in a deliberate attempt to maintain its profit margins. It is doing so at the expense of its Federal customers, and thus at the expense of the taxpayers. VA can convert some of its drug purchases from the FSS system to other avenues and avoid extraordinary price increases. But in

many cases, VA will have no alternative but to absorb the higher prices being passed along by pharmaceutical manufacturers. In light of the OBRA-stimulated FSS price hikes which VA has sustained to date and cannot escape, the Department has projected that it will incur unavoidable, significant cost increases.

How will VA absorb those increased costs? It is important to appreciate that the VA's appropriation for fiscal year 1991 could not conceivably have foreseen the impact of a law passed in October 1990. Further, the President's budget for fiscal year 1992 did not take OBRA into account and did not provide for any increase in drug costs beyond the 6.1 percent inflation factor. In the absence of a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1991, and appropriations substantially above the President's request for fiscal year 1992, VA will simply have to absorb those costs.

The House Veterans' Affairs Committee's March 1991 report to the Committee on the Budget detailed graphically the significance of imposing new costs onto the VA health care system. A decade-long pattern has seen VA hospitals absorb cost increases and new program obligations in the face of virtually straight-lined health care budgets. The result has been a decline in service to the veteran—in the form of ever-thinner staff to patient ratios, increased waiting times for needed treatment, delays or denials of care, and inability to replace needed medical equipment or hire needed clinicians. In that connection, we identified shortcomings in the President's fiscal year 1992 budget request. Despite an apparently meaningful increase, that budget—after adjusting for illusory OMB manufactured savings—would only have covered fixed costs, and left an already strained system with no relief. As we warned in March, however, that budget's failure to anticipate the impact of OBRA meant that veterans would suffer still further cuts in service by virtue of the drug price increases which industry had already signaled lay ahead. The appropriations process offers no assurance that Congress will add sufficient moneys to the amount requested by the President for VA medical care to offset these drug price hikes as well as other unfunded, but unavoidable costs.

Congress, in enacting OBRA, anticipated the possibility of such price increases, and specifically provided a mechanism to monitor price changes and warn it accordingly. Thus, the law calls on the Comptroller General to report annually by not later than May 1, on changes in prices charged by manufacturers for prescription drugs to the Department of Veterans Affairs, other Federal programs, and others.

Apparently, the Comptroller General has not yet met the law's reporting requirement. At my request, members of Committee staff initiated a meeting with General Accounting Office [GAO] staff to ascertain what progress they were making. GAO has been looking into the subject. I was disturbed to learn, however, that despite growing and widespread evidence that VA had been experiencing substantial pharmaceutical price increases, GAO officials appear to be taking a studied show me attitude. The job may be too big for the staff GAO has assigned to it. But I am concerned that this staff seems too ready to dismiss the issue, be-

cause it can't find the smoking gun or because its methodology has obscured it.

VA has been conducting a cost impact analysis of its own, and has shared cost data with GAO. While the Department continues to enlarge its data collection and refine its analysis, it has become increasingly clear that pharmaceutical manufacturers are circumventing OBRA and hiking VA prices. VA and other Federal providers—and thus the taxpayer—have unquestionably been hit by dramatically higher costs for critically needed medications.

VA officials have advised us that the Department is creating a complete, automated data base for all FSS drugs. That data base will include pre- and post-OBRA prices, as well as drugs which are no longer available through a contract and which VA may therefore have to purchase on the open market. It is our understanding that VA has conducted a preliminary cost analysis based on the data it has already compiled. VA reportedly analyzed some 158 of the approximately 1,500 pharmaceutical inventory items routinely used by its pharmacies. Considering just this limited list, which represents only about 10 percent of the items VA uses routinely, VA's Chief Medical Director reportedly found that the cost impact from pre- to post-OBRA already exceeds \$46 million. These cost increases—far more substantial than can be attributed to any reasonable inflation factor—have been experienced both in products purchased from FSS contract or open market sources, as well as in proprietary drug items available through VA depots. VA has yet to measure the total impact of manufacturer's effectively eliminating products from the Federal supply schedule since OBRA's enactment. On an item by item basis, those losses from the FSS have caused VA to sustain price increases ranging from 20 percent to 800 percent.

Whether or not the pharmaceutical industry's response to OBRA is as high as the \$150 million figure which one VA official projected earlier this year, or higher, its impact has been felt, and will be felt with increasing force in the months ahead. One loses sight of the significance of these dollar figures in a system as large as the VA's. It is more telling ultimately to gauge that impact at the level of the individual facility and its patients. By way of example, our committee became aware this week of pharmacy budget shortfalls at one of VA's medical centers. Specifically, the director advised that the pharmacy budget will not be sufficient to meet the demands of our patients for the remainder of this fiscal year. Among the reasons cited was the response of pharmaceutical manufacturers to OBRA. The result? The hospital wrote to its patients to advise them that until the budget for medications becomes adequate it would no longer fill prescriptions for certain medications and diagnostic supplies. Right now the problem is most acute at hospitals which have limited inventory capacity. But it will become increasingly acute throughout the VA system.

#### SUMMARY OF THE BILL

It is apparent, therefore, that legislation is needed. We must reverse the unintended, but nonetheless pernicious effects of loopholes in OBRA. We must undo the effects of industry gaming and related efforts to circumvent that law. And we must establish a mechanism to

restore the bargaining position VA had achieved and to reinstate a level playing field on which VA can negotiate appropriate discounts.

I am introducing a bill today which will achieve those goals. This legislation has several elements. Its major provisions would: Exclude all Federal prices from the calculations of best price, thereby eliminating a loophole which had the effect of encouraging manufacturers to escalate Federal prices; and expand the current law—which requires that manufacturers must enter into rebate agreements in order to participate in the Medicaid program—to require that manufacturers must also agree to provide drugs to VA through the Federal supply schedule and its drug depot system at pre-OBRA prices adjusted by an inflation factor, or pursuant to renegotiated contracts.

Some may question the need to roll back prices. They may urge that simply exempting Federal prices from the best price benchmark will solve the problem. Such thinking is at best naive. It ignores recent history and it ignores economics. Earlier this year, drug companies dramatically raised Federal prices not only of drugs which are subject to best price calculation but VA depot prices as well, which OBRA specifically excludes from best price. Clearly, an exemption from the definition of best price alone is no solution. While the existence of a comprehensive exemption for Federal providers might in some instances have removed what was a stimulus for companies to raise prices, creating an exemption now, without more, provides no economic incentive for companies to lower prices.

Given the need to roll back prices, is this a price-fixing bill? No more so than OBRA is! OBRA has the effect of distorting the market and passing artificially increased drug costs on to the taxpayer through drastically higher prices to VA. This bill would set up a mechanism to stimulate even-handed contract negotiations between VA and pharmaceutical manufacturers. Manufacturers would be freed from being penalized economically for providing reasonable contract prices to the Federal Government. The bill would create the incentive for negotiations by requiring that, in the absence of a renegotiated contract, prices for drugs which had been procured through the Federal supply schedule or through VA's drug depot system—and including drugs which manufacturers had deleted from the Federal supply schedule in anticipation of, or after OBRA's enactment—would be rolled back to pre-OBRA levels and adjusted by an inflation factor on a quarterly basis, beginning on April 1, 1991.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER, for 5 minutes, on July 16, 17, and 18.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, for 60 minutes, on July 16.

Mr. BOEHNER, for 60 minutes, on July 16.

Mr. GUNDERSON, for 60 minutes, on July 16.

Mr. BALLENGER, for 60 minutes, on July 16.

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

Mr. UNSOELD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 30 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

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

Mr. LAROCO.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. DOWNEY.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. BONIOR in two instances.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 16, 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:

1714. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into challenge cost-share agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1715. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1716. A letter from the Assistant Secretary (Acquisition), Department of the Air Force, transmitting notification of the plan to study the conversion to contract performance the Strategic Air Command's Education Services Centers at various installations, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1717. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense transmitting the combined annual report on standardization of equipment with NATO members and cooperative research and development projects with allied countries, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2457(d)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1718. A letter from the Secretary of Energy transmitting a report on plans for a program to relocate the operations of the Rocky Flats Plant at Golden, CO, pursuant to Public Law 102-25, Section 804(b) (105 Stat. 122); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1719. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize revisions to current legislation that will improve the acquisition reporting process for major defense acquisition programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1720. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the age at which a member of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps receiving financial assistance may be appointed as a commissioned officer if the member is enrolled in a baccalaureate nursing program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1721. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on the tied-aid and partially untied-aid credits offers by the Bank, pursuant to Public Law 99-472, section 19 (100 Stat. 1207); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1722. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development transmitting the report of the Advisory Commission on Regulatory Barriers to Affordable Housing entitled, "Not In My Back Yard: Removing Barriers to Affordable Housing"; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1723. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of D.C. Act 9-52, "District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Conformity Amendment Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1724. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of D.C. Act 9-53, "Redistricting Procedures Amendment Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1725. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of D.C. Act 9-54, "Public Assistance Act of 1982 Budget Conformity Amendment Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1726. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of D.C. Act 9-55, "Day Care Policy Budget Conformity Amendment Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1727. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of D.C. Act 9-56, "District of Columbia Public School Nurse Assignment Budget Conformity Amendment Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1728. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of D.C. Act 9-57, "District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Services Fees Amendment

Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1729. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of D.C. Act 9-58, "Cigarette Tax Amendment Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1730. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of D.C. Act 9-59, "District of Columbia Election Code of 1955 Amendment Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1731. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of D.C. Act 9-60, "District of Columbia Housing Bonus Repealer Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1732. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting copies of D.C. Act 9-61, "District of Columbia Gross Receipts and Toll Telecommunications Service Tax Temporary Amendment Act of 1991," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1733. A letter from the District of Columbia Board of Elections and Ethics, transmitting notifications that on July 12, 1991, Albert Gallmon, Jr., the proponent, submitted a referendum petition for filing with the District of Columbia Board of Elections and Ethics; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1734. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 11th annual report on the implementation of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 by departments and agencies which administer programs of Federal financial assistance, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6106a(b); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1735. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to alleviate burdens imposed upon educational agencies and institutions by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 with respect to the maintenances of records by campus law enforcement units; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1736. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report regarding the implementation of the "Imported Vehicle Safety Compliance Act of 1988," pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1397 note; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1737. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Robert S. Strauss, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1738. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the first report on the utilization and donation of Federal personal property for fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 484(o)(2); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1739. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for the 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.

1740. 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.

1741. 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.

1742. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's notice on leasing systems for the western Gulf of Mexico, sale 135, scheduled to be held in August 1991, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(8); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1743. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Department of the Interior, transmitting a biennial report on the quality of water in the Colorado River Basin, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1596; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1744. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 639(b); to the Committee on Small Business.

1745. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to equalize payments of dependency and indemnity compensation to surviving spouses; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1746. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit the Secretary to guarantee the timely payment of principal and interest on certificates evidencing an interest in a pool of mortgage loans made in connection with the sale of properties acquired under chapter 37; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1747. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to limit the protection afforded certain service-connected disability ratings which have been continuously in force for 20 or more years; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1748. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the Health Professional Scholarship Program operated by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1749. A letter from the Acting Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting the 42d report for 1990 on the operation of trade agreements program, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2213(a); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1750. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10 and title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the educational assistance programs for veterans and eligible persons, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Armed Services.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FORD of Michigan: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 2031. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for equal treatment of telephone and electric cooperative welfare plans for the purposes of pre-emption; with an amendment (Rept. 102-150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1216. A bill to modify the boundaries of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 102-151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted July 12, 1991]

#### SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

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

H.R. 2130. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2130.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado):

H.R. 2883. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to transfer jurisdiction over the Rocky Mountain Arsenal, CO, to the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of establishing a national wildlife refuge, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell a portion of the property comprising the Rocky Mountain Arsenal for public or commercial uses, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:  
H.R. 2884. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for interest on automobile loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLUMS:  
H.R. 2885. A bill to permit the District of Columbia to issue general obligation bonds to finance the accumulated operating deficit of the general fund of the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2886. A bill to permit the Mayor of the District of Columbia to carry out reductions to the budgets of independent agencies of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2887. A bill to permit the District of Columbia to carry out a separation program for employees of the District government; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOOLEY:  
H.R. 2888. A bill to modify the flood control project for the Success Reservoir, Tule River, Tulare County, CA, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to enlarge the Success Reservoir, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. OBEY):

H.R. 2889. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to end deferral for U.S.

shareholders on income of controlled foreign corporations attributable to property imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT):

H.R. 2890. A bill to establish limits on the prices of drugs procured by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TORRICELLI:  
H.R. 2891. A bill to establish national centers for plastics recycling research and development and to establish a national clearinghouse on plastics recycling; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SOLOMON:  
H.R. 2892. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the exclusion and departure of aliens engaged in terrorist activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAHALL:  
H.J. Res. 299. Joint resolution designating the week beginning September 2, 1991, as "Buy American Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H. Con. Res. 181. Concurrent resolution condemning resurgent anti-Semitism and ethnic intolerance in Romania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

226. By the SPEAKER: Memorials of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to the 50th Armored Division of the Army National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

227. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to autism; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

228. Also memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of the Virgin Islands, relative to section 16 of the Virgin Islands Revised Organic Act of 1954 relating to the Confirmation of Heads of Executive Departments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

229. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to disabled veterans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

230. Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York, relative to veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 500: Mr. GILLMOR.  
H.R. 552: Mr. WYLIE.  
H.R. 582: Mr. MONTGOMERY.  
H.R. 872: Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DUNCAN, and Ms. HORN.  
H.R. 917: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. ESPY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mrs. BYRON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. WALSH, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ORTON, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. TANNER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.

H.R. 1155: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1277: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 1405: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ROE, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 1515: Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HENRY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 1531: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. MINK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. AUCOIN.

H.R. 1539: Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 1584: Mr. MARLENEE.

H.R. 1774: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1820: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2037: Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. DYMALLY, and Mr. ANTHONY.

H.R. 2081: Mr. FUSTER.

H.R. 2141: Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. KLUG, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 2254: Mr. TORRES, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 2336: Mr. FROST, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2530: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE,

Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 2579: Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 2603: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 2672: Mr. WOLF, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BE-REUTER, Mr. IRELAND, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. DICKINSON and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 2818: Mr. EARLY.

H.J. Res. 83: Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LENT, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. CAMP.

H.J. Res. 217: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. COX of California, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. RITTER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.J. Res. 253: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. FROST, Mr.

SPENCE, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ROE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.J. Res. 257: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LENT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. TANNER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WOLF.

H.J. Res. 274: Mr. BROWDER.

H.J. Res. 285: Mr. KASICH, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.J. Res. 294: Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FROST, and Mr. HORTON.

H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. JONTZ, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. TOWNS.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

102. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Lakewood, OH, relative to the Violence Against Women Act of 1991; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.