



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 24, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.  
The Reverend Harry Wood, Visalia United Methodist Church, Visalia, CA, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we thank You for Your everlasting love.

In a time of declining world powers and rising new nations.

In a time when technology has elevated humanity's place and power, yet left us more vulnerable and less able to feed ourselves than ever before.

In a time when history has destroyed conventional faith and morality but left us hungry for honest values.

We seek Your face O God. Grant us wisdom. Grant us courage.

Bless the President and the Members of Congress that they may be worthy of this hour.

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] if she would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. BOXER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution designating the third Sunday of August of 1991 as "National Senior Citizens Day."

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2212. An act regarding the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes.

### PASTOR HARRY WOOD

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

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure today of welcoming my pastor from Visalia, CA, Harry Wood, who delivered our opening prayer.

Pastor Wood has led the Visalia United Methodist Church since 1978. In his time there, he has instilled an unselfish spirit in his congregation and in others in the community whose lives he has touched.

His good work has shown itself in particular in the past 6 months as the people of central California have struggled to cope with the effects of a deep freeze that devastated the region's farm economy.

In that time, as he has many times before, Pastor Wood has brought together his congregation and the entire community to deal with the day-to-day challenges that we face.

On behalf of the community he serves, and as one who has been inspired by him, I would like to thank Pastor Wood for his good works, his friendship, his spirit, and his compassion.

### DEFICIENCIES IN CORPORATE TAX SYSTEM

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

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, recent hearings in the Ways and Means Committee have exposed huge deficiencies in our corporate tax system.

First, foreign corporations operating in America are failing to pay an esti-

mated \$30 billion in tax each year; \$30 billion that could reduce the deficit or cut taxes on American families.

Second, the Congressional Research Service has found that we impose a negative tax rate on debt. This has led to uneconomic leveraged buyouts and Wall Street shenanigans.

Third, recent studies have found that the tax is so complex that it costs American corporations \$1 for each dollar paid, in corporate tax, to the Treasury.

Fourth, America is the only industrialized Nation without a tax on imported goods coming across our border. Every other nation taxes our goods when sold in their markets.

Mr. Speaker, America is now a tax haven for foreign goods and a tax trap for American business.

### MORE, NOT LESS, FUNDING NEEDED FOR EARLY DETECTION OF BREAST CANCER

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I was astonished to read in a report of the Committee on Energy and Commerce a letter from the Health Secretary objecting, as follows, to a provision in the NIH reauthorization bill, H.R. 2281, "A \$50 billion earmark for breast cancer research and the development of a test for early detection of ovarian cancer is unnecessary."

Do not tell this Member, whose wife has fought for 8 years against breast cancer, who is lying in a hospital now, that breast cancer research is unnecessary.

More women this year will die of breast cancer than all people will die of AIDS.

The \$50 million is an insignificant amount to deal with the problem of breast cancer. We need more, not fewer, researchers working on this problem. We need more, not fewer, people putting their will, their energy, their creativity to finding something

□ 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.

that will not only detect early on but also deal effectively with the problem, the invasive problem of breast cancer.

#### FAMILY PLANNING WITH INTEGRITY

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it is time to tell the truth about the title X regulations. Mr. Speaker, these regulations simply echo the beliefs of the overwhelming majority of Americans who do not equate abortion with family planning. Poll after poll reveals American support for keeping family planning true to its name. According to a June 1991, Wirthlin Group poll, 83 percent oppose abortion being used as a method of birth control in tax-funded family planning programs. A 1990 Gallup poll revealed 91 percent of Americans think abortion is an unacceptable means of birth control during the first 3 months of pregnancy and that 94 percent think it is unacceptable as birth control after the first 3 months. A 1989 Boston Globe poll found 88 percent disapproval of abortion as birth control.

Mr. Speaker, no one need wear the label "pro-life" to support these commonsense regulations. One need only join the majority of Americans in making the distinction between abortion and family planning. A vote in support of these regulations is a vote for family planning with integrity.

#### SUPPORT AGRICULTURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1991

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with all of the mention that is going to be made today about the \$50 million and getting the research for cancer.

Also, I would like to advise my colleagues that the Chaplain, guest chaplain, today did a lot of yeoman work in helping farmworkers during the disaster in California, and we still have a disaster throughout the Nation.

I would like to inform my colleagues that yesterday we considered a bill on suspension trying to give some assistance. The vote will be today after the business is concluded, and I would hope that the Members would help us in the Committee on Agriculture and help all those who are in need.

It is only the authorization, regretfully. The money is yet to come down the line, but I would urge your support of this legislation when it comes later this afternoon.

#### WERE REAGAN TAX CUTS FOR THE RICH?

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the Democrats' main political ploys over the last few years has been to convince the American people the Reagan tax cuts were entirely for the rich and left the middle class and the poor paying more.

The fact is that income taxes paid by the top 10 percent of income earners have risen nearly 70 percent in real terms during this period, while those paid by the group earning less than \$30,000 have fallen more than 15 percent in real terms.

The 1987 and 1988 income tax return information from the Internal Revenue Service show the massive concentration of the income tax burden to be on the top taxpayers. Further, the information demonstrates conclusively that virtually all the growth in income tax revenues is now coming from the top 13 percent of the taxpayers, and nearly 77 percent of it is coming from those with incomes over \$100,000.

The story that the rich in this country pay very little taxes, and are paying less every year, at the expense of the poor and middle class is simply not true. The facts prove otherwise.

#### LAGGING DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT FOR WOMEN IS A HUMAN TRAGEDY

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

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by the lack of compassion and outright insensitivity shown by Secretary Sullivan to the women in our country by his opposition to the women's health research provisions. And no wonder considering the past policy of using men as the standard in medical research. The result of this shortsighted policy has been serious, substandard health care treatment and diagnosis for women.

I have been amazed by the sheer number of women throughout our country who have contacted me recently to share their experiences in light of my recent breast cancer surgery. They have been hurt by this lack of support from their Government. Yet, Secretary Sullivan and others see no reason to change the status quo. Diagnosis and treatment for women lags far behind those for men. The result is human tragedy.

I urge my colleagues who deem the provisions in the bill unnecessary to consider their wives, daughters, and mothers before making this vote. Do they not deserve the benefits and knowledge from the health research

performed at our National Institutes of Health?

□ 1210

#### THE GLOBAL WARMING ASSESSMENT ACT OF 1991

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Congress may be fiddling while the Earth burns.

Steps toward reducing global warming can't wait. We must act now to put conclusive data into the hands of our Nation's scientists and policymakers.

To ensure this happens, today I am introducing the Global Warming Assessment Act.

This bill will appeal to environmentalists and fiscal conservatives, because it does something dramatic for the environment in a common sense, cost effective manner.

It will require the Defense and Energy Departments and NASA to work together on a plan that would begin measuring global warming no later than 1995.

Current proposals are not expected to produce global warming data until the turn of the century.

The National Academy of Sciences in a recent study said our current scientific understanding of greenhouse warming is both incomplete and uncertain.

Mr. Speaker, we must actively work to reduce this uncertainty and organize our Nation's resources to gather conclusive data in time for effective action.

#### WOMEN'S HEALTH

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, "civil rights," "fairness," "level playing field," "freedom of opportunity," and even the "right to life"—each is a phrase we hear often in this Chamber.

Unfortunately, this high flown rhetoric gets buried when we try to resolve the real life problems faced by millions of Americans who are denied housing, jobs, opportunities for advancement, and educational opportunity.

Most disturbing to me is that there are categories of Americans for whom life is lived with more illness, disability, pain, and suffering. There are Americans for whom, ultimately, life is much shorter than it ought to be—minorities and women are chief among them.

Our spouses, our sisters, our mothers and our daughters, those closest to us, have been too long ignored in medical research.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health and Human Services, I've had an opportunity to hear the testimony, and ask the questions of witnesses who admit the inadequacy of our commitment to research on problems that are principally of concern to women.

I reviewed the HHS inspector general's report that concluded that despite the existence of voluntary guidelines for including women in clinical trials, no progress was being made.

H.R. 2707, the health appropriations bill includes significant increases for the Office of Women's Health at NIH, for breast and ovarian cancer, contraceptive, and other women's reproductive health research. I am very proud of that bill, because I was a strong advocate for increasing funds for ovarian cancer, fibroids, endometriosis, and contraceptive research.

With the help of Chairman NATCHER and JOE EARLY, we made genuine progress.

But it is within the NIH reauthorization bill that the Congress should make the most prominent statement of policy enhancing the opportunities for more and better research on women's health.

The NIH revitalization bill includes provisions enhancing the Office of Women's Health, codifying NIH policies promoting the inclusion of women and minorities in clinical trials and in the community of extramural researchers, as well as encouraging research in areas of special concern like breast and ovarian cancer.

If Secretary Sullivan's letter to Chairman DINGELL complaining about the inclusion of some of these provisions in the NIH reauthorization is another example of the President's kinder and gentler leadership, then I suggest that 535 points of light in the U.S. Congress send him a message about "fairness," "freedom," "opportunity," and yes, even the "right to a healthy life" by voting yea on the NIH reauthorization tomorrow.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

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

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider the NIH reauthorization bill. Included in this bill are provisions that will take significant steps in addressing the lack of research that has been done in areas of ovarian cancer, breast cancer, osteoporosis, and infertility. If we're ever going to make advances against these gender-specific illnesses, we need to authorize and fund gender-specific research.

It will take some money. It will take the commitment of a nation. It may

label us micromanagers, but it will result in research being targeted specifically to women—a group that until now, has only received 13 percent of NIH dollars when we are 51 percent of the population. Women as a group suffer from many curable diseases that we just do not catch in time.

This is a call for fairness in medical research, which should more clearly reflect the ills of all society not of those in the decisionmaking roles.

We have a unique chance tomorrow to make history. An opportunity to correct the medical injustices that have sent too many of our mothers and daughters to an early grave. I urge my colleagues to support the NIH reauthorization.

#### WOMEN DEPRIVED MEDICAL RESEARCH AND TREATMENT

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the subject that for me is a very personal subject. It is, in no small way, a matter of life and death. It is a matter of life and death to the 100,000 American women who will contract breast or ovarian cancer, a matter of life and death for over 127 million American women who are neglected by our health care bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, I am a survivor of ovarian cancer, and I have a unique appreciation of the need for early detection research for a disease that will kill 12,000 women this year.

The sad fact is that our country, recognized around the world as a leader in medical research and treatment, has systematically deprived women the full benefit of that expertise. Research for diseases specifically affecting women is underfunded, and women are often purposefully excluded from the clinical trials investigating disease.

As we consider the NIH authorization we will debate amendments that provide increased funding for research for breast and ovarian cancer, establish basic guidelines to ensure that women are not by design excluded. They would, for the first time, ensure equity to the health research system.

Mr. Speaker, cancer is frightening, painful, and traumatic. It is an ordeal for both the victim and the victim's family.

The President has threatened to veto this bill if the amendments are included. This is a blow to women and their families. It is a blow to victims of this disease. The President should not play politics with this issue. Passage of these amendments is a matter of life and death.

#### INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION FOR NEW DISTRICT COURT IN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to join my colleague from California in introducing a bill to bring a new court to Riverside and San Bernardino Counties.

Over the last 10 years, the population in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties has nearly doubled in size. In the next 15 years, it is predicted that it will double once again. This increase has clogged both the courts with more cases and the freeways with more cars.

Justice should not be dependent upon freeway traffic or population growth. When a court appearance involves a daily 6 hour commute on the freeway, many citizens simply give up pursuing their cases through the Federal courts. Relief for this situation is needed now.

This bill that is being introduced today will divide the central district of California into two halves, providing a court for each. I am pleased to work with my colleague in designing this bill and I hope we can move to enact it and return the courts to the people of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties.

#### BUSH ADMINISTRATION OPPOSES WOMEN'S HEALTH PROGRAMS

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration is fighting against a program for women's health. It is incredible to me that this administration says modest additional funding for osteoporosis is unnecessary. Unnecessary? Ask some of our grandmothers who suffer from breaking bones and intense pain. Twenty-four million Americans get osteoporosis each year. Eighty percent are women.

This administration opposes a modest \$50 million initiative for ovarian and breast cancer; 12,400 women will die of ovarian cancer in 1991. There is no screening test. It is a silent killer.

One in nine women will get breast cancer in this country. Moms, sisters, and aunts are taken away in the prime of life because of breast cancer. In 1991, 45,000 women will die, and 175,000 women will be stricken with breast cancer.

This administration attacks our initiatives on contraceptive research. For people who want to outlaw abortion, this action is outrageous. They are against abortion. They are against contraception. I sadly conclude they are against women. I cannot come to any other conclusion.

Let Members vote for the NIH bill tomorrow.

#### WOMEN'S HEALTH MEASURES URGENTLY NEEDED

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

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, for years, women in this country have been the missing page in America's medical textbook. Our health needs are chronically unaddressed and unresearched. At the same time, little has been researched about the health of middle-aged white males.

The cost women pay for this institutionalized oversight is a dear one. Some 44,000 American women die each year from breast cancer. Some 12,000 American women die each year from ovarian cancer. Osteoporosis affects half of all women between ages 45 and 90.

Fortunately, some progress has been made in the last couple of years, after the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues tackled this issue. The NIH authorization bill we are scheduled to consider tomorrow contains many provisions that continue the progress in this fight for life.

How, then, could it be objectionable and unnecessary to try and find a cure for breast cancer? How could it be objectionable and unnecessary to try and find a cure for ovarian cancer? Or seek ways to prevent abortions of unplanned pregnancies?

Mr. Speaker, I would venture to guess that almost everyone in this Chamber knows a woman whose health has been damaged by serious illness. I hope each Member thinks of such women tomorrow when they vote on the NIH authorization.

#### IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2507, THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH REVITALIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1991

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

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, this week we will consider a very important piece of legislation, H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health [NIH] Revitalization Amendments of 1991.

I am particularly concerned about what the President wants to do to the provisions of this bill which will someday save the lives of millions of American women who are diagnosed with breast and ovarian cancers. The administration and others argue that NIH is already engaged in research on these diseases, but this research is not directed toward finding answers to fundamental questions related to cancers which are unique to women. The fund-

ing level authorized in this bill will take us toward knowledge of a cause and cure of these diseases. Without earmarking a funding level for this research, we cannot ensure that it will receive the attention that it deserves.

While I understand the need for fiscal responsibility during these difficult economic times, by supporting research, we will save lives. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2507 to ensure that women's health research receives the funding that it merits.

#### U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE— SHEER IDIOCY

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, as Paul Harvey would say, "Here is the rest of the story."

A proposal, now, by our Trade Ambassador, Carla Hills, has been made public—get this—to relax restrictions on cheese imported from Eastern Europe which in no way meets American health and sanitary standards.

She wants to dump even more unsanitary European cheese on the American market which will even further devastate the hard-hit dairy farmers; a mindless idea like this should be an impeachable offense.

The Department of Agriculture said that this idea, when it is implemented, will result in an additional 136,000 metric tons of cheese annually into the United States.

This idea is crazier than "Animal House."

This idea to increase cheese imports will be presented at the GATT meeting in Europe. Notice, the Europeans are not giving an inch—but our towers of jelly—the U.S. trade negotiators are caving in again—and the dairy farmers are the scapegoats again. Well, we are not going to allow it to happen.

If our Trade Representative cannot speak up for America's interests for a change, then let us get a new Trade Representative.

#### WOMEN ARE SICK AND TIRED OF OUR NATION'S FAILURE TO ADDRESS THEIR HEALTH CARE NEEDS

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

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, tragically, our Nation has failed to adequately address women's health care needs. In 1991, 1 in 9 women will contract breast cancer; 20,500 women will be diagnosed with ovarian cancer this year; and women are the fastest growing population with AIDS.

Yet, NIH spends only 13 percent of its funds on women's health, and women

have been excluded from many clinical trials. So what is the response of the administration to this crisis in women's health?

Total inaction, stonewalling, and contempt for the very lives of women. In fact, the administration opposes every one of the key enhancements for women's health in the NIH revitalization bill.

Women are sick and tired—sick because their health concerns are ignored—and tired of inaction by the administration.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO CARLA HILLS ON TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on granting fast-track trade authority, some Members of this body alleged that Congress would be shut out of the trade negotiations with Mexico and Canada.

One Member said of fast track, "granting the unique authority \* \* \* effectively removes the Congress from this process and does great damage to the separation of powers and the role of Congress."

Oh, really?

I believe Carla Hills should be congratulated for her Herculean efforts to conduct two major trade negotiations and at the same time bend over backward to meet with Members of Congress.

In the month that NAFTA negotiations have been underway, Ambassador Hills has met with the Speaker, the majority leader, has held two executive sessions each with the Ways and Means and Finance Committees, and plans an additional session with each in the near future.

And the USTR's Office has already been to the Hill to exchange information and input with the House Agriculture Committee, House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

Before the August recess, every single relevant committee in Congress—and that means nearly every congressional Committee—will have been paid a visit by the USTR's Office.

Again, I commend Carla Hills and her office for the extraordinary efforts they have taken to interact with Congress on the progress of trade negotiations.

I hope that when the agreement comes back to the Congress next year, Members will take note of this effort, and not claim they were left out of the process.

#### WOMEN'S HEALTH EQUITY

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider the reauthorization of the National Institutes of Health. The bill includes many provisions from the Women's Health Equity Act which are of critical importance to American women.

Some of our women colleagues in the House of Representatives have taken to the well and showed great courage in sharing with us their own experiences with breast cancer or ovarian cancer, and although we are only 29 women in the House of Representatives I know that this experience is known to many of the men in the House because of the suffering of their own wives. They have shared this experience with us and I want them to know that tomorrow they can make a very big difference and do something about the suffering in their own homes.

Tomorrow we will have the opportunity to vote on this legislation which will make permanent the Office of Women's Health at NIH and expand the responsibilities of the Office to include monitoring the representation of women among senior scientists at NIH. More importantly, the legislation would require the inclusion of women and ethnic minorities in federally funded clinical research studies.

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed that the Bush administration has expressed opposition to almost all of the women's health provisions of this legislation. The administration is even opposed to the increased emphasis on research on osteoporosis and breast and ovarian cancer. It is hard to believe.

But, Mr. Speaker, what will we tell the women of America if we do not vote for this legislation? The women of America are watching, and they are watching the men and women in this Chamber. For too long the federally funded research, supported by women's tax dollars, has excluded them from clinical studies. We as a nation must continue the recent progress on women's health issues. I urge my colleagues to reject the terrible views of the administration and support the NIH reauthorization.

#### SUPPORT WOMEN'S HEALTH—SUPPORT THE NIH REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I join a number of my colleagues today to express my deep concern with the administration's opposition to the women's health research provisions of the National Institutes of Health reauthorization bill.

In a letter to Chairman DINGELL, Dr. Louis Sullivan expressed the view that

the NIH bill imposes funding and research directives that "duplicate existing efforts, and are costly and unnecessary." He gives several examples of micromanagement in the bill, including "provisions related to the authorities of the National Cancer Institute \* \* \* and a program for research in osteoporosis \* \* \*."

Mr. Speaker, I find it very disturbing that the administration is opposed to efforts to reverse decades of neglect in the area of women's health. The NIH bill includes vital provisions for women's health research, including: the establishment of an Office of Research on Women's Health within NIH and ADAMHA to identify women's health needs and to ensure that women are adequately represented in health research at NIH; additional funding for breast and ovarian cancer research, and osteoporosis research; the establishment of an intramural and clinical research program in obstetrics and gynecology; funding for contraceptive and infertility research, and provisions to ensure that women and minorities are represented in research.

These provisions are necessary because these needs have been ignored for many years. The NIH reauthorization bill recognizes the failure of federally funded research to adequately include women and to focus on woman-specific diseases. I urge the administration to change their position on this important bill, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2507.

□ 1230

#### WE NEED ADDITIONAL RESEARCH INTO BREAST CANCER AND OVARIAN CANCER

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

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, we have taken this opportunity to address the issue of women's health research because of the astounding letter which is in the committee report that we will be debating tomorrow which provides funds for the National Institutes of Health. This astounding letter has been sent by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Louis Sullivan, in which he says he is going to recommend to the President that the bill be vetoed because it contains unwarranted and unwise intrusions into his authority. The intrusion into his authority, my friends, is a mere \$100 million which we are seeking for vital health research, areas that affect women all across this country. The area that I am particularly concerned about is the \$50 million which have been earmarked for breast cancer and ovarian cancer. In the area of ovarian cancer, think of it, 20,000, 20,000 women each year are diagnosed as having ovarian cancer. Most of them are found in the terminal stages because there is

no detection possible, there is no kind of symptom for which you can look. Doctors are helpless.

This country has come across with all kinds of technology research. Certainly, if we put our emphasis on research, we are going to be able to come up with an early detection method and save the lives of the 12,000 women who die each year unnecessarily because of ovarian cancer.

#### THE 1991 HIGHWAY BILL IS OUTRAGEOUS LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I have only been here 7 months, but during my years of public service I have seen some pretty outrageous activities occur in legislative bodies. But I have never seen anything as outrageous as the 1991 highway bill that proposes to increase taxes on Americans by 5 cents, the so-called nickle for America, and load it up with pork in congressional districts all across this country.

What happened to last year's nickle for America? Well, it was flushed down that toilet that we know as the national debt. And you all know what the pork is. That is the special projects that we hand out in congressional districts around this country so we can buy enough votes to get these types of bills passed. Mr. Speaker, I stand opposed to this legislation because it is another tax on working Americans. I stand opposed to this legislation because spreading pork around to secure enough votes to pass this turkey is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are fed up with this kind of politics, and we had better wake up before it is too late.

#### NIH RESEARCH FUNDS CRUCIAL FOR AMERICAN WOMEN

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of legislation reauthorizing the National Institute of Health—H.R. 2507—which will soon be considered by the House. Included in this bill are several important provisions that American women are counting on. However, it is my understanding that the administration strongly opposes the provisions concerning women's health.

To my surprise the administration is opposed to authorizing an additional \$50 million earmarked specifically for basic breast cancer and ovarian cancer research at the National Cancer Institute [NCI]. These are diseases which can strike our mothers, wives, daugh-

ters, and friends. No woman is immune from being hit by such fatal diseases, without research and early intervention. Breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death among women, surpassed only by lung cancer. This life-threatening disease is expected to strike an estimated 175,000 women this year. In my home State of Michigan, over 1,500 women died of breast cancer last year. One of the most tragic aspects of this disease is that it is preventable. African-American women are highly susceptible to having this sometimes fatal disease; it is the leading cause of cancer in my community for women.

H.R. 2507 will encourage researchers to include women in their studies. Women know that they have not been part of the clinical research at the National Institutes of Health—and they are demanding a change. This legislation sends a clear signal to the women of America that a change is being made. But the administration appears to be sending a different signal—one which has been sent before and one which will not be tolerated again.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the reauthorization of the National Institutes of Health—H.R. 2507.

#### THE CHOP-SHOP KILLER FROM MILWAUKEE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, there is a new mass murderer in America. This one is called the chop-shop killer of Milwaukee. Parts of 18 different bodies were found dismembered, torsos were stuffed into closets, 11 skulls were found in refrigerators and freezers.

Mr. Speaker, the killing goes on. Over 23,000 murders per year in America. And while Congress continues to kill the death penalty, killers and murderers on the street continue to sentence American victims to death in record numbers, be it drive-by, drive-in, drive-up or mail-order murders—we have them, folks.

I say it is time for Congress to pass the death penalty, start protecting innocent victims in this country, and stop protecting the rights of murderers.

#### WE ARE TIRED OF SEEING CRIMINALS BEING AWARDED FEDERAL CONTRACTS

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the other day in the newspaper there was a story headlined "Unisys Awarded \$612 Million Air

Force Computer Contract." Now, this is not about Unisys; I do not know much about that company. But let me read it:

Unisys Corporation, facing a possible record-setting criminal fine and embarrassing cost overruns in connection with its government business, yesterday got some good news from Washington: An Air Force computer contract potentially worth \$612 million.

Further, it says:

Even while the Air Force was announcing the contract at the Pentagon, federal prosecutors in nearby Alexandria continued in negotiations with the company on a plea bargain to criminal charges growing out of the Pentagon procurement fraud investigation known as Ill Wind.

Again, this is not mainly about Unisys, but it is about a principle.

When might we expect the administration to behave as people on Main Street in this country do? If somebody cheats you once, you do not do business with them again. Could we expect that minimum standard on the part of the administration? Some of us are getting tired of seeing criminals awarded contracts.

Now, I know that a whole lot of the big defense contractors would not be doing work today if you had a standard that says if you were convicted of a criminal act, you could not do any more work. But I wonder if we should not start expecting that standard to be applied to companies doing business with the Federal Government, as is already the case for individuals which do contract work for the Government.

#### REPORTS OF UNFAIR TAX BURDEN REINFORCED BY NEW STUDY

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, there are many people in my home State of Vermont who have gotten tired of me saying over and over again that the decade of the eighties was a time in which the rich got richer and the poor got poorer, while at the same time the rich paid less in taxes while the middle class and the working people of our country paid more in taxes.

It is interesting, therefore, to bring to your attention today the results of a recent study by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. And what does this report conclude? The rich got richer, the poor got poorer, and the rich are paying significantly less in Federal income tax. What the study tells us is that the wealthiest 1 percent of our population have seen a 122 percent increase in their real income. Meanwhile, their income taxes will decline by 18 percent between 1977 and 1992.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to announce that I will be introducing legislation after the August recess which, if adopted, will ask the wealthy to start

paying their fair share of taxes so that we can take the tax burden off the middle class and working people.

□ 1240

#### MOTOR VOTER BILL'S REJECTION BY THE SENATE LAST WEEK

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

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Senate, for the lack of one vote, failed to act on one of the most critical prodemocracy bills considered in this Congress in years, the motor voter registration bill. It is a bill that simply lets people register to vote at a time that they register for their driver's licenses.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal had a patriotic purpose: To make it easier for the citizens of this country to exercise their most basic right, the right to vote.

I am proud that the House of Representatives passed this bill last year by a resounding margin. None of us in this House who did that deserve necessarily a pat on the back. After all, one either believes in democracy, or one does not believe in democracy. I say, "If you do believe in democracy, it would be impossible to oppose the motor voter registration bill and then still be sincere if you did oppose it when you go to your constituents and ask them for their votes."

Forty Members of the U.S. Senate apparently have no such inhibitions, Mr. Speaker, but motor voter registration is coming back to the Senate floor in September. It is building momentum far beyond the beltway around this Capital City. Those 40 Members in the other body had better learn and learn quickly, before they learn the hard way, that they either believe in democracy or they do not and the voters will not believe in them.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would remind the Member that urging action by or questioning the motivation of Members of the other body is not permitted under House rules.

Mr. AUCOIN. I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker.

#### THE AMERICAN DISCOVERY TRAIL

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

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, this morning I am introducing legislation calling for a study to determine the feasibility of designating the American

Discovery Trail as a national scenic trail. I appreciate the assistance of my 12 colleagues who have joined me as original cosponsors of this legislation and a companion bill that will be introduced in the Senate by Senator HANK BROWN of Colorado.

I would like to say this morning that I had an opportunity to greet three hikers that have just completed, almost, the American Discovery Trail. Eric Seaborg, Ellen Dudley, and Bill Sprotte have charted a national east to west trail since leaving Point Reyes National Seashore in California on June 2, 1990.

We believe that the American Discovery Trail has the potential to provide the missing element in the National Trails System. Using local trail groups and land managers, the ADT team has pieced together a number of existing trails and public rights-of-way. The 5,500-mile route links a number of wilderness areas, historic trails and urban greenways. This trail is entirely located on public lands, and it uses existing trails wherever possible. It crosses private lands only in a few cases and only in the existing rights-of-way by land agreement. On its way, coast to coast, the trail passes through 12 States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in making sure that the enthusiasm that we have seen in this process continues with the reality of the American Discovery Trail.

#### HOW TO HELP THE STARVING PEOPLE IN IRAQ

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

Mr. APPELEGATE. Mr. Speaker, President Bush wants to show the world that he is a great humanitarian. He wants to allow Saddam Hussein to sell oil so that Saddam Hussein will take the money and feed all of the starving people in Iraq.

Does President Bush actually think that Saddam Hussein is going to use any kind of money for anybody but himself? Well, if Mr. Bush believes that, I have got an old bridge I would like to sell him.

Mr. Speaker, I do not imagine that the President is that naive. Just check the bank in Switzerland after that first sale. Oh, yes, he might replenish some of his military losses, but to help the starving children, to help the starving people of his country, to help to give them food, clothing and shelter, is absolutely ridiculous because he is not going to do it.

However, Mr. Speaker, I tell my colleagues what he ought to do. The Iraqis have \$8 billion invested in the Western world. Let us take that \$8 billion of theirs and use it for the people of Iraq. But do not give it to him. Let the Western allies administer the money to

make sure it is going to get to where it ought to be going, back to the people he stole it from in the first place.

#### MAKING CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS IN OPERATION OF THE U.S. COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 153) to amend title 38, United States Code, to make miscellaneous administrative and technical improvements in the operation of the U.S. Court of Veterans Appeals, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate Amendments: Page 1, line 5, strike out "4067" and insert: 7267.

Page 2, line 9, strike out "4086" and insert: 7286.

Page 2, line 22, strike out "4085" and insert: 7285.

Page 2 in the line after line 22, strike out "4086" and insert: 7286.

Page 2, strike out all after the line under line 22 over to and including line 6 on page 3.

Page 3, line 7, strike out "4" and insert: 3.

Page 3, line 8, strike out "4053" and insert: 7253.

Page 3, line 17, strike out "5" and insert: 4.

Page 3, line 18, strike out "4064" and insert: 7264.

Page 4, line 1, strike out "6" and insert: 5.

Page 4, line 20, strike out "4096" and insert: 7296.

Page 4, line 25, strike out "4096(b)" and insert: 7296(b).

Page 5, line 5, strike out "4096(b)" and insert: 7296(b).

Page 5, line 19, strike out "4096(f)(2)(A)" and insert: 7296(f)(2)(A).

Page 5, line 22, strike out "4097" and insert: 7297(n).

Page 6, line 1, strike out "7" and insert: 6.

Page 6, after line 7, insert:

#### SEC. 7. ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTARY SERVICES AND GIFTS BY THE UNITED STATES COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS.

Section 7281 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i) The Court may accept and utilize voluntary services and uncompensated (gratuitous) services, including services as authorized by section 3102(b) of title 5 and may accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts and bequests of personal property for the purposes of aiding or facilitating the work of the Court. Gifts or bequests of money to the Court shall be covered into the Treasury."

Page 6, line 11, strike out "4067" and insert: 7267.

Page 6, line 16, strike out "4068(b)(2)" and insert: 7268(b)(2).

Page 7, line 2, strike out "4054" and insert: 7254.

Mr. MONTGOMERY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY]?

Mr. STUMP. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object, but I will ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUMP. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 153 passed the House on February 20, 1991.

The bill consists of several provisions affecting the Court of Veterans Appeals which was established by the Congress in 1988 to provide judicial review of decisions made by the Board of Veterans Appeals. The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs struck the provision increasing the salaries of the associate judges of the court. The Senate also added a provision which would authorize the court to accept voluntary services. Other than these two changes, the bill is the same as the House-passed bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

There follows an explanatory statement concerning the provisions contained in this bill. With the Senate's agreement, this statement contains a number of changes to the statement which appeared in the RECORD of Senate consideration of this measure—S 10176, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, daily edition July 16, 1991—in order to accurately reflect the provisions contained in the bill considered and passed by the House on February 20, 1991.

#### EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON H.R. 153, RELATING TO THE U.S. COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS

H.R. 153 was passed by the House on February 20, 1991. As amended by the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs during a Committee meeting on June 6, 1991, and further amended during Senate consideration, it reflects a compromise agreement that the Senate and House of Representatives Committees on Veterans' Affairs have reached on the measure. The Committees note that H.R. 153 contains provisions that are similar or identical to provisions contained in certain measures relating to the United States Court of Veterans Appeals that were considered, or proposed to be offered, in the Senate and the House of Representatives during the 101st Congress but were not enacted. Those measures are H.R. 4557, which the House passed on May 1, 1990; H.R. 5657, which the House passed on May 1, 1990; S. 2100, which the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported on July 19, 1990, but which did not receive Senate consideration prior to the end of the 101st Congress; and amendments that the Chairman of the Senate Committee was prepared (on behalf of the Senate Committee) to offer to H.R. 5657 in October 1990, but which were not offered because the Senate was unable to consider that bill prior to the end of the 101st Congress.

The Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives have prepared the following explanatory statement on H.R. 153. Differences between

the provisions contained in H.R. 153 as amended by the Senate (hereinafter referred to as the "Compromise agreement") and the related provisions in the House-passed versions of H.R. 4557, H.R. 5657, H.R. 153 as passed by the House, S. 2100 as reported by the Senate, and the proposed amendments to S. 2100 are noted in this document, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by the compromise agreement, and minor drafting, technical and clarifying changes.

#### PROCEDURES FOR DECISIONS OF THE COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS

Current law: Under section 7267(b) of title 38, the Court of Veterans Appeals is required to include in each of its decisions a statement of its conclusions of law and determinations as to factual matters.

Section 7267(d)(1) of title 38 provides that, in the case of a decision by a single judge of the court, the decision of the judge becomes the decision of the court unless, before the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the decision of the judge, the court directs that the decision be reviewed by a panel of the court, in which case the decision of the single judge is not part of the record. Section 7267(d)(2) provides that, in the case of a proceeding determined by a panel of the court, the decision of the panel becomes the decision of the court unless, before the expiration of the 30-day period beginning on the date of the panel's decision, the court directs that the decision be reviewed by an expanded panel of the court (or the court en banc), in which case the decision of the panel initially deciding the case is not part of the record.

House bill: Section 1 of H.R. 153 would repeal subsections (b) and (d) of section 7267.

Senate bill: No provision.

Compromise agreement: Section 1 follows the House bill.

#### JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

Current law: There is no authority under current law for the chief judge of the Court of Veterans Appeals to convene a judicial conference. Under section 331 of title 28, the Chief Justice of the United States is required to summon annually the chief judge of each judicial circuit, the chief judge of the Court of International Trade, and a district judge from each judicial circuit to a judicial conference.

House bill: Section 2 of H.R. 153 would amend title 38 so as to authorize the chief judge of the Court of Veterans Appeals to summon the judges of the court to an annual judicial conference for the purpose of considering the business of the court and recommending means of improving the court's jurisdiction. The court would be required to provide by its rules for representation at the conference by persons admitted to practice before the court and by other persons active in the legal profession.

Senate bill: No provision.

Compromise agreement: Section 2 follows the House bill.

#### JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE

Current law: Section 372(c) of title 28 sets forth the procedures to be followed when a complaint alleging conduct "prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts" or inability to discharge the duties of office due to mental or physical disability is filed against a Federal circuit, district, or bankruptcy judge, or a magistrate.

Upon completion of an investigation of a complaint, a written report is filed with the judicial council of the circuit concerned.

Upon receipt of such a report, the judicial council is authorized to conduct additional investigation and to take action to assure the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts within the circuit. A judicial council may also refer a matter to the Judicial Conference of the United States for consideration and appropriate action. Section 372(c) also provides the opportunity for a complainant or a judge or magistrate aggrieved by a decision of the chief judge or of a judicial council to petition the judicial council or the judicial conference, respectively, for review.

Section 372(c)(17) requires that the U.S. Claims Court, the Court of International Trade, and the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit prescribe rules consistent with the provisions of section 372(c) establishing procedures for the filing of complaints with respect to the conduct of judges of those courts and for the investigation and resolution of such complaints.

House bill: Section 4 of H.R. 153 would amend section 7253 of title 38 to require the Court of Veterans Appeals to prescribe rules, consistent with the provisions of section 372(c) of title 28, establishing procedures for the filing of complaints with respect to the conduct of any judge of the court and would grant the court the same powers with respect to the disciplining of judges of the court as are granted to a judicial council under section 372(c) with respect to judges of a court covered by that section.

Senate bill: No provision.

Compromise agreement: Section 3 follows the House bill.

The Committees expect that the judges of the court would constitute the judicial council for the court.

#### RECUSAL OF JUDGES

Current law: Section 455 of title 28, which applies to judges of the U.S. Courts of Appeals, U.S. district courts, the Court of International Trade and any court created by Act of Congress, the judges of which are entitled to hold office during good behavior, sets forth the circumstances under which judges must disqualify themselves from participating in particular cases.

House bill: Section 4 of H.R. 153 would make applicable to the Court of Veterans Appeals the provisions of section 455 of title 28.

Senate bill: Section 705 of S. 2100 is substantively identical to the House provision.

Compromise agreement: Section 4 contains this provision.

#### PARTICIPATION OF JUDGES IN THE THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN

Current law: No provision in current law authorizes judges of the Court of Veterans Appeals to participate in the Thrift Savings Fund.

House bill: Section 6 of H.R. 153 would amend chapter 84 of title 5 so as to authorize judges of the Court of Veterans Appeals to elect to contribute to the Thrift Savings Fund. Judges would be authorized to contribute to the fund not more than 5 percent of their basic pay, and would be required to make an election to contribute to the fund within 60 days after the date of enactment of this provision.

Senate provision: Section 5 of the proposed amendment to H.R. 5657 is substantively identical to the House provision.

Compromise agreement: Section 5 contains this provision.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD TO THE COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS

Current law: Section 906 of title 44 provides for the distribution of gratuitous copies of

the Congressional Record to certain offices and individuals, including, among others, virtually all Federal judges and court libraries other than those of the Court of Veterans Appeals.

House bill: Section 7 of H.R. 153 would amend section 906 of title 44 to require the distribution of copies of the Congressional Record to the judges of the Court of Veterans Appeals and to the library of the Court.

Senate provision: Section 7 of the proposed Senate amendment to H.R. 5657 is substantively identical to the House provision.

Compromise agreement: Section 6 contains this provision.

#### ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTARY SERVICES AND GIFTS

Current law: Public Law 100-687, the Veterans' Judicial Review Act, does not provide the Court of Veterans Appeals with statutory authority for the acceptance of voluntary services or gifts. However section 604(a)(17) of title 28, grants to article III courts authority to accept such services and gifts of personal property.

House bill: No provision.

Senate provision: Section 1 of S. 1050, as introduced on May 14, 1991, at the request of the chief judge of the Court of Veterans Appeals, would amend section 7281 of title 38 to allow the court to accept voluntary services and gifts and bequests.

Compromise agreement: Section 7 contains the Senate provision.

□ 1250

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation. I support H.R. 152 with the Senate amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2942, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 200 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 200

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2942) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI are hereby waived. It shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member specified or his

designee, and all points of order against the amendments for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7 of rule XVI and clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume, and during consideration of this resolution all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 200 is the rule waiving points of order against certain provisions of the bill, H.R. 2942, the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies appropriations bill, for fiscal year 1992.

Mr. Speaker, since general appropriations are privileged under the Rules of the House, the rule does not provide for any special guidelines for the consideration of the bill.

Customarily, Mr. Speaker, general debate time is limited by a unanimous-consent request by the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee prior to consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 200 waives clause, 2 and 6 of rule XXI, against the entire bill. Clause 2 of rule XXI prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions in general appropriations bills. Clause 6 of rule XXI prohibits reappropriation or transfers of unexpended appropriations.

The waivers are necessary because legislation for programs of the Coast Guard and surface transportation programs have not yet been enacted.

As my colleagues are aware, the House passed the Coast Guard authorization for fiscal year 1992, last week and it is anticipated that the House will consider the surface transportation authorization sometime next week.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the rule makes in order two amendments that are printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying this rule. The first amendment is to be offered by Mr. OBERSTAR of Minnesota or his designee.

The second amendment is to be offered by Mr. SOLOMON of New York or his designee. The rule waives clause 7 of rule XVI, which prohibits non-germane amendments, against the amendments.

Also waived against the amendments is clause 2 of rule XXI, which I stated earlier prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislation on general appropriation bills.

Mr. Speaker, the Oberstar amendment is identical to H.R. 172, the Aging Aircraft Safety Act of 1991, which passed the House last April.

The Solomon amendment relates to the revocation or suspension of drivers licenses of individuals convicted of drug offenses.

This amendment would simply make technical and conforming changes in current law by striking section 332 from the bill and inserting a corrected version of the Solomon amendment, which was enacted into law last year.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2942 appropriates \$14.2 billion for the Department of Transportation and for certain related agencies including the Coast Guard, Amtrak, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, and the National Transportation Safety Board.

H.R. 2942 also increases the limit on spending from the highway trust fund to \$16.2 billion which is an increase of \$1.7 billion from the fiscal year 1991 level.

This increase will provide the necessary funding for the continued construction and repairs of the Nation's Interstate Highway System and secondary roads and bridges.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also increases funding to the Federal Aviation Administration which oversees the operation of the Nation's air control system, the development and modernization of our airports, and aircraft safety technology.

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any opposition to this rule and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has fully explained the provisions of this rule. Since general appropriations bills are privileged, this legislation will be considered under the normal legislative process for appropriations bills. The bill will be open to amendment under the 5-minute rule and any amendment which does not violate the rules of the House will be in order.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the chairman and ranking republican member of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] for their hard work in putting this legislation together and their leadership in moving this final regular appropriations bill to the floor.

H.R. 2942 provides appropriations in fiscal year 1992 for the Department of Transportation and certain related agencies. I am personally interested in this appropriation bill because it provides funds for the continued operation of the flight service station in my district. This station has faced possible closure and these funds will ensure safe air travel by keeping it open.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the statement of administration policy notes that the administration has concerns with several provisions of this legislation. Under this rule, the House can make improvements to the bill and address the con-

cerns of the administration. I urge adoption of the rule and of the underlying bill.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2942) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and that I may be permitted to include tables, charts, and other extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill—H.R. 2942—making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair designates the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole and requests the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1259

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2942)

making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, with Mr. MONTGOMERY (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

□ 1300

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to submit for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole House the bill, H.R. 2942, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for fiscal year 1992.

Before I get into the details of this particular bill, let me express my appreciation to the Members who serve on the transportation appropriations subcommittee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE] all provided valuable insight and perspective during the 5-month in-depth review we gave to Federal transportation programs and policies during our hearing process. Most of us have been together in transportation for a number of years now. It is my privilege and good fortune to serve with them.

The subcommittee minority members are also very special. We will all miss greatly the experience, humor, and talent of the late Silvio Conte of Massachusetts, who served on the subcommittee and represented his constituents well until his death on February 8, 1991. We are pleased to welcome the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] as an ex officio member of the subcommittee. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] both have the determination, the spirit, the concern, and the commitment to a safe and effective transportation system for this Nation. We are about as bipartisan as a committee can be, and I certainly appreciate the hard work of every member.

Let me make special mention of our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], who spent long hours in committee hearings and has such a strong and comprehensive understanding of our

transportation programs and policies. I have great admiration for his knowledge, dedication, and character, and I want him to know of my great appreciation for his sound judgment and cooperation. He is a class act, and he is my special friend. The bill before you today is a bipartisan one.

Mr. Chairman, in preparation for this bill the committee reviewed 2,081 pages of budget and grant justification documents and developed a hearing record contained in five published volumes amounting to 5,696 pages. Testimony was received from hundreds of witnesses in over 10 weeks of hearings. Requests were received from a large number of Members of Congress representing all geographic areas of this Nation.

#### SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Let me take a brief moment in order to summarize the bill. In total, it provides spending for Federal transportation programs of about \$34.4 billion, of which approximately \$14.1 billion is new budget authority and \$20.2 billion is comprised of various limitations on contract authority obligations.

In terms of new budget authority, the bill is \$967 million above the amount provided in the Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for similar activities in fiscal year 1991. This excludes \$318.9 million in other appropriations acts for fiscal year 1991. In terms of the total amount of funding controlled by this bill—new budget authority and obligation limitations—the bill is \$3.1 billion or 10 percent over the amounts provided last year. This is the same increase as the committee recommended last year, and which overwhelmingly passed the House.

#### BUDGET RESOLUTION TARGET

I would direct the Members' attention to page 167 of the committee report, which shows that this bill does not exceed our section 602(b) allocation for discretionary budget authority or outlays. As the Members know, under the Budget Act, the committee is provided a lump sum allocation pursuant to section 602(a), and the Appropriations Committee then subdivides that among its 13 subcommittees. The 602(b) totals are within the limits set forth in last year's budget agreement with the White House.

This is a fiscally responsible bill which meets the requirements of the House-passed resolution in both discretionary budget authority and outlays.

#### BUDGET REQUEST

Mr. Chairman, I think the administration's fiscal year 1992 transportation budget deserves a comment at this point. Even though we are under our section 602(b) discretionary budget authority allocation, the bill we are considering today is \$1 billion over the administration's budget request. That budget request is simply inadequate to handle the serious transportation prob-

lems facing the Nation today. Americans spend almost \$800 billion each year for transportation products and services. According to the Department of Labor, this represents almost 19 percent of all consumer spending in the United States—a higher percentage than we pay for food, clothing, or health care. These expenses are rising as our highways and airways become increasingly congested. Highway travel delays in urban areas now total more than 2 billion hours each year. Delays at our major airports are now above 20,000 hours a year. These delays cost billions of dollars in lost working hours and economic production, which is ultimately passed on to American consumers in increased prices for goods and services.

Mr. Chairman, the administration's budget proposed large increases in aviation at the expense of the significant increases in funds for surface transportation which are needed to address the growing congestion problems and infrastructure needs of this Nation. Furthermore, the budget proposes a large reduction in Federal support for the national passenger rail system [Amtrak]. The committee recognizes that increases in aviation funding are necessary to reduce delays in our airway system. However, as I have stated in past years, we have the responsibility to provide for a balanced transportation system which adequately addresses the surface infrastructure needs of the Nation. All segments of our transportation system are vital to the prosperity of this country. The bill before you recognizes these needs, particularly in the surface transportation sector.

This was not easy to accomplish. Now I want to thank our full committee chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] for his efforts on our behalf. As he often reminds us, our Nation's public works represent the real and lasting wealth of this country. Our transportation system has served our country well—and we must continue to preserve and enhance it.

#### SELECTED MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

With respect to the major recommendations in this bill, I would call the attention of the Members to pages 2 and 3 of the report. A table comparing the bill to fiscal year 1991 and the President's request appears beginning on page 170 of the report. The major highlights of this bill include:

First, a 13-percent increase in total FAA funding—\$992 million more than last year's level. This includes \$1.9 billion for grants-in-aid for airports—a 6-percent increase—\$4.3 billion for FAA operations—an 8-percent increase—and \$2.4 billion for facilities and equipment—an 18-percent increase;

Second, obligations of not to exceed \$16.2 billion for Federal-aid highways, an increase of \$1.7 billion—12 percent—over fiscal year 1991;

Third, funding for the existing urban mass transportation formula grant program at a level of \$2 billion;

Fourth, obligations of not to exceed \$1.45 billion for the discretionary grants program of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, excluding funding for section 9(b) formula grants, an increase of \$250 million—21 percent—over last year's level;

Fifth, \$503 million for grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation [Amtrak], which is \$173 million above the level for comparable expenses in the President's budget request;

Sixth, funding of \$118 million for operations and research activities of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the same level as provided in fiscal year 1991;

Seventh, a reduction of \$117.8 million—3 percent—from the President's budget request for overall Coast Guard funding; and

Eighth, continued funding for the construction of the Washington, DC metrorail system at the level of \$124 million.

#### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Chairman, for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, the bill provides a total of \$63.7 million. In addition, office-by-office dollar breakdowns are specified in the bill as has been done in the past. The bill also provides an obligation limitation of \$38.6 million, as requested in the budget, for payments to air carriers and \$111.9 million for GSA rental payments.

Payments to air carriers: With respect to the payments to air carriers appropriation, the committee has tried to strike a fair balance between the transportation needs of rural America and the need to rid this program of the excess subsidies that have taken place in the past. Last year's budget act requires a funding level of \$38.6 million in fiscal year 1992 for passenger facility charges [PFC's] to go into effect, and the committee's bill provides that funding. However, the committee remains concerned over the continuing high levels of subsidy in this program. Therefore, the bill includes a limitation against expanding the program or upgrading service levels.

#### COAST GUARD

With respect to the Coast Guard, we recommend a total program level of \$3.5 billion. Including funds provided in other appropriations acts, this total level is \$132 million more than the total Coast Guard program level for fiscal year 1991. The bill includes \$603.4 million for drug enforcement operating expenses of the Coast Guard. I invite the Members' attention to pages 28 through 30 of the committee report regarding drug interdiction. The bill specifies that \$56.7 million be derived from the oilspill liability trust fund,

which was established by the Oil Pollution Act of 1990.

Operating expenses: For Coast Guard operating expenses, the bill provides a program level of \$2.4 billion for fiscal year 1992, and assumes no funding from the 1992 DOD appropriations bill. Including funds provided in other appropriations acts, this total amount is \$130 million, or 6 percent, more than the amount appropriated for similar activities in fiscal year 1991. It is also \$55.8 million below the budget request. The reduction from the budget request is primarily due to transfers of funds to a separate appropriation for GSA rental payments, transfer of landbased aerostat operations to the DOD, and a reduction in Defense Logistics Agency stock charges.

Acquisition, construction, and improvements: For acquisition, construction, and improvements, we are recommending an appropriation of \$365 million for fiscal year 1992. The total program level is comprised of \$132.7 million for vessels; \$62.5 million for shore and aids to navigation facilities; \$86.9 million for aircraft; \$50.3 million for other equipment; and \$32.5 million for personnel. The recommended level includes funding to begin procurement of a new oceangoing buoy tender, continue the 210-foot cutter overhaul, and continue the procurement of essential search and rescue and drug interdiction helicopters. The recommended level provides sufficient funding to allow the highest priority, most well justified projects to proceed.

Alteration of bridges: The bill also includes \$11 million to alter or remove bridges that may be unreasonable obstructions to the waterborne commerce of the United States. This sum will support the alteration of three railroad bridges over the Mississippi, Pascagoula, and Brunswick Rivers.

Retired pay: The sum of \$487.7 million, as requested in the 1992 budget, would be appropriated for the pay of retired military personnel of the Coast Guard and Coast Guard Reserve. This is based on an average of 26,819 personnel on the retired rolls.

Reserve training: For reserve training, \$77 million is recommended. This is a 4-percent increase over fiscal year 1991 and will provide for a ready reserve of 19,500, including a selected reserve of 12,000.

Research, development, test, and evaluation: The bill includes \$27.8 million for the applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation projects necessary to maintain and expand the technology required for the Coast Guard's operational and regulatory missions. This amount is an 11-percent increase over the fiscal year 1991 level. The largest increase would provide additional funding for oil spill response capability.

Boat safety: For the State recreational boating safety program, we

have included \$35 million, which is the same level as provided for fiscal year 1991.

#### FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

For the Federal Aviation Administration, we are recommending a total program level of \$8.9 billion, including a \$1.9-billion limitation on the use of contract authority for fiscal year 1992. This is \$792 million—or 10 percent—more than the fiscal year 1991 level. While this is a fairly large increase for these austere budget years, I believe it is absolutely essential to continue the restoration of the air traffic control system, continue modernization of the national airspace system, improve our airports, and continue important safety regulatory and research initiatives.

Aviation trust fund: Mr. Chairman, there has been much discussion in recent years about the adequacy of FAA funding to do its important job. The focus has been on the large balance in the aviation trust fund. I am pleased to tell you that due to last year's repeal of the so-called penalty clause, section 506(c) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, the general fund will no longer be making overpayments of FAA costs. The bill before you specifies that 49 percent of the funding for FAA operations is to be derived from the aviation trust fund. The amounts in the bill are estimated to result in a reduction of approximately \$900,000,000 in the aviation trust fund's uncommitted balance. I urge the Members to take the time to read the discussion on pages 45 and 46 of the report, which represents a balanced perspective of FAA funding patterns.

Operations: For FAA operations, we recommend a total program level of \$4.3 billion. This represents an increase of \$305 million over the fiscal year 1991 program level. This would provide for 52,353 positions including 22,963 controllers, supervisors, and support personnel for air traffic centers and towers, and 4,120 flight service station personnel.

Controller staffing: Under the committee recommendation, actual air traffic controller end-of-year employment would increase to the requested level of 17,945 personnel by September 30, 1992. This is 450 controllers above the level projected for September 30, 1991.

Facilities and equipment: For facilities and equipment, the bill contains \$2.4 billion for fiscal year 1992—an increase of \$374.1 million—18 percent—over fiscal year 1991. This account finances modernization and improvements to our air traffic control system. I want to stress that, although the FAA's Capital Investment Plan is behind schedule, those delays are due to technology development and contractor deficiencies—not to lack of funding. For example, this year the General Accounting Office reports that 8 of the NAS Plan's 12 largest programs experi-

enced delays ranging from 8 to 32 months in the past year alone. The two largest programs in the fiscal year 1992 budget are among those with the longest delays.

To provide a larger increase, given the state of individual F&E programs and the deficit problems facing the Nation this year, would not be fiscally responsible. However, as the equipment is developed, adequately tested, and ready to purchase, the funds will be provided—and our record proves this. In fiscal year 1987, the amount appropriated for F&E was about \$800 million. The bill before you recommends \$2.4 billion. That's 300 percent of the level provided just 5 years ago.

Research, engineering, and development: With respect to FAA research, engineering, and development, we recommend \$218 million, which is an increase of \$8 million over the budget request and \$13 million over fiscal year 1991.

Airport improvement program: The bill also includes a \$1.9 billion obligation limitation for airport development and planning grants. This is the highest funding level ever provided for this program, and represents an increase of \$100 million over the fiscal year 1991 level. It represents no change from the budget request. Both the Office of Technology Assessment and the FAA have indicated that a lack of airport capacity will lead to increasing travel delays if no action is taken. I'm sure many Members have experienced these delays firsthand, as I have.

Aircraft purchase loans: We also recommend continuing the FAA's authority to borrow from the Treasury to pay defaulted aircraft purchase loans at the requested level of \$1.3 million.

#### FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

Under the Federal Highway Administration, the bill provides for a total fiscal year 1992 program level of \$17.7 billion in highway aid. This includes a limitation on Federal-aid highway contract authority obligations of \$16.2 billion. That is \$1.7 billion (12 percent) over last year's level and \$480 million over the budget estimate.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most, if not the most, important transportation programs that we have. Over 90 percent of total interstate passenger-miles and 20 percent of total interstate freight ton-miles move on the Nation's highway system. As I mentioned earlier, congestion delays on our highways are in the billions of hours each year, and are far greater than the amount of airway system delays. I think the administration's proposal, while proposing to increase highway spending, does not go far enough. It is important to our continued economic development and to our national defense to maintain a first class highway system. It's clear that the needs are there, and are not limited

by geographic boundaries or political party lines.

Mr. Chairman, because no authorizing legislation for surface transportation had been reported by the House Public Works and Transportation Committee at the time of the committee's markup, the committee recommendations assume a continuation of existing law. The committee recognizes that some adjustments may be required after the enactment of authorizing legislation. We have worked well with Chairman ROE and Chairman MINETA and their committee as a whole this year, and we look forward to a good relationship in the future.

Highway trust fund balance: Under the provisions and assumptions in this bill, we estimate that fiscal year 1992 outlays attributable to the highway account of the trust fund will be about \$15.95 billion. This compares to estimated fiscal year 1992 direct user fee income credited to the highway account of approximately \$15.86 billion. In addition, the highway account of the trust fund is expected to receive general fund interest payments of \$930 million. A comparison and discussion of highway spending versus trust fund revenues is found on pages 93 through 95 of the report.

Federal-aid highways: Mr. Chairman, the most important account in this program is the Federal-aid highway obligation limitation. We are recommending a ceiling of \$16.2 billion for this account.

Administrative expenses: Mr. Chairman, the bill also provides a total of \$212.2 million of FHWA administrative expenses, \$23 million more than the fiscal year 1991 level.

Miscellaneous highway programs: The bill also contains an appropriation of \$13.2 million for railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects at four different locations. For highway-related safety grants, an obligation limitation of \$10 million is recommended, the same as the fiscal year 1991 funding level. We also recommend a limitation on direct loans for the right-of-way revolving fund of \$70 million and appropriations totaling \$308.3 million for a number of specific highway projects.

Motor carrier safety: For motor carrier safety, the bill includes \$48.4 million to continue the activities of the Office of Motor Carrier Safety. This is an increase of \$8.4 million over the fiscal year 1991 level. The bill also provides a \$60 million limitation on obligations for the motor carrier safety grant program.

#### NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

For the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the bill includes a total program level of \$253.3 million. This is the same level as provided for fiscal year 1991. The bill specifies that \$42.3 million of this

amount is to be derived from the highway trust fund, with the balance from the general fund.

Operations and research: Mr. Chairman, the committee's recommendation of \$118.3 million pares down the excessive growth requested in some areas of this appropriation in order to eliminate or reduce low priority activities and to fund critical but unbudgeted activities in the areas of safety standard compliance, biomechanics research, and shock trauma research.

State and community highway safety grants: We also recommend a limitation on obligations for the State and community highway safety grant program of \$115 million, the same as the budget request.

Alcohol safety grants: For the section 408 alcohol safety incentive grant program, we have established a limitation on obligations of \$20 million in fiscal year 1992. The administration proposed to fund similar grants under a new "safety bonus grant" program, which is not yet authorized. The sum of \$19.9 million was provided for fiscal year 1991.

#### FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Chairman, for the Federal Railroad Administration, major recommendations include a program level of \$37.1 million for railroad safety, \$14.7 million for railroad research and development, \$10 million for local rail freight assistance, \$145 million for mandatory rail passenger service payments, \$36 million for the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program, and \$16 million for office of the administrator expenses.

Mandatory rail passenger service payments: Once again this year, the bill recommends funds in a separate appropriation for FRA to make certain payments on behalf of Amtrak to the Railroad Retirement Trust Account and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Account. Up until fiscal year 1991, these expenses were covered by the appropriation for grants to Amtrak. This practice unfairly inflated Amtrak's true subsidy needs, since these expenses are merely passed on by Amtrak as a subsidy for the freight railroads. Therefore, the Congress last year decided to fund these expenses in a separate FRA appropriation. The committee's recommendation reflects continuation of that account, at the level of \$145 million for fiscal year 1992.

Amtrak: We are recommending \$328.9 million for Amtrak operating expenses in fiscal year 1992. The President's budget proposed \$180 million, and assumed significant savings from legislation which has not been enacted. The committee's recommended level represents a 4 percent decrease from the operating subsidy provided in fiscal year 1991. Mr. Chairman, the Members should know that Amtrak's financial performance continues to improve, and that as a result, its operating subsidy

continues to go down. Amtrak estimates that its revenues will rise by almost 8 percent next year. Passenger miles are estimated at 6.3 billion next year. I would direct the Members' attention to the discussion and graphs on Amtrak's financial performance on pages 129 through 131 of the report.

However, Amtrak's rolling stock and other equipment is old and insufficient to meet the growing demand. Administration officials agree that Amtrak needs additional equipment to increase revenues further and to reduce maintenance costs. The committee's recommendation of \$175 million for capital is between the administration's proposed level of \$150 million and Amtrak's request of \$242 million.

In addition, the bill includes a loan of \$3.5 million for track work in Illinois. This will be of direct benefit to Amtrak.

#### URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

For the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, a total program level of \$3.8 billion is recommended for fiscal year 1992. This is \$518 million more than the budget request, and \$588 million more than the fiscal year 1991 program level. As mentioned previously, the bill assumes current law due to lack of enactment of authorizing legislation at this time.

Formula grants: Under the formula grant program, we recommend an appropriation of \$1.6 billion. Another \$450 million is provided for the section 9(B) program, which allows total formula grant funding of over \$2 billion. This is \$245 million more than was provided for fiscal year 1991.

Operating assistance: The committee recommends that \$802.2 million of the formula grant appropriation be made available for operating assistance. This is the same as the level provided last year and \$504.4 million above the budget request.

Discretionary grants: The bill also includes language limiting obligations for transit discretionary grants and section 9(B) formula grants to \$1.9 billion. This is \$500 million (36 percent) above the fiscal year 1991 limitation. This account is financed from the mass transit account of the highway trust fund. I invite the Members' attention to pages 139 through 146 of the report for a detailed description of how these funds are to be distributed.

Interstate transfer—transit: The bill also includes \$160 million for transit projects that have been substituted for interstate highway projects. Of this amount, 50 percent is to be distributed on a formula basis and 50 percent on a discretionary basis. The discretionary funds will be distributed as outlined on page 148 of the report.

R&D/administrative expenses. The bill also provides a total of \$63 million for research and administrative expenses of UMTA.

Washington Metro. The bill provides \$124 million to continue construction

of the Washington, DC Metrorail system. This is \$59.9 million above the fiscal year 1991 level.

#### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The bill includes an appropriation of \$10.6 million from the harbor maintenance trust fund to finance operations and maintenance of the Saint Lawrence Seaway.

#### RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

For the Research and Special Programs Administration, the bill contains appropriations of \$31 million. This represents a 16 percent increase over the fiscal year 1991 level. Of this amount, \$13.4 million is provided for the pipeline safety program, including funding for the State grants-in-aid program at the requested level of \$7 million. The recommended level includes \$1.1 million for initial implementation of the Sanitary Food Transportation Act and the large majority of funds requested to implement the Hazardous Materials Transportation and Uniform Safety Act, which were both enacted in 1990.

#### INSPECTOR GENERAL

For the Office of the Inspector General, the bill includes an appropriation of \$37 million, a 16 percent increase over the fiscal year 1991 level. Funding for implementation of the Chief Financial Officers Act has not been included. For a discussion of the committee's concerns in this area, I direct the Members' attention to pages 154 and 155 of the report. The committee believes that funds to combat waste, fraud, and abuse within the Department of Transportation would be put to better use by hiring additional audit staff rather than preparing and auditing business-type financial statements.

#### TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Title II of the bill contains new budget authority for six transportation-related agencies and commissions. Specifically, we recommend \$2.9 million for the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, \$34.1 million for the National Transportation Safety Board, \$40.9 million for the Interstate Commerce Commission, limitations on the Panama Canal Commission of \$49.4 million for administrative expenses and \$519 million for operating and capital expenses, \$10.2 million for the Department of the Treasury to rebate Saint Lawrence Seaway tolls, and \$51.6 million for the Federal share of interest payments for the bonded indebtedness of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

#### TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of general provisions in this bill that will be of interest to the Members, and I direct their attention to pages 162 and 163 of the report for a discussion of these provisions.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the body is a fiscally responsible one which

provides adequate funding for our transportation programs and will significantly improve the infrastructure of this Nation. It restores adequate funding for Amtrak and mass transit operating subsidies, and at the same time provides needed increases for aviation and surface transportation and the Coast Guard. I say again that it does not exceed the Section 602(b) ceiling for discretionary budget authority and outlays. I ask for its favorable consideration and approval.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Gospel appointed for last Sunday—Mark 6:30-44—was the beloved parable of the feeding of the multitudes with five loaves and two fishes. That miracle lives on in today's fiscal year 1992 Transportation appropriations bill. Under the leadership of our distinguished chairman, Congressman BILL LEHMAN from Florida, the apostles on the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee have worked as a team to keep the country afloat, on the rails, on the roads, and in the air. Balancing the often competing needs of the different transportation modes is a real art. In our wildest imagination, we could not have anticipated being able to accommodate so many of the priorities and requests out of our pot of transportation funds.

I invite my colleagues to take a good look because you may never see such a bill again. H.R. 2942 shows the importance Congress and the committee attach to maintaining infrastructure. It is a bill that everybody can support, as there is something in here for darn near everyone. The fiscal year 1992 Transportation appropriations bill shows what we can do when given adequate funding and fulfills our duty to bring out a bill at the 602(b) level.

While the official position of the Office of Management and Budget is that the bill should be exactly as requested by the administration, OMB acknowledges that the bill is within the section 602(b) allocation and they do not oppose it.

I have said it before, and it is worth saying again: BILL LEHMAN is the most enthusiastic, hard-working, and dedicated chairman I know. The hearings may be long and grueling, but he conducts them at a lively pace. The budget requests may not always include enough funds for every mode of transportation, but he ensures we have a balanced system. The number of requests for projects from individual Members may be great, but he will always offer a compromise instead of turning someone down with a flat "no." It is a great treat to know BILL and see him work.

He was determined to see this bill through personally and here he is—always a gentleman of his word.

I congratulate Chairman LEHMAN and the rest of the members of the sub-

committee on what I believe is a good bill. All subcommittee members, Republican and Democratic, believe in a balanced transportation system for the United States. Despite personal interests and regional needs, subcommittee members have pulled together to produce this bill. I salute the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDONALD], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], my next door neighbor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE].

I also note with great sadness that this is the first transportation appropriations bill to come to the floor since the untimely death of our colleague from Massachusetts, Silvio Conte. In the field of transportation he was a force with which to be reckoned. I like to think he would approve of the bill we bring forth today.

Finally, let me compliment the staff on their good work: Kenny Kraft and Jim Ogsbury for the minority; Tom Kingfield, Rich Efford, Lucy McLelland Hand, Linda Muir, and Zee Latif for the majority.

The bill provides \$14.1 billion in new budget authority. This is a decrease of \$940 million from the \$15.1 billion requested in the budget. When you include limitations on obligations, the bill is \$34.4 billion. This is \$1 billion more than the budget request and \$3 billion more than fiscal year 1991.

Major recommendations are:

First, \$2.48 billion in operating expenses for the Coast Guard. This bill does not include the usual \$300 million from Defense which we have had for the past several years.

Second, \$4.3 billion in Federal Aviation Administration operations. This is a 7.6-percent increase over fiscal year 1991.

Third, \$2.4 billion in FAA facilities and equipment. This is an 18-percent increase, instead of the 29-percent increase requested in the budget.

Fourth, \$1.9 billion in FAA airport grants [AIP]. This is a 5.5-percent increase over fiscal year 1991.

Fifth, \$16.2 billion in highway obligation ceiling. This is approximately a 12-percent increase over fiscal year 1991.

Sixth, \$125.7 million to continue work on 16 existing highway demonstration projects.

Seventh, \$141.9 million in new highway demonstration projects.

Eighth, \$503 million in Amtrak grants. This is a 52.7-percent increase over the budget.

Ninth, \$3.5 billion in Urban Mass Transportation Administration grants. This is a 16.5-percent increase over fiscal year 1991.

Tenth, \$124 million for Washington Metro.

The one drawback in the list of pluses is report language recommending no funding for implementation of the Chief Financial Officers Act. The Department would have to propose a reprogramming or a transfer to begin this activity. Congress should be enthusiastically supporting this important statute and assisting departments in implementing it.

First, an agency such as DOT, with strong operating components, needs a single individual—the CFO—to be accountable for departmentwide financial management.

Second, DOT has an ambitious plan to integrate 80 divergent administrative and program financial systems into a single, integrated system.

Third, an example of the need for financial data is acknowledged by the committee on page 63 of the report: The "FAA does not have an automated management information system which can track on a monthly basis obligations and expenditures by budget line item, for each appropriation year, for the F&E account. The Committee believes that such a management tool is essential for effective project oversight, both within the Department and within the Congress."

Fourth, the Office of Management and Budget identified DOT financial management and administrative systems, as a high risk area in 1989.

Fifth, the CFO's Act will not lessen the nonfinancial audit activity of the inspector general.

In closing, the bill is within the 602(b) allocations for domestic discretionary budget authority and outlays. The administration does not oppose it and Members should support it.

□ 1310

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very proud indeed of the work of my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Transportation Appropriations and our fine chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

TRANSPORTATION BILL IS INVESTMENT IN OUR FUTURE

We have again recommended an excellent bill—one which provides over \$34 billion in investments for our Nation's future. Money in this bill is indeed an investment in America—in the real wealth of our country. It will produce both immediate and long-term dividends. It will help us to compete in the world marketplace and regain our normal share of domestic and world markets. Transportation is a basic underpinning of our economy, and we cannot afford to continue the decline we have seen in the 1980's.

I am proud to be a member of the subcommittee which recognizes the importance of transportation in a strong nation on which all else depends.

CONSIDERATION OF 13TH APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. Chairman, today also represents an important milestone for this House—for this bill is the last of the 13 regular 1992 appropriations bills to be considered by this body.

Mr. Chairman, we all can take great pride in the work of the 59 members who serve in the Committee on Appropriations. All members of our committee put in extremely long hours and give much time and thought to the difficult decisions we must make. And they do it with little fanfare.

This year, our 13 subcommittees heard more than 5,150 witnesses in 271 hearing days of testimony which totaled over 96,000 printed pages. These hearings are not always glamorous, but they are necessary for making the tough spending choices we must make.

APPROPRIATIONS BILLS HAVE BEEN ON TIME

This was a difficult year. When we started out in February, our staff had identified over \$8.7 billion in additional immediate needs for our domestic programs that could not be met under the budget caps.

Even so, our committee rolled up its sleeves and produced bills at a near record pace that will meet America's needs as responsibly and as fairly as possible. In the 29 days between May 29 and June 26, the House passed 12 of the 13 regular appropriations bills—which is on par with the record pace set in 1960. We also passed three supplemental appropriations acts between March and May to support our troops in Saudi Arabia and meet other problems stemming from Operation Desert Storm.

APPROPRIATIONS BILLS ARE UNDER BUDGET LIMITS

The 1992 bills recommended by the committee and passed overwhelmingly by the House by an average vote of 340 to 71 have been under all the spending caps set in last year's budget summit agreement.

The total of these bills has also once again been under the amount requested by the President. Many Members don't know that since 1945, we have held the total of all appropriations bills \$180.8 billion below the total requested by the Presidents.

This year, the committee bills coming to the floor have been, in total, \$11.7 billion below the cumulative 1992 budget request—for discretionary budget authority—of the President—mainly due to foreign aid and military spending reductions.

APPROPRIATIONS BILLS ARE SETTING NATIONAL PRIORITIES

But more important than meeting a tight budget and a tight schedule, the appropriations bills we have passed continue to implement important legislative priorities for our Nation to keep a leader into the 21st century.

Over the years, with little fanfare, your Committee on Appropriations has done its best to focus dollars on programs that:

First, enhance America's economic competitiveness into the 21st century; second, improve our quality of life; and third, maintain our national security.

We have continued this year-in and year-out. To do this, we have given priority to programs that add to our Nation's real wealth in areas such as: Lasting capital investments, science and civilian research and development, education, nutrition and health, law enforcement and drug abuse prevention, environmental protection, veterans programs, housing, parks/natural resources and conservation.

#### 1992 APPROPRIATIONS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. Chairman, although we still must iron out our differences with the Senate, I think the House can be proud of the priorities we have followed in our 1992 appropriations bills.

Unlike plans laid out in Presidents' budgets and budget resolutions which focus on only a few highly publicized areas, the Committee on Appropriations has taken on the hard task of staying under the budget ceilings fairly and responsibly.

These are the programs that built America into a great Nation, and these are the programs that must be supported if we are to remain a great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I will present a description of some of the important priorities that have been emphasized in the appropriations bills that have passed the House this year.

#### APPROPRIATIONS BILLS—DOMESTIC PRIORITIES

The "Budget Summit Agreement" limited annual growth in new discretionary budget authority for 1992 to 5.4 percent for domestic programs. It also foreclosed the option of paying for domestic increases with reductions in foreign aid or military spending. Under these constraints, the Committee on Appropriations has identified an immediate 1992 shortfall of at least \$8.7 billion in fully justified domestic needs that cannot be met.

Funds available for domestic programs in 1992 were focused on the following priority areas:

#### LASTING CAPITAL INVESTMENTS:

\$17.852 billion (obligational authority) for federal highway capital spending, an increase of \$1.586 billion (+10%) over 1991, and an increase of \$1.429 billion over the President's request.

\$4.37 billion for FAA aviation capacity expansion and modernization programs, an increase of \$475 million (+12%) over 1991.

\$3.847 billion for mass transportation capital programs, an increase of \$588 million over 1991, and an increase of \$518 million over the President's request.

\$3.166 billion for Corps of Engineers water resources development activities, an increase of \$228 million over 1991, more than the President's request.

\$2.522 billion for Rural Electrification Administration electric and telephone loans, \$727.7 million (+40%) more than 1991, and \$1.095 billion over the President's request.

\$985 million for rural water and sewer loans and grants, \$150 million (+18%) more

than 1991, and \$335 million over the President's request.

\$246 million for the Economic Development Administration (in Committee reported bill), \$69 million (+39%) more than 1991, and \$226 million more than the President's request.

\$3.265 billion for Department of Housing and Urban Development's community development grants program, \$65 million more than 1991, and \$345 million above the President's request.

\$812 million for Bureau of Reclamation water resource development and irrigation activities, a decrease of \$77.5 million from 1991, but \$7 million more than the President's request.

#### SCIENCE/CIVILIAN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT:

\$11.148 billion for National Aeronautics and Space Administration research & development and space flight, control and data communication accounts, the same as provided in 1991, but \$1.544 million (+16%) more than the amount provided in 1990.

\$2.721 billion for programs of the National Science Foundation, an increase of \$405 million (+17%) over 1991. This includes \$435 million for science education activities—an increase of \$113 million (+95%) above 1991 and \$45 million above the President's request.

\$238 million for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, \$22 million more than 1991.

\$1.490 billion for research of the Department of Agriculture, including basic and applied research in the fields of livestock, plant sciences, entomology, soil and water conservation, nutrition, and agricultural engineering. This is an increase of \$80 million over 1991, and \$33 million over the President's request.

\$2.854 billion for energy supply, research and development activities of the Department of Energy, an increase of \$327 million (+13%) over FY 1991, and \$33 million more than the President's request.

\$454 million for fossil energy research and development, an increase of \$219 million above the President's request.

\$560 million for energy conservation programs, an increase of \$64.5 million (+13%) over 1991, and \$234 million more than the President's request.

\$218 million for Federal Aviation Administration research, engineering and development programs, an increase of \$13 million over 1991, and \$8 million more than the President's request.

#### EDUCATION:

\$31.342 billion for programs at the Department of Education, an increase of \$4.249 billion (+16%) over 1991. This included \$23.344 billion for discretionary education programs which is an increase of \$2.458 billion over 1991, and an increase of \$1.685 billion above the amount requested by the President. The major increases over 1991 include \$1 billion for compensatory education activities under Chapter I; \$367 million for vocational education; \$203 million for education of the handicapped; and \$139 million for student financial assistance. In addition to these increases for existing education programs, \$250 million would be appropriated to carry out new education initiatives which may be authorized during 1991. The bill also fully funds the guaranteed student loan program which is expected to provide more than \$11 billion in new loans to students in 1992.

\$2.214 billion for Head Start, an increase of \$262 million (+13%) over 1991, and \$162 million over the President's request.

#### NUTRITION AND HEALTH:

\$31.494 billion for domestic food and nutrition programs of the Agriculture Depart-

ment such as WIC, Food Stamps, Child Nutrition, and emergency food assistance. This is an increase of \$2.377 billion (+8%) over 1991.

\$8.825 billion for biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health, \$548 million (+7%) over 1991 and \$50 million more than the President's request. Funds provided will support about 6,000 new grants. This amount includes an increase of \$117 million over 1991 for the National Cancer Institute. About \$70 million of the NIH increase is targeted to women's health issues, including breast and ovarian cancer, reproductive problems, heart disease, and osteoporosis. The President's budget made no similar request for women's health issues.

\$139 million for grants to provide a wide range of pre-natal services in areas where infant mortality rates are very high. This is an increase of \$114 million over the 1991 level.

\$298 million for childhood immunization, an increase of \$80 million (+37%) over 1991 and \$40 million over the President's request.

\$1.878 million for AIDS research, education, and care, \$63 million more than the amount expected to be spent on AIDS in 1991. Included in this total is \$247 million for the Ryan White AIDS CARE programs, an increase of \$26 million (+12%) over 1991.

\$1.7 billion for Indian health needs, an increase of \$150 million (+9.5%) over 1991, and \$304 million above the President's request.

\$762 million for the Food and Drug Administration, an increase of \$71 million (10%) over 1991, and \$189 million over the President's request.

#### LAW ENFORCEMENT/DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION:

\$11.67 billion for the Justice Department and the Judiciary for law enforcement and administration of justice, an increase of \$1.143 billion (+11%) over 1991. This includes over \$532 million in program increases for the war on drugs and crime and the administration of justice.

\$1.354 billion for the U.S. Customs Service, an increase of \$89 million (+7%) over 1991.

\$475 million for the U.S. Secret Service, an increase of \$64 million (+16%) over 1991.

\$6.707 billion for the International Revenue Service, an increase of \$600 million (+10%) over 1991.

\$332 million for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, an increase of \$28 million over 1991, and an increase of \$15 million over the President's request.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION:

\$6.541 billion for programs of the Environmental Protection Agency, an increase of \$447 million (+7%) over 1991 and \$329 million more than the President's request. This includes \$2.195 billion for EPA construction grants/state revolving funds, an increase of \$295 million above the President's request; \$50.75 million for non-point source water pollution grants, \$27 million more than the President's request; \$47.5 million for asbestos in schools loans and grants, a 100% increase over 1991—the President requested no funds for this program; and \$46.9 million for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences for hazardous waste research and training, an increase of \$25 million above the President's request.

\$86 million for the Corps of Engineers regulatory program, an increase of \$15 million (+21%) above 1991.

#### VETERANS PROGRAMS:

\$32.604 billion for activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, a net increase of \$331 million over 1991, and \$300 million more than the President's request. This includes a \$1.16 billion (+9%) increase for veterans medical

care, \$208 million more than the President's request.

#### HOUSING:

\$9.986 billion for the Department of Housing and Urban Development's annual contributions for assisted housing account, \$461 million more than 1991 and \$920 million above the President's request. In addition, \$861 million is provided for two new housing programs—HOME investment partnerships program (\$500 million) and Home ownership and opportunity for people everywhere (HOPE) grants (\$361 million).

\$2.513 billion for rural housing loans, an increase of \$534 million (+27%) over 1991, and \$607 million more than the President's request.

#### PARKS/NATURAL RESOURCES/CONSERVATION:

\$1.4 billion for the National Park Service, \$116 million more than 1991 and \$30 million more than the President's request. This includes \$969 million for Park Operations, an increase of 10.5% over 1991.

\$691 million for the Fish and Wildlife Service, including a \$37 million increase (+8%) above 1991 for operations.

\$909 million for the Bureau of Land Management, including an increase of \$19 million over 1991 for operations.

\$2.747 billion for Soil and Water Conservation programs of the Department of Agriculture, \$419 million (+18%) more than 1991.

#### APPROPRIATIONS BILLS—MILITARY SPENDING PRIORITIES

The "Budget Summit Agreement" specified that up to \$291.361 billion in budget authority could be appropriated for military spending programs, an increase of \$1.443 billion over the 1991 limit. The agreement also foreclosed the option of paying for domestic increases with reductions in military spending programs.

The 1992 appropriation bills provide a total of \$291.227 in new budget authority, \$459 million less than the President's request, and \$134 million under the "Budget Summit" spending limit. This is keeping with the traditions of the Committee and the Congress which have made a total net reduction of \$154.5 billion in Presidential defense budget requests between 1980 and 1991. Military spending appropriations for 1992 were tailored to emphasize morale, readiness, mobility, deployability, and sustainability. Priority was given to keeping the current force ready and supplied with the proper equipment. Major highlights include:

\$78.753 billion for military personnel, \$508 million over 1991 and \$736 million more than requested by the President.

\$87.72 billion for operation and maintenance, \$2.309 billion over 1991 and \$3.983 billion over the President's request.

\$37.185 billion for research, development, test and evaluation, \$1.21 billion over 1991 but \$2.036 billion under the President's request.

\$64.646 billion for procurement, \$2.530 billion less than 1991 and \$1.275 billion more than the President's request.

\$3.749 billion for environmental restoration and waste management at the Department of Energy's defense production complex, an increase of \$704 million (+23%) over FY 1991, and \$44 million more than the President's request.

\$8.483 billion for military construction activities, an increase of \$121 million over 1991, but \$80 million below the President's request. This includes \$759 million for two separate Base Closure Accounts.

Reallocation of funds in the President's request to enhance readiness including: In-

creased funds to avoid involuntary separation, +\$300 million; Depot maintenance backlog, +\$800 million; Real property maintenance, +\$1 billion; Land based and maritime pre-positioning equipment, +\$995 million; Sealift, +\$1.3 billion; LHD-1 amphibious assault ship, +\$972 million; Landing Craft Air Cushion (LCAC) vessels, +\$541 million; Spares and repair parts, +\$600 million; V-22 Osprey, +\$625 million; Upgrade M1 tank, +\$266 million; Ammunition, +\$99 million.

Rescissions of previously appropriated funds totaling \$1.8 billion.

#### APPROPRIATIONS BILLS—FOREIGN AID PRIORITIES

The "Budget Summit Agreement" specifies that up to \$34.025 billion in discretionary budget authority may be appropriated for international programs in 1992, an increase of 69 percent over 1991. The agreement also foreclosed the option of paying for domestic increases with reductions in foreign aid spending.

The 1992 appropriations bills provided a total of \$21.404 billion for international programs, \$12.522 billion below the President's request. Within this amount, appropriations bills included:

\$135 million appropriated directly to the U.S. Treasury for the purpose of deficit reduction. The President made no such request.

No funding for the International Monetary Fund, \$12.16 billion below the President's budget request.

\$583 million for children's programs for child survival, UNICEF, and others, \$114 million (+24%) more than 1991 and \$104 million more than the President's request.

A \$571 million program level for the P.L. 480 Food for Progress program, \$309 million below the 1991 program level, but \$107 million above the program level requested by the President.

\$1 billion for the Development Fund for Africa, an increase of \$200 million over 1991 and \$200 million more than the President's request.

\$400 million for Eastern Europe bilateral programs, \$30 million more than 1991. In addition, \$70 million was provided for the paid-in capital of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

\$691 million for export and trade related programs, a decrease of \$94 million from 1991, but \$100 million more than the President's request.

\$100 million for the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative for the Multilateral Investment Fund administered by the Inter-American Development Bank.

\$260 million for development and economic support programs in the Philippines. This represents a \$100 million increase in economic programs and a decrease of \$100 million in military programs compared to the President's request.

\$690 million for refugee assistance, \$160 million (+30%) over 1991, and \$180 million above the President's request.

\$3.217 billion for security assistance funded through the Economic Support Fund, \$790 million less than 1991, and \$11.4 million less than the President's request.

\$4.504 billion for foreign military financing grants and loans, \$159.4 million less than 1991, and \$400 million less than the President's request.

The Committee on Appropriations also called on the Administration to prepare a new 5-year foreign aid agenda to respond to the needs of a changing world. Particular Committee recommendations included giving increased priority to economic and envi-

ronmental support programs over military aid, the development of American export markets, and aid to children.

Mr. Chairman, given the funding constraints we face, this is truly a record of which we can be proud.

Mr. Chairman, these bills have passed the House by large margins after full debate.

Following is a table which shows, by bill, the amendments offered and passed and the final passage vote:

	Amendments		Across the board amendment		Final passage vote
	Offered	Adopted	Offered	Adopted	
Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary .....	5	2	1	0	338-80
Defense .....	4	2	0	0	273-105
District of Columbia .....	4	2	0	0	300-123
Energy and Water Development .....	5	2	1	0	392-24
Foreign Operations .....	5	5	1	1	301-102
Interior .....	12	5	0	0	345-76
Labor, HHS, and Education .....	5	2	1	0	353-74
Legislative .....	7	0	1	0	308-110
Military Construction .....	0	0	0	0	392-18
Agriculture, Rural Development .....	5	3	0	0	368-48
Treasury, Postal Service .....	13	11	0	0	349-48
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies .....	6	4	0	0	363-39

<sup>1</sup> Six amendments were offered by Mr. Roybal to restore matter deleted by points of order.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE] for a brief colloquy.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], and the distinguished ranking member, my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], in a colloquy on the National Railroad Passenger Corporation service in Montana.

Mr. Chairman, section 11 of the Amtrak Reauthorization Improvement Act of 1990 directs Amtrak to study the economic feasibility of providing new services to areas not presently served. This new service must have the potential for covering the operating costs associated with such service. I understand that, for the purposes of the study, Amtrak intends to analyze economic feasibility of passenger service in various regions of the country not presently included in Amtrak's national rail passenger system. Southern Montana is one such region that I want to ensure that it is included in the study.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARLENEE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Southern Montana is the type of region in which Amtrak should be look-

ing, and I believe should be included in this study, and I hope to be one of the first passengers on the train. I have never been to Montana, but I know the Big Sky Country is beautiful.

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

Mr. MARLENEE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and distinguished colleague for yielding.

I agree that southern Montana should be included in the Amtrak study. It is a great country.

Mr. MARLENEE. That pleases me greatly. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CARR. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], and in addition, just say that the lion's share of this bill goes to the credit of our able chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], who labored under very difficult circumstances to nevertheless lead this committee and lead the end product to the floor.

I do not think people out there appreciate the number of hours, the countless phone calls, the number of meetings that the chairman has had with individual Members and their constituents from across the country.

He was able to bring together the diverse parts of this bill into a comprehensive and a cohesive but, nonetheless, balanced product.

While some of us either on or off the subcommittee might have a quibble here or a quibble there, that is basically all it is a quibble, because, Mr. Chairman, you did a fine job, and we love you, and we are proud of you.

I urge all of our colleagues to support your product.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1992 transportation appropriations bill and I want to commend the chairman, Mr. LEHMAN, and the ranking member, Mr. COUGHLIN, for their hard work in crafting a fair, balanced bill in tough economic times.

It is a bill that attacks congestion in urban communities by addressing the importance of expanding the capacity of our Nation's highway system, while at the same time recognizing the importance of getting some of the cars off the roads by encouraging the use of mass transportation. It is a bill that also focuses on our Nation's rail system and on aviation safety for the traveling public. It is truly a bill that takes a balanced approach to the inter-

modal infrastructure system so critical to the economic well-being of our country and the quality of life for our citizens.

This bill provides the necessary funding for an effective national transportation system and I believe the committee has done an outstanding job in balancing competing interests for limited funds. I urge the support of my colleagues for this legislation.

Again, I want to commend Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. COUGHLIN and all the members of the subcommittee for their outstanding work on this bill. Also, I would be remiss if I did not express appreciation to the subcommittee staff, Tom Kingfield, Rich Efford, Linda Muir, and Kenny Kraft for their tireless work.

□ 1320

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2942, the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992.

As a new member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, I have been very appreciative of the help and courtesy Chairman LEHMAN has extended to me this year. Despite some personal adversity, he has once again brought a bill to the floor which is a credit to the U.S. House of Representatives. He is a fine chairman, and it has been my pleasure to work closely with him and the ranking Republican, LARRY COUGHLIN, this year.

I also want to thank the staff of this subcommittee. Tom Kingfield, Rich Efford, Linda Muir, and Zee Latif, have displayed a professionalism and expertise that is a model for all committees and subcommittees. I also want to thank Lucy Hand of Chairman LEHMAN'S staff, who is a great help to members of the subcommittee.

To remain economically competitive, we must move goods and people efficiently. This bill responds to the challenge by providing funds to upgrade airports, highways, and public transportation in this country.

The capacity of our Nation's airports will be enhanced through investments in air traffic control and airway facilities and equipment. This investment will be felt daily by every American who flies by ensuring fewer travel delays and safer flying.

Our highways will be less congested and needed safety improvements will be made because of this bill. Our committee also ensures a robust research program, to make certain that we remain competitive with nations like Japan and the European Community that are making large investments in highway technology and research.

In the area of public transportation, the subcommittee responds to the

needs of large urban areas and inter-urban areas like the research triangle area of North Carolina that are growing rapidly and face the challenge of minimizing traffic congestion, meeting clean air standards, and planning intelligently for the future.

At the same time the subcommittee is funding these investments in our economic future, we are also taking steps to ensure that these dollars will be spent wisely. I have been impressed by the high priority this subcommittee places on procurement reform. In recent years, the Federal Aviation Administration and the Coast Guard, in particular, have made major acquisitions under faulty or inadequate procurement procedures. Under the prodding of this subcommittee, progress has been made in this area but more needs to be done by these agencies. In tight budget times, this kind of oversight is critical to making certain that our Federal dollars are not wasted and the large investment of Federal resources in these modernization projects are accomplished efficiently and effectively.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is a well-crafted and responsible bill and deserving of every Member's support.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2942, the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992.

I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] and the rest of the subcommittee for an excellent bill.

Since joining the committee I have found a new appreciation for the difficult work of the committee which must try to maximize the utility of every Federal dollar.

The bill reflects the excellent work of its members and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

At this point Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, as I know the gentleman is well aware, last October Congress enacted legislation requiring the Secretary of Transportation to develop and implement a system of manned auxiliary flight service stations to supplement the service of the 61 automated flight service stations which FAA plans to establish. These stations are to be located in areas of unique weather or operational conditions which are critical to flight safety. The FAA was to report to Congress within 180 days after enactment on the plan and on the schedule for implementa-

tion of these auxiliary flight service stations.

However, this date has been moved to October of this year so the FAA might have sufficient time to thoroughly research the various issues surrounding the establishment of these auxiliary stations.

While I am sure it is the case, I would like to know, Chairman LEHMAN, if there are sufficient funds provided in this legislation to pay for the development and implementation of the auxiliary flight service station program, and to continue operations of existing flight service stations at current levels while the auxiliary program is being established?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. LIGHTFOOT, the Subcommittee on Transportation has provided the necessary funds in this bill to address the planning and implementation needs of the auxiliary flight service station program for fiscal year 1992. The subcommittee has also provided sufficient funds to continue the operation of existing flight service stations at their current level while the auxiliary program is being developed and implemented.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I thank the distinguished chairman for his response.

I am concerned, that with the FAA's report to Congress on the auxiliary flight service station program not expected until the end of October—which is close, hopefully, to the end of this session—and considering the FAA's past history of promptly closing stations when Congress is not in session, and remarks by FAA officials having referred to the auxiliary program as pork barrel politics; that again FAA may start closing stations or cut back service before implementation of the auxiliary plan begins. As a pilot myself, and frequent user of the flight service station system, I can say with confidence that such a move would be devastating, as well as potentially dangerous.

It is my hope the subcommittee will continue to closely monitor the FAA's actions in this regard while the auxiliary flight service station program is being planned and implemented.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. As I have indicated, this appropriations bill provides sufficient funds to the FAA to both keep existing stations open and operating, and to continue the planning and implementation of the auxiliary program. You can be sure that our committee will monitor FAA to ensure that both of these directives are carried out.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee for his encouraging remarks on this matter. My colleagues should know

that Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. COUGHLIN have contributed an enormous amount of time and effort to this issue. Their diligent work on behalf of the general aviation community is appreciated.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank personally these gentlemen for the courtesies they have extended me as a new member of the committee, as well as encouraging remarks on this matter.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2942, which is the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies appropriations bill.

On a personal note, let me say how pleased and proud we are to have the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] back in the saddle handling legislation. He has provided tremendous leadership in this issue, and it is welcome to have him back on in this position.

This provides \$13.6 billion in discretionary budget authority, and \$31.7 billion in discretionary outlays. I am pleased to report that the bill is \$3 million below the level of discretionary budget authority, and \$1 million below the outlays as set forth by the subdivision for the subcommittee, so they are well within the allocations provided by the Committee on Appropriations and by the budget resolution.

Now, this is the last, as pointed out by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, this is the last of the appropriation bills to be taken up by the House. I want to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and to thank his ranking member as well as all the subcommittee chairmen and their ranking members, because every one of these appropriations bills has been within the targets established in the caps established by the budget resolution and the budget agreement.

These subcommittees have had to make tough choices. It is not easy to operate within the limits that are provided here.

I want to commend them for the choices they have had to make in trying to stick within the boundaries established by the resolution. My hope is that the other body does exactly the same thing in terms of adhering to the discipline that was established here, because the subcommittees have not only stayed within the caps and with the caps and within the allocations, but they have also stayed within the walls that were established by the budget agreement.

I have to express my concern about what I read that the Senate, or the other body is attempting to try to break some of those walls when it

comes to particular priorities they think are important. We have to stick not only within the caps, but we have to stick within the walls that were established by the resolution.

I want to commend the Committee on Appropriations, and in particular now, commend the chairman of this subcommittee for the work that has been done here in adhering to the budget resolution and completing all these appropriations bills in time, so that we adhere to an appropriate schedule in the House of Representatives.

Hopefully, the other body will do the same thing.

I rise in support of H.R. 2942, Department of Transportation and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. This is the last of the 13 annual appropriations bills to be considered by the House.

The bill provides \$13.627 billion in discretionary budget authority and \$31.799 billion in discretionary outlays. I am pleased to note that the bill is \$3 million below the level of discretionary budget authority and \$1 million below the outlays as set by the subdivision for this subcommittee.

Because this is the last of the appropriations bills to be taken up in the House, I want to pay particular thanks to the chairman of the full committee and the ranking member, and to all of the chairmen and ranking members of the subcommittees for adhering to the cap established by the budget agreement and the budget resolution. The subcommittees have had to make tough choices within the constraints established by the resolution. My hope is that the other body will exhibit similar discipline so that we can conclude all of the appropriations bills by October 1.

I look forward to working with the Appropriations Committee on its other bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,

Washington, DC, July 22, 1991.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Attached is a fact sheet on H.R. 2942, the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 1992, scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, July 24, subject to a rule being adopted.

This is the thirteenth regular fiscal year 1992 appropriations bill to be considered. The bill is \$3 million below the discretionary budget authority 602(b) spending subdivision and \$1 million below the outlay subdivision. I hope this information will be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,  
Chairman.

[Fact Sheet]

H.R. 2942, Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, Fiscal Year 1992 (H. Rept. 102-156)

The House Appropriations Committee reported the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1992 on Thursday, July 18, 1991. Floor consideration of this bill is scheduled for Wednesday, July 24, 1991, subject to a rule being adopted.

COMPARISON TO THE 602(b) SUBDIVISION

The bill, as reported, provides \$13,627 million of discretionary budget authority, \$3 million less than the appropriations subdivision for this subcommittee. The bill is \$1 million below the subdivision total for esti-

mated discretionary outlays. A comparison

of the bill with the funding subdivision follows:

COMPARISON TO DOMESTIC SPENDING ALLOCATION

(In millions of dollars)

	Transportation and related agencies appropriations bill		Appropriations Committee 302(b) subdivision		Bill over(+)/under(-) committee 302(b) subdivision	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Discretionary	13,627	31,799	13,630	31,800	-3	-1
Mandatory <sup>1</sup>	537	540	537	540		
Total	14,164	32,339	14,167	32,340	-3	-1

<sup>1</sup> Conforms to the budget resolution estimates for existing law.  
Note.—BA—New budget authority; O—Estimated outlays.

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

Following are the major program highlights for the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 1992, as reported:

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS  
(In millions of dollars)

Department of Transportation	Budget authority	New outlays
Coast Guard operations	2,484	1,987
Coast Guard acquisition, construction and improvement	365	40
Federal Aviation Administration:		
Operations	4,342	3,821
Facilities and equipment	2,470	494
Research and engineering	218	131
Airport improvement programs (obligation ceiling)	(1,900)	304
Amtrak	649	579
Northeast Corridor Improvement Program	36	7
Urban Mass Transportation Administration:		
Formula grants	1,600	521
Interstate transfer grants	150	3
Washington Metro	124	2
Discretionary grants (obligation ceiling)	(1,900)	49
Federal-aid highways: (obligation ceiling)	(16,200)	2,950

□ 1330

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ROWLAND].

Mr. ROWLAND. Mr. Chairman, at this time I wish to engage the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] in a colloquy regarding the W.H. Barron Airport in Dublin, GA.

Mr. Chairman, as we have discussed recently, the W.H. Barron Airport in Dublin, GA, is seeking assistance from the Federal Aviation Administration in order to complete an instrument landing system. Local and State officials have already installed two-thirds of the system; the glide slope is the only component lacking. Unfortunately, the FAA has indicated to airport officials that they will only fund the glide slope if Congress directs them to do so.

Consequently, this project has come to a standstill. We are planning to ask this request to be put into some Senate language, and I would hope that when this comes over in conference, that the gentleman will consider favorably the

Senate provision. The completion of ILS would further enhance safety and provide more diverse economic development in our area.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I appreciate the gentleman bringing this request to our attention. Unfortunately, there was not enough time to consider it in the subcommittee itself. The subcommittee is sensitive to the need to improve safety at smaller general aviation airports.

I will assure the gentleman if this item is presented in conference that it will receive every possible consideration.

Mr. ROWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much and thank him also for the opportunity to bring this to the attention of the body.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee chairman whom we all admire and respect greatly and I am delighted to have him in his position of leadership once again.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope we could have a colloquy. On pages 123 and 124 of the committee report, the committee explains its rationale for not providing additional funding for improving Amtrak's travel time between New York and Boston. I understand the committee's position and I appreciate especially the fact that the committee withheld funds without prejudice.

Is it the understanding of the chairman that if some of these concerns are addressed, that the committee would consider supporting funds for high-speed rail between Boston and New York?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, although the committee has concerns about this project, the gentleman is correct that if some of those concerns are addressed, the committee will certainly consider future funding for this project, as the gentleman said, without prejudice.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that, because it is my understanding that we are on the way to answering some of

the questions. For example, while fiscal year 1991 funds had not been obligated by Amtrak at the time the gentleman had the hearings, they have obligated I believe \$140 million now and they are putting out requests for proposals for the remaining funds.

Would the chairman agree that this particular question could be resolved if Amtrak shows it has committed its fiscal year 1991 funds?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is certainly correct. The concern over the unobligated balance for this project would be resolved if Amtrak shows the funds have been obligated.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I thank the chairman.

Let me just say finally that I understand also the concern about the hidden costs of lines not owned by Amtrak, and it is my hope those will be resolved shortly. Some of these costs will be required to repair and upgrade lines for any rail traffic, not just high-speed rail. For example, one large repair item, the Peck Bridge in Connecticut, which our colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], has been working very hard on, might be financed through other funding sources.

Would the chairman agree that this concern could be resolved if we could find some alternative funding sources for the major projects on the non-Amtrak lines?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the committee is concerned that the total Federal cost of the project is not well understood at this time. To the extent that non-Federal funds are involved, that concern would be resolved.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that, and I look forward to working with the chairman to resolve these issues so we can move ahead.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my chairman and ranking member, both of whom are a pleasure to work with on this subcommittee, and the staff on the subcommittee on both

the majority and the minority side are also equally pleasurable to work for and work with. They are very open people on the staff who understand the transportation needs of this country and understand it very well and take care of those transportation needs in a very efficient manner.

Because I do not have a whole lot of time, Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out one thing in this bill that some of the Members on my side are very concerned about that have been brought up especially in discussions this morning and the rest of this week, and that is the new intermodal bill that is coming out of the Public Works Committee in the House and soon to come to the floor.

I just want to point out that you do not need a new tax for this Subcommittee on Transportation Appropriations to take care of many of the needs in this bill. We are going to spend in this bill about \$16 billion on the transportation needs of this country, and we are only going to take in about \$12 billion in receipts to the Treasury from the gas tax. This tells me that if you prioritize spending properly, and our Appropriations Committee tries its best to do that, then a lot of money will be available without having to raise taxes. We need to prioritize our spending in this country, and this bill is an example of prioritizing spending.

I want to just touch on one local issue that is vital to the Houston area. I represent Houston. We have had a tremendous controversy in Houston over its monorail project.

In my nearly 13 years of public service, I have never seen an issue divide a city more than the monorail plan has divided Houston. I have fully researched this monorail plan. I have spent countless hours with the opposition, with proponents, with the staff of Houston Metro. My conclusion is that this particular plan does not fit the needs of Houston. Houston, as many of you know, is a very dispersed and decentralized city. At the present time, it cannot support a huge rail system. It cannot raise the ridership. Indeed, the numbers of Metro show that most of the riders on the rail plan for Houston would come out of buses or walk to the rail system, thereby not relieving congestion.

Houston Metro's own numbers as far as relieving air pollution problems show that this rail system will have less than 1 percent of an effect on clean air in Houston. So therefore we are going to spend a lot of money obligating—and this is the most important part, obligating local taxpayers dollars to operate and maintain a system that will not carry anybody and will not significantly affect congestion in Houston.

Houston is a futuristic city. We have a plan for our future as it pertains to transportation like no other city in

this Nation. We have more transit ways being built or on the planning boards than any other city in this Nation. We are the first city and one of the few cities that bring all transportation authorities together participating in the projects. We have ongoing research that ultimately will result in a traffic management system unlike any other city in this country.

We are the cutting edge of technology. The vast majority of Houstonians feel that we do not need monorail technology in Houston, that we need a combined mobility plan, a plan that we have developed in 1989 that included a small rail segment, but overall it is a mobility plan, a plan designed to fit the lifestyle of Houstonians, not designed to force the lifestyle of Houstonians to fit into rail.

Now, we are trying to build a consensus and bring the community back together. We are going to work very hard on that to bring the community back together on a consensus, on a mobility plan for Houston.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee, the chairman, and the ranking member, for supporting Houston in the past and look forward to their support in the future.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON].

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

I rise in support of the legislation and want to express my great pleasure and pride in seeing my colleague, when I was first a freshman up here, and he was also a freshman.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORNTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. There is not much left of the class of 1973.

Mr. THORNTON. I want to congratulate Chairman LEHMAN for his leadership and courtesy, which has been acknowledged.

I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Chairman, an idea which I believe to have considerable merit has been advanced which would allow the Administrator of the FAA to make agreement with not more than four aviation magnet secondary schools, chosen at his discretion. These agreements may include funds from which schools could acquire equipment, books, and supplies. In addition the Administrator may make agreements with not more than 25 educational institutions to assist in the operation of affiliated summer camps where aviation training will be carried out.

The cost of these aviation training activities would be modest, as the program would be intended only to provide seed money to help develop aviation training opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, these funds would allow the FAA to assist in the training of workers to help keep our aviation industry competitive in the world marketplace.

The FAA may have the discretion to enter into these agreements already under Public Law 101-516, section 317, however if report language, perhaps from the other body, were to make clear such authority and ensure the Administrator of the appropriateness of this activity would you anticipate any objection from the House conferees?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORNTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON] that if this item is presented in conference, it will receive every possible consideration.

Mr. THORNTON. I thank the chairman.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to look at the bill in terms of some of the things which were in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, particularly the authorization cycle. I would note the committee has come in below the fiscal 1992 authorization amount. So from that standpoint we certainly do appreciate it.

I am somewhat concerned, however, that in a couple of areas the committee has exceeded the authorization in particular programs. For example, the committee is \$1.951 million above the authorized amounts in the advanced computer area and is \$688,000 more than the authorized amounts in the aircraft safety area.

I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania might be able to tell me why the subcommittee exceeded the authorizations in those areas and whether or not something might be able to be done in the future to correct those particular problems?

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have the information on those particular items available to me right at the moment. I would be happy to work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania to examine those at a later time.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. As I say, the committee had done a commendable job sticking within the authorizations, in the totality;

the amount of funding for FAA R&D is certainly within the authorized amounts. It was in particular programs where there are a couple of problems. I would appreciate an opportunity maybe to try to work that out in the future.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Generally, these reflect the budget requests, so I would want to check that out.

Mr. WALKER. OK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

Mr. FROST. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee chaired by the distinguished floor manager, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, has, for the second consecutive year, provided capital funding in support of the construction of the DART rail project in Dallas. It is important to note, Mr. Chairman, that the federally funded rail line is one of three light rail lines to be constructed simultaneously by DART at a total cost of \$803 million, of which only \$160 million, or 20 percent, is being requested from the Federal mass transit program. The sales tax which Dallas area voters levied upon themselves for transit improvements will finance the remaining 80 percent of the cost to construct the 20-mile, three-line starter system.

While the light rail system is under construction DART will also be developing a commuter rail line, constructing HOV facilities, and making additional improvements to its bus operations at an additional cost of \$518 million, of which 65 percent will be totally funded with local money. Thus, of a total transit improvement program of \$1.3 billion, the citizens of the Dallas area will finance 76 percent of the cost while seeking only 24 percent from the Federal transit programs.

In order to maximize the available local resources as well as to minimize the size of its Federal transit funding requests, DART has energetically pursued opportunities to acquire rights-of-way as they become available, and to study, design, and construct fixed guideways and related projects with its own local funds. It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that such practices are in keeping with both the initiative of Transportation Secretary Skinner to encourage localities to overmatch the Federal investment in transit improvements in our urban areas, and with the interest by many in Congress to see Federal funds used as an increment of the total financing package for major infrastructure projects.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida, is it not the position of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee to encourage the practice of overmatching Federal transit funds with local funds in order to encourage the selection of cost-effective

projects at the local level, and to increase the availability of limited Federal funds for more projects throughout the country?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FROST. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. Local money certainly talks when it comes to allocating Federal funds.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I would further like to inquire of the gentleman from Florida: Given the fact that agencies like DART can realize substantial savings in construction time and cost through the timely acquisition of property as well as through the planning, design, construction, and procurement of facilities and equipment for transit improvements with local funds in advance of requesting or receiving any Federal funds, and given the tremendous amount of overmatch funding that DART is providing for its transit projects, is it not the position of his subcommittee that such actions should not be viewed as prejudicial to the process promulgated by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration [UMTA] to evaluate proposed major mass transit capital investments?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. The gentleman is properly stating the committee's position.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his consideration.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I take this moment to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] for the most responsible and well-crafted bill. I particularly want to point out to my colleagues the point on boating safety which is so important particularly to the people of Florida, and also thank the gentlemen for including in their support the tunnel project in the Intracoastal Waterway in my district, which is tremendously important.

I also most specifically want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida, my friend BILL LEHMAN, on his wonderful recovery and tell him he is certainly to be congratulated. BILL, you are showing the same determination in your recovery that you do in crafting legislation, and the Congress is certainly pleased to see you well and back in the saddle.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 2942, the transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. This legislation contains many fine provisions, but there are two provisions in the bill which I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention.

The first provision is a \$35 million appropriation for the recreational boating safety pro-

gram as authorized by the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971. These funds will be used primarily to help enforce boating safety laws and to expand boating education programs. As co-chairman of the congressional boating caucus, I endorse this worthy expenditure, and commend the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee for including it in its bill. Of course, boaters have already paid for this appropriation by paying the tax on motorboat fuel, excise taxes on sport fishing equipment, and import duties on fishing tackle and yachts to the aquatic resources trust fund.

As my colleagues will recall, last year was a dismal year for our American boaters. This particular program went unfunded, Congress imposed a so-called boat user fee for which boaters will receive no additional services from the Coast Guard, and, as well, a new luxury excise tax on boats. I am pleased that our Nation's boaters are finally getting something back through this program, considering the huge amount of taxes they pay.

The second provision is a tunnel that would be constructed under the Intracoastal Waterway in Fort Lauderdale, FL, called the 17th Street tunnel project. I am enthused that the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee has included \$6 million in this bill for this much-needed project.

This is the third year in a row that the House has included funds in its annual transportation bill for the 17th Street tunnel project. I am extremely gratified that this project finally seems to be coming to fruition. Of course, I have not been alone in my efforts to realize this project—many Government officials, as well as private citizens, have been crucial in lending their support and guidance to this project. Florida Department of Transportation District Secretary, Rick Chesser, and the 17th Street Advisory Committee Chairman, Ralph Marrinson, as well as numerous other individuals, have been instrumental in assisting this project. I appreciate their time and hard work.

Most of all, I appreciate the efforts of the distinguished chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, the Honorable BILL LEHMAN of Florida. Congressman LEHMAN has already left his mark on transportation policy in this country, but perhaps nowhere more noticeably than our home State of Florida. I am proud to serve with him in Congress, and look forward to working with him for many years to come.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Florida and the subcommittee he chairs has again crafted an excellent piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yea" on H.R. 2942.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I offer my deep thanks to the chairman and ranking member and the members of the Transportation Subcommittee for their excellent work in putting this bill together. If it is not piling on, Mr. Chairman, I want to add my expression of respect and relief for your being back in the harness after going through your recent battle. We are all glad to see you here.

You have been extremely helpful in dealing with the needs of the State of Colorado and the Denver metropolitan area, in particular the continued funding for the construction of the new Denver airport. As you well know, this will be a major factor in relieving pressure on the entire national aviation system. Airport construction is proceeding on schedule, under budget, and I believe will be shown to be an excellent investment of Federal AIP dollars.

The committee has also been most gracious in supporting many important highway projects in the Denver metropolitan area, particularly in unsnarling the intersection of Interstate 25 and Interstate 70, where we are making important safety and efficiency improvements, as well as other major highway projects in the greater Denver area. We certainly appreciate very much the support the committee has shown.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

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

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to bring to the attention of the body, since the gentleman from Colorado had mentioned the Denver airport, that the General Accounting Office, at the request of several members of Congress, I being one of them, are now investigating whether or not there are serious problems, safety problems, weather problems, financial problems, and other problems.

□ 1350

So, as this bill goes through, let there be no misunderstanding that the body is not sanctioning this airport as the perfect airport. We are waiting for the General Accounting Office to come back with its objective, nonpartisan, bipartisan analysis, and then at that time we will look at it. If they say it is a fine airport, that would be one thing. If they say there are some serious problems, then the body may have to deal with this issue by voting on it and looking at it in a very close way, in a way they have not looked at it before.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] yielding to me.

As the gentleman knows, we have welcomed this inquiry. The issues raised have been subjected to scrutiny before, and we are sure they will stand up to it again.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the

distinguished gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee.

I would first like to commend the gentleman for his excellent leadership on this measure. As the gentleman knows, northwest Ohio is the third largest rail hub area in the United States and has one of the highest traffic density rail segments in the country. Because of these characteristics, the area has been hit hard by a number of rail-related deaths. The State of Ohio ranks second in the number of accidents at railroad crossings. Six railroad corridors in northwest Ohio have been designated to be of high priority for further study, to alleviate the safety problems, and help economic development. Is it the gentleman from Florida's understanding that the railroad corridor studies included in the report accompanying H.R. 2942, are CSX-East Toledo/Oregon; CRC-Airline Junction West; CSX-Perrysburg; NS-Maumee; NS-Oregon; and CRC-Vickers to Stanley Yard-East Toledo/Northwood?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is correct.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] for his assistance and commend him for his efforts on the entire bill.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the bill that we have before us today has \$1 million for preliminary engineering of an important project in Orlando known as Orlando Streetcar or as OSCAR. The OSCAR downtown trolley project marks the beginning of a new era in transportation in central Florida. Orlando's growth alone will result in a ten-fold increase—from 7,000 to 70,000—in downtown employment by the year 2000, a problem that cannot be realistically addressed with increased bus service alone. The OSCAR project will significantly improve mobility in the city's downtown core, keeping an estimated 1,400 cars off downtown streets, and giving Orlando office workers an attractive alternative to using their cars. It will also promote economic growth downtown, particularly for the retail industry. OSCAR will further demonstrate the vital role of mass transit to the downtown business community.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the total estimated cost of the project is \$27.2 million, with total Federal funding requested to be \$15.1 million over the next 4 years. This represents a very high level of local matching funds, including some private sector participation. Additionally, I would like to point out a very unique

component of OSCAR in that its operating expenses will be derived solely from revenues generated by city-owned parking facilities, thus requiring no Federal general revenue operating subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is extremely significant, and, if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] would let me engage him in a colloquy, I would just like to ask him a question to confirm the fact that his understanding is the same as mine, and that is under this unique Orlando project OSCAR the operating costs will not be incurred by the Federal Government, that the \$1 million in the future request the city has made of the gentleman's committee is only for construction costs. The operating costs would come from parking revenues, and it is unique in that regard.

Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is correct.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I think that is very important, for us to have a project that does not have the operating costs paid for by the Federal Government.

I also want to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] if it is his understanding currently, in the preliminary stages of the project, that until such time as the project is fulfilled, we are just beginning this process at the present time on construction, as I understand it, with what is in the bill today. We were not coming to the gentleman for additional operating expenses. My understanding is, though, we will be coming back for future building and construction costs.

I ask the gentleman from Florida, "Is that your understanding, Mr. Chairman?"

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, let me assure my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], that the subcommittee is aware that this project and several others are still in early stages and that we will be hearing from the gentleman in order to help him in all possible ways.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] back today. He looks in good form, and we appreciate being yielded the time for this very important project in my city.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill and want to draw attention to the aviation R&D portion of H.R. 2942. I realized that the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee

had a limited authorization, and I am pleased that they were able to be more generous with this important program than the administration's request. I only wish that we could put more of the earmarked tax dollars that the air traveler pays toward the purpose for which they are intended. That purpose, of course, is upgrading the national air traffic control system and funding the research that will make the system function more safely and efficiently in the future.

The Federal Aviation Administration is a nonstop high technology business that is allowed no mistakes. Outside of a war, the largest full-time, real-time Government operation in the world is the FAA air traffic control system. Even the U.S. Post Office, which is larger, takes holidays.

The current version of the national air space plan, which provides both for system upgrades and aviation research began in the early 1980's. It has had many critics and supporters. It was intended as a dynamic plan. The resulting flexibility has been the source of its success as well as a source of some difficult stages. It also has suffered from underfunding. Ironically, there was, on May 30 over \$15 billion in the airport and airway trust fund, and less than half of that is allocated to the R&D and capital programs for which it was raised. This fund is created by many, and it must be protected if Congress is to keep faith with the airline passenger and the aviation industry. To keep that faith, we really should give the airline passenger the system for which he and she has paid.

The \$218 million appropriated through this bill for aviation research and development does fairly well in supporting the short-term R&D needs of our national air traffic control system. It does little, however, to address the long-term problems facing the system. There is a major need for modernization of communications and data systems. This need will only increase as the skies grow more congested. If we provided the funding for an automated airport surface detection system, we could dramatically reduce the risks of repeating the recent tragic ground collisions that occurred at the Los Angeles and Detroit airports.

We are paying a stiff penalty in increased risk by not accelerating safety research for other parts of the system as well. I realize that you can waste money when programs grow too quickly, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology carefully considered how much additional funds the system could absorb efficiently. Our conclusion was that an increase of up to \$40 million could easily be absorbed during the coming fiscal year.

Therefore, while I give my wholehearted support to this bill and the research program the committee has recommended, I hope that the House con-

ferrees on this legislation will remember FAA R&D if any possibility of increased funding presents itself later in the legislative process.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises in support of H.R. 2942.

Mr. Chairman, this Member would begin by commending the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], the chairman of the subcommittee, as well as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], the ranking member of the subcommittee, for their assistance in expediting this legislation.

This appropriations bill represents a significant and much needed investment in our Nation's transportation system. The bill takes into account the overall needs of the Nation as well as addressing local and regional transportation concerns.

Specifically, this Member would like to thank the committee and subcommittee for recognizing the need for a bridge between Niobrara, NE, and Springfield, SD. Since 1927, numerous attempts have been made to improve this transportation corridor through the construction of a bridge. However, due to a variety of reasons—including the Depression and World War II—this important project has not materialized. This Member would also like to note that contrary to a recent Congressional Quarterly article on the House transportation appropriations bill, this interstate bridge is indeed, formally and actually, the top interstate bridge priority for both Nebraska and South Dakota.

This Member would also like to thank his distinguished colleague from South Dakota, Mr. JOHNSON, for his outstanding assistance to this Member on behalf of this bridge project. The completion of this bridge will play an important role in facilitating an interdependence between communities in Nebraska and South Dakota and Mr. JOHNSON deserves recognition for the important role he has played in bringing this goal closer to reality.

It is important to note that in addition to the obvious economic benefits of this project, the bridge will also help to improve medical care for certain Indian tribes in the area by reducing the driving time to the Indian Health Service facility in Wagner, SD.

This Member also wishes to express his appreciation for the report language which urges priority status for grant applications for a number of airports including Nebraska City and York, NE. This action will help ensure quality air service for these communities.

This Member would like to briefly explain the circumstances which necessitate this indication of priority in the

committee report on this legislation. Prior to construction of the airport in York, this Member made the case that the runway should be of such length to handle the larger multiengine and jet aircraft of businesses vital to the economic development of the area. This approach, however, was not approved by Nebraska's Department of Aeronautics or the FAA. Now, year after year, the community's needs are frustrated by the priority system which does not elevate this project high enough to receive approval. Unfortunately, the Nebraska Department of Aeronautics and the FAA have been unresponsive to the community or the congressional delegation on this important matter. This Member very strongly urges and requests that the FAA re-evaluate this runway extension request and, if necessary, overrule the rating or rating system of the State agency, thereby beginning the runway extension project with a portion of Nebraska's existing allocation of Federal funds for fiscal year 1992.

Second, this Member would like to point out the need for an increase in the land acquisition grant to facilitate the construction of an adequate airport for Nebraska City. An increase is necessary so that sufficient funds will be available for buying all the FAA-approved parcels, even though appraisals may ultimately be higher than initially planned due to court challenges of the initial land appraisals. When such a supplemental grant is approved, it would be understood that any funds not necessary for land acquisition should be directed toward the airport's runway and other approved construction elements.

Nebraska City does not currently have a city-owned municipal airport. As a result, the city has been leasing an airstrip. However, this airstrip does not meet the city's current needs and the community recognizes the necessity of constructing a municipal airport. Following an elaborate site selection process, a site was selected approximately 4 miles south of Nebraska City.

The Nebraska City Airport Authority is requesting a supplemental grant of an amount not to exceed \$200,000. Without a grant increase, the scope of the airport project would be greatly limited and would only allow for a much shorter runway than will eventually be required—a duplication of the problem now experienced at the airport in York, NE, about which this Member commented just a few minutes ago. For this reason, an increase in Nebraska City's grant amount from fiscal year 1992 funding is needed to facilitate the construction of an adequate airport.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, H.R. 2942 is a step forward in addressing the current and future transportation needs of the United States; therefore, this Member urges

his colleagues to support the legislation.

□ 1400

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] on another job well done. And, to also join with my colleagues in saying to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], these have not been easy months for him, but we appreciate his fortitude and perseverance.

There are two items in the bill I would like to give some attention. One is the \$35.5 million which the committee has appropriated for improved instrument landing systems. Some \$1 million of that amount will wind up in Louisville's Standiford Field Airport, which I am proud to represent, and will help with our airport improvement program.

The second item I would like to mention is the \$15.1 million in the bill which is the fiscal year 1992 portion of the letter of intent signed by the FAA of \$126 million for the full improvement program at Standiford Field.

I want to thank the chairman for having put in those two programs for Standiford Field, but also to thank both of my friends for a job well done for transportation throughout this Nation.

Mr. BACCHUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for this Transportation appropriations bill and my appreciation for the time my colleague from Florida, Mr. LEHMAN, and his subcommittee have devoted to its formation. I recognize the burden that has been placed on my colleague from Florida as the number of requests coming before his subcommittee continues to grow.

Mr. Chairman, the city of Orlando and its downtown business community have developed a new and unique transportation system—the Orlando Streetcar [OSCAR] in downtown Orlando. The subcommittee chaired by Mr. LEHMAN has provided first-time funding in support of preliminary engineering for this project. As you probably know, Central Florida is growing at such a rate that buses and other conventional modes of transportation are gradually becoming ineffective and unreliable. The growth and increasing congestion in Orlando alone make reliable, efficient mass transit a critical necessity. OSCAR, although a small project, is the first step toward developing a vital new mode of public transportation in central Florida, and could well serve as an example for future transit systems in downtown areas across the country. This 1.7-mile light rail system, linking the major activity and employment centers in downtown Orlando, will improve mobility and increase the quality of the downtown area.

OSCAR also will demonstrate how transit systems can work without being a continuing

burden on the taxpayer. The entire operating and maintenance costs of the system are covered through parking fees collected in the downtown. This is a responsible approach to financing mass transit that can work well in other urban settings. Also, OSCAR has a considerable overmatch compared to most transit projects, with a 50 percent Federal/50 percent local sharing compared to the 80 percent/20 percent match required in the recently released highway reauthorization bill. OSCAR is clearly an excellent investment.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2942, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for fiscal year 1992. This is the 13th and final regular appropriations bill to come to the floor this year. The Appropriations Committee has worked with great determination to pass all of the appropriations bills before the August district work period. With passage of the Transportation bill, the committee will accomplish that considerable feat.

Mr. Chairman, I join all of my colleagues in hailing the return of the chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee, the honorable gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN]. I congratulate Chairman LEHMAN for his outstanding work on this bill under very trying circumstances. BILL LEHMAN has proven the old adage that you can't keep a good man down, and he has come back from illness to produce a bill that is fair, balanced, and good for America. Welcome back, BILL, and congratulations on a job well done.

I would also like to acknowledge the dedicated efforts of my dear and wise friend, the ranking Republican member of the Transportation Committee, the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN]. LARRY COUGHLIN has worked tirelessly on this legislation, and his contributions have been enormous. I would like to express my gratitude to LARRY and to all members of the subcommittee for their good work.

Mr. Chairman, the Transportation appropriations bill provides for the development of our highways, the safety of our flyways, the protection of our seaways, and the continued strength of our railways. In short, this bill provides the resources necessary to sustain our national transportation system. It protects the free flow of commerce; empowers Americans to exercise their right to travel; and enhances national security.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to note that the bill as reported is within the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. The subcommittee is to be commended for conforming to the terms of last year's budget agreement. This has been a difficult task, but the subcommittee has done its best to maximize the benefits to be derived from a very limited pool of resources.

The bill includes \$16.6 billion for programs of the Federal Highway Administration. This amount, \$16.3 billion of which represents a limitation on obligations from the highway trust fund, is an important contribution to this country's surface transportation system. The Federal Government has a multibillion dollar investment in our Nation's highways; this appropriation helps protect that investment and further improve roadway systems from coast to coast.

The bill also includes \$7 billion for the programs of the Federal Aviation Administration. Because of fiscal constraints, the committee was unable to fully fund the administration's request for FAA facilities and equipment at the full level of the administration's request. Nevertheless, the appropriation of \$2.47 billion—\$231 million less than requested by the President—does represent an increase of \$374 million over the fiscal year 1991 level. The committee looks forward to working with the Department to ensure that these resources are used as efficiently as possible to conduct an orderly acquisition program.

The bill contains funding for many other critical government programs, including: \$3.5 billion for the U.S. Coast Guard, \$3.8 billion for the Urban Mass Transit Administration, \$253 million for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and \$794 million for the Federal Railroad Administration. This latter appropriation includes \$504 million for grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corp., better known as Amtrak. This funding level compares to an fiscal year 1991 level of \$475 million and an fiscal year 1992 budget request of \$330 million.

Mr. Chairman, I observe with disappointment that a provision of the report accompanying the bill notes that no funds are provided for the implementation of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990. Mr. Chairman, the House has spoken loudly and clearly on the issue of CFO implementation. During consideration of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill just last month, this body voted 341 to 52 to remove a provision prohibiting implementation of the act. Throughout the Federal Government, there is a need for better and more uniform audit procedures, accounting mechanisms, and budget controls. Congress has enacted the CFO Act to satisfy that need, and we should move with dispatch to provide the resources necessary for its implementation. I trust that this matter will be resolved satisfactorily in conference. But in any event, I wish to clearly state my understanding that nothing contained in the bill or report will operate to prevent the Department from seeking to allocate resources for CFO implementation through ordinary reprogramming procedures.

Again, I wish to commend the subcommittee for its excellent work and encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2942, the Transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992.

The bill appropriates \$14.2 billion in fiscal year 1992 for the Department of Transportation and related agencies, including the Coast Guard, the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA], the Federal Highway Administration [FHA], the Federal Railroad Administration [FRA], and the Urban Mass Transit Administration [UMTA]. The total appropriations in this bill are \$1.2 billion above the fiscal year 1991 funding level, but \$941 million less than the request by the Bush administration.

I want to commend the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, BILL LEHMAN, and the members of the subcommittee for reporting a measure which responds to our Nation's urgent transportation needs. I am particularly pleased that the bill includes a significant increase over last year's

bill in funding for various mass transit programs administered by UMTA. The mass transit provisions in the bill specifically reject the administration's position of seeking to terminate capital and operating assistance for large urban mass transit systems, such as the Metropolitan Transit Commission [MTC] in Minnesota which serves the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. Mass transit operators in our Nation's large urban centers cannot continue to indefinitely absorb operating cost increases due to a reduced national commitment and cannot continue to pass on such costs by raising fares without seriously reducing ridership on public transportation. As ridership decreases, congestion on streets and highways increases along with its associated reductions in air quality. Assisting large public transit systems represents a sound policy choice.

H.R. 2942 also provides \$370 million for the Federal Highway Administration [FHA] in fiscal year 1992 and authorizes the release of up to \$16.3 billion from the highway trust fund for Federal-aid highway grants, motor safety grants, and highway-related safety grants. In Minnesota, safety grants are used to assist the Minnesota Department of Transportation in improving railroad crossings throughout our State and to improve the safety of highways in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, as well.

I am also pleased that H.R. 2942 provides \$8.9 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA], including authorizing the release of up to \$1.9 billion from the \$7 billion airport and airway trust fund. Following the last reauthorization of the trust fund when Congress gave local airport operators the authority to levy new passenger facility charges [PFC's] for capital improvements, it is encouraging to see that we will finally begin to spend down some of the large surplus in this trust fund which is meant to be used to finance such capital improvement projects at our Nation's airports. As the Nation's airways become more crowded with aircraft and passengers, the pressure has increased to improve the aviation infrastructure.

H.R. 2942 also includes funding for the Department of Transportation's Research and Special Projects Administration [RSPA], which includes the Federal Office of Pipeline Safety. I have had a longstanding interest in the regulatory activities of the Office of Pipeline Safety [OPS], which is responsible for overseeing the administration of the Hazardous Liquid and Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Acts. Both of these laws are currently in the process of being reauthorized in the Energy and Commerce Committee. OPS currently has 16 pipeline safety inspectors and is planning to hire 5 additional safety inspectors before the end of this year. When these new pipeline safety inspectors are hired, the Office of Pipeline Safety will have 21 inspectors along with its 5 regional chiefs. Along with the granting of interstate agency status to State pipeline safety programs, such as Minnesota, this will strengthen the Department's ability to conduct hazardous liquid and natural gas pipeline safety inspections.

Finally, the bill provides \$504 million for Amtrak operating and capital grants, a modest increase above the fiscal year 1991 figure. Of significance to Amtrak workers and retirees,

the bill also appropriates \$145 million for payments on behalf of Amtrak to the railroad retirement trust fund and the railroad unemployment insurance account. The payments reflect mandatory contributions which Amtrak as a rail carrier must make to these funds, but which are in excess of the actual benefits received by current and former Amtrak employees.

I urge my colleagues to vote for final passage of H.R. 2942, which addresses the urgent demands of our national transportation system.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Coast Guard appropriation bill. The honorable chairman, Mr. LEHMAN, and the ranking member, Mr. COUGHLIN, have done an outstanding job of providing the funding for the Coast Guard needs.

#### OPERATING EXPENSES

This appropriations bill will allow the Coast Guard to:

Sustain the current level of effectiveness in the interdiction of drugs.

Focus operations to protect fisheries resources in the Gulf of Mexico, the Pacific Northwest, and New England.

Improve this Nation's ability to respond to oil spills.

Significantly upgrade our Nation's vessel traffic systems.

Serve its critical role in our Nation's defense, just as it did in Desert Storm.

Most of all, this appropriation will provide for improved housing, better training, basic medical care, and more adequate housing for the men and women of the Coast Guard.

#### AC&I

I want to work with Chairman LEHMAN to consistently invest in the Coast Guard's future. We must provide the dedicated men and women of the Coast Guard with safe, modern, and efficient ships and aircraft.

I would ask the chairman to take a second look at the Coast Guard's housing needs in Puerto Rico. This project will be funded below the amount the Coast Guard has asked for.

This bill will improve this Nation's transportation infrastructure with new or improved vessel traffic services.

This bill will allow the Coast Guard to begin to build a new fleet of ocean-going buoy tenders. These new ships will replace 50-year-old buoy tenders. This acquisition must move forward without delay.

This bill provides \$20 million of the \$29 million authorized for the replacement of the Commandant's command and control aircraft. This aircraft played a critical role in responding to the Persian Gulf oil spill. The command control aircraft is over 20 years old, and I can tell you from personal experience, it is imperative that we replace this plane.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

This bill will allow the Coast Guard to continue to clean toxic waste sites in Elizabeth City, NC, Traverse City, MI, and Kodiak, AK, as well as other sites.

#### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

This appropriation will initiate research and development programs to meet the requirements of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 and continue development of navigation and communications systems to improve the national transportation infrastructure.

I congratulate the Appropriations Committee on its outstanding effort to support the Coast Guard.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in support of H.R. 2942, the fiscal year 1992 Transportation appropriations. I support the initiatives included in this legislation and look forward to its passage.

I am particularly excited about one provision in this bill that will provide \$10 million for the establishment of an ASR-9 radar at Walker Field Airport in Grand Junction, CO. Walker Field, the third busiest commercial airport in Colorado, had over 85,000 aircraft operations in 1990. As the largest airport between Denver and Salt Lake City, Walker Field is the backup airport for, and receives diverted aircraft over nine regional airports, including Denver's Stapleton and the Salt Lake City airport. The airport has experienced sustained growth of over 6 percent over the past several years.

Mr. Chairman, the Grand Junction ASR-9 radar system has been ranked by the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] as the highest rated proposal in the Northwest Mountain Region. The FAA has recommended funding for this proposal for the past several years.

I wish to express my appreciation to the committee for its hard work. I look forward to the implementation of this proposal and urge my colleagues to support this carefully crafted bill.

Ms. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] for his outstanding work in putting together the Transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992.

In the midst of shrinking budget authority and an array of competing demands, the chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee worked hard to set priorities for this Nation's transportation budget that will ensure the effective use of the limited funding available. This era of tight budgets places severe pressures on the Appropriations Committee to make tough decisions and at the same time address vital local needs. During this difficult time, we are indeed blessed to have a chairman with the discipline and vision to meet this challenge.

In particular, I want to thank Chairman LEHMAN for his assistance in addressing an issue of great importance to Westchester County. Residents of Westchester County are being bombarded on almost a daily basis by aircraft noise caused by flights arriving at La Guardia Airport. The chairman agreed to include language that will bring relief to the community by directing the Federal Aviation Administration to upgrade its flight directional equipment at La Guardia and take any other steps necessary to redirect flights over Long Island Sound—instead of Westchester County. The committee report also directs the FAA to expand its study of the noise impacts of the expanded east coast plan to include the entire New York metropolitan region, including Westchester County and Fairfield County in Connecticut.

I also want to compliment the chairman for his sensitivity to the transportation needs of smaller communities. In particular, the chairman's support for the development of intermodal facilities will provide a vital founda-

tion for the economic development of many communities. Chairman LEHMAN recognized the importance of these projects and found the funds necessary to get them off the ground.

In light of Chairman LEHMAN'S work in balancing this Nation's transportation needs with fiscal realities facing this country, H.R. 2942 deserves strong support from this body. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I thank the Chair.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and want to congratulate Chairman LEHMAN and his excellent staff on this complex and important legislation. At a time when our Nation's infrastructure is critically deteriorated as a result of more than a decade of neglect, this subcommittee faces a daunting challenge. This bill rises to that challenge.

Everyone in this body should know that Chairman LEHMAN has crafted a tight, streamline and effective bill. It allocates limited resources and achieves maximum impact for every dollar spent. The direct appropriations provided by this legislation is \$136,000 less than the target established by the Appropriations Committee for discretionary budget authority and \$2 million less than the target for discretionary spending.

It is true that the bill authorizes the release of \$20.2 billion from the aviation and highway trust funds for certain programs which is more than requested by the President. But the condition of our airports and highways demands that this money be released and used for its intended purpose now and not be permitted to languish in the trust fund accounts.

Last year when this bill was before the House, I emphasized the importance of infrastructure investments for impoverished rural areas, particularly in the Mississippi River Delta which covers much of my congressional district. The poorly maintained and undersized airports serving small communities have been repeatedly cited as an impediment to economic development and prosperity. The report of the federally chartered Lower Mississippi River Delta Development Commission underscored this need.

The absence of adequate airport and air industrial park facilities will continue to hinder the efforts of rural areas to attract growth industries which generate jobs and income. We must have the vision to realize that investments in these projects will invigorate our communities and our economy and—consequently—create taxpayers who will return tax revenues to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out three important airport projects in my congressional district to which the committee has to assign priority status. Improvement of the Jonesboro, AR, Municipal Airport continues to be a priority for the committee. Within the past few years, the Federal Aviation Administration has commissioned an automated flight service station at the Jonesboro Airport which provides critical weather and navigational aid information to aviators throughout the State.

Another example of the growing importance of the Jonesboro Airport in the northeast quadrant of Arkansas, which has been recognized by the FAA, is the agency's commitment to commission an instrument landing system at this facility. With the growing need for a re-

liever airport to serve as an alternate landing site for nearby Memphis International, continued upgrading of the runways and equipment at Jonesboro must be pursued.

The committee has, therefore, established the review and consideration of an application for runway extension and strengthening at Jonesboro Airport as a priority.

The committee has also recognized the importance of continued airport development in the cities of Stuttgart and Melbourne in order to facilitate economic expansion and growth. In Melbourne, airport construction now underway is critical to the retention of the McDonnell Douglas facility, a major employer which produces components for the MD-80 commercial aircraft.

An application is also pending to rehabilitate portions of the airport in Stuttgart, AR. Stuttgart is the site of a major food processing industry and a center of agribusiness activity in this region of the delta. Approval of this funding will continue the progress of the Stuttgart area in attracting and serving industrial clients and creating jobs for its citizens.

Mr. Chairman, it has become an unfortunate custom in the Congress to use appropriations bills as scapegoats for the deficit crisis in which the Nation finds itself today. Yet, it is an unassailable fact that the Appropriations Committee has recommended more than \$175 billion less than Presidents have requested. Appropriations Committees do not write, nor do they determine fiscal policies which are related to the deficit—and it would be penny wise and pound foolish to attempt to balance the budget on the back of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, if America is to enter the 21st century prepared to continue the economic leadership and preeminence it has enjoyed in the 20th century, we must have the foresight to make the investments required to insure our prosperity in the future. The public policy which is embodied in this measure will carry us forward toward that goal.

I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to raise several points about H.R. 2942, the Department of Transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. LEHMAN, for his consideration of my request to assist Amtrak and the town of Willimantic, CT, in constructing a train station in Willimantic. Amtrak recently announced that the Montrealer train would stop in the town of Willimantic if a station is constructed there. I would also like to express my concern about the inadequate funding level for the tremendously successful Northeast corridor project and, in particular, the New York to Boston improvement project to reduce the New York to Boston travel time to 3 hours or less.

Mr. Chairman, as many know, Connecticut and the New England States are facing a very serious economic crunch. These two projects not only will provide much needed economic development opportunities for the region, they will each afford much needed public transportation options to people who have no other means of public transportation in eastern Connecticut, New England, and the rest of Amtrak's east coast routes to New York, Boston, and Washington. In addition, these two

projects, establishing a station in Willimantic and continued funds for the New York/Boston route are very important to Amtrak. Both will lead to increased ridership and, more importantly they will encourage more people to leave their cars and make public transportation a part of their lives.

With respect to the Willimantic station, Mr. Chairman, I want to give a little history of the effort to establish a train station in Willimantic, CT, for the popular Amtrak Montrealer train.

In 1987, when Amtrak discontinued the Montrealer train from Washington, DC, to Montreal, Quebec, because of poor track conditions in Massachusetts, residents of eastern Connecticut contacted Amtrak encouraging them to reinstate the train on an alternate route through eastern Connecticut with a station stop in New London. We joined those urging Amtrak to establish a station stop in the town of Willimantic.

In 1989, the Montrealer train was reinstated on the alternate route through eastern Connecticut with the station stop in New London. This route was intended to be "on a temporary basis" while Amtrak determined whether track repairs could be done on the original route.

In January 1991, Amtrak announced that track work in Massachusetts will not be done and that the eastern Connecticut route will become permanent. Amtrak also indicated that it intended to establish a station stop in Willimantic, CT, if a station is completed.

Since that time, the town of Windham, which includes Willimantic, has been working very closely with Amtrak, the Central Vermont Railroad, which owns the tracks that are to be used, the regional planning agencies, the University of Connecticut, Eastern Connecticut State University, other nearby towns, and private groups to find a suitable site and develop a plan for a station to accommodate the Amtrak Montrealer.

As Amtrak will attest, ridership on the alternate route with the station stop in New London has been very strong, especially considering the short time that the route has been in service.

The construction of a station and a station stop in Willimantic can provide significant additional ridership potential for Amtrak, and will offer considerable benefits to the people of northeastern Connecticut, who have no other public transportation options. The Willimantic stop can serve the college communities of the University of Connecticut, with a student body of more than 20,000, and Eastern Connecticut State University, with a student population of more than 4,500. The Montrealer station in Willimantic can also provide the over 200,000 residents of Windham and Tolland Counties with the only public transportation alternatives to Vermont, Massachusetts, New York, and the remainder of the Montrealer's scheduled stops.

I would like to thank the chairman and the members of the committee for including language in the committee report identifying Willimantic as a priority for the committee. By recommending that Amtrak work closely with State and local officials on this Willimantic station, the committee has set the groundwork for establishing a station stop in Willimantic. As a result of recent meetings, Amtrak, the town of

Windham and others have agreed that the best strategy for this station stop will be to establish a test run and stop for the Montrealer train in Willimantic. By doing this, in a year, Amtrak will be able to evaluate the ridership numbers and determine whether a permanent station stop should be established.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned about the future of the Northeast corridor improvement project, particularly the New York to Boston project. As my colleagues know, the Northeast corridor is perhaps the most successful train route in the Nation. Hundreds of thousands of people take the Amtrak passenger trains to New York and Boston and this has become tremendously important to the people of eastern Connecticut. For many, Amtrak is the only public transportation available. The necessity to continue the work on the New York to Boston route is crucial.

As my colleagues also know, Interstate 95 between Boston and New York through New Haven, Bridgeport, New London, and Providence is one of the most heavily traveled stretches of road in the Nation. Improving the Amtrak route could profoundly reduce the volume of cars on this already oversaturated road and could significantly improve the air quality of the region, which because of highway traffic, is out of compliance with the Clean Air Act.

It is clear that increased funding is necessary for this route. In this Nation, we must make a commitment to mass transportation. As most European nations have, we must make a commitment to our passenger rail systems, especially in those areas like the Northeast corridor, where ridership is strong and where passenger rail can make a difference in the economies, the environment, and the quality of life. I urge my colleagues in the committee and the Congress to reevaluate this project and restore the necessary funds to it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the fiscal year 1992 Transportation appropriations bill.

Just yesterday, the Public Works and Transportation Subcommittee, on which I serve, ordered reported to the full committee H.R. 2950, the highway/transit Federal aid reauthorization bill, covering the next 5 years.

We have nearly completed the Interstate Highway System begun in 1956 and are now in the position of having to redirect our highway dollars into the rebuilding of our entire transportation infrastructure. Our roads and bridges are in a desperate state of disrepair, and many are unsafe at any speed, so to speak.

In the next 2 weeks, we will continue and redouble our efforts to pass new Federal-aid highway/transit legislation that will bring us into the 21st century as a viable, competing nation making a long-deferred investment in public works at the State and local levels. It is our intent to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure, to improve upon it through the use of new technologies, and to revive the economic development potential of the entire country.

While the bill does not include funding for many of the new authorizations about to be enacted by this House for transportation purposes, this bill is still of immense importance to West Virginia and the Nation.

This bill appropriates \$14.2 billion in fiscal year 1992 for the Coast Guard, Federal avia-

tion, Federal highways, the Federal Railroad Administration, and the Urban Mass Transit Administration. The total of appropriations reflects an increase of \$1.2 billion more than in fiscal year 1991. However, the bill authorizes the release of \$20.2 billion from the aviation and highway trust funds which, combined with the bill's direct appropriations, provides a total of \$34.4 billion for transportation in fiscal year 1992. This combination brings the new spending to \$3.5 billion more than current funding levels for these programs.

The bill provides for major increases over current levels for several important transportation programs, including an 18-percent increase for mass transit, 12 percent for Federal highways, and 12 percent for aviation programs.

For highways alone, the bill contains a total of \$16.3 billion released from the highway trust fund for Federal-aid highway grants, motor safety grants, and highway safety related grants, for fiscal year 1992.

For mass transit, a subject of overriding concern to me, the bill appropriates \$1.9 billion for mass transit programs under UMTA, and it authorizes the release of \$1.9 billion from the mass transit account of the highway trust fund. This is a combined total of \$3.8 billion for mass transit in fiscal year 1992.

For Federal aviation programs, this bill appropriates \$7 billion for the FAA in fiscal year 1992 and authorizes the release of up to \$1.9 billion from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund for airport planning and development grants. This combines to make a total of \$8.9 billion available for aviation projects in fiscal year 1992, reflecting a \$992 million increase of last year's total.

Essential air services is of great importance to West Virginia and to my congressional district. The bill authorizes the release of up to \$39 million from the airport and airway trust fund for essential air services, which go for payments to subsidize airline service to smaller communities. This amounts to \$12 million more than last year's funding level. While none of these funds can be used to add new communities or flight destinations under the Essential Air Service Program, or to increase service levels to communities currently participating in the program, it is still of huge importance that EAS not only be continued but that it receive increased funding to assure airline service to and from small communities.

Essential air services came about due to deregulation of the airline industry by Congress several years ago. It was created to ensure that small communities would not lose air service entirely as a result of deregulation. Five communities in West Virginia will benefit under this EAS appropriation, two of which—Beckley and Bluefield—are in my Fourth Congressional District.

As West Virginia continues its struggle toward economic stability by broadening its industrial base and strengthening its tourism industry, EAS subsidies continue to be critical to its success in these efforts.

The increase contained in this bill helps allay my fears that began with previous reductions in EAS payments—and that fear was that the administration would bring enough pressure to bear to totally eliminate EAS from FAA programs. Such action on the part of

Congress would constitute a serious setback for West Virginia and other States, made up entirely of small communities, in their continuing efforts to assure access to air transport for their people.

FAA operations overall, in this bill, are funded at increased levels, for air traffic control, safety, and airport expansion efforts.

Last but not least, Mr. Chairman, is funding in the bill for the Federal Railroad Administration, set at \$794 million in fiscal year 1992. This reflects a slight decrease from current year funding but not as much a decrease as that requested by the President.

Specifically, the bill funds Amtrak at \$504 million, reflecting a small increase of \$29 million over last year's level. The bill also appropriates \$145 million for payments on behalf of Amtrak to the Railroad Retirement Trust Fund and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Account.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2942, the fiscal year 1992 Transportation appropriations bill.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, this appropriations measure contains one of the most shortsighted deletions of high-technology funding that I have seen in many a day. As the ranking member of the Transportation and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I have worked long and hard to assure that emerging transportation technologies, such as magnetic levitation, are given proper attention and support in the Department of Transportation and elsewhere.

After all, mag-lev is one of the most energy efficient and environmentally benign forms of transportation. It can move thousands of people at hundreds of miles per hour with no diminution in air quality. How many other modes of transportation can you name where neither the powerplant nor the fuel supply has to be carried on board the vehicle? Yet that is what mag-lev systems achieve through use of remotely sited electrical generation.

We are supposed to be looking at a balanced and comprehensive transportation policy to take us into the 21st century. And we are also in the midst of implementing the sweeping mandates of last year's clean air legislation. Against that background, who can fathom an appropriations measure that deletes virtually all funding for mag-lev activities?

The Appropriations Committee's report simply dismisses mag-lev as a technology with dim prospects. I suppose that could have been said of the airplane, the internal combustion engine, and many other technological advances. It is especially penny wise and pound foolish to do this when our congested airports and crumbling highways are inflicting a huge competitive handicap on the American economy.

Mag-lev offers the prospect for replacing the most inefficient, short-haul air routes that congest our airports with reliable, all-weather, environmentally benign systems. That prospect alone would be worth the small public investment of \$11 million that the administration asked for.

We need to look ahead, not backward, to a balanced, efficient transportation system that enhances—not diminishes—our national competitive posture. That means trains—including

mag-lev trains—and planes, and automobiles. All have a role to play, and this appropriations measure epitomizes the medieval approach to scientific progress: If I don't understand it, I must kill it. Let us hope that the final measure produced in conference will be more worthy of at least the 20th century, and preferably the 21st.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2942, the Transportation Department appropriations for fiscal year 1992. I commend Chairman JAMIE WHITTEN, distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, for his outstanding work in producing a bill that addresses the needs of this Nation's transportation system.

I would also like to thank my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Representative BERNARD DWYER, for his work on the Appropriations Committee, and Chairman WILLIAM LEHMAN, the distinguished chairman of the House Subcommittee on Transportation.

This bill appropriates \$14.2 billion in fiscal year 1992 for agencies in the Transportation Department that include the Coast Guard, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, and the Urban Mass Transit Administration.

I am especially enthusiastic about H.R. 2942 because of its support of the transportation system in New Jersey. Most of the items of interest that pertain to New Jersey greatly enhance my district, especially my hometown of Newark, NJ. One particular item of interest to my constituents is the New Jersey urban core project.

In this bill, the committee has provided a total of \$65 million for a project that will enhance the rail system that connects and serves the New Jersey urban core.

These enhancements include the Secaucus Transfer—Allied Junction rail transfer extension, the Newark-Newark International Airport-Elizabeth rail line, the Hudson Waterfront Connection fixed-guide-way system, and an extension to the Newark city subway.

These particular items are important because they ease the strain on the commuters and the New Jersey residents who utilize the multifaceted public transportation system. The urban core project will provide the elderly and the disabled with a more accessible and more efficient method of travel.

H.R. 2942 will help connect the State of New Jersey by expanding the transportation system to meet with the growing needs of its residents.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the projects outlined in the Transportation Department appropriations bill are of great concern to my constituents in the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2942

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

are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
IMMEDIATE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For necessary expenses of the Immediate Office of the Secretary, \$1,435,000.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. PENNY

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PENNY: Page 2, line 7, strike out "\$1,435,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,324,000".

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I have several similar amendments, all applicable to title I. The amendments deal with the administrative accounts in several executive offices: The immediate Office of the Secretary on page 2, line 7; the immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary, page 2, line 10; the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs, page 2, line 22; the Assistant Secretary for Administration, page 3, line 8; the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, page 3, line 13; and the Office of Commercial Space Transportation, page 5, line 1.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there are several of those accounts that I do not have any particular knowledge of, but I do have knowledge of the Office of Commercial Space. The gentleman is taking about half the cut he anticipates out of that particular office. I think that I would want a separate vote on that particular issue and see if the gentleman would take that particular one out of his unanimous-consent request. I would be glad to have him bring up the rest, but I would want a separate issue raised on the Office of Commercial Space.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] remove that amendment from the en bloc request?

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I do not see any other Member that wants to separate out another item, and if that is the only one that we would separate out, I would accede to that request and ask that the other five amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the remaining amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. PENNY: Page 2, line 10, strike out "\$550,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$449,000".

Page 2, line 22, strike out "\$2,726,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,605,000".

Page 3, line 8, strike out "\$30,262,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$29,152,000".

Page 3, line 13, strike out "\$1,546,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,514,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota that these five amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, since I do not have a copy of the bill or the amendments in front of me, the amendment read by the Clerk included everything that was in the gentleman's presentation except for the commercial space transportation. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct in that statement.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment en bloc I offer with my friend BYRON DORGAN, would reduce the level of increase for six administrative and management-related accounts within the Transportation Department appropriation bill before us today. The committee-reported bill provides for increases in the range of 11 to 33 percent for these administrative accounts. By limiting the increase in spending in these accounts to 9 percent, which is the level of increase in the overall bill, we save about \$2 million.

The measure before us provides for a 33-percent increase for the immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary of Transportation, a 25-percent increase for the Office of Commercial Space Transportation, an 18-percent increase for the immediate Office of the Secretary of Transportation, a 15-percent increase for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs, a 13-percent increase for the Assistant Secretary for Administration, and an 11-percent increase for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Public Affairs.

These increases are out of line with the level of increase in the overall bill—9 percent, but the increases for these management functions at Transportation are also greater than the increases, already appropriated, for other Government agencies and departments. The Treasury Department is slated to receive a 7.9-percent increase for management, the Labor Department has been appropriated a 9.1-percent increase for next fiscal year, the Education Department will receive a 9.3-percent increase, HHS has been appropriated a 10-percent increase. Interestingly, the Executive Office of the President itself will only receive a 1.3-percent increase and our House-passed legislative branch appropriations bill provided for less than a 4-percent increase for the U.S. House of Representatives.

So what gives? Why does the Secretary of Transportation need big increases in his budget? Maybe it's for travel; the bill before us provides for an

increase of 200 percent in the Secretary's travel budget.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment we offer is fair: It's in keeping with the overall increase in the bill, it is in line with increases for several other departments and agencies, and it is more than enough to accommodate routine and official needs of the Secretary of Transportation and his principal deputies. It also saves the taxpayers over \$2 million at a time we are asking Americans to accept cuts in Government programs and services.

I urge support for the Penny-Dorgan en bloc amendment. It's the right thing to do.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of mischievous amendment which is a personal affront to the current Secretary of Transportation. While having the appearance of sending a symbolic message, in fact it would do serious harm to the good relations enjoyed today between the Congress and Secretary Skinner, for no real purpose. Particularly with major transportation-related legislation being considered this year, maintaining those relationships are vital.

Let me point out to the Members that the committee's recommendation for Office of the Secretary salaries and expenses represents a cut of \$17.7 million—22 percent—from the budget request. In total, the recommended increase for all 15 offices is only 9 percent—just what the gentleman's amendment assumes is reasonable. The committee has fairly allocated an overall 9-percent increase. Some offices have more than 9 percent, and some have less. The request has been strongly scrubbed already.

These amendments would only reduce \$2,029,000 from the bill, which is only a fraction of 1 percent of the amounts included in the bill. If austerity were the objective, the gentleman should support this bill, rather than waste the House's time in this manner. The bill is within the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation.

The committee recommendation is based on extensive hearing data—almost 200 pages of questions and answers in our hearing record which I would invite any Members to review. The gentleman offers no contrary evidence that these funds are not needed. The amendment is arbitrary and unfounded in fact.

As always, if individual Members experience problems in dealing with departmental officials, we are ready to work with you to resolve the problems. But let's not resort to hurting innocent parts of the department for no constructive purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge that this amendment be defeated.

□ 1410

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for the chairman of the committee. I think he does wonderful work. I come here today not to challenge him nor his work, but to raise some questions with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] about the kind of increases that were allowed in this appropriations bill, particularly with respect to the Office of the Secretary. We are talking about an account here that is around \$40 million in total, with a number of subparts.

We spend a lot of time here hearing that people on this side of the aisle are always the big spenders. It is alleged that people over here always want to spend more and more and more of the taxpayer's dollars.

Then I take a look at this appropriations bill, and I see that a Cabinet Secretary has an 18-percent increase approved by the Committee on Appropriations for his immediate office, which is about \$1,400,000; a 33-percent increase for the immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary; and the Assistant Secretary, with a 14-percent increase; Assistant Secretary of Public Affairs, 11-percent increase.

Well, I think these increases are pretty generous. I do not understand this. It seems to me it is well above what a lot of my friends who say we ought to hold expenses and costs down would generally think is a reasonable yearly increase.

The chairman of the subcommittee surely cannot mean that this is truly a mischievous amendment, as he suggested, or that it is a personal insult. It is not meant to be a personal insult to the Secretary of Transportation. It is, I think, an effort by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] to say look, let us take a look at the nuts and bolts of some of these, and ask who are the conservatives and who are the liberals.

Are we going to apply the same standards across the board here? Do we want 18-percent increases and 12-percent increases and 14-percent increases?

Mr. Chairman, if I might, let me ask a question of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN]. I noticed in the newspaper a couple of weeks ago that the Secretary of Transportation is taking flying lessons, and it costs more than \$40,000, with instructions from Government pilots charged to the Government. When asked about that, the Secretary said that he was one of only 65 Department officials who participate in that program.

The question I raise is, Do we have a program down there at DOT which is supported in these appropriations bills, and by which we are funding flying

lessons for a lot of executives of the Department of Transportation?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with the specific article to which the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] refers. There are over 100 pilots in the Department, most of whom are in FAA. They are needed to check out the adequacy of our navigational aids. These personnel are essential to aviation safety.

I do not know about the specific personnel to which the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] is referring. I might add that, in my opinion, the present Secretary of Transportation is about the best one I have worked with yet. I think he is the best one most Members of Congress have worked with yet. I would not want to hinder the Secretary.

Let us give the Secretary a chance to implement the programs to the best of his ability, and not take away the budget he needs to do it.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think Secretary Skinner is a fellow who has done a pretty good job in a lot of areas. He has been a little slow on some rules and regulations that I would like to see him work on down there, but, overall, my assessment is that Secretary Skinner is someone who has done a pretty good job. But that does not mean that we have to be offering 18-percent, 33-percent, 14-percent, 13-percent increases in the bureaucracy and in the offices of people that head all these programs.

Mr. Chairman, I think the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] were right on point. When we talk about holding some of these costs down, it seems to me this is a good place to take a look at holding some of it down. It might be an object lesson for us to take a close look at some of these things in the future.

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify something that was an understanding of mine. Is there someone in the Secretary's office who wrote a letter to the editor you have sought to get fired in that office?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, no, that is not true. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] have information about that?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I do have some information, that there was a letter written by a young staffer in the Secretary's office that the gentleman called the Department on about

three occasions about, and that on one of those occasions, the gentleman actually suggested that that person be fired, and that the Secretary has refused to do that.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, let me reclaim my time. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] does a tremendous disservice by coming to the floor to talk about something he knows nothing about.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I am asking the question, because that is information I received.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the time is my own. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is completely misinformed. Let me just say, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] wants to come to the floor to talk about things he does not know anything about, he ought to do it on somebody else's time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The subcommittee, on a bipartisan basis, has very carefully considered these accounts. It has gone into great length in hearings to look at each one of the requests from the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a department that is engaged in a new national transportation plan, developing with the Congress new surface transportation legislation, implementing a national air space plan, and some very, very important activities.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of that, the subcommittee, on a bipartisan basis, unanimously, and without any concern or dispute on the subcommittee, agreed to the funding for these offices.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a gross miscarriage to strap that agency at a time when it is engaged in such important work for the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, it is also important to point out that Secretary Samuel Skinner has indeed been a hands-on Secretary. It is important that Secretary Skinner have the ability to operate in our air system, so that he can have the firsthand knowledge that comes from being a pilot. That is important, because we want the Secretary and the people in our departments to have that kind of knowledge about the system. Certainly this Secretary has been one of the great, active Secretaries we have had at Transportation. I would certainly hope that this amendment would not be adopted and hamstringing the Department.

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I just want confirmation on the percentages that we have used. The ranking member does not dispute that the increase

for the immediate Office of the Secretary is 18 percent?

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, that is not the question. These requests and these figures came before the subcommittee on a bipartisan basis. They were approved on a bipartisan basis, because the Department is engaged in very important activity in the fields of aviation, surface transportation, and safety. Certainly we would not want to jeopardize either the safety of the American traveling public or the ability of this Department to manage our various transportation systems.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate that. Then we are not disputing the numbers here, the percentage increases. The dispute is between the committee's position that these levels of increases are needed to perform these tasks.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, there was a need for these funds. That is why the committee, on a unanimous basis, adopted these figures. The committee felt that these were needed in the interest of a good transportation system, a safe transportation system, and a transportation system important to all of the people of our country.

□ 1420

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

I first want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member on the splendid job they have done on the aviation portion of the funds included in this appropriation bill. They have kept faith with the authorizing committee and with the agreement that we struck last year on spending levels and investment in the future of aviation, and I greatly appreciate the work the committee has done. They have been very astute and very responsive to the needs of aviation now and in the future.

I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY]. I do think it was inappropriate and unnecessary for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] to raise the point that he did about the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN]. I did not think that contributed beneficially to the debate. There are other reasons; there are substantive reasons to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota.

First of all, the Secretary of Transportation has undertaken enormous responsibilities at the direction of Congress in legislation enacted last year in the Aviation Security Act of 1990. They are far reaching, they are of vital importance to Americans who travel abroad by air, and the Secretary has undertaken the responsibilities we have given him in that law with great

seriousness of purpose and great dispatch. We in fact today in the Aviation Subcommittee have been holding a hearing since 8 o'clock this morning on the way in which that act is being implemented, and I must say that the Secretary, the Department, the FAA have carried out their far reaching responsibilities with commendable concern and professionalism. And also, if one looks at that act, the number of rulemakings required is very considerable and requires an enormous amount of staff time at the secretarial level as well as at the level of the FAA.

Second, aviation trade has been a matter of very great significance, responsibility for which is vested in the Office of the Secretary. We have had a number of negotiations on aviation bilaterals which are of very serious economic consequence and have required the active participation from the Office of the Secretary which has unique responsibilities under the law for management of our vast and very complex multibillion dollar aviation trade sector.

Third, in the legislation soon to reach the floor, the Surface Transportation Assistance Act, there will be new responsibilities which the Secretary is anticipating in the area of intermodalism. The Committee on Public Works and Transportation will be asking the Secretary to undertake a great deal of coordination among several modes of transportation for the benefit and efficiency of the total U.S. transportation system. That will require additional work in the Office of the Secretary, for which the funding will be needed.

With respect to the matter of the Secretary flying, it was mentioned that there have been flying lessons for the Secretary. In fairness and in accuracy, I must point out that these were flight checks, not training lessons. The Secretary of Transportation is a licensed pilot and frequently pilots FAA or DOT aircraft to various meetings that the Secretary, on official business, undertakes throughout the country. Periodically he, like any other pilot, must undergo a flight check. Those flight checks were conducted in the course of piloting an official aircraft on the way to official business. There should be no misunderstanding or misrepresentation of that responsibility of the Secretary.

While we may question whether there is an appropriate staffing level or appropriate funding level for various activities, it is important to point out that there has been no staff growth in the Secretary's budget, but a very significant increase in staffing responsibilities. I think the level of funding is appropriate, and I oppose the effort to reduce that level of funding.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment this afternoon.

First of all, I am from Illinois. Not only am I from Illinois, I am also from the city of Chicago, and so is the Secretary of Transportation. He is an individual whom I have known for a number of years. We have not always seen eye to eye on projects, or programs, or policies, but I have always been very much impressed with him in regards to how involved he is in everything that he undertakes.

I personally believe that he is the most hard-working, most dedicated, most supportive, most cooperative, most visionary member of the George Bush Cabinet. In fact, I have often said to him the only thing that stands between him being the greatest Secretary of Transportation in the history of the United States of America is the fact that he is not serving under a liberal Democratic President. Perhaps in the future we can change that around.

This amendment to me seems to be directly aimed at Sam Skinner and his immediate office in the Department of Transportation, and everything that I have said about him I believe to be true. That is why I strongly oppose this amendment.

I have worked with him, members on the Public Works and Transportation Committee have worked with him, members on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee have worked with him, and I think they would all feel, I believe they all feel the same way about him. This is a man who is always personally involved in what he is doing. His staff is always very cooperative. His staff always responds to requests by Members of the House, and I just really feel personally hurt by an amendment of this nature when it goes after an individual who I think so very highly of. And I would like to have the Members of the House who know Sam Skinner, know the operation of the Department of Transportation, to come down and express themselves to the rest of the Members of the House, and I would like to see them strongly oppose this amendment the same way I am opposing it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment that is before us today. While it looks reasonable at first blush since it would limit growth to 9 percent in this category, let me suggest to Members that it is unfortunately an unreasonable limitation.

First I want to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] and his ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] for I think a fine effort here and an excellent piece of legislation. I suggest that the work of the committee is in fact a good piece of work that we ought to endorse here on the floor.

For those Members who may not be aware of it, the U.S. Coast Guard, the committee of authorization for it which I chair on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, is within the Department of Transportation, and so I am particularly interested in this Department, and in ensuring that the Department has adequate funds to carry out its responsibilities.

□ 1430

Unlike many of our departments of government which may have large equipment purchase budgets, large procurement budgets in which it can defer some purchases, some acquisitions in order to cover needed salary increases that this Congress has already approved for Members and offices within the executive branches of government, Sam Skinner's Department of Transportation does not have such a large equipment procurement budget. On the contrary, Mr. Skinner, who I think is doing an extraordinary job in his Cabinet position for this country, operates a budget that is extremely short of those kinds of procurement items that might otherwise be deferred.

He is, nevertheless, required, as are other executive agencies, to maintain salary levels for his department personnel commensurate with other salary levels in other Cabinet-level assignments.

When you look at his budget, you find that about half of the increase is, in fact, to cover those pay raises, and the other half is to make up for some areas of shortfall with some areas that are vitally important to the administration of the transportation function in America. For example, the Committee on Appropriations depends on the Office of Budget and Programs in the Transportation Department for sound budget estimates and technical assistance. Not to fund that office would be a mistake in terms of managing this function of our Government for years to come.

The bill provides, for example, a 13-percent increase in the administration. That is primarily to fund the completion of the departmental accounting system which has begun work on other financial management systems needed to ensure the integrity of the Department's programs. In other words, it may be penny wise to cut that function, but it may be, indeed, pound foolish because of savings in financial integrity that are going to be realized in years to come.

For example, the Deputy Secretary's increase is for travel and staff support desperately needed if the Secretary is going to do an effective job of maintaining accountability in the operation of his department across this country.

When it comes to Office of Commercial Space, for example, that office was cut 20 percent in the last budget, so the increase here is simply to make up cuts we made in the past.

So while I suggest to you that a 9-percent reduction, limitation of growth, rather, may sound reasonable, when you look at it in terms of what it does in these various functions, it may be unwise for us to make those kinds of reductions in growth that are necessary in this Department.

Let me say, again, the Department of Transportation is a vitally important function of our Government, not only airlines and trains, but the extraordinary work the Department does in maintenance of the waterways of the country and support for the Coast Guard and its necessary functions in traffic safety on the waterways and in maintenance of some sort of protection against oil spills and what have you. Maintaining a sound and competent Department of Transportation is critical to all of these functions, and I would urge you, while, again, this amendment looks reasonable, look beyond it and see what impact it will have upon the extraordinary operations of this Department.

I would urge you to stay with the committee bill and to reject this amendment as, although well intended, I think unwise in its applications and to consider that, by approving the bill as the committee recommended it, there are savings down the line in financial efficiencies and budget accountabilities that are going to come to us in this Department as well as other Departments.

I would urge rejection of this amendment and for the committee to stay with the committee print.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I listened carefully to the several speakers who objected to the amendment on the basis that we were reducing the ability of the Secretary to perform his job. I listened to a long list of functions that fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation, and the argument that we somehow needed huge increases in the administrative budget of the Secretary and his Assistant Secretaries in order to carry out those functions.

Yet, it is surprising to me that we would need increases in the area of 18 percent or 25 percent or 33 percent in the executive office of this Department when the overall functions of the Department are only being increased by 9 percent.

It is also interesting to me that we would stand here on the floor of the House and argue in support of huge increases in the administrative accounts at this Department when the size of this Department's budget and the breadth of its responsibilities, frankly, do not compare with the budgets and

the responsibilities of the departments like the Department of Health and Human Services and, yet, the increase for the administrative account in that department only runs to 10 percent.

Before we get carried away with rhetoric about how we are going to crimp and restrict the ability of the Secretary of Transportation to perform the duties of his office, let us keep in mind that we have already dealt with a number of appropriations bills on this floor. In no instance have we approved administrative budget increases in the neighborhood of 15, 20, or 30 percent for those other departments and agencies. All of them ranged somewhere between 7 percent and 10 percent.

Personally, I even think in a time of huge budget deficits that those increases are tough to justify, but all we are asking in this amendment is to scale back the size of these administrative budgets to a 9-percent increase, very generous, very generous in these tight budget times.

This Department, really, I do not think, can make the case that its functions and its programs are more pertinent and important to the American public than the functions and programs in the Department of Education or the Department of Health and Human Services or the Executive Office of the President where increases are far smaller than those being slated for the Department Secretary. The increase of 9 percent is more than sufficient.

Our amendment allows for that 9-percent increase. It simply eliminates what we felt were excessive increases.

I would urge strongly that my colleagues give this amendment serious consideration and give it a vote of support.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

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

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 219]

Abercrombie	Andrews (ME)	Applegate
Ackerman	Andrews (NJ)	Army
Alexander	Andrews (TX)	Aspin
Allard	Annunzio	Atkins
Anderson	Anthony	AuCoin

Bacchus	Evans	Lehman (FL)
Baker	Ewing	Lent
Ballenger	Fascell	Levin (MI)
Barnard	Fawell	Levine (CA)
Barrett	Fazio	Lewis (CA)
Barton	Feighan	Lewis (FL)
Bateman	Fields	Lewis (GA)
Bellenson	Fish	Lightfoot
Bennett	Foglietta	Lipinski
Bentley	Ford (MI)	Livingston
Bereuter	Ford (TN)	Lloyd
Berman	Franks (CT)	Long
Bevill	Galleghy	Lowery (CA)
Bilbray	Gallo	Lowey (NY)
Bilirakis	Gaydos	Luken
Bliley	Gedjenson	Machtley
Boehler	Gekas	Manton
Boehner	Gephardt	Markey
Bonior	Geren	Marlenee
Borski	Gibbons	Martine
Boucher	Gilchrest	Martinez
Boxer	Gillmor	Matsui
Brewster	Gilman	Mavroules
Brooks	Glickman	Mazzoli
Broomfield	Gonzalez	McCandless
Browder	Goodling	McCloskey
Brown	Gordon	McCollum
Bruce	Goss	McCrery
Bryant	Gradison	McCurdy
Bunning	Grandy	McDade
Burton	Gray	McDermott
Bustamante	Green	McEwen
Byron	Guarini	McGrath
Callahan	Gunderson	McHugh
Camp	Hall (OH)	McMillan (NC)
Campbell (CA)	Hall (TX)	McMillen (MD)
Campbell (CO)	Hamilton	McNulty
Cardin	Hammerschmidt	Meyers
Carper	Hancock	Mfume
Carr	Hansen	Michel
Chandler	Harris	Miller (CA)
Chapman	Hastert	Miller (OH)
Clay	Hatcher	Miller (WA)
Clement	Hayes (IL)	Mineta
Clinger	Hayes (LA)	Mink
Coble	Hefley	Moakley
Coleman (MO)	Hefner	Molinar
Coleman (TX)	Henry	Mollohan
Collins (IL)	Herger	Montgomery
Collins (MI)	Hertel	Moody
Combest	Hoagland	Moorhead
Condit	Hobson	Moran
Conyers	Hochbrueckner	Morella
Cooper	Holloway	Morrison
Costello	Horn	Murphy
Coughlin	Horton	Murtha
Cox (CA)	Houghton	Myers
Cox (IL)	Hoyer	Natcher
Coyne	Hubbard	Neal (MA)
Cramer	Huckaby	Nichols
Crane	Hughes	Nowak
Cunningham	Hunter	Nussle
Dannemeyer	Hutto	Oakar
Darden	Hyde	Oberstar
Davis	Inhofe	Obey
de la Garza	Ireland	Olin
DeFazio	Jacobs	Olver
DeLauro	James	Ortiz
DeLay	Jefferson	Orton
Dellums	Jenkins	Owens (NY)
Derrick	Johnson (CT)	Owens (UT)
Dickinson	Johnson (SD)	Oxley
Dicks	Johnson (TX)	Packard
Dingell	Johnston	Pallone
Dixon	Jones (GA)	Panetta
Donnelly	Jones (NC)	Parker
Dooley	Jontz	Patterson
Doolittle	Kanjorski	Paxon
Dorgan (ND)	Kaptur	Payne (NJ)
Dornan (CA)	Kasich	Payne (VA)
Downey	Kennedy	Pease
Dreier	Kennelly	Pelosi
Duncan	Kildee	Penny
Durbin	Kiecicka	Perkins
Dwyer	Klug	Peterson (FL)
Dymally	Kolbe	Peterson (MN)
Early	Kopetski	Petri
Eckart	Kostmayer	Pickett
Edwards (CA)	Kyl	Pickle
Edwards (OK)	LaFalce	Porter
Edwards (TX)	Lancaster	Poshard
Emerson	Lantos	Price
Engel	LaRocco	Pursell
English	Laughlin	Quillen
Erdreich	Leach	Rahall
Espy	Lehman (CA)	Ramstad

Rangel	Serrano	Thomas (WY)
Ravenel	Shaw	Thornton
Ray	Shays	Torres
Reed	Shuster	Torricelli
Regula	Sikorski	Towns
Rhodes	Sisisky	Trafiacant
Richardson	Skaggs	Traxler
Ridge	Skeen	Unsoeld
Riggs	Skelton	Upton
Rinaldo	Slattery	Valentine
Ritter	Slaughter (NY)	Vander Jagt
Roberts	Slaughter (VA)	Vento
Roe	Smith (FL)	Visclosky
Roemer	Smith (IA)	Volkmer
Rogers	Smith (NJ)	Vucanovich
Rohrabacher	Smith (OR)	Walker
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Walsh
Rose	Snowe	Washington
Rostenkowski	Solarz	Waters
Roth	Solomon	Waxman
Roukema	Spence	Weber
Rowland	Spratt	Weldon
Roybal	Staggers	Wheat
Russo	Stallings	Whitten
Sabo	Stearns	Williams
Sanders	Stenholm	Wilson
Studds	Sungmeister	Wise
Santorum	Stump	Wolf
Savage	Sundquist	Wolpe
Sawyer	Swett	Wyden
Saxton	Swift	Wyllie
Schaefer	Synar	Yates
Scheuer	Tanner	Young (AK)
Schiff	Tauzin	Young (FL)
Schroeder	Taylor (MS)	Zeliff
Schulze	Thomas (NC)	Zimmer
Schumer	Thomas (CA)	
Sensenbrenner	Thomas (GA)	

□ 1450

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred and fifteen Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Missesota [Mr. PENNY] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind Members this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 84, noes 339, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]

AYES—84

Andrews (NJ)	Hall (TX)	Petri
Andrews (TX)	Hamilton	Porter
Archer	Hancock	Ramstad
Army	Hansen	Ray
Bennett	Hefley	Riggs
Boehner	Herger	Roemer
Broomfield	Holloway	Sanders
Bryant	Huckaby	Schiff
Byron	Hughes	Schumer
Camp	Hutto	Sensenbrenner
Carper	Jacobs	Skelton
Chandler	Kasich	Slattery
Condit	Klug	Snowe
Cooper	Kolbe	Spence
Crane	LaRocco	Staggers
Dannemeyer	Luken	Stallings
Dorgan (ND)	McCandless	Stearns
Duncan	McCurdy	Stenholm
Early	Meyers	Stump
Eckart	Miller (WA)	Swett
Edwards (OK)	Moody	Synar
Edwards (TX)	Panetta	Taylor (MS)
English	Parker	Thomas (WY)
Fawell	Patterson	Upton
Feighan	Pease	Volkmer
Fields	Penny	Waters
Gunderson	Peterson (FL)	Williams
Hall (OH)	Peterson (MN)	Zimmer

NOES—339

Abercrombie	Alexander	Anderson
Ackerman	Allard	Andrews (ME)

Annunzio  
Anthony  
Applegate  
Aspin  
Atkins  
AuCoin  
Bacchus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barnard  
Barrett  
Barton  
Bateman  
Beilenson  
Bentley  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Billbray  
Billrakis  
Billey  
Boehert  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Boxer  
Brewster  
Brooks  
Browder  
Brown  
Bruce  
Bunning  
Burton  
Bustamante  
Callahan  
Campbell (CA)  
Campbell (CO)  
Cardin  
Carr  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clement  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coleman (MO)  
Coleman (TX)  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Combest  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coughlin  
Cox (CA)  
Cox (IL)  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Cunningham  
Darden  
Davis  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Derrick  
Dickinson  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Donnelly  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dorman (CA)  
Downey  
Dreier  
Durbin  
Dwyer  
Dymally  
Edwards (CA)  
Emerson  
Engel  
Erdreich  
Espy  
Evans  
Ewing  
Fasoell  
Fazio  
Fish  
Foglietta  
Ford (MI)  
Ford (TN)  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Gallo

Gaydos  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Glickman  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Gradison  
Grandy  
Gray  
Green  
Guarini  
Hammerschmidt  
Harris  
Hastert  
Hatcher  
Hayes (L)  
Hayes (LA)  
Hefner  
Henry  
Hertel  
Hoagland  
Hobson  
Hochbrueckner  
Horn  
Horton  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hubbard  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inhofe  
Ireland  
James  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson (TX)  
Johnston  
Jones (GA)  
Jones (NC)  
Jontz  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kleczka  
Kopetski  
Kostmayer  
Kyl  
LaFalce  
Lancaster  
Lantos  
Laughlin  
Leach  
Lehman (CA)  
Lehman (FL)  
Lent  
Levin (MI)  
Levine (CA)  
Rowland  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lightfoot  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
Lloyd  
Long  
Lowery (CA)  
Lowey (NY)  
Machtley  
Manton  
Markey  
Marlenee  
Martin  
Martinez  
Matsui  
Mavroules  
Mazzoli  
McCloskey  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McDermott  
McEwen  
McGrath

McHugh  
McMillan (NC)  
McMillen (MD)  
McNulty  
Mfume  
Michel  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (OH)  
Mineta  
Mink  
Moakley  
Molinari  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Morrison  
Mrazek  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Myers  
Nagle  
Natcher  
Neal (MA)  
Nichols  
Nowak  
Nussle  
Oakar  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olin  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens (NY)  
Owens (UT)  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Paxon  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Perkins  
Pickett  
Pickle  
Poshard  
Price  
Pursell  
Quillen  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Ravenel  
Reed  
Regula  
Rhodes  
Richardson  
Ridge  
Rinaldo  
Ritter  
Roberts  
Roe  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roukema  
Rowland  
Roybal  
Russo  
Sabo  
Sangmeister  
Santorum  
Savage  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Scheuer  
Schroeder  
Schulze  
Serrano  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sikorski  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Slaughter (NY)  
Slaughter (VA)  
Smith (FL)  
Smith (IA)  
Smith (NJ)

Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Solarz  
Solomon  
Spratt  
Stark  
Studds  
Sundquist  
Swift  
Tallon  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (GA)

Thornton  
Torres  
Torrice  
Towns  
Trafcant  
Traxler  
Unsoeld  
Valentine  
Vander Jagt  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Washington

Waxman  
Weber  
Weldon  
Wheat  
Whitten  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Wolpe  
Wyden  
Wylie  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—10

Flake  
Hopkins  
Kolter  
Lagomarsino

Neal (NC)  
Sarpalius  
Sharp  
Stokes

Weiss  
Yatron

□ 1505

Mrs. ROUKEMA and Mrs. BENTLEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mr. HANCOCK changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments were rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

IMMEDIATE OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY  
For necessary expenses of the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary, \$550,000.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL  
For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, \$6,904,000.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS  
For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy and International Affairs, \$8,733,000.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR BUDGET AND PROGRAMS  
For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs, \$2,726,000, including not to exceed \$40,000 for allocation within the Department of official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS  
For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs, \$2,320,000.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION  
For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration, \$30,262,000, of which \$6,323,000 shall remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS  
For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, \$1,546,000.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT  
For necessary expenses of the Executive Secretariat, \$965,000.

CONTRACT APPEALS BOARD  
For necessary expenses of the Contract Appeals Board, \$590,000.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS  
For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, \$1,462,000.

OFFICE OF ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE  
For necessary expenses of the Office of Essential Air Service, \$1,545,000.

OFFICE OF SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION

For necessary expenses of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, \$3,527,000, of which \$2,600,000 shall remain available until expended and shall be available for the purposes of the Minority Business Resource Center as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 332: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available for the purposes of the Minority Business Resource Center in this or any other Act may be used for business opportunities related to any mode of transportation.

OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Intelligence and Security, \$1,200,000.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for conducting transportation planning, research, and development activities, including the collection of national transportation statistics, to remain available until expended, \$3,100,000.

OFFICE OF COMMERCIAL SPACE

TRANSPORTATION

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses for operations and research activities related to commercial space transportation, \$4,245,000, of which \$1,400,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this account up to \$300,000 received from user fees established for regulatory services.

□ 1510

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENNY

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PENNY: Page 5, line 1, strike out "\$4,245,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,691,000".

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment, as presented, would have reduced from 25 percent to 9 percent the level of increase in this administrative budget. The amendment was prepared to parallel the amendments offered previously en bloc, which also would have limited administrative budget increases to no more than 9 percent in next year's budget for the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Chairman, given the outcome of the previous vote, I am, frankly, tempted to offer to increase this particular budget by 9 percent since that seems to be the mood of the House today, but, rather than eat up the time of the House or my own personal time, which could be used better, I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak for a few moments with the distinguished chairman of the

subcommittee, and the distinguished ranking minority members of the subcommittee and the Government Operations Committee, about this very important topic: The implementation of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 in the Department of Transportation.

As my colleagues recall, on June 18, the House voted overwhelmingly, 341 to 52, to remove language from the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill that would have prohibited the expenditure of funds to implement the provisions of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990. In that vote of June 18 Congress spoke resoundingly that it wanted the Chief Financial Officers Act to be implemented, not only in the departments and agencies covered by that bill but in all the 23 departments and agencies covered by the act. No appropriations bills passed since that vote have included the prohibitory language.

In light of these events, the Committee on Government Operations is distressed by the language in the Transportation Appropriation Subcommittee's report that recommended that no Department of Transportation funds be spent to implement the CFO's Act. A large bipartisan group of legislators, in fact, have expressed their concern about this language and was even considering offering an amendment today to explicitly state that funds could be used for CFO Act implementation, but because of the assurances of subcommittee Chairman LEHMAN today by telephone that it is not his or the committee's intention, either in the text or report language, to in any way restrict the CFO Act implementation and we will not offer this amendment.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the cosponsor of the Chief Financial Officers Act and the ranking member of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] for yielding, and I would like to join with the chairman in his colloquy with the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], and then also with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], two very good friends who, I understand, agree with what we are trying to do here.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Transportation will benefit greatly from the implementation of the Chief Financial Officers Act. In an agency like DOT, with its strong operating components, the existence of a departmentwide CFO structure is critical to successful accomplishment of financial management improvements. And DOT acknowledges that it needs such improvements—the GAO, Congress, and

OMB have identified several areas within DOT in need of financial management reform, such as the FAA's management information system and DOT procurement activities, and the DOT has already worked out the organizational plan of its CFO structure. We want DOT to act with the knowledge that Congress supports its efforts to implement the CFO's Act.

I understand the subcommittee's concern about resources within the DOT's Inspector General Office—I have always strongly supported IG activity, as an author of the 1978 IG Act. Indeed, the IG will have a primary role in the implementation of the CFO Act. I understand the subcommittee's report language to be mostly addressed to the concern that the inspector general in DOT not be swamped with unnecessary work, regardless of the source. However, as I believe Congress recognized in its recent vote, the CFO Act has some specific requirements that are designed to bring about needed change in financial management.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], my colleague, and I would like to turn to our distinguished chairman of this subcommittee and ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] if it is his understanding, particularly in light of the recent 341 to 52 vote on CFO Act implementation in the Treasury and OMB, that nothing in this bill or its accompanying report is in any way intended to restrict the CFO Act implementation?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] for yielding, and, yes, the gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] for yielding, and I also thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my inquiry to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] is a long-standing supporter of the CFO's Act. As you know, this bill's appropriations for the Office of Inspector General in DOT will allow especially for implementation of the CFO Act's requirements of audited financial statements, which will produce usable management information for the Agency, OMB, Congress, and the public. That act will, however, create the catalyst for all kinds of needed reforms. What are some of the things that you hope the

act would accomplish within the Department of Transportation, if implemented as planned?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CONYERS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] for yielding.

As was indicated in the general debate, an agency such as DOT, with strong operating components, needs a single individual, the CFO, to be accountable for departmentwide financial management. DOT has an ambitious plan to integrate 80 divergent administrative and program financial systems into a single, integrated system. For example, as you pointed out, Mr. HORTON, the FAA lacks the kind of management information system which can track monthly obligations and expenditures. DOT financial and administrative systems constitute a high risk area, in the opinion of OMB. The act, if implemented, will not lessen the non-financial audit activity of the DOT inspector general—it will just allow for newer, deeper improvement in the financial management health of the Department. Like all the 23 departments and agencies covered by the CFO Act, DOT will benefit greatly from the CFO Act.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], my friends.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

#### WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Department of Transportation Working Capital Fund not to exceed \$85,509,000 shall be paid, in accordance with law, from appropriations made available by this Act and prior appropriations Acts to the Department of Transportation, together with advances and reimbursements received by the Department of Transportation.

#### PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

##### (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

##### (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined under section 419 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1389), as is payable by the Department of Transportation, \$38,600,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs in excess of \$38,600,000 for the Payments to Air Carriers program in fiscal year 1992: *Provided further*, That none of the funds

in this Act shall be available for service to communities not receiving such service during fiscal year 1991 or to increase the service levels to communities receiving service.

#### RENTAL PAYMENTS

For necessary expenses for rental of headquarters and field space and related services assessed by the General Services Administration, \$11,970,000: *Provided*, That of this amount, \$16,225,000 shall be derived from the Highway Trust Fund, \$29,887,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, \$481,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, and \$16,000 shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund.

#### COAST GUARD

##### OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for; purchase of not to exceed eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)); and recreation and welfare; \$2,483,800,000, of which \$30,379,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and \$35,000,000 shall be expended from the Boat Safety Account: *Provided*, That the number of aircraft on hand at any one time shall not exceed two hundred and twenty-three, exclusive of planes and parts stored to meet future attrition: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this or any other Act shall be available for pay or administrative expenses in connection with shipping commissioners in the United States: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for expenses incurred for yacht documentation under 46 U.S.C. 12109, except to the extent fees are collected from yacht owners and credited to this appropriation.

#### ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto, \$365,031,000, of which \$26,377,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund; of which \$132,700,000 shall be available to acquire, repair, renovate or improve vessels, small boats and related equipment, to remain available until September 30, 1996; \$86,950,000 shall be available to acquire new aircraft and increase aviation capability, to remain available until September 30, 1994; \$50,331,000 shall be available for other equipment, to remain available until September 30, 1994; \$62,550,000 shall be available for shore facilities and aids to navigation facilities, to remain available until September 30, 1994; and \$32,500,000 shall be available for personnel compensation and benefits and related costs, to remain available until September 30, 1992: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Transportation shall issue regulations requiring that written warranties shall be included in all contracts with prime contractors for major systems acquisitions of the Coast Guard: *Provided further*, That any such written warranty shall not apply in the case of any system or component thereof that has been furnished by the Government to a contractor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Transportation may provide for a waiver of the requirements for a warranty where: (1) the waiver is necessary in the interest of the national defense or the warranty would not be cost effective; and (2) the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House

of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives are notified in writing of the Secretary's intention to waive and reasons for waiving such requirements: *Provided further*, That the requirements for such written warranties shall not cover combat damage: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided herein for Acquisition, Construction and Improvements shall be made available for personnel compensation and benefits in excess of six hundred and twenty-one full time equivalent staff years: *Provided further*, That of the thirty-five new staff years provided in this appropriation, at least twenty-five shall be filled by civilian personnel.

□ 1520

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for taking the time to engage in this brief colloquy. I rise to draw attention to a problem that all Members have faced or may face some day if Amtrak services their districts. The problem is Amtrak's method of human waste disposal. In my district, on Wednesday, July 17, a northbound Amtrak train discharged a substantial amount of human waste, toilet paper and all, along the railroad tracks in downtown Oregon City, OR. Within hours, the stench was so bad that city crews were called to the scene to address the mess left behind. The press refers to this particular train as the pooh-pooch choo-choo.

Mr. Chairman, Amtrak provides valuable services to my district. However, this is not one of them. The residents of Oregon City deserve better treatment—Amtrak does not even stop in Oregon City. Equally offensive as the mess left by the Amtrak train is the fact that the residents of Oregon City were forced to pay for the cleanup.

In Oregon there are miles and miles of train tracks isolated from populated areas, downtown business centers, and rural agriculture. Clearly, with a little advanced planning, Amtrak could develop a kinder, gentler method of waste disposal.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPETSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the gentleman from Oregon and his constituents. Amtrak has come under increased scrutiny for its waste-disposal practices in the past several years. Amtrak has begun an aggressive research and development program and is currently testing six different systems for waste disposal on transcontinental train travel. The Congress has appropriated funds for this program. Unfortunately, it will be several years before the testing process is complete and changes can be enacted.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude my remarks by

urging Amtrak to adopt a policy to avoid, voluntarily, the dumping of human waste within incorporated areas. As you know, I was so upset over this incident that I was prepared to offer an amendment on behalf of my constituents to prohibit, immediately, the practice of discharging human waste in urbanized areas. I understand that Amtrak has apologized to the citizens of Oregon City and I also recognize the fine work of the chairman and the members of his subcommittee in going forward with retrofitting Amtrak cars. Nonetheless, I will be vigilant of Amtrak's waste-disposal practice over the next year and will bring this issue before the committee next year if necessary.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I agree with the gentleman and join you in asking Amtrak to adopt a voluntary policy of avoiding the disposal of waste within incorporated areas.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee Chair and the chairman for their leadership and cooperation on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I insert two articles on this incident for the RECORD.

CHOO CHOO POOH-POOHS ON O.C.

(By Andrew Oman)

OREGON CITY.—Amtrak doesn't drop off passengers in Oregon City, but it does drop off something else.

As it passed through Oregon City about 3 p.m. Wednesday, a north-bound Amtrak passenger train voided a toilet that discharged waste along the Southern Pacific railroad tracks near 10th Street downtown.

Within an hour, an Oregon City Public Works crew was on the scene picking up solids with a shovel and spraying the area with water.

"It is a common occurrence right now," explained Howard Robertson of the corporation's Washington, D.C. public affairs office. "It happens all across the nation."

Most Amtrak train coaches have one of two types of toilets, Robertson said. Some toilets dump the waste out of the car with each flush. Others save up the waste for 25 flushes and then dump it all at once.

"We try to instruct our passengers not to flush in the station," he said. However, he said, there is no such rule to stop flushing in urban areas.

Congress recently ordered the carrier to equip all of its passenger coaches with storage tanks—by 1996.

Robertson said the requirement was enacted after fishermen in Florida and Burlington Northern workers in Washington and Oregon complained of getting splashed by the toilets. The additions are being made as the coaches are taken off-line for service.

"It just costs too much to bring all the cars in and fix it," he said. Until 1996, he said, some number of cars will continue to dump as they roll.

"It doesn't create a health hazard—it's not that much at one time," Robertson said.

A state Department of Environmental Quality official contacted for comment Wednesday did not respond by presstime Thursday afternoon.

## AMTRAK PROVIDES "CRAPPY" SERVICE

Oregon City offers a variety of things to people who inhabit our fair city. To many of us, it is a place to live and work. For others, it's a place to learn more about the Oregon Territory's heritage.

Apparently Amtrak holds Oregon City in slightly lesser esteem. It considers us a good place to use as a toilet. And not a modern toilet at that, but more like the outhouse variety.

A member of the Enterprise Courier's editorial staff was walking on the tracks Wednesday. The tracks, owned by Southern Pacific Rail Co., run through downtown and just behind the Courier office.

An Amtrak train breezed through about 3 p.m. Our staff member stepped away from the track about 50 feet before the train went by. It was the best decision he made all week.

When he returned to the tracks, the ties were soaking wet and there was soiled toilet paper along the lines. The stench of human feces the train left behind added to the effect.

We realize Oregon City's image regionwide could use some improvement. But this community has never been described as a toilet. And we don't have to take Amtrak's ----. What can we do?

Legally, there appears to be little remedy. It's Southern Pacific's property, and they can defecate on it if they want.

But we could:

Boycott Amtrak. We're not sure how effective that would be and besides, we hate to snub our noses (pun intended) at any kind of mass transit when our highways are filled to capacity as it is.

Buy lots of tickets to Amtrak and defecate in their aisles. We could say "hey, you dump where we work." Amtrak might actually enjoy the increased ridership though. And we wouldn't want to sink to Amtrak's level.

Wait along the side of the rail lines and throw feces at the Amtrak trains as they pass by. Perhaps we're a bit too dignified for that.

Put pressure on our congressional representatives, like 5th District Congressman Mike Kopetski, to reduce Amtrak funding until it can clean up its act. Maybe convince lawmakers to cut personnel salaries and funnel the money into deodorized holding tanks that are big enough to stay closed until the train reaches a station. If all that fails, the federal government runs Amtrak and could make it clear to train operators that dumping their toilets on our cities simply won't be tolerated.

Apparently, there isn't even a company policy in place that prohibits dumping of train passenger sewage within city limits. Amtrak officials are kind enough to ask passengers not to use train toilets while at the station. That's big of them. Apparently they see some value in spreading sewage at 40 miles per hour rather than dumping it when the train is stopped.

Show a little class Amtrak. Oregon City deserves better.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

## ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the Coast Guard's environmental compliance and restoration functions under chapter 19 of title 14 United States Code, \$21,500,000, to remain available until expended.

## ALTERATION OF BRIDGES

For necessary expenses for alteration or removal of obstructive bridges, \$11,000,000, to remain available until expended.

## RETIRED PAY

For retired pay, including the payment of obligations therefor otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose, and payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plans, and for payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C. ch. 55), \$487,700,000.

## RESERVE TRAINING

For all necessary expenses for the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; maintenance and operation of facilities; and supplies, equipment, and services; \$77,000,000.

## RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law, \$27,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from State and local governments, other public authorities, private sources, and foreign countries, for expenses incurred for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

## BOAT SAFETY

## (AQUATIC RESOURCES TRUST FUND)

For payment of necessary expenses incurred for recreational boating safety assistance under Public Law 92-75, as amended, \$35,000,000, to be derived from the Boat Safety Account and to remain available until expended.

## FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development, establishment of air navigation facilities and the operation and maintenance of aircraft, and carrying out the provisions of the Airport and Airway Development Act, as amended, or other provisions of law authorizing the obligation of funds for similar programs of airport and airway development or improvement, lease or purchase of four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$4,342,000,000, of which \$2,109,625,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities and for issuance, renewal or modification of certificates, including airman, aircraft, and repair station certificates, or for tests related thereto, or for processing major repair or alteration forms: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be available for new applicants for the second career training program: *Provided further*, That, of the funds available under this head, \$2,000,000 shall be made available for the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into contractual agreement with the Mid-American Aviation Resource Consortium in Minnesota to operate an air traffic controller training program: *Provided further*, That funds may be used to enter into a grant agreement with a non-profit standard setting organization to assist in the development of aviation safety standards.

## FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

## (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for acquisition, establishment, and

improvement by contract or purchase, and hire of air navigation and experimental facilities as authorized by the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. App. 1301 et seq.), including initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; engineering and service testing including construction of test facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; and construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations of officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Administration stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available; and the purchase, lease or transfer of aircraft from funds available under this head; to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, \$2,469,500,000, of which \$682,523,000 shall be available for engineering development and related activities, to remain available until September 30, 1993; \$1,135,429,000 shall be available for the procurement and modernization of air traffic control facilities and equipment and related activities, to remain available until September 30, 1994; \$146,880,000 shall be available for the procurement and modernization of facilities and equipment not directly related to air traffic control, to remain available until September 30, 1994; \$476,768,000 shall be available for facilities and equipment mission support activities, to remain available until September 30, 1994; and \$27,900,000 shall be available for development, test and evaluation activities, to remain available until September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment and modernization of air navigation facilities: *Provided further*, That with appropriations made for the Airway Science program, as authorized below in this section, the Federal Aviation Administration may hereafter enter into competitive grant agreements with institutions of higher education having airway science curricula, for the Federal share of the allowable direct costs of the following categories of items, to the extent that such items are in support of airway science curricula: (a) the purchase, or lease with option to purchase, of buildings and associated facilities, and (b) instructional materials and equipment. Such funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated and may remain available until expended. The Federal Aviation Administration shall establish guidelines for determining the direct costs allowable under grants to be made pursuant to this section. The maximum Federal share of the allowable cost of any project assisted by such grants shall be 50 percent: *Provided further*, That the \$35,000,000 provided under this head for the precision runway monitor program shall be available only for the procurement of not less than five commissionable systems of the electronic scan (E-scan) design: *Provided further*, That for each seven-day period following March 31, 1992, that the E-scan precision runway monitor production contract is not signed, the funds made available for facilities and equipment-related personnel compensation and benefits shall be reduced by 1 per centum.

## RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for research, engineering, and development, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. App. 1301 et seq.), including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or

grant, \$218,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred for research, engineering, and development.

#### GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

##### (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for airport planning and development under section 14 of Public Law 91-258, as amended, and under other law authorizing such obligations, and obligations for noise compatibility planning and programs, \$1,520,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the commitments for which are in excess of \$1,900,000,000 in fiscal year 1992 for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development, and noise compatibility planning and programs, notwithstanding section 506(e)(4) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended, of which not to exceed \$156,564,400 shall be available for letters of intent issued prior to July 31, 1991.

#### AVIATION INSURANCE REVOLVING FUND

The Secretary of Transportation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures and investments, within the limits of funds available pursuant to section 1306 of the Act of August 23, 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1536), and in accordance with section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the program set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for aviation insurance activities under said Act.

#### AIRCRAFT PURCHASE LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

The Secretary of Transportation may hereafter issue notes or other obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury, in such forms and denominations, bearing such maturities, and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. Such obligations may be issued to pay any necessary expenses required pursuant to any guarantee issued under the Act of September 7, 1957, Public Law 85-307, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1324 note). None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs under this head the obligations for which are in excess of \$9,970,000 during fiscal year 1992. Such obligations shall be redeemed by the Secretary from appropriations authorized by this section. The Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase any such obligations, and for such purpose he may use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force. The purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include any purchase of notes or other obligations issued under the subsection. The Secretary of the Treasury may sell any such obligations at such times and price and upon such terms and conditions as he shall determine in his discretion. All purchases, redemptions, and sales of such obligations by such Secretary shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. For the settlement of promissory notes issued to the Secretary of the Treasury, \$1,200,000, to remain available until expended, together with such sums as

may be necessary for the payment of interest due under the terms and conditions of such notes.

#### FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION LIMITATION ON GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Necessary expenses for administration, operation, and research of the Federal Highway Administration not to exceed \$326,400,000 shall be paid in accordance with law from appropriations made available by this Act to the Federal Highway Administration together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Highway Administration: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$114,200,000 of the amount provided herein shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this account funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for training expenses incurred for non-Federal employees.

#### UNIVERSITY TRANSPORTATION CENTERS (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses for university transportation centers, as authorized by section 21(i)(2) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, \$5,000,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account).

#### HIGHWAY-RELATED SAFETY GRANTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND) (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 402 administered by the Federal Highway Administration, to remain available until expended, \$10,000,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$350,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available for "Limitation on general operating expenses": *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$10,000,000 in fiscal year 1992 for "Highway-Related Safety Grants".

#### RAILROAD-HIGHWAY CROSSINGS DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

For necessary expenses of certain railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects as authorized by section 163 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973, as amended, to remain available until expended, \$13,270,000, of which \$8,846,667 shall be derived from the Highway Trust Fund.

#### FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS (LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$16,200,000,000 for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 1992.

#### FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are attributable to Federal-aid highways, including the National Scenic and Recreational Highway as authorized by 23 U.S.C. 148, not otherwise provided, including reimbursements for sums expended pursuant to the provisions of 23

U.S.C. 308, \$15,100,000,000 or so much thereof as may be available in and derived from the Highway Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

#### RIGHT-OF-WAY REVOLVING FUND (LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS AND LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

During fiscal year 1992 and with the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans shall not exceed \$70,000,000. For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of section 107 of title 23, United States Code, \$40,000,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

#### MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY

For necessary expenses to carry out the motor carrier safety functions of the Secretary as authorized by the Department of Transportation Act (80 Stat. 939-940), \$48,417,000, of which \$3,579,000 shall remain available until expended.

#### MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION) (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of section 402 of Public Law 97-424 \$62,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$60,000,000 for "Motor Carrier Safety Grants".

#### BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON PARKWAY (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, to carry out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970 for the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, to remain available until expended, \$22,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to be withdrawn therefrom at such times and in such amounts as may be necessary.

#### INTERMODAL URBAN DEMONSTRATION PROJECT (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 124 of the Federal-Aid Highway Amendments of 1974, \$10,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

#### HIGHWAY SAFETY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses to carry out construction projects as authorized by Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, \$22,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

#### HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

For the purpose of carrying out a coordinated project of highway improvements in the vicinity of Pontiac and East Lansing, Michigan, that demonstrates methods of enhancing safety and promoting economic development through widening and resurfacing of highways on the Federal-aid primary system and on roads on the Federal-aid urban system, \$18,700,000, to remain available until expended.

#### HIGHWAY-RAILROAD GRADE CROSSING SAFETY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For the purpose of carrying out a coordinated project of highway-railroad grade

crossing separations in Mineola, New York, that demonstrates methods of enhancing highway-railroad crossing safety while minimizing surrounding environmental effects, as authorized by Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, \$9,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FAWELL

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FAWELL:  
Page 22, strike lines 8 through 17.  
Page 23, strike line 9 and all that follows through line 5 on page 27.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman also request unanimous consent that his amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. FAWELL. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a relatively simple one. It deletes 63 special highway demonstration projects from the appropriation bill, which would amount to a deletion in dollars and cents of \$243.3 million.

I would like to point out that the money in support of these special projects comes from the general fund and not from the transportation trust fund, and very important is the fact that there has been no authorization from any substantive committee, now or in the future, as a practical matter, inasmuch as authorizations on projects such as this only come every 4 years when the authorization bill is presented.

Thus, there has been no competitively awarded project here, as well as no authorization and no substantive committee analysis.

I think it is important to point out that many of the States, if not all of the State highway entities, take the same view as Francis B. Francois, who is referred to in a recent edition of the Congressional Quarterly. And I quote, "It," and he refers to these demonstration projects, "has become an art form, most of the projects demonstrating nothing more than the Congressman's ability to get money for his district."

□ 1530

In the pros and cons portion of that article, it says:

As much as State and Federal officials want a highway bill, they are continually frustrated by demonstration projects which allow lawmakers to push a project to the head of the priority list and distort the formulas that Congress uses to fairly distribute highway funding.

It further says, "The selection of projects should be decided by State

highway officials," quoting C.D. McGrath, Jr., acting general counsel to the Federal Transportation Department.

Mr. Chairman, I know that this represents a change in the way of doing business, so to speak, and I do not say that lightly. But I do believe that the formula for allocating transportation funds is one in which all of the various States will share, as well as can be equitably set forth. If the formula is not doing that, it certainly should be changed.

I think when we talk about special projects, we should just look at that word "special." It is special in terms of certain of our Members having a greater ability or proclivity to be able to obtain these kinds of special grants. But today, as we look and see the problems we have before us, we realize that we have not balanced a budget for 22 years in a row; that we have a \$3.2 trillion national debt; that we spend \$500 billion per year just to pay interest on that national debt; and that even after all of the work that was done in regard to the deficit reduction act, which many of us felt was far from perfect, we are still going to see \$5 trillion of new debt per year for the next 3 years, which are the years that count under that deficit reduction law. That is taking into consideration all of the borrowing from the trust funds, which, of course, are added on to the debt of this Nation, though it does not show up as part of the deficit, due to peculiar accounting. We all know that we have in 1991 and 1992 the largest deficits we have ever had.

Well, under those circumstances, and especially as we ask for increases in the gas tax next year, it would seem to me that we could suggest to the people of this Nation to forgo these special projects, which have never had substantive hearings and analysis by the substantive committee. It does not have to be "business as usual." We must recognize we have got a very deep indebtedness problem, that with the best of minds in this Congress, we cannot seem to do anything about.

Mr. Chairman, this is my 7th year. Each year I have wondered when are we ever going to be able to get control? So this is just a very feeble gesture, but an important one.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are basically several categories of highway demonstration projects in this bill:

First, some of the projects are authorized and have been funded in previous years. The total for these projects amounts to \$33 million. The gentleman's amendment would not affect these projects.

Second, most of the others are continuations of projects started in previous years—worth \$182 million.

Third, the remaining projects involve feasibility studies, preliminary engineering, environmental studies, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of a number of projects that would be started this year—worth \$92 million.

Seventy percent of these funds are to continue ongoing demonstration projects. With regard to these continuations, I think most Members would agree that once Congress gives its approval to start a project, it should not turn around the next year and stop it in its tracks unless there are good, sound environmental, or engineering, or cost reasons to do so. No such arguments are being made here.

The new projects represent less than \$100 million, which is less than 1 percent of the total recommended highway funding. We have received testimony or correspondence from the Members whose area are affected by these projects. I am sure they can all discuss the benefits of each of these projects. I believe they are all justified on the basis of safety or economic development. It is easy for a Member to criticize a project in someone else's district as being unjustified. There is no reason why Members should not decide on the allocation of 1 or 2 percent of our Federal highway spending.

Mr. Chairman, we have developed a balanced bill. It is within our 602(b) allocation. These projects have been included within our overall budget allocation—they are not budget busters. The projects are important to the Members and their districts.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The maker of the amendment in so many words says that the demonstration projects listed in the bill are unimportant, spurious, and should be eliminated.

Let me tell the gentleman a little about the project which exists in my district. It is known as the Mon Valley Expressway, which is a new limited access highway stretching from Pittsburgh to U.S. Route 48 near Morgantown, WV.

State, regional, and local authorities have identified the Mon Valley Expressway as the single most important undertaking in the area.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] also suggested in explaining his amendment that a lot of these demonstration projects should be designated by State and highway officials. I submit to the gentleman that this project specifically has been so designated. The State of Pennsylvania has shown its commitment to this project with an allocation of State and Turnpike Commission resources. Total costs of the project, however, are beyond the Commonwealth's grasp at this time. The requested Federal support will be part of a total cost shared by the Com-

monwealth of Pennsylvania and the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I want my friend to know that the area that this proposed road and turnpike will traverse is an area that has served this Nation from time immemorial. We lost 35,000 to 40,000 steel workers in the last 8 years. They in turn generated over the last 50 years billions of dollars of revenue.

In my district, this particular project is a very scarce and small project compared to what has been going on throughout the Nation. This region needs this highway and it needs it desperately. West Virginia is an integral part of this highway connection.

Mr. Chairman, again I want to emphasize that, contrary to what the maker of the amendment suggests, this has received State consideration and State commitment. I ask that this amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. GAYDOS. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to imply that the particular project to which the gentleman referred, or any of the particular projects, do or do not have merit. I know that in a number of States the States feel a bit frustrated, and feel once a project comes to them, they certainly are going to try to find the money to meet it.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure if the gentleman has said so, that this is a project that the State would like to have. But my point is, if we do not have authorizations and an analysis by the authorizing and substantive committee on these special projects, we never know, and we never will know, if they could withstand the light of day. I think perhaps that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] could, from what the gentleman has said about it. I think all of us in every district throughout this Nation could think of very important projects which for some reason do not hit the priority list of the States when they take money by formula. And the taking of money, of course, distorts the formula, and that is my argument. But it is not meant to pass judgment or be righteous about the merits of any particular project.

□ 1540

Mr. GAYDOS. These are somewhat exceptional circumstances and do not follow the usual course of events where we have an authorization and a point of order would lie. These are special projects that are proven by their own very nature to be needed, and that was one of the reasons and the purposes of asking for the aid, and we were very grateful in our district in receiving the aid.

I think the gentleman does a grave disservice to me and other Members

with meritorious projects by taking the position he takes on the floor of the House at this time.

Mr. FAWELL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GAYDOS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FAWELL. I would say that the authorization bill will be coming up next week, and I do not think all of the projects have necessarily been filled in, according to the DOT. There are a lot of blanks in there, and it could well be that the gentleman's project would fit, and that is in an authorization bill that would be before us at that point.

I certainly would not have as strong objections, if a project has an authorization, if a hearing has been held, if it had to compete against others in that priority list and things of that sort—although I much prefer to have it funded under the formula. The gentleman would then have an authorization, and I do not think there would be any problem.

But when they waive, as the Rules Committee does, authorization, then there will be no authorization because they only come every 4 years from the authorizing committee.

Mr. GAYDOS. I want to thank my friend for speaking so kindly and nicely about my project, I really do. So I hope he does not mind if I do not support his amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from the State of Illinois.

The gentleman from the State of Illinois has made an impassioned speech on the state of our Nation's deficit. We all share his concern about that deficit. In fact, some of us share it to the point where we joined with President Bush last year in a deficit reduction package, a bipartisan package offered by Democratic and Republican leaders in the House and the Senate, agreed to by the President, which puts this body and the Federal Government on a diet for several years, reducing the deficit by some \$500 billion.

The net impact of that agreement affects directly the appropriation bills which we consider on the floor of the House. When the House Appropriations Committee receives its allocations from the Budget Committee as to the amount that can be spent under the budget summit agreement, it will allocate those sums that are allowed under that same agreement to the subcommittees. I serve on the Transportation Subcommittee. We have accepted the guidelines, the instruction of the full House Appropriations Committee, the Budget Committee and the budget summit agreement. The amount of money that is being spent by all of the appropriation committees this year reflects President Bush's agreed-to plan for reducing the Federal deficit.

So for the gentleman to come and suggest that we are not doing our duty I think, frankly, does not tell the whole story. Can we do more? Of course we can. But the fact is we are living up to the terms of that agreement with the allocation that we are using in this subcommittee for the projects that are being funded.

The second point raised by the gentleman suggests that the projects, the so-called special projects, by his nomenclature, have not received thorough review. I would say to the gentleman that each and every project involved here is at least part of some State's highway or transit plan and may even have, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania alluded to before, the support of regional and municipal sources that believe these are worthy projects.

The question the gentleman raises is why did we not go through the authorization bill. The gentleman is fully aware of the fact that the authorization bill has not come to the floor of the House. We are trying to move the appropriation bills in an appropriate manner so that they can be on the President's desk before the beginning of the fiscal year. So we have moved this appropriation bill and we have included in it projects not specifically authorized by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

But let me tell the gentleman, these are projects that have been heard by our subcommittee. We sat many hours listening to public witnesses from both sides of the aisle, and the projects affected by the gentleman are from every corner of the United States, Republican, Democratic districts alike. There is no favoritism here. We are trying to help with those projects which are timely, those projects where Members like the gentleman from Pennsylvania come to us and say there is a pressing need for an expenditure at this moment, and we are hoping that these projects can be included as part of the appropriation bill, realizing full well that whatever we put in this bill must be consistent with the budget summit deficit agreement President Bush brought forward for the Members of Congress to live by.

So I would say to the gentleman that the projects in this bill are in fact worthy projects, that they have followed the orderly process, that we have tried to serve the needs of projects which are timely and need our decision quickly. They have in every instance been approved by the State highway departments and other local or regional organs of government that have come forward in support of these projects.

I would say to the gentleman that I believe that we all share his concern about the deficit. The fact is though that this appropriation bill is consistent with our goal of reducing the deficit in an agreement which we have had

with President Bush, and I hope the gentleman will reconsider his amendment.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, is there not a troublesome little rule of the House that suggests we authorize, ought to authorize before we appropriate? And the gentleman I think regularly votes for that rule. None of us on our side that I know have voted for that rules package ever, at least in my tenure in the Congress.

The gentleman, it seems to me, does have a legitimate point when he suggests we ought not be appropriating that which has not been authorized.

Mr. DURBIN. If I can reclaim my time, neither highway or transit programs have been authorized. That is the purpose of the bill we are going to be considering later this week. We are trying to move forward with the transportation needs. We cannot always wait for what has been the historic process. Members of the Public Works and Transportation Committee are on the floor today, and I think they understand it, and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania understands it.

What we are doing is not underhanded. It is aboveboard. It is printed in the RECORD. It is public information. What we are trying to do is fund projects which need money now. If we are going to sit and wait then we are going to cost people money and we are going to cost lives. Many of these projects represent important safety concerns for Members in their districts, and I think we ought to be responsive. We ought not to sit and wait perhaps for public works action later in the year which could jeopardize important projects which Members all across the Nation have come forward and asked for help on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has expired.

(On request of Mr. FAWELL and by unanimous consent, Mr. DURBIN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have paid attention to whether or not any of these projects which are in the appropriation bill are going to be in the authorizing bill. If I thought that they were, I would not have raised them. They are coming up next week, and certainly they can go back into it in conference, if that is the case. I am assured, however, that that is not the case.

Mr. DURBIN. I can tell the gentleman he is mistaken at least as to one project I am familiar with, and it

is very difficult for the gentlemen to keep track of the authorizing committee. We just learned this week the projects that were included in that bill. I think the gentleman should be cognizant of the fact that the Appropriations Committee has considered these projects. Some of them are ongoing appropriation projects year in and year out. We have worked with the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. We are meeting our responsibility with projects which have been approved by highway departments in each of the States, and other units of government.

Mr. FAWELL. If the gentleman will yield further, I think it is fairly common knowledge that the authorizing committee has determined what will be in their new 4-year authorization. The fact is that we get authorizations out of the authorizing committee only every 4 years, and these bills simply have never had any scrutiny by the States or by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. CARR and by unanimous consent, Mr. DURBIN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CARR. Mr. Chairman, I think what we are getting is basically the old discussion we have had on this House floor for probably decades, and maybe even centuries, and we will have it into the future, and that is whether the authorization committees have inherently better judgment about matters than the Appropriations Committee. I do not think you can make a statement that either has better judgment. The fact of the matter is, I would tell my friend from Illinois, the offeror of the amendment, that a number of the projects that we see in this bill before us today are also included as authorizations in the surface transportation bill which will be coming to the floor in the future. But I dare say that none of those projects have had the kinds of hearings and the kinds of treatments that he is criticizing this committee for having.

Furthermore, I would tell the gentleman from Illinois, the offeror of the amendment, that those projects are good projects too, and the Committee on Public Works and Transportation does a good job of understanding the problems before America on specifics, and in meeting those needs just as this committee does.

I must take some offense by the gentleman from Illinois, the offeror of the amendment, when he said twice in his presentation that somehow or other the Appropriations Committee is not a substantive committee. We are a very substantive committee, and as other

gentlemen here on the floor have said, we determine these priorities with a great deal of intellectual bearing, and try to bring as much good judgment in the public interest as we can to these projects.

□ 1550

But I would tell the gentleman that both the authorizing committee and the Appropriations Committee are legitimate in operating in this area, and one committee is not more legitimate than the other, as the gentleman would seem to imply.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. FAWELL and by unanimous consent, Mr. DURBIN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to point out that when the authorizing committee does its authorizing in the 4-year authorizations, they have within the law of this land the ability, and they are given the ability, to contractually appropriate. You do not need, believe it or not, an appropriation of a special project that goes through the authorizing committee. So if you are correct that any of these bills which I am referring to is in the authorizing bill, it has an authorization and it has the right to contract under contractual budgeting.

Mr. CARR. If the gentleman will yield further, I understand the gentleman, but now we are really getting to the crux of the matter.

The gentleman is stating that the authorizing committee can, by the device of contracting, actually appropriate money. We do not call it that. We can appropriate money sometimes with the help of the Committee on Rules without the so-called authorizing. Both committees are doing the same thing, and, in fact, the gentleman must concede are doing it in much the same manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. CARR and by unanimous consent, Mr. DURBIN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CARR. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I would be less offended if he said all committees, authorizing committees and appropriating committees, need to perfect their processes so that not one dime of America's money be spent without a full-blown hearing and analysis by all people who are concerned, but the gentleman clearly does not do that. The gentleman is clearly trying to divide the authorizers from the appropriators, and I think in a purely fictitious way that is terribly unfair.

Mr. FAWELL. I certainly am not trying to do that. I am only suggesting

that when you have 63 special projects bouncing out of the Committee on Appropriations and you never had any action by the authorizing committee which will be enacting some \$4.2 billion worth of authorizing special projects, next week which also will give them, and their exclusive authority under the Department of Transportation to go ahead and spend, which I understand nobody else has, I am just suggesting that we ask that we not pass those kinds of appropriations.

Mr. CARR. Let me ask the gentleman a question: Is he going to be on the floor in the weeks ahead offering the same kind of amendment against the Public Works and Transportation surface transportation bill for the projects that they have?

Mr. FAWELL. In regard to any that do not have an authorization.

Mr. CARR. I think we have made the point. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DURBIN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by saying that this amendment has little to do with the deficit. This amendment has to do with the orderly process of this Chamber.

The gentleman should be advised and should note that there are no members of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation joining him in his amendment. It suggests that perhaps the Committee on Public Works and Transportation is aware of what has been done. They do not consider it offensive. In fact, they consider it consistent with the orderly process, and I would urge those who consider this debate to vote against the amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just love the way we talk about money around this place. You know, we are facing a \$350 billion to \$400 billion deficit this year, and here are 63 projects that have not been authorized totaling \$243.3 million, and yet everybody says there is nothing wrong with that.

Last year we passed the biggest tax increase in American history, and next week we are going to come back under the authorization bill and ask for a 5 cent increase in the gas tax to fund, according to the Washington Post today, \$5.7 billion in earmarked transit funds and \$6.8 billion in highway demonstration projects. Is there anybody in this place who does not have a demonstration project?

This sign I am going to bring down to the floor quite a bit in the coming months. I do not know if you can see that or not. It is a hog eating the Capitol. It demonstrates what the American people think about what goes on around here.

We are facing a \$350 to \$400 billion deficit after we were supposed to have solved the problem last year with the

largest tax increase in history, and we are going to come back next week and ask for a 5-percent increase in the gas tax.

What do the people of America think about that? I can tell you what I think about it and what I think most of them think about it. We are wasting a hell of a lot of money around here, and we ought to do something about it.

I think the pork, and a lot of these demonstration projects are pork, I think it ought to be cut out of the process. We can no longer go on with business as usual. We are facing a \$350 billion to \$400 billion deficit this fiscal year, and it is not going to get any better in the foreseeable future.

We have got a \$3 trillion national debt, and the interest alone is going to cause us severe problems down the road. We are saddling our children and our grandchildren and every future generation with a terrible liability, because we are not addressing the problem. We are not coming to grips with controlling our appetite for spending.

Sure, everybody has some kind of project they want for their district, but if they are not authorized, if they are not necessary, we should not be doing them.

We have to set priorities around this place, but here we have people coming to the well saying the authorizing committee ought to be able to get what they want, the Committee on Appropriations ought to get what they want, and to heck with what it is costing the American taxpayer.

I say to the Members today that we have got to address the problem of spending. We raised all those taxes last year, and you are talking about raising the gas tax a nickel again this year. When is it going to end? When the people cannot afford to live in this country?

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

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

Let us be very clear. This bill is within our 602(b) allocation. If it were not funding these particular items, it would be funding something else still within the 602(b) allocation. This would not be saving any funds.

These are not causing an increase in spending. You know, this is a representative body. That is what the forefathers designed it to be. I suggest the Members in this body know the priorities in their districts as well as any bureaucrat knows the priorities. For the Members to be able to have those priorities expressed in this bill is entirely appropriate.

These projects have been the subject of hearings. They are entirely appropriate. The amendment should be voted down.

We are within our 602(b) allocation. This is not something that is saving the taxpayers money.

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond in part to my good friend from Indiana, the immediate last speaker. That was very interesting art work he showed, and as a lover of art, I can look at it and laugh, but I have to say to people who die on our highways, the people who sit in congestion on our highways, the people, the taxpayers, the constituents whom we represent who are costing great sums of money for repair of their automobiles and their worn-out shocks for the inefficient road systems that we have in places in this country, costing them more fuel and more time, should resent the gentleman calling them pigs and hogs. This is not for our benefit.

In fact, I rarely get to drive on some of the highways that we provide for here. This is not even for the gentleman's benefit, because he probably does not drive on many of these highways. These are for the people of America. They are not hogs. They are not pigs. They do not regard it as pork.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Reclaiming my time, let me just say that these are legitimate transportation projects that are in the best interests of the United States of America. I hope the amendment is defeated and that we support the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Fawell amendment.

I will grant to the proponents of the various projects that they are worthwhile projects, that they are desirable projects, that their constituents want those projects. But I think that there are dozens, probably hundreds, maybe even thousands of transportation projects that would fit that description.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania points out correctly that we are operating under a cap here, and what that means, for every dollar that is spent on one of these projects, it is a dollar less that we can spend on a project that has gone through the process which this House and which this Government has prescribed for identifying those projects which are the top priority for the point of view of State government and Federal Government, and that includes us.

I believe that we have to understand that to govern is to choose. The process of choosing projects that are embodied in this bill is a faulty process.

□ 1600

In that, the gentleman from Illinois is correct. That is why we should support this.

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

Mr. ZIMMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FAWELL. I will try to be very brief. I guess I have not made my intent very clear.

Obviously, the law gives a substantive committee, and usually appropriation committee the right to approve spending. I want to point out that insofar as this particular authorizing committee is concerned, the law, under the Budget Reform Act back in 1974, and I do not know why, not only gave that committee the right to authorize, but it also said the authorization is an implied right to enter into contracts. For what, for special projects. Now, that is the law.

Now, this committee did its authorizing 4 years ago. They did a lot of authorizing of special projects, which I did not come in and object to. What I am saying is that when we have the committee that is supposed to be the expert on the substantive law, and they remain mute here and do nothing, I simply say that the rules of this House are being trivialized to the extent of being kicked around.

In regard to the 302(b) allocation, the 302(b) allocation is going to give everyone a half trillion dollars of new debt. What kind of a defense is that? When are we ever going to recognize that when we are going to blow away \$243 million from general fund, not even from the tax that we increased last year? I just think that those points we have to remember. Once in a while we can change our old club rules around here. I think it is time we do that.

(By request of Mr. BURTON and by unanimous consent, Mr. ZIMMER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ZIMMER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my colleague from Michigan.

We certainly do not want to see any American dying on the highways, and we are certainly not talking about people in America being hogs. I am talking about people in the Congress who want pork-barrel projects for their district, that have not been seen as a major priority. We have to set priorities on spending around here. That is the problem.

Demonstration projects and that authorization bill we are going to get next week, are 8 times what the demonstration projects were just 7 years ago. Seven years ago we had 8 times less in demonstration projects. The appetite for special projects in our districts around this country is out of control, and along with it, the deficit.

That is what I am talking about. Not the people of this country, but setting priorities on spending, No. 1; and making sure we get control of this deficit which is going to kill the economy.

(By request of Mr. CARR and by unanimous consent Mr. ZIMMER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. ZIMMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CARR. Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to my friend, and he is a friend. I did not yield to the gentleman last time because it was not my time. It was the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I hope the gentleman realizes that.

I would say that this committee is a substantive committee, notwithstanding what my good friend from Illinois has tried to imply here. We look at these things carefully. We discuss them, argue them, and make sure they are endorsed as priority projects in the State they come from. I want to assure the gentleman that this is not some circumvention of priorities.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin my remarks by paying my compliments, in particular, to the chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN]. Certainly this House has no finer gentleman among its Members, certainly a man that we all respect and admire.

The same can be true, in general terms if not as enthusiastic terms, for all the members of the subcommittee. It is a good subcommittee. They do fine work. They do stay within their 302(b) allocations. I would also like to pay compliment to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

There is no malice intended here with respect to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] as opposed to the committee or the members of the committee, nor is there malice on the part of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] with respect to any Member who has had the good fortune to negotiate successfully with the committee regarding a project in their district. Mr. FAWELL is one of the most thoughtful Members of this body. He is acutely aware of the fact that the people of the United States, as they are being asked year after year after year to pony up more taxes to support an evergrowing government, are concerned about pork barrel politics and pork barrel projects.

Now, if there is any Member here that has been to a townhall meeting and not found themselves recently berated by people in their community whom they represent, for pork barrel politics, and pork barrel projects, they certainly must not have spent much time in their district.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] quite rightly understands that every project that is funded in a bill is a pork barrel project. There may be a good project in Pennsylvania, as described earlier by one of our Members.

The project might be totally justifiable within the context of good government, although I personally believe that we do not justify the construction of a road in your district on the basis of the number of jobs that are created in the construction of the road. That may be a sufficient justification for the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The fact of the matter is, after this bill is passed, and in fact before the bill has passed, according to Congressional Quarterly, which most people who really want to know what goes in Washington will read to find out particulars, will report, the press in general report, aberrations in the bill that seem to be out of place. Last year, for example, in this bill, we funded a parking garage in Chicago. The idea apparently was intended to demonstrate the effectiveness of construction of parking facilities in relieving on-street parking congestion and unsafe parking practices.

Now, I would be willing to bet that the average American taxpayer would figure out that a parking garage will reduce parking on the street without several hundred thousands of dollars of taxpayers' dollars demonstrating that.

Today we have, in this bill, and in fact it may be demonstrated in Chicago, but not to the satisfaction of the New Yorkers, a similar parking garage in New York. Parking garages are not authorized under the authorizing legislation to which we appropriate today.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] quite rightly believes that it is possible that the authorizing committee may have differentiated. We had in Michigan, last year in this bill, appropriated funds for a bicycle path. The State of Michigan has found this bicycle path so low in its priorities that they will not come up with the matching funds. That is according to Congressional Quarterly.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to correct the gentleman, because we will get into that debate in a few minutes.

The fact of the matter is that the State of Michigan and all the local communities that you referred to with respect to that bike path, have provided the matching grants of 25 percent from that particular project.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that update. Unhappily to me, Congressional Quarterly did not get that information.

In any event, I suppose bicycle paths do represent urgent ground transportation.

I recommend that the Members in this Chamber vote yes for this amendment, and I appreciate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] for having the courage and the thoughtfulness in this matter.

□ 1610

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 61, noes 365, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 221]

AYES—61

Allard	Galleghy	Penny
Archer	Gilchrest	Petri
Army	Goodling	Rhodes
Bailenger	Goss	Roberts
Barton	Gradison	Rohrabacher
Boehner	Hancock	Roth
Bunning	Hastert	Sanders
Burton	Hefley	Saxton
Campbell (CA)	Hergert	Schiff
Coble	Holloway	Sensenbrenner
Cox (CA)	Hunter	Smith (TX)
Crane	Hyde	Solomon
Dannemeyer	Inhofe	Stearns
Doolittle	Kasich	Strom
Dornan (CA)	Klug	Stump
Dreier	Kyl	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	Leach	Thomas (WY)
Edwards (OK)	Luken	Walker
Ewing	Michel	Zeliff
Fawell	Moorhead	Zimmer
Fields	Paxon	

NOES—365

Abercrombie	Clement	Ford (MI)
Ackerman	Clinger	Ford (TN)
Alexander	Coleman (MO)	Frank (MA)
Anderson	Coleman (TX)	Franks (CT)
Andrews (ME)	Collins (IL)	Frost
Andrews (NJ)	Collins (MI)	Gallo
Andrews (TX)	Combust	Gaydos
Anunzio	Condit	Gejdenson
Anthony	Conyers	Gekas
Applegate	Cooper	Gephardt
Aspin	Costello	Geren
Atkins	Coughlin	Gibbons
AuCoin	Cox (IL)	Gillmor
Bacchus	Coyne	Gilman
Baker	Cramer	Gingrich
Barnard	Cunningham	Glickman
Barrett	Darden	Gonzalez
Bateman	Davis	Gordon
Bellenson	de la Garza	Grandy
Bennett	DeFazio	Gray
Bentley	DeLauro	Green
Bereuter	DeLay	Guarini
Berman	Dellums	Gunderson
Bevill	Derrick	Hall (OH)
Billbray	Dickinson	Hall (TX)
Billrakis	Dicks	Hamilton
Billey	Dingell	Hammerschmidt
Boehlert	Dixon	Hansen
Bontor	Donnelly	Harris
Borski	Dooley	Hatcher
Boucher	Dorgan (ND)	Hayes (IL)
Boxer	Downey	Hayes (LA)
Brewster	Durbin	Hefner
Brooks	Dwyer	Henry
Broomfield	Dymally	Hertel
Browder	Early	Hoagland
Brown	Eckart	Hobson
Bruce	Edwards (CA)	Hochbrueckner
Bryant	Edwards (TX)	Horn
Bustamante	Engel	Horton
Byron	English	Houghton
Callahan	Erdreich	Hoyer
Camp	Espy	Hubbard
Campbell (CO)	Evans	Huckaby
Cardin	Fascell	Hughes
Carper	Fazio	Hutto
Carr	Feighan	Ireland
Chandler	Fish	Jacobs
Chapman	Flake	James
Clay	Foglietta	Jefferson

Jenkins	Moran	Schroeder
Johnson (CT)	Morella	Schulze
Johnson (SD)	Morrison	Schumer
Johnson (TX)	Mrazek	Serrano
Johnston	Murphy	Sharp
Jones (GA)	Murtha	Shaw
Jones (NC)	Myers	Shays
Jontz	Nagle	Shuster
Kanjorski	Natcher	Sikorski
Kaptur	Neal (MA)	Sisisky
Kennedy	Neal (NC)	Skaggs
Kennelly	Nichols	Skeen
Kildee	Nowak	Skelton
Kleczka	Nussle	Slattery
Kolbe	Oakar	Slaughter (NY)
Kolter	Oberstar	Slaughter (VA)
Kopetski	Obey	Smith (FL)
Kostmayer	Olin	Smith (IA)
LaFalce	Olver	Smith (NJ)
Lancaster	Ortiz	Smith (OR)
Lantos	Orton	Snowe
LaRocco	Owens (NY)	Solarz
Laughlin	Owens (UT)	Spence
Lehman (CA)	Oxley	Spratt
Lehman (FL)	Packard	Staggers
Lent	Pallone	Stallings
Levin (MI)	Panetta	Stark
Levine (CA)	Parker	Stenholm
Lewis (CA)	Patterson	Studds
Lewis (FL)	Payne (NJ)	Sundquist
Lewis (GA)	Payne (VA)	Swett
Lightfoot	Pease	Swift
Lipinski	Pelosi	Synar
Livingston	Perkins	Tallon
Lloyd	Peterson (FL)	Tanner
Long	Peterson (MN)	Tauzin
Lowery (CA)	Pickett	Taylor (MS)
Lowey (NY)	Pickle	Thomas (CA)
Machtley	Porter	Thomas (GA)
Manton	Poshard	Thornton
Markey	Price	Torres
Marlenee	Pursell	Torricelli
Martin	Quillen	Towns
Martinez	Rahall	Traficant
Matsui	Ramstad	Traxler
Mavroules	Rangel	Unsoeld
Mazzoil	Ravenel	Upton
McCandless	Ray	Valentine
McCloskey	Reed	Vander Jagt
McCollum	Regula	Vento
McCrery	Richardson	Viscosky
McCurdy	Ridge	Volkmer
McDade	Riggs	Vucanovich
McDermott	Rinaldo	Walsh
McEwen	Ritter	Washington
McGrath	Roe	Waters
McHugh	Roemer	Waxman
McMillan (NC)	Rogers	Weber
McMillen (MD)	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon
McNulty	Rose	Wheat
Meyers	Rostenkowski	Whitten
Mfume	Roukema	Williams
Miller (CA)	Rowland	Wilson
Miller (OH)	Roybal	Wise
Miller (WA)	Russo	Wolf
Mineta	Sabo	Wolpe
Mink	Sangmeister	Wyden
Moakley	Santorum	Wyllie
Mollinari	Savage	Yates
Mollohan	Sawyer	Young (AK)
Montgomery	Schaefer	Young (FL)
Moody	Scheuer	

NOT VOTING—7

Emerson	Sarpalius	Yatron
Hopkins	Stokes	
Lagomarsino	Weiss	

□ 1630

Messrs. BROOMFIELD, MOODY, SHAYS, and NICHOLS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. ZELIFF changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARDIN) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

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.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

The committee resumed its sitting. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

HIGHWAY-RAILROAD GRADE CROSSING SAFETY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For the purpose of carrying out a coordinated project of highway-railroad grade crossing separations in Mineola, New York, that demonstrates methods of enhancing highway-railroad crossing safety while minimizing surrounding environmental effects, as authorized by Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, \$9,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. MRAZEK

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MRAZEK: On page 23, line 1, strike out "\$9,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000" and

On page 38, line 9, strike out "\$17,582,000," and insert "\$21,582,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall be available for a comprehensive audit and report by the Presidential Task Force on Trans-Alaska Pipeline System as authorized in Sec. 8103 of Public Law 101-380 and".

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object so I can get an explanation.

Mr. Chairman, we did not have any information on our side, and I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK].

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, I would respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that this is a very simple en bloc amendment. It reduces by \$4 million a demonstration grant project that happens to be in my district and instead allocates that same amount of money, \$4 million, without affecting any other budget line

or program in this bill and allocates it for spending on the Presidential task force on the trans-Alaska pipeline.

Mr. Chairman, I have letters from both the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], as well as the ranking Republican, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], who both would like to see that expenditure made in this bill, and it is entirely appropriate within the context of the transportation portion of the pipeline question that this money be expended in this legislation.

So, what I have simply done is transferred the funding in the first amendment, reduced the funding for this demonstration project, added it for use for this study requested by the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the ranking Republican on the committee.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, is there any indication by those who are going to be forced to do this study as to whether or not this is something that they are wanting to do?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes, Mr. Chairman, this would put the money in the program. It would be that the President will have to appoint the oversight committee.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, is this something the administration is in favor of doing?

Mr. MILLER of California. I think the indications are that they are moving in that direction. The Senators from Alaska are supporting this provision. Yes, the indications are that they are inclined to do it, if the money is there.

Mr. WALKER. In addition, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] is in support of this?

Mr. MILLER of California. Correct, and check with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of the en bloc amendments.

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, after having explained the amendment, I would simply ask that the House approve this en bloc amendment in support of the transfer.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK].

Mr. Chairman, I understand the amendments. I have no objection to their adoption.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, this has been cleared with the minority, and the minority has no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK].

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### HIGHWAY WIDENING DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

For necessary expenses to carry out a demonstration project to improve U.S. Route 202 in the vicinity of King of Prussia, Pennsylvania, as authorized by Public Law 100-202, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### HIGHWAY WIDENING AND IMPROVEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

For up to 80 percent of the expenses necessary to carry out a highway project between Paintsville and Prestonsburg, Kentucky, that demonstrates the safety and economic benefits of widening and improving highways in mountainous areas, \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### CLIMBING LANE AND HIGHWAY SAFETY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

For 80 percent of the expenses necessary to carry out a highway project on U.S. Route 15 in the vicinity of Tioga County, Pennsylvania, for the purpose of demonstrating methods of improved highway and highway safety construction, \$7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### INDIANA INDUSTRIAL CORRIDOR SAFETY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

For 80 percent of the expenses necessary for an improved route between Logansport and Peru, Indiana, for the purpose of demonstrating the safety and economic benefits of widening and improving rural highways, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### ALABAMA HIGHWAY BYPASS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

For 80 percent of the expenses necessary for the construction of a highway bypass project in the vicinity of Jasper, Alabama, for the purpose of demonstrating methods of improved highway and highway safety construction, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### KENTUCKY BRIDGE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

For 80 percent of the expenses necessary to replace the Glover Cary Bridge in Owensboro, Kentucky, for the purpose of demonstrating methods of improved highway and highway safety construction, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### VIRGINIA HOV SAFETY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

For 80 percent of the expenses necessary to construct High Occupancy Vehicle lanes on Interstate Route 66 between U.S. Route 50 and U.S. Route 29 for the purpose of demonstrating methods of increasing highway capacity and safety by the use of highway shoulders to construct HOV lanes, \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### URBAN HIGHWAY CORRIDOR AND BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

For 80 percent of the expenses necessary to improve and upgrade the M-59 urban highway corridor in southeast Michigan for the purpose of demonstrating methods of improving congested urban corridors that have been neglected during construction of the Interstate system, \$10,700,000, to remain available until expended, together with \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended, to provide for 80 percent of the expenses necessary for a bicycle transportation demonstration project in Macomb County, Michigan.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 25, beginning line 10, strike "together with \$1,000,000," and all that follows through line 14 and insert a period.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] just a few moments ago would have cut 63 demonstration projects and saved \$243.3 million. This body did not see fit to pass that amendment, but this amendment I am offering right now is a very simple and very direct amendment, and I think it is one that has a lot of merit, and I hope that everybody will listen to it and look upon it with favor. It will only save \$1 million, but it will save \$1 million. As my colleagues know, I think Everett Dirksen said a million here, a million there, a billion here, a billion there; pretty soon we are talking about real money.

Mr. Chairman, we are facing, as I have said many times on this floor, a \$350 to \$400 billion deficit this year. They are talking about another tax increase on gasoline. So, we need to address spending and cutting spending wherever we possibly can to get control of this budget.

Mr. Chairman, this project I am talking about is a bicycle path in Macomb County in southeast Michigan. The term "demonstration project" as it is used in the bill describing this project is simply a polite way of describing a pork-barrel project. This project was not a priority of State and local officials. They could have obtained this funding through the regular highway and funding process if this is one of their priorities.

□ 1640

As a matter of fact, according to the July 13 issue of the Congressional Quarterly, Mr. Carlo Santia, the assistant highway engineer for the Macomb County Road Commission, said that this bikeway project was "not on our list of priorities." So the people who deal with priorities up in that county do not even think this is a priority, and yet this body is being asked to appropriate \$1 million for a bicycle path when they have got all these budget deficits and all these other very important projects going on.

So I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that we are facing a huge deficit this year. We need to look very closely and scrutinize every single demonstration project. This project, in my opinion, is not a worthy project. I cannot see how it is going to help expedite the transportation problems in Michigan or this country. I do not think the people of Indiana in my congressional district want to spend \$1 million for a bicycle path in Macomb County, MI.

Mr. Chairman, I think that my colleagues who I know are fiscally prudent should look with favor upon this amendment and vote for it.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I oppose this amendment for the same reason I opposed the previous amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL], and I urge this amendment be defeated.

The problem with this bill is, there are not enough bicycle paths. I urge the amendment be defeated.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment affects Macomb County and it happens to be in my district.

I would like to tell my colleagues a little story. About 10 years ago, we had a baseball game out at Four Mile Run. We were playing the Republicans. I was playing shortstop and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], who is my friend, was on second base. And he was leading off a little bit, and I was trying to pick him off.

Finally, he got a little too far off the bag. I snuck in behind him, the pitcher threw me the ball. I tagged him, and he was out. But in the process, with his steel spikes, he put about a 5-inch scar into my right foot. I ended up going to the hospital, getting it stitched. And for the last 10 years, every morning when I put on my socks, I am reminded of DAN BURTON because I look at that scar.

Well, he is stepping on my toes again, Mr. Chairman. He wants to go after my project.

This is a good project. My friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], just reminded me that the bicycle industry is a growing industry, one of the few export-growing industries in this country today. We need to do some new thinking about where we are going with transportation.

When we have the authorization bill on the floor here next week, we are going to talk about trails. We are going to talk about bicycle trails. We are going to talk about hiking and we are going to talk about a lot of things.

Fifty percent of the people in this country live within 5 miles of where they work. They can become healthier. They can relieve congestion. They can deal with the question of foreign oil imports by doing some alternative transportation, and this trail has been an overwhelming success. We have had it funded now for about 3 years.

It has tremendous local support, to the contrary of the gentleman from Indiana. The local communities and the State have come up with the 25-percent match with enthusiasm.

This is a good bill. This is a good project.

The Secretary of Transportation, Mr. Skinner himself, in a memorandum form the Department of Transpor-

tation indicated that it is "the policy of the National Transportation Policy Network to promote and increase bicycling, to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian needs in designing transportation facilities for urban and suburban areas."

So I ask my colleagues to stay with me on this one. It is a good project. It is needed. It binds communities together. It is an alternative means to get around.

It is a type of new, innovative thinking which we have got to start doing around here instead of staying with the same thing year after year after year.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, in the Surface Transportation Assistance Act soon to be reported out by the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation there will be considerable authorization funding for bicycle and pedestrian pathways in conjunction with our National Transportation Network, with a focus also on significantly improving commuting to work by bicycle as a means of saving energy, as a means of improving health or for all the other good and valid purposes for which people bicycle, as the gentleman and I frequently and regularly do.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment. It is on the right path of good public policy for the future. This is the kind of transportation initiative that we ought to be supporting because it does have so many public policy benefits.

I commend the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to my colleague, I hope my amendment passes, but I do apologize for spiking him 5 years ago.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, 10 years.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this is a good amendment or not. I do not know much about the gentleman's project, but the two gentlemen in their discussion piqued my interest because there is a section of the bill to come up next week that I think relates to what the gentlemen were talking about. Is chapter 5 or title V of the bill the intermodal part of the bill? Is that where bike paths are?

I ask the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell the gentleman which title it is in, but there will be a provision relating to bicycling.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, is all of that material when we are talking about the intermodal portion of the bill, the commission and so on, is that what this is aimed at?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, whether this will be included in the intermodal title of the legislation, I cannot tell the gentleman either. I do not know how that portion of the bill is being structured title by title.

I can only say that there is, in the subcommittee version of the bill that will be considered in full committee, language providing for funding and policy direction for bicycling. And there is already authorization in current law for bicycling initiatives.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the reason I raised the question is, I am concerned, having looked at chapter 5, and there are a couple of groups around town, including the Heritage Foundation, that have looked at chapter 5. I think that is where some of this may be.

It is very clear that there is an orientation that is beginning to build in what we are doing in the Congress, which is antiautomobile, which is specifically aimed at forcing the American people to give up their cars for other kinds of transportation.

I will suggest that that is something which the American people need to focus on because there are an awful lot of the American people who are not prepared to give up their automobiles to do bicycling or to take mass transit or to do a whole series of other things that some of the Greens in this country may think are wonderful, but for most of us we think the car has been a pretty wonderful device and something which has contributed a lot to the economy of this country. And we do not particularly want to see it destroyed by policy frameworks that we develop in Washington.

It appears as though chapter 5 of that bill that begins to suggest commissions and all kinds of other alternatives to the automobile is headed in specifically that direction.

I would say to my colleagues that they may want to examine that bill, and they may want to examine some of the projects that we are now funding in the name of transportation in that light as well, because I do not think the American people are prepared to suggest that their cars are the evil of society, that most people still like to get in their car to go to work. Most people still like to take their car on vacation. Most people like the freedom that their car gives them to go to the supermarket and to do a lot of things in their daily lives, and are not prepared to succumb to the policy options that suggest that the car is a bad thing.

So I am just increasingly concerned, and the discussion that we had here a

moment ago, which seemed to indicate that we are moving in directions that would say to people, "The car is bad, give it up for alternative forms of transportation," is something that I think we will want to have some voices of opposition raised as we come along.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate the concern he has raised.

First, may I point out that in a bill over a 5-year period of \$153 billion in authorization for transportation, of which a few million, literally a few million may be used by States at their discretion for alternative means of transportation, is not an orientation away from the automobile.

□ 1650

Second, for those of us who do pay highway gasoline taxes and would like an alternate means of transportation, I am choosing that my highway user tax dollars can be used for a means of transportation that I would like to use in addition to the automobile. I do not think it is fair to characterize it as an orientation away from or anti-automobile.

Mr. WALKER. Well, except it used to be that the entire amount out of the trust fund was spent only for highways and automobiles. You are now asking automobile drivers to fund other priorities that the gentleman has that are not shared by the vast majority of Americans.

I would also suggest to the gentleman, this is not the only bill we have to be concerned about. The CAFE standards that many Members have suggested in Congress are also aimed at the American automobile industry, and aimed specifically at the cars Americans like to drive.

So we have had a series of bills that can be demonstrated to be anti-automobile, to be anticar, and they could have a devastating impact, although I am sure an unintended impact, on the economy. I just warn Members as these issues begin to develop over the next couple of weeks, that we do have at least some in this Congress who have decided that cars are bad things and that the American people ought to be lifted out of them, by force, if necessary, by the force of policy, and many of us may not want to be a part of that effort.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, you know, there are some Members who regard the automobile industry as absolutely essential for the survival of our constituents, and I am not ashamed to say that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making me very nervous appointing himself as the defender of the American automobile industry. We have enough trouble. Please stop.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I will be interested to see how the gentleman votes when we get to the bill next week. He claims to be a defender of the automobile industry. It will be interesting to see whether he votes to take people out of cars.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have a tremendous amount of respect for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]. I know the gentleman is an effective short-stop. I know the gentleman is an effective Congressman, a tremendous Congressman. I know the gentleman will be an outstanding whip. But those statements are not relevant to what we are talking about here.

Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that what is relevant is, first, that this particular \$1 million request for a bicycle path will not appear in the 1992 transportation bill, where the authorizing committee has the full authority to authorize and, in effect, bypass the Committee on Appropriations, and commence to spend for that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, it apparently was not felt to be, with all due respect to an immensely talented member, that indeed he can secure from the authorizing committee the \$1 million necessary to fund the project.

I think that those are relevant measures. Once again, with all due respect for all Members who at one time or another have been connected with special projects, we are carrying it too far. One of these days the people of this Nation are going to boot us all out when we continue to do these kinds of things.

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

Mr. FAWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] that there has been a lot of commentary that has not been particularly relevant nor germane to the nature of this debate. We are dealing with a \$34 billion appropriations bill, \$34 billion in total in the 4-year plan on this thing. We are getting tied up on \$1 million of money that will try to encourage communities and States to see that when we create highway corridors across the Nation and through our

cities and urban areas, we do not keep people from walking or bicycling somewhere.

Mr. Chairman, I resent it very much when I get trapped in neighborhoods, as I am here in some parts of Washington where my apartment is, where I cannot get anywhere on foot because everything is cut off with interstates.

Mr. Chairman, I am from Michigan. I want cars. I do not view this as anticar. I don't view this as anticar, to suggest to take \$1 million out of this whole bill, and hearing other grumbling saying, "Isn't this terrible? We are taking money on gas taxes from motorists for bicycles."

Then I find out no, it is not the gas tax, it is general funds. Either way, people are going to make the same objections, if they think the only way we ought to be able to locomote in this country is in a four-wheel automobile.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest there is nothing wrong with walking on your feet, whether they are scarred or spiked or not, and there is nothing wrong with riding a bicycle. Maybe our communities will be a little better off if we took this kind of planning more broadly, not just in the gentleman's district, but across the Nation.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, my only point is, I agree, I like bicycles, I ride bicycles. They are healthy and all that. I am all for bicycles.

I am only trying to point out that in the authorization bill which will be coming up next week, you will not see this as high enough a priority to be there. That is what I am trying to say. One million here, one million there, and pretty soon you are talking about big money.

Mr. Chairman, I talked about \$243 million in special highway demonstration projects a short time ago. That did not move us. I do not think this will move us. I did want to put these relevancies into the argument.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the assistant engineer for this country in charge of transportation said this was not one of their priorities. Now, if this county in Michigan wants a bicycle path, I think they should have it, but they should pay for it. Not the people in California, not the people in Indiana, and not the people in New York. It is a bicycle path in Michigan. It should be paid for in Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. There are 102 Members present, a quorum.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

**URBAN AIRPORT ACCESS SAFETY  
DEMONSTRATION PROJECT**

For 80 percent of the expenses necessary to improve and upgrade access to Detroit Metropolitan Airport in southeast Michigan, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the purpose of demonstrating methods of improving access to major urban airports.

**PENNSYLVANIA RECONSTRUCTION  
DEMONSTRATION PROJECT**

For 80 percent of the expenses necessary to upgrade, widen, and reconstruct the sections of Pennsylvania Route 56 known as Haws Pike and the Windber By-Pass, for the purpose of demonstrating methods of promoting economic development and highway safety, \$9,000,000, to remain available until expended.

**PENNSYLVANIA TOLL ROAD DEMONSTRATION  
PROJECT**

For necessary expenses for the Monongahela Valley Expressway, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds, together with funds made available from the Highway Trust Fund, for Federal participation in the toll highway project being carried out under section 129(j) of title 23, United States Code, in the State of Pennsylvania shall be subject to section 129(j) of such title, relating to Federal share limitation.

**HIGHWAY BYPASS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT**

For 80 percent of the expenses necessary to carry out a highway project in the vicinity of Prunedale, California, that demonstrates methods of accelerating right-of-way acquisition and construction of a highway bypass, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

**HIGHWAY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

For up to 80 percent of the expenses necessary for certain highway and bicycle transportation projects and parking facilities, including feasibility and environmental studies, that demonstrate methods of improving safety, reducing congestion, or promoting economic development, \$141,908,000, of which \$4,628,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Nuclear Waste Transportation Safety Demonstration project", to remain available until expended.

**NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY  
ADMINISTRATION**

**OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH**

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary with respect to traffic and highway safety under the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act (Public Law 92-513, as amended) and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, \$75,995,000, to remain available until September 30, 1994.

**OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH  
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)**

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary with respect to traffic and highway safety under chapter 4, title 23, United States Code, to be derived

from the Highway Trust Fund, \$42,357,000, to remain available until September 30, 1994.

**HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS  
(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)  
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)**

For payment of obligations incurred carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 402, 406, and 408, and section 209 of Public Law 95-599, as amended, to remain available until expended, \$130,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which are in excess of \$115,000,000 in fiscal year 1992 for "State and community highway safety grants" authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used for construction, rehabilitation or remodeling costs, or for office furnishings and fixtures for State, local, or private buildings or structures: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which are in excess of \$20,000,000 for "Alcohol safety incentive grants" authorized under 23 U.S.C. 408: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,353,000 may be available for administering the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 402: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs authorized under section 209 of Public Law 95-599, as amended, the total obligations for which are in excess of \$4,750,000 in fiscal years 1992 through 1992.

**FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION  
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR**

For necessary expenses of the Federal Railroad Administration, not otherwise provided for, \$16,077,000, of which \$2,168,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of a program making commitments to guarantee new loans under the Emergency Rail Services Act of 1970, as amended, and that no new commitments to guarantee loans under section 211(a) or 211(h) of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973, as amended, shall be made: *Provided further*, That, as part of the Washington Union Station transaction in which the Secretary assumed the first deed of trust on the property and, where the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation or any successor is obligated to make payments on such deed of trust on the Secretary's behalf, including payments on and after September 30, 1988, the Secretary is authorized to receive such payments directly from the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, credit them to the appropriation charged for the first deed of trust, and make payments on the first deed of trust with those funds: *Provided further*, That such additional sums as may be necessary for payment on the first deed of trust may be advanced by the Administrator from unobligated balances available to the Federal Railroad Administration, to be reimbursed from payments received from the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation.

**LOCAL RAIL FREIGHT ASSISTANCE**

For necessary expenses for rail assistance under section 5(q) of the Department of Transportation Act, as amended, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

**RAILROAD SAFETY**

For necessary expenses in connection with railroad safety, not otherwise provided for, \$37,136,000, of which \$1,220,000 shall remain

available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from non-Federal sources for expenses incurred in training safety employees of private industry, State and local authorities, or other public authorities other than State rail safety inspectors participating in training pursuant to section 206 of the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1976.

**RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**

For necessary expenses for railroad research and development, \$14,713,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That up to \$500,000 of the funds made available in fiscal year 1991 shall be made available to support, by financial assistance agreement, railroad-highway grade crossing safety programs, including Operation Life-saver.

**NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

For necessary expenses related to Northeast Corridor improvements authorized by title VII of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976, as amended (45 U.S.C. 851 et seq.) and the Rail Safety Improvement Act of 1988, \$36,000,000, to remain available until expended.

**GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD  
PASSENGER CORPORATION**

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for operating losses incurred by the Corporation, capital improvements, and labor protection costs authorized by 45 U.S.C. 601, to remain available until expended, \$503,900,000, of which \$328,900,000 shall be available for operating losses incurred by the Corporation and for labor protection costs, and of which \$175,000,000 shall be available for capital improvements: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for lease or purchase of passenger motor vehicles or for the hire of vehicle operators for any officer or employee, other than the president of the Corporation, excluding the lease of passenger motor vehicles for those officers or employees while in official travel status: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall make no commitments to guarantee new loans or loans for new purposes under 45 U.S.C. 602 in fiscal year 1992: *Provided further*, That no funds are required to be expended or reserved for expenditure pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 601(e): *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Railroad Passenger Corporation shall not operate rail passenger service between Atlantic City, New Jersey, and the Northeast Corridor main line unless the Corporation's Board of Directors determines that revenues from such service have covered or exceeded 80 percent of the short-term avoidable costs of operating such service in the third year of operation and 100 percent of the short-term avoidable operating costs for each year thereafter.

**MANDATORY PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE  
PAYMENTS**

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to pay obligations and liabilities of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, \$145,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this amount is available only for the payment of: (1) tax liabilities under section 3221 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 due in fiscal year 1992 in excess of amounts needed to fund benefits for individuals who retired from the National Railroad Passenger Corporation and for their beneficiaries; (2) obligations of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation under sec-

tion 358(a) of title 45, United States Code, due in fiscal year 1992 in excess of its obligations calculated on an experience-rated basis; and (3) obligations of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation due under section 3321 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

#### RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT FINANCING FUNDS

The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations pursuant to section 512 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-210), as amended, in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary to pay any amounts required pursuant to the guarantee of the principal amount of obligations under sections 511 through 513 of such Act, such authority to exist as long as any such guaranteed obligation is outstanding: *Provided*, That no new loan guarantee commitments shall be made during fiscal year 1992: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 1989 and each fiscal year thereafter all amounts realized from the sale of notes or securities sold under authority of this section shall be considered as current year domestic discretionary outlay offsets and not as "asset sales" or "loan prepayments" as defined by section 257(12) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That any underwriting fees and related expenses shall be derived solely from the proceeds of the sales.

#### CONRAIL COMMUTER TRANSITION ASSISTANCE

For necessary capital expenses of Conrail commuter transition assistance, not otherwise provided for, \$27,200,000, to remain available until expended.

#### AMTRAK CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT LOANS

For loans to the Chicago, Missouri and Western Railroad, or its successors, to replace existing jointed rail with continuous welded rail between Joliet and Granite City, Illinois, \$3,500,000: *Provided*, That any loan authorized under this section shall be structured with a maximum 20-year payment at an annual interest rate of 4 per centum: *Provided further*, That the Federal Government shall hold a first and prior purchase money security interest with respect to any materials to be acquired with Federal funds: *Provided further*, That any such loan shall be matched on a dollar for dollar basis by the State of Illinois: *Provided further*, That any such loan shall be made available no later than thirty days after enactment of this Act.

#### URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

##### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of the urban mass transportation program authorized by the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), and 23 U.S.C. chapter 1 in connection with these activities, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$37,000,000.

##### RESEARCH, TRAINING, AND HUMAN RESOURCES

For necessary expenses for research, training, and human resources as authorized by the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), to remain available until expended, \$26,000,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of section 18(h) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States,

counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred for training.

##### FORMULA GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of sections 9 and 18 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), \$1,600,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds provided under this head for formula grants no more than \$802,278,000 may be used for operating assistance under section 9(k)(2) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended.

##### DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

##### (LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

##### (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs in excess of \$1,900,000,000 in fiscal year 1992 for grants under the contract authority authorized in section 21 (a)(2) and (b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

##### MASS TRANSIT CAPITAL FUND

##### (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

##### (HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out section 21 (a)(2) and (b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), administered by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, \$1,400,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

##### INTERSTATE TRANSFER GRANTS—TRANSIT

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 103(e)(4) related to transit projects, \$160,000,000, to remain available until expended.

##### WASHINGTON METRO

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 14 of Public Law 96-184 and Public Law 101-551, \$124,000,000, to remain available until expended.

##### SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to the Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Corporation's budget for the current fiscal year.

##### OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

##### (HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses for operation and maintenance of those portions of the Saint Lawrence Seaway operated and maintained by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, \$10,600,000, to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662.

##### RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

##### RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Research and Special Programs Administration, and for expenses for conducting research and development, \$17,582,000, of which \$1,592,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation

funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, for reports publication and dissemination, and for aviation information management: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation up to \$1,000,000 in funds received from user fees established to support the electronic tariff filing system.

##### PIPELINE SAFETY

##### (PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

For expenses necessary to conduct the functions of the pipeline safety program and for grants-in-aid to carry out a pipeline safety program, as authorized by section 5 of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 and the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979, \$13,472,000, to be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, of which \$7,850,000 shall remain available until expended.

##### OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$37,005,000.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title I of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to the remainder of the title?

##### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZELIFF

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZELIFF: On page 39, after line 7, insert the following:

Notwithstanding any provision of this title, each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this title is hereby reduced by 9.89 percent.

□ 1700

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the balanced budget amendment. Now, I do not mean to suggest that this amendment alone will balance the budget, but it is a first step.

Since 1985, Federal spending has increased by nearly 50 percent. Federal spending is projected to increase by over 10 percent in this fiscal year alone.

That is what my amendment today does. It imposes restraint on the rate of increase in spending. Notice I did not say a reduction in spending. This amendment will allow overall spending to rise by 0.36 percent. Why 0.36 percent?

Based on the Office of Management and Budget's midsession review, Congress can balance the budget without cutting spending or raising taxes.

All Congress has to do is hold the growth in Federal spending to 0.36 percent in fiscal year 1992, and for the

next 3 fiscal years. As a result, the budget can be brought into balance by fiscal year 1995. This projection assumes full funding of Social Security, S&L's and net interest.

Getting to a balanced budget is an attainable goal. My amendment is one small part of achieving that goal.

Remember, just a few weeks ago we talked about 2.4 percent. Now we are at midyear and we are talking about 0.36 percent.

Time is running out, Mr. Chairman, and if we do not wake up soon we will not be talking about increases, we will be talking about decreases.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I said before, the bill before us today is below the subcommittee's allocation for discretionary budget authority and outlays. In addition, I am not aware of any opposition from OMB to the overall funding level we have recommended.

But let's set-aside for a moment the issue of whether we are within our budget allocations. Let's look at the impact of this cut. This is not a small or insignificant reduction. It would cut approximately \$3.1 billion and would have a dramatic affect on our Nation's transportation system.

Let me explain what that means to important individual programs. This reduction would cut \$245 million from Coast Guard operating expenses, which would lessen their ability to conduct search and rescue, drug interdiction, and oil spill response activities. For the FAA, this reduction would cut \$429 million from the operations account, resulting in a less efficient air traffic control system.

It would also result in major reductions to our surface transportation programs. Under this amendment we would be able to spend little, if any, of the revenue resulting from last year's gas tax increase.

The Members should know that a large number of the programs in this bill provide for safety activities—aviation safety and security inspections, investigations by the National Transportation Safety Board, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, hazardous materials inspectors, and so forth. This bill is different from some others in that respect. Does this House really want to cut transportation safety.

Mr. Chairman, many of us in the past have criticized Gramm-Rudman's automatic sequestration as being an abdication of the Congress' responsibility to review and provide adequately for individual Federal programs. It invokes mindless reductions without any regard for the needs of individual programs or the efficient operation of our transportation system. This amendment follows the same approach.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate that the committee has done its job.

We have reported a bill which meets our allocation for discretionary budget authority and outlays. This is a good, fiscally responsible bill. I strongly urge that the amended be defeated.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. Let me just give a couple of reasons why.

One, this bill that we are now on is within the 602(b) allocation. Second, for those who are concerned, the Office of Management and Budget does not, let me just state again, does not object to the bill, and if they did, the chairman and Mr. Darman and others would have a letter up here in opposition.

Third, to talk to the substantive issues, this would be a 10-percent cut across the board in title I, which is the lion's share, the bulk of the bill. It would severely and negatively impact, it would almost be a killer amendment for the FAA. For anyone who files and cares about air safety, this would be one of the worst things we could do.

Second, it would have a very negative impact on the Coast Guard search and rescue, I would say, for those who are concerned with regard to that.

Last, there are so many other reasons, but the other main one is for drug interdiction. This would be a severe cut with regard to drug interdiction.

So again, I am sure the gentleman had good faith in offering this amendment, but I would urge Members to oppose it because I do not believe that the Department of Transportation could adequately operate with it. It would clearly be a killer amendment for the FAA and a killer amendment for the Coast Guard.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Chairman, we are talking about a revision of priorities here. We are talking about living within our means. If we spend no more than 0.036 percent, we live within our means. If we spend more than that, we do not.

All of the things the gentleman talked about are good projects, so I think it is a reallocation of priorities that we need. And we have to start living within our means, and all this amendment is doing is recognizing the fact that we cannot continue to spend more money than we take in.

Mr. WOLF. Let me just answer the gentleman. I respect his position.

I have voted for as many cuts on this floor as perhaps most Members. I received the award from the Taxpayers Alliance last year with regard to cuts. I am a strong supporter of the balanced budget amendment.

There can be reallocations. This is not the place to do it.

You cannot bring an ax to the Coast Guard and then say you are for strong

drug interdiction and you want to stop drugs coming into the country and then vote for this. You cannot really be for airline safety. You want to reallocate in different areas, but you cannot take a meat ax of 10 percent to the FAA and then say you are for airline safety.

Although I sympathize with the gentleman on many of these budget cuts, we cannot take 10 percent out.

Mr. ZELIFF. With all due respect, I agree with the gentleman's priorities, but if we do not start cutting across the board, and we are not taking a meat ax, we are talking about taking some fiscal restraint in spending, and we are talking about living within our means. But I think the gentleman's point is well taken, and I respect it.

Mr. WOLF. I understand, and would just urge Members on my side of the body to vote no.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The gentleman from New Hampshire described this as a balanced budget amendment, and indeed it is. And the gentleman from Virginia, in opposing him, has pointed out exactly why most Members should want to support this amendment if they are really in favor of a balanced budget.

The gentleman indicates this is within the 602(b), and it is. He indicates that the administration is not opposed to this bill, and indeed that is true. The point being, however, that the administration is living within the budget agreement from last year, and the committee is taking us down the road of the budget agreement of last year too, both of which are taking us down the road to budget deficits, not to a balanced budget.

The gentleman from New Hampshire is offering us a unique opportunity. He says we need to go further than what we committed to in last year's budget agreement. We actually ought to move toward a balanced budget.

That is considered a terrible thing to do on the House floor. I mean, just raising programs a little bit is regarded as a killer cut, that somehow this undermines the entire program.

The gentleman from New Hampshire is not talking about a cut in any program. His amendment would allow an across-the-board increase in all programs relative to this year's spending. How you can increase spending and have it be a killer kind of amendment is beyond my imagination. In fact, most companies in this country faced with the kind of recessionary pressures we have imposed upon them because of the budget deal last year are having to cut way back, they are having to make real cuts. They know what the killer type of economic decisions are really all about. We do not know here.

Instead, we go along our merry way continuing to pile up debt and continuing to do the kinds of things that move

us further away from a balanced budget, not toward it.

The gentleman's amendment is particularly important in light of what the OMB told us this week. Just this week they indicated that last year's budget deal is unraveling in terms of the deficit, that in fact the deficit is getting worse, not better, that revenues are down as a result of the economic recession, that in fact they miscalculated in some instances in the bill and that, in fact, we are overspending, over and above what the budget deal thought we would.

So all of those things together is in fact increasing the deficit and moving us further away from a balanced budget. The gentleman from New Hampshire with his amendment gives us a chance to get back on track, because he has lowered his amendment to a figure to reflect what the OMB told us this week is necessary in order to get to a balanced budget.

I think he should be congratulated, and I think that this House, if it really is concerned about balanced budgets for the future, ought to vote with the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to this amendment. And I hope the people have been following this debate. It is amazing the twist and turns it has taken.

My friend from Pennsylvania, who stood up just a few moments ago in defense of American automobiles, is now standing up in support of an amendment which cuts \$1.6 billion in highway spending, which I believe in most cases will be used for automobiles. I think it is an antiautomobile amendment, and I hope the gentleman is sensitive to that fact.

The Members may also be interested in knowing that this amendment cuts \$420 million from the Federal Aviation Administration. Have you flown into an airport lately?

□ 1710

Have you relied on an air traffic controller? Are you worried about the glut of traffic over major airports? Are you concerned, as we are, about having professional men and women serving as air traffic controllers? Do you want to promote those who are professional and skilled in this?

I am afraid you will not be able to if the gentleman from New Hampshire should prevail, because he cut \$420 million out of the FAA, money for air traffic controllers, money for air safety, and now let me tell you something else he does.

You are going to hear a lot of speeches around here, and we hear them every day, about law and order and crime. Every Member, Republican and Democrat alike, takes the floor saying, "We are the party; we are the people who want to fight crime. We want to do

something about the drug crisis in America."

Congress made a decision several years ago to enlist the services of the Coast Guard in fighting the drug crisis in America. "Let us stop the importation of these narcotic substances into America which are, in fact, debilitating and destroying our society." We made that commitment. We said to the Coast Guard, "You know what, we are going to give you the resources to do it, to get out and fight this battle. It is not just empty rhetoric. You are going to have the money, the personnel, the boats necessary to help us fight the drug crisis," and then along comes my friend from New Hampshire. He wants to take \$245 million from the Coast Guard, money that can be used to fight the drug crisis.

Mr. Chairman, now, I am sure he will give a speech soon, if he has not already, in Congress about his devotion to law and order and fighting crime.

I would tell the gentleman that when you take this across-the-board meat-ax approach to cutting spending, you end up cutting money for highways that is going to try to be used to eliminate the problems that we have, the congestion, and you are going to cut money for air traffic controllers so that families flying into airports across America will not be certain of the safety of their landings and takeoffs, and you are going to cut money from the Coast Guard that is being used to fight crime and the drug crisis. That is what it is all about.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. ZELIFF. What we are talking about is holding the level of increase to 3.6 percent. We are not talking about a meat ax. We are talking about holding the level within affordable levels, staying within our ability to pay. That is all we are saying.

Mr. DURBIN. I concede the gentleman is absolutely right, and the gentleman will have to concede to me that it cost \$1.6 billion in highway spending, \$245 million in Coast Guard expenditures, and \$420 million for the FAA and air traffic controllers.

I ask everyone to oppose the amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it really gets me when people talk about taking a meat ax to a spending bill like this. They say this meat-ax approach is the wrong approach.

Well, we just had an amendment approach a few minutes ago where we tried to cut out 63 demonstration projects that are going to cost \$243.3 million. We had an amendment that would cut \$1 million for a bicycle path in Michigan that the people in the rest

of the country are going to have to pay for with their tax dollars, and we could not even get a vote, and now you are complaining that we are taking a meat-ax approach because the gentleman wants to make a percentage cut in the spending which is still an increase over last year.

The fact of the matter is those who are interested in pork in this place want their pork. They want to take it back home and, as a result, we are going to have a \$350 billion to \$400 billion deficit this year. We have a \$3 trillion national debt. The interest is going to be about 15 percent of the total budget, and we sit around here and do not do a darn thing about it. We are spending ourselves into oblivion.

You say we cannot do it through amendments. You will not give votes on that. We cannot do it through the meat-ax approach. You say we cannot do that. How are you going to cut spending? When are we going to cut spending? When are we going to live within our means like a businessman or businesswoman has to? The answer is never, never.

As a result, this economy is going to be a continual problem in the years to come until we realize we have got to live within our means.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF].

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 222]

Abercrombie	Barton	Broomfield
Ackerman	Bateman	Browder
Alexander	Bellenson	Brown
Allard	Bennett	Bruce
Anderson	Bentley	Bryant
Andrews (ME)	Bereuter	Bunning
Andrews (NJ)	Berman	Burton
Andrews (TX)	Bevill	Bustamante
Annunzio	Bilbray	Byron
Anthony	Bilirakis	Callahan
Applegate	Bliley	Camp
Armev	Boehlert	Campbell (CA)
Aspin	Boehner	Campbell (CO)
Atkins	Bonior	Cardin
AuCoin	Borski	Carper
Bacchus	Boucher	Carr
Baker	Boxer	Chandler
Barnard	Brewster	Chapman
Barrett	Brooks	Clay

Clement  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coleman (MO)  
Coleman (TX)  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Coughlin  
Cox (CA)  
Cox (IL)  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Cunningham  
Dannemeyer  
Darden  
Davis  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Derrick  
Dickinson  
Dicks  
Dixon  
Donnelly  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dorgan (ND)  
Dornan (CA)  
Downey  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Durbin  
Dwyer  
Early  
Eckart  
Edwards (CA)  
Edwards (OK)  
Edwards (TX)  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Erdreich  
Espy  
Evans  
Ewing  
Fascell  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Feighan  
Fields  
Fish  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford (MI)  
Ford (TN)  
Franks (CT)  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Gallo  
Gaydos  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Glickman  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Gradison  
Grandy  
Gray  
Green  
Guarini  
Gunderson  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hammerschmidt  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Harris  
Hastert

Hatcher  
Hayes (IL)  
Hayes (LA)  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Henry  
Herger  
Hertel  
Hoagland  
Hobson  
Hochbrueckner  
Holloway  
Horn  
Horton  
Myers  
Nagle  
Natcher  
Neal (MA)  
Neal (NC)  
Nichols  
Hunter  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Inhofe  
Ireland  
Jacobs  
James  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson (TX)  
Johnston  
Jones (GA)  
Jones (NC)  
Jontz  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kleczka  
Klug  
Kolbe  
Kolter  
Kopetski  
Kostmayer  
Kyl  
LaFalce  
Lancaster  
Lantos  
LaRocco  
Laughlin  
Leach  
Lehman (CA)  
Lehman (FL)  
Lent  
Levin (MI)  
Levine (CA)  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lightfoot  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
Long  
Lowery (CA)  
Lowey (NY)  
Luken  
Machtley  
Manton  
Markey  
Marlenee  
Martinez  
Matsui  
Mavroules  
Mazzoli  
McCandless  
McCloskey  
McCollum  
McCormack  
McCord  
McDade  
McDermott  
McEwen  
McGrath  
McHugh  
McMillan (NC)  
McMillen (MD)  
McNulty  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Michel  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (OH)

Miller (WA)  
Mineta  
Mink  
Moakley  
Molinari  
Mollohan  
Moody  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Morrison  
Mrazek  
Murphy  
Myers  
Nagle  
Natcher  
Neal (MA)  
Neal (NC)  
Nichols  
Nowak  
Nussle  
Oakar  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olin  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens (NY)  
Owens (UT)  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Patterson  
Paxon  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pease  
Pelosi  
Penny  
Perkins  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pickle  
Porter  
Poshard  
Price  
Pursell  
Quillen  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Ravenel  
Ray  
Reed  
Regula  
Rhodes  
Richardson  
Ridge  
Rinaldo  
Ritter  
Roberts  
Roe  
Roemer  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Rowland  
Roybal  
Russo  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sangmeister  
Santorum  
Savage  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Scheuer  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schulze  
Schumer  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sharp  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster

□ 1736

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred and fourteen Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind Members this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 64, noes 362, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

AYES—64

Allard  
Archer  
Armey  
Barrett  
Barton  
Boehner  
Bunning  
Burton  
Campbell (CA)  
Coble  
Condit  
Cox (CA)  
Crane  
Cunningham  
Dannemeyer  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields  
Gallegly

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Alexander  
Anderson  
Andrews (ME)  
Andrews (NJ)  
Andrews (TX)  
Annunzio  
Anthony  
Applegate  
Aspin  
Atkins  
AuCoin  
Bacchus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barnard  
Bateman  
Bellenson  
Bennett  
Bentley  
Bereuter

Studds  
Stump  
Sundquist  
Swett  
Swift  
Synar  
Tallon  
Tanner  
Tausin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (GA)  
Thomas (WY)  
Thornton  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traficant  
Traxler  
Unsoeld  
Upton  
Valentine

Vander Jagt  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Waters  
Waxman  
Weber  
Weldon  
Whitten  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Wolpe  
Wyden  
Wylie  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Gilchrest  
Goodling  
Gradison  
Grandy  
Hancock  
Hastert  
Hefley  
Herger  
Holloway  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Jacobs  
Johnson (TX)  
Kasich  
Klug  
Kolbe  
Kyl  
Luken  
Machtley  
Miller (OH)  
Nussle  
Penny

NOES—362

Cardin  
Carper  
Carr  
Chandler  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clement  
Clinger  
Coleman (MO)  
Coleman (TX)  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Combest  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Coughlin  
Cox (IL)  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Darden  
Davis

de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Derrick  
Dickinson  
Dicks  
Dixon  
Donnelly  
Dooley  
Dorgan (ND)  
Dornan (CA)  
Downey  
Durbin  
Dwyer  
Dymally  
Early  
Eckart  
Edwards (CA)  
Edwards (OK)  
Edwards (TX)  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Erdreich  
Espy  
Evans  
Fascell  
Fazio  
Feighan  
Fish  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford (MI)  
Ford (TN)  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Frost  
Gallo  
Gaydos  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Glickman  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Goss  
Gray  
Green  
Guarini  
Gunderson  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hammerschmidt  
Hansen  
Harris  
Hastert  
Hobson  
Hochbrueckner  
Horn  
Horton  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hubbard  
Huckaby  
Hughes  
Hutto  
Inhofe  
Ireland  
James  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnston  
Jones (GA)  
Jones (NC)  
Jontz  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kennelly

Pickel  
Poshard  
Price  
Pursell  
Quillen  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Ravenel  
Ray  
Reed  
Regula  
Richardson  
Ridge  
Riggs  
Rinaldo  
Ritter  
Roe  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roukema  
Rowland  
Roybal  
Russo  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sangmeister  
Santorum  
Savage  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Scheuer  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schulze  
Schumer  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sharp  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster

Wise  
Wolf  
Wolpe

Wyden  
Wyllie  
Yates

Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION  
PANAMA CANAL REVOLVING FUND

NOT VOTING—7

Hopkins  
Lagomarsino  
Lloyd

Sarpallus  
Weiss  
Williams

Yatron

□ 1743

Mr. SIKORSKI and Mr. PEASE changed their vote from "aye" to "no." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill is as follows:

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

ARCHITECTURAL AND TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS COMPLIANCE BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, as authorized by section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, \$2,900,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation funds received for training expenses.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS-18; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902), \$34,176,000, of which not to exceed \$1,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b), and not to exceed \$1,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$40,923,000: *Provided*, That joint board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their official duties as such: *Provided further*, That fees collected in fiscal year 1992 by the Interstate Commerce Commission pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9701 shall be made available to this appropriation in fiscal year 1992.

PAYMENTS FOR DIRECTED RAIL SERVICE

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for the execution of programs the obligations for which can reasonably be expected to exceed \$475,000 for directed rail service authorized under 49 U.S.C. 11125 or any other Act.

For administrative expenses of the Panama Canal Commission, including not to exceed \$11,000 for official reception and representation expenses of the Board; not to exceed \$5,000 for official reception and representation expenses of the Secretary; and not to exceed \$30,000 for official reception and representation expenses of the Administrator, \$49,497,000, to be derived from the Panama Canal Revolving Fund: *Provided*, That none of these funds may be used for the planning or execution of non-administrative and capital programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$519,000,000 in fiscal year 1992: *Provided further*, That funds available to the Panama Canal Commission shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed forty-four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only (including large heavy-duty vehicles used to transport Commission personnel across the Isthmus of Panama) the purchase price of which shall not exceed \$16,500 per vehicle.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

REBATE OF SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY TOLLS (HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

For rebate of the United States portion of tolls paid for use of the Saint Lawrence Seaway, pursuant to Public Law 99-662, \$10,250,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, of which not to exceed \$170,000 shall be available for expenses of administering the rebates.

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

INTEREST PAYMENTS

For necessary expenses for interest payments, to remain available until expended, \$51,663,569: *Provided*, That these funds shall be disbursed pursuant to terms and conditions established by Public Law 96-184 and the Initial Bond Repayment Participation Agreement.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 301. During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations to the Department of Transportation shall be available for maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of liability insurance for motor vehicles operating in foreign countries on official department business; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902).

SEC. 302. Funds for the Panama Canal Commission may be apportioned notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1341 to the extent necessary to permit payment of such pay increases for officers or employees as may be authorized by administrative action pursuant to law that are not in excess of statutory increases granted for the same period in corresponding rates of compensation for other employees of the Government in comparable positions.

SEC. 303. Funds appropriated under this Act for expenditures by the Federal Aviation Administration shall be available (1) except as otherwise authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 236-244), for expenses of primary and secondary schooling for dependents of Federal Aviation Administration personnel stationed outside the continental United States at costs for any given area not in excess of those of the Department of Defense for the same area, when it is determined by the Secretary that the schools, if any, available in the locality are

unable to provide adequately for the education of such dependents, and (2) for transportation of said dependents between schools serving the area that they attend and their places of residence when the Secretary, under such regulations as may be prescribed, determines that such schools are not accessible by public means of transportation on a regular basis.

SEC. 304. Appropriations contained in this Act for the Department of Transportation shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS-18.

SEC. 305. None of the funds for the Panama Canal Commission may be expended unless in conformance with the Panama Canal Treaties of 1977 and any law implementing those treaties.

SEC. 306. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

SEC. 307. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 308. None of the funds in this or any previous or subsequent Act shall be available for the planning or implementation of any change in the current Federal status of the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, and none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation of any change in the current Federal status of the Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center: *Provided*, That the Secretary may plan for further development of the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center and for other compatible uses of the Center's real property: *Provided*, That any such planning does not alter the Federal status of the Center's research and development operation.

SEC. 309. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 310. (a) For fiscal year 1992 the Secretary of Transportation shall distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways by allocation in the ratio which sums authorized to be appropriated for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction that are apportioned or allocated to each State for such fiscal year bear to the total of the sums authorized to be appropriated for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction that are apportioned or allocated to all the States for such fiscal year.

(b) During the period October 1 through December 31, 1991, no State shall obligate more than 35 per centum of the amount distributed to such State under subsection (a), and the total of all State obligations during such period shall not exceed 25 per centum of the total amount distributed to all States under such subsection: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to funds obligated for the Kennedy Expressway rehabilitation project in Chicago, Illinois.

(c) Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) provide all States with authority sufficient to prevent lapses of sums authorized to

be appropriated for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction that have been apportioned to a State, except in those instances in which a State indicates its intention to lapse sums apportioned under section 104(b)(5)(A) of title 23, United States Code;

(2) after August 1, 1992, revise a distribution of the funds made available under subsection (a) if a State will not obligate the amount distributed during that fiscal year and redistribute sufficient amounts to those States able to obligate amounts in addition to those previously distributed during that fiscal year giving priority to those States having large unobligated balances of funds apportioned under section 104 of title 23, United States Code, and giving priority to those States which, because of statutory changes made by the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1981, have experienced substantial proportional reductions in their apportionments and allocations; and

(3) not distribute amounts authorized for administrative expenses, the Federal lands highway program, the strategic highway research program and amounts made available under sections 149(d), 158, 159, 164, 165, and 167 of Public Law 100-17.

(d) The limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 1992 shall not apply to obligations for emergency relief under section 125 of title 23, United States Code; obligations under section 157 of title 23, United States Code; projects covered under section 147 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978, section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1981, subsections 131 (b) and (j) of Public Law 97-424, section 118 of the National Visitors Center Facilities Act of 1968, or section 320 of title 23, United States Code; projects authorized by Public Law 99-500, Public Law 99-591 and Public Law 100-202; or projects covered under subsections 149 (b) and (c) of Public Law 100-17.

(e) Subject to paragraph (c)(2) of this General Provision, a State which after August 1 and on or before September 30 of fiscal year 1992 obligates the amount distributed to such State in that fiscal year under paragraphs (a) and (c) of this General Provision may obligate for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction on or before September 30, 1992, an additional amount not to exceed 5 percent of the aggregate amount of funds apportioned or allocated to such State—

(1) under sections 104, 130, 144, and 152 of title 23, United States Code, and

(2) for highway assistance projects under section 103(e)(4) of such title, which are not obligated on the date such State completes obligation of the amount so distributed.

(f) During the period August 2 through September 30, 1992, the aggregate amount which may be obligated by all States pursuant to paragraph (e) shall not exceed 2.5 percent of the aggregate amount of funds apportioned or allocated to all States—

(1) under sections 104, 130, 144, and 152 of title 23, United States Code, and

(2) for highway assistance projects under section 103(e)(4) of such title, which would not be obligated in fiscal year 1992 if the total amount of the obligation limitation provided for such fiscal year in this Act were utilized.

(g) Paragraph (e) shall not apply to any State which on or after August 1, 1992, has the amount distributed to such State under paragraph (a) for fiscal year 1992 reduced under paragraph (c)(2).

SEC. 311. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of

more than one hundred and twenty political and Presidential appointees in the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 312. Not to exceed \$800,000 of the funds provided in this Act for the Department of Transportation shall be available for the necessary expenses of advisory committees.

SEC. 313. The limitation on obligations for the Discretionary Grants program of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration shall not apply to any authority under sections 21(a) (2) and (b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, previously made available for obligation.

SEC. 314. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the construction of, or any other costs related to, the Central Automated Transit System (Downtown People Mover) in Detroit, Michigan.

SEC. 315. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to implement section 404 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 316. Every 30 days, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration shall publish in the Federal Register an announcement of each grant obligated pursuant to sections 3 and 9 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, including the grant number, the grant amount, and the transit property receiving each grant.

SEC. 317. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this or any other Act intended for studies, reports, training, salaries, or research, and related costs thereof including necessary capital expenses, including site acquisition, construction and equipment, are available for such purposes to be conducted through contracts, grants, or financial assistance agreements with the educational institutions that are specified in such Acts or in any report accompanying such Acts.

SEC. 318. The Secretary of Transportation shall permit the obligation of not to exceed \$4,000,000, apportioned under title 23, United States Code, section 104(b)(5)(B) for the State of Florida for operating expenses of the Tri-County Commuter Rail Project in the area of Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties, Florida, during each year that Interstate 95 is under reconstruction in such area.

SEC. 319. ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE COMPENSATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation shall make payment of compensation under subsection 419 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, only to the extent and in the manner provided in appropriations Acts, at times and in a manner determined by the Secretary to be appropriate, and claims for such compensation shall not arise except in accordance with this provision.

SEC. 320. The authority conferred by section 513(d) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended, to issue letters of intent shall remain in effect subsequent to September 30, 1992. Letters of intent may be issued under such subsection to applicants determined to be qualified under such Act: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, all such letters of intent in excess of \$10,000,000 shall be submitted for approval to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives; the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 321. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to transfer funds appropriated for any office of the Office of the Secretary

to any other office of the Office of the Secretary: *Provided*, That no appropriation shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent by all such transfers: *Provided further*, That any such transfer shall be submitted for approval to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 322. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1992 pay raises for programs funded in this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 323. VESSEL TRAFFIC SAFETY FAIRWAY.—None of the funds in this Act shall be available to plan, finalize, or implement regulations that would establish a vessel traffic safety fairway less than five miles wide between the Santa Barbara Traffic Separation Scheme and the San Francisco Traffic Separation Scheme.

SEC. 324. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, airports may transfer, without consideration, to the Federal Aviation Administration instrument landing systems (along with associated approach lighting equipment and runway visual range equipment) which conform to Federal Aviation Administration performance specifications, the purchase of which was assisted by a Federal airport aid program, airport development aid program or airport improvement program grant. The Federal Aviation Administration shall accept such equipment, which shall thereafter be operated and maintained by the Federal Aviation Administration in accordance with agency criteria.

SEC. 325. WESTSIDE LIGHT RAIL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall, with regard to the Discretionary Grants program of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, by September 30, 1992, issue a letter of intent and enter into a full funding agreement for the Westside Light Rail extension, including systems related costs, between downtown Portland, Oregon, and S.W. 185th Avenue. That full funding agreement shall provide for a future amendment under the same terms and conditions set forth above, for the extension known as the Hillsboro project which extends from S.W. 185th Avenue to the Transit Center in the City of Hillsboro, Oregon. Subject to a regional decision documented in the Hillsboro project's preferred alternatives report, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District in Portland, Oregon, to initiate preliminary engineering on the Hillsboro project, which shall proceed independent of and concurrent with the project between downtown Portland, Oregon, and S.W. 185th Avenue.

SEC. 326. NATIONAL WEATHER GRAPHICS SYSTEM.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Federal Aviation Administration for a new National Weather Graphics System.

SEC. 327. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to award a multiyear contract for production end items that (1) includes economic order quantity or long lead time material procurement in excess of \$10,000,000 in any one year of the contract or (2) includes a cancellation charge greater than \$10,000,000 which at the time of obligation has not been appropriated to the limits of the government's liability or (3) includes a requirement that permits performance under the contract during the second and subsequent years of the contract without conditioning such performance upon the appropriation of funds: *Provided*, That this limitation does not apply to a contract in which the Federal Government incurs no financial liability from not buying additional systems,

subsystems, or components beyond the basic contract requirements.

SEC. 328. From funds appropriated to the Department of Transportation or made available by this Act or any other Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other Act, make available not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the planning of a multimodal transportation center in St. Louis, Missouri.

SEC. 329. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to close the Federal Aviation Administration's airport facilities equipment office in Little Rock, Arkansas, or to transfer or reduce personnel therefrom.

SEC. 330. SOUTH BOSTON PIERS TRANSITWAY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall, with regard to the Discretionary Grants program of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration—

(a) issue a letter of no prejudice by October 1, 1991, and enter into a full funding agreement, including system related costs, by June 1, 1992, for the portion of the South Boston Piers Transitway project between South Station and the portal at D Street in South Boston, Massachusetts. That full funding agreement shall provide for a future amendment under the same terms and conditions set forth above, for the extension of the Transitway from South Station to Boylston Station; and

(b) issue a letter of intent by September 30, 1992, for the extension of the Transitway from South Station to Boylston Station.

SEC. 331. NATIONAL 55 MPH SPEED LIMIT ENFORCEMENT PENALTIES.—Notwithstanding sections 141(a) and 154 of title 23, United States Code, none of the funds in this or any previous or subsequent Act shall be used for the purpose of reducing or reserving any portion of a State's apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds as required by section 154(f) of title 23, United States Code, for reason of noncompliance with the criteria of that subsection during fiscal year 1990. The Secretary shall promptly restore any apportionments which, prior to enactment of this Act, were reduced or reserved from obligation for reason of noncompliance under section 154(f) during said fiscal year.

SEC. 332. The Secretary of Transportation shall withhold 5 per centum of the amount required to be apportioned to any State under each of paragraphs (1), (2), (5), and (6) of section 104(b) of title 23, United States Code, on the first day of fiscal years 1994 and 1995 if the State does not meet the requirements of section 104(a) (3) of title 23, United States Code, on such dates.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1992".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to the remainder of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a noncontroversial technical amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Strike section 332 and insert in lieu thereof: SEC. . REVOCATION OR SUSPENSION OF DRIVERS' LICENSES OF INDIVIDUALS CONVICTED OF DRUG OFFENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 159. Revocation or suspension of drivers' licenses of individuals convicted of drug offenses

"(a) WITHHOLDING OF APPORTIONMENTS FOR NONCOMPLIANCE.—

"(1) AFTER SECOND CALENDAR YEAR.—For each fiscal year the Secretary shall withhold 5 percent of the amount required to be apportioned to any State under each of paragraphs (1), (2), (5), and (6) of section 104(b) on the first day of each fiscal year which begins after the second calendar year following the effective date of this section if the State does not meet the requirements of paragraph (3) on such date.

"(2) AFTER FOURTH CALENDAR YEAR.—The Secretary shall withhold 10 percent (including any amounts withheld under paragraph (1)) of the amount required to be apportioned to any State under each of paragraphs (1), (2), (5), and (6) of section 104(b) on the first day of each fiscal year which begins after the fourth calendar year following the effective date of this section if the State does not meet the requirements of paragraph (3) on the first day of such fiscal year.

"(3) REQUIREMENTS.—A State meets the requirements of this paragraph if—

"(A) the State has enacted and is enforcing a law that requires in all circumstances, or requires in the absence of compelling circumstances warranting an exception—

"(i) the revocation, or suspension for at least 6 months, of the driver's license of any individual who is convicted, after the enactment of such law, of—

"(I) any violation of the Controlled Substances Act, or

"(II) any drug offense, and

"(ii) a delay in the issuance or reinstatement of a driver's license to such an individual for at least 6 months after the individual applies for the issuance or reinstatement of a driver's license if the individual does not have a driver's license, or the driver's license of the individual is suspended, at the time the individual is so convicted; or

"(B) the Governor of the State—

"(i) submits to the Secretary no earlier than the adjournment sine die of the first regularly scheduled session of the State's legislature which begins after the effective date of this section a written certification stating that the Governor is opposed to the enactment or enforcement in the State of a law described in subparagraph (A), relating to the revocation, suspension, issuance, or reinstatement of driver's licenses to convicted drug offenders; and

"(ii) submits to the Secretary a written certification that the legislature (including both Houses where applicable) has adopted a resolution expressing its opposition to a law described in clause (i).

"(b) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY; EFFECT OF COMPLIANCE AND NONCOMPLIANCE—

"(1) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY OF WITHHELD FUNDS.—

"(A) FUNDS WITHHELD ON OR BEFORE SEPTEMBER 30, 1995.—Any funds withheld under subsection (a) from apportionment to any State on or before September 30, 1995, shall remain available for apportionment to such State as follows:

"(i) If such funds would have been apportioned under section 104(b)(5)(A) but for this section, such funds shall remain available until the end of the fiscal year for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated.

"(ii) If such funds would have been apportioned under section 104(b)(5)(B) but for this section, such funds shall remain available until the end of the second fiscal year following the fiscal year for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated.

"(iii) If such funds would have been apportioned under paragraph (1), (2), or (6) of section 104(b) but for this section, such funds shall remain available until the end of the

third fiscal year following the fiscal year for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated.

"(B) FUNDS WITHHELD AFTER SEPTEMBER 30, 1995.—No funds withheld under this section from apportionment to any State after September 30, 1995, shall be available for apportionment to such State.

"(2) APPORTIONMENT OF WITHHELD FUNDS AFTER COMPLIANCE.—If, before the last day of the period for which funds withheld under subsection (a) from apportionment are to remain available for apportionment to a State under paragraph (1), the State meets the requirements of subsection (a)(3), the Secretary shall, on the first day on which the State meets the requirements of subsection (a)(3), apportion to the State the funds withheld under subsection (a) that remain available for apportionment to the State.

"(3) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY OF SUBSEQUENTLY APPORTIONED FUNDS.—Any funds apportioned pursuant to paragraph (2) shall remain available for expenditure as follows:

"(A) Funds which would have been originally apportioned under section 104(b)(5)(A) shall remain available until the end of the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year in which such funds are apportioned under paragraph (2).

"(B) Funds which would have been originally apportioned under paragraph (1), (2), (5)(B), or (6) of section 104(b) shall remain available until the end of the third fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year in which such funds are so apportioned.

Sums not obligated at the end of such period shall lapse or, in the case of funds apportioned under section 104(b)(5), shall lapse and be made available by the Secretary for projects in accordance with section 118(b).

"(4) EFFECT OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—If, at the end of the period for which funds withheld under subsection (a) from apportionment are available for apportionment to a State under paragraph (1), the State does not meet the requirements of subsection (a)(3), such funds shall lapse or, in the case of funds withheld from apportionment under section 104(b)(5), such funds shall lapse and be made available by the Secretary for projects in accordance with section 118(b).

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) DRIVER'S LICENSE.—The term 'driver's license' means a license issued by a State to any individual that authorizes the individual to operate a motor vehicle on highways.

"(2) DRUG OFFENSE.—The term 'drug offense' means any criminal offense which prescribes—

"(A) the possession, distribution, manufacture, cultivation, sale, transfer, or the attempt or conspiracy to possess, distribute, manufacture, cultivate, sell, or transfer any substance the possession of which is prohibited under the Controlled Substances Act; or

"(B) the operation of a motor vehicle under the influence of such a substance.

"(3) CONVICTED.—The term 'convicted' includes adjudicated under juvenile proceedings."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER ANALYSIS.—The analysis for chapter 1 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 159 and inserting the following:

"159. Revocation or suspension of drivers' licenses of individuals convicted of drug offenses."

(c) REPEAL OF FORMER PROVISION.—Section 333 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991 (104 Stat. 2184-2186) is repealed.

(d) TREATMENT OF AMENDMENTS MADE BY FORMER PROVISION.—The amendments made by section 333 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991 (104 Stat. 2184-2186) shall be treated as having not been enacted into law.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall take effect November 5, 1990.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, last year the Committee on Appropriations was good enough to accept my amendment that withholds Federal funds from States that fail to enact legislation that suspends drivers licenses of convicted drug felons. That amendment became law last year.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today is a clarifying technical amendment to change the language in the DOT bill of fiscal year 1991 so that we can carry out the program without having to revisit the enactment provision year after year.

It was our original intent to set in motion a program implemented through the DOT that would reduce the Federal highway funds to any State that did not put into effect and enforce a program to suspend the driver's licenses of an individual convicted of any drug offense.

Unfortunately, due to drafting errors, unless we change the language included in the DOT fiscal year 1991 bill the provision allowing enactment would need to be included in every appropriations bill throughout the course of the program. This was never our original intent.

We agreed that suspending driver's licenses of individuals convicted of any drug offense was a good idea. An idea that the American public wholeheartedly supported and has had great results in the States or Oregon and New Jersey. Conditioning the privilege of driving to the responsibility of remaining drug free has a positive effect in the war against drugs. It makes people, especially our Nation's youth, think before using illegal drugs because the privilege of driving is so very important to everyone.

I strongly feel that if we condition the privilege of driving to the responsibility of remaining drug free, it will send a meaningful message to our youth at a time in their lives when they are yearning for that great rite of passage into adulthood, obtaining their driver's license. The message is that we are not going to tolerate illegal drug use, so think hard about it before you make your decision.

The States of Oregon and New Jersey have implemented this idea with great success. In 1989, New Jersey alone suspended the licenses of over 17,000 individuals convicted of drug offenses and a survey of their high school students showed that 41 percent were strongly influenced by this legislation and do not use illegal drugs.

Money and rhetoric aren't going to win the war against drugs. And as long

as casual drug users go unpunished, they are going to continue to finance the illegal drug trade. But this approach which costs the Government little, will effectively reduce illegal drug use.

If we change the language now, the program we agreed to can run its course uninterrupted as we intended.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment and congratulate the gentleman from New York for bringing it to our attention.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBERSTAR.

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE IV—AGING AIRCRAFT SAFETY

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Aging Aircraft Safety Act of 1991".

SEC. 402. AGING AIRCRAFT RULEMAKING PROCEEDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Administrator shall initiate a rulemaking proceeding for the purpose of issuing a rule to assure the continuing airworthiness of aging aircraft.

(b) INSPECTIONS AND RECORD REVIEWS.—

(1) GENERAL REQUIREMENT.—The rule issued pursuant to this section shall, at a minimum, require the Administrator to make such inspections, and conduct such reviews of maintenance and other records, of each aircraft used by an air carrier to provide air transportation as may be necessary to enable the Administrator to determine that such aircraft is in safe condition and is properly maintained for operation in air transportation.

(2) PART OF HEAVY MAINTENANCE CHECKS.—The inspections and reviews required under paragraph (1) shall be carried out as part of each heavy maintenance check of the aircraft conducted on or after the first day of the 15th year in which the aircraft is in service.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT.—The inspections required under paragraph (1) shall be conducted as provided in section 601(a)(3)(C) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

(c) DEMONSTRATION OF STRUCTURAL AND PARTS MAINTENANCE.—The rule issued pursuant to this section shall, at a minimum, require the air carrier to demonstrate to the Administrator, as part of the inspection required by the rule, that maintenance of the aircraft's structure, skin, and other age-sensitive parts and components has been adequate and timely enough to ensure the highest degree of safety.

(d) PROCEDURES.—The rule issued pursuant to this section shall establish procedures to be followed in carrying out the inspections required by the rule.

(e) AVAILABILITY OF AIRCRAFT.—The rule issued pursuant to this section shall require the air carrier to make available to the Administrator the aircraft and such inspection, maintenance, and other records pertaining to the aircraft as the Administrator may require for carrying out reviews required by the rule.

SEC. 403. AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE SAFETY PROGRAMS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this title, the Administrator shall establish—

(1) a program to verify that air carriers are maintaining their aircraft in accordance with maintenance programs approved by the Federal Aviation Administration;

(2) a program—

(A) to provide inspectors and engineers of the Federal Aviation Administration with training necessary for conducting auditing inspections of aircraft operated by air carriers for corrosion and metal fatigue; and

(B) to enhance participation of such inspectors and engineers in such inspections; and

(3) a program to ensure that air carriers demonstrate to the Administrator their commitment and technical competence to assure the airworthiness of aircraft operated by such carriers.

SEC. 404. FOREIGN AIR TRANSPORTATION.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—The Administrator shall take all possible steps to encourage foreign governments and relevant international organizations to develop standards and requirements for inspections and reviews which will ensure the continuing airworthiness of aging aircraft used by foreign air carriers to provide foreign air transportation to and from the United States and which will afford passengers of such foreign air carriers the same level of safety as will be afforded passengers of air carriers by implementation of this title.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than the last day of the second fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this title, the Administrator shall report to Congress on implementation of this section.

SEC. 405. ADMINISTRATOR DEFINED.

As used in this title, the term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment and urge its adoption. The amendment is identical to H.R. 172, the Aging Aircraft Safety Act of 1991, which was passed by the House in April by a voice vote without opposition. Similar legislation passed the House 1 year ago.

Ever since the Aloha Airlines accident 2 years ago, the issues surrounding the aging of the world's airline fleet have been of major concern to the flying public, the Government, and the aviation industry. The Government and industry have undertaken a number of very deliberate and beneficial actions on the problems of aging aircraft. Very quickly after the Aloha accident, the FAA, the manufacturers, and the airlines moved to change the assumptions upon which the regulatory approach to aging aircraft was based.

Before Aloha, a key assumption was that inspections for cracks and other damage could be discovered through routine, periodic inspections, and after

discovered, the cracks could be repaired. The Achilles heel of this approach was the reliance and dependence on inspections to detect cracks. The Aloha accident revealed that placing so much reliance on inspections did not serve the highest degree of safety, because cracks could be missed even under optimum inspection conditions.

Given the difficulty of these sorts of inspections to detect all potentially dangerous cracks, that assumption has been scrapped and we now have a new and improved approach. The approach now is to establish life limits to various structures and parts so that replacement of parts comes at certain intervals even if no crack reveals itself through inspections.

H.R. 172 builds on this new approach by requiring the FAA to make a special aircraft-by-aircraft inspection and assessment focused specifically on aging aircraft issues.

While I generally expect the industry and the FAA to do what is expected on the aging aircraft problem, I believe we need to develop a special regulatory and safety assurance system to ensure that all of the aging aircraft maintenance work now being required is actually accomplished.

This is necessary for three reasons. First, relatively few aircraft in the fleet will be retired over the next several years which means the average age of the fleet will significantly increase. Maintenance on aging aircraft will become an increasingly important aspect of air carriers' maintenance programs. Also, aircraft are increasingly being operated longer than was anticipated at the time of their manufacture. Prudence dictates that our legal and regulatory philosophy and framework recognize this, so that we are not simply relying upon the ordinary airworthiness compliance process for addressing this critical problem of increasing significance.

Second, when it comes to ownership of aircraft, the airline industry today is a web of complex ownership and leasing relationships and financial transactions. The specter of maintenance work being deferred to the next owner or lessee in order to save money is very real. This bill will ensure that from an FAA perspective that necessary work is accomplished and not deferred from owner to owner.

Third, for all the industry and the FAA have done to address the aging aircraft problem—and they are to be strongly commended—I have a sense most of it has been lost on the traveling public. The public should not be expected to sort out airworthiness directives, service bulletins, economic design life, and other arcane terms in determining their comfort level with flying. The public is very concerned about older aircraft. Let's develop a system of safety assurance that the public does not have to struggle and grapple with

in order to feel assured. Under this bill, the question asked is straightforward: "Is this old airplane safe?" And under this bill, the answer will be equally as straightforward: "Yes" or "no."

The reason for adding it to the fiscal year 1992 Transportation appropriations bill is that the other body has made it clear that it will not move this legislation separately and will only deal with it as part of a larger package.

The House has passed this legislation on two separate occasions before. It enjoys bipartisan support. I urge the House to act again on this important safety initiative.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly agree with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] and urge its adoption.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the penultimate word.

Mr. Chairman, we support the amendment and welcome its inclusion in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1750

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BARNARD] having assumed the chair, Mr. BOUCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2942) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARNARD). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 379, noes 47, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

AYES—379

Abercrombie	Downey	Jones (GA)
Ackerman	Durbin	Jones (NC)
Alexander	Dwyer	Jontz
Anderson	Dymally	Kanjorski
Andrews (ME)	Early	Kaptur
Andrews (NJ)	Eckart	Kasich
Andrews (TX)	Edwards (CA)	Kennedy
Annunzio	Edwards (OK)	Kennelly
Anthony	Edwards (TX)	Kildee
Applegate	Emerson	Klaczka
Aspin	Engel	Klug
Atkins	English	Kolbe
AuCoin	Erdreich	Kolter
Bacchus	Espy	Kopetski
Barnard	Evans	Kostmayer
Barrett	Ewing	LaFalce
Bateman	Fascell	Lancaster
Bellenson	Fazio	Lantos
Bennett	Feighan	LaRocco
Bentley	Fields	Laughlin
Bereuter	Flake	Leach
Berman	Foglietta	Lehman (CA)
Bevill	Ford (MI)	Lehman (FL)
Bilbray	Ford (TN)	Lent
Bilirakis	Frank (MA)	Levin (MI)
Bliley	Franks (CT)	Levine (CA)
Boehert	Frost	Lewis (CA)
Bonior	Galleghy	Lewis (FL)
Borski	Gallo	Lewis (GA)
Boucher	Gaydos	Lightfoot
Boxer	Gejdenson	Lipinski
Brewster	Gephardt	Livingston
Brooks	Geren	Lloyd
Broomfield	Gibbons	Long
Browder	Gilchrest	Lowery (CA)
Brown	Gillmor	Lowey (NY)
Bruce	Gilman	Machtley
Bryant	Gingrich	Manton
Bustamante	Glickman	Markey
Byron	Gonzalez	Marlenee
Callahan	Goodling	Martin
Camp	Gordon	Martinez
Campbell (CO)	Gradison	Matsui
Cardin	Grandy	Mavroules
Carper	Gray	Mazzoli
Carr	Green	McCandless
Chandler	Guarini	McCloskey
Chapman	Gunderson	McCollum
Clay	Hall (OH)	McCrary
Clement	Hall (TX)	McCurdy
Clinger	Hamilton	McDade
Coleman (MO)	Hammerschmidt	McDermott
Coleman (TX)	Hansen	McEwen
Collins (IL)	Harris	McGrath
Collins (MI)	Hastert	McHugh
Condit	Hatcher	McMillan (NC)
Conyers	Hayes (IL)	McMillen (MD)
Cooper	Hayes (LA)	McNulty
Costello	Hefner	Meyers
Coughlin	Hoagland	Mfume
Cox (CA)	Hobson	Michel
Cox (IL)	Hochbrueckner	Miller (CA)
Coyne	Horn	Miller (OH)
Cramer	Horton	Miller (WA)
Darden	Houghton	Mineta
Davis	Hoyer	Mink
De la Garza	Hubbard	Moakley
DeFazio	Huckaby	Molinari
DeLauro	Hughes	Mollohan
DeLay	Hutto	Montgomery
Dellums	Inhofe	Moody
Derrick	Ireland	Moran
Dickinson	James	Morella
Dicks	Jefferson	Morrison
Dingell	Jenkins	Mrazek
Dixon	Johnson (CT)	Murphy
Donnelly	Johnson (SD)	Murtha
Dooley	Johnson (TX)	Myers
Dornan (CA)	Johnston	Nagle

Natcher	Roemer	Stenholm
Neal (MA)	Rogers	Stokes
Neal (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen	Studds
Nichols	Rose	Sundquist
Nowak	Rostenkowski	Swett
Oakar	Roth	Swift
Oberstar	Roukema	Synar
Obey	Rowland	Tallon
Olin	Roybal	Tanner
Oliver	Russo	Tauzin
Ortiz	Sabo	Taylor (MS)
Orton	Sanders	Thomas (CA)
Owens (NY)	Sangmeister	Thomas (GA)
Owens (UT)	Santorum	Thomas (WY)
Oxley	Savage	Thornton
Packard	Sawyer	Torres
Pallone	Saxton	Torricelli
Panetta	Schaefer	Towns
Parker	Scheuer	Trafcant
Patterson	Schiff	Traxler
Paxon	Schroeder	Unsoeld
Payne (NJ)	Schulze	Upton
Payne (VA)	Schumer	Valentine
Pease	Serrano	Vander Jagt
Pelosi	Sharp	Vento
Perkins	Shaw	Visclosky
Peterson (FL)	Shays	Volkmer
Peterson (MN)	Shuster	Vucanovich
Pickett	Sikorski	Walsh
Pickle	Siskiy	Washington
Porter	Skaggs	Waters
Posahard	Skeen	Waxman
Price	Skelton	Weber
Purseell	Slattery	Weldon
Quillen	Slaughter (NY)	Wheat
Rahall	Slaughter (VA)	Whitten
Ramstad	Smith (FL)	Williams
Rangel	Smith (IA)	Wilson
Ravenel	Smith (NJ)	Wise
Ray	Smith (OR)	Wolf
Reed	Smith (TX)	Wolpe
Regula	Snowe	Wyden
Richardson	Solarz	Wyllie
Ridge	Spence	Yates
Riggs	Spratt	Young (AK)
Rinaldo	Staggers	Young (FL)
Ritter	Stallings	
Roe	Stark	

NOES—47

Allard	Dorgan (ND)	Luken
Archer	Dreier	Moorhead
Armey	Duncan	Nussle
Baker	Fawell	Penny
Ballenger	Gekas	Petri
Barton	Goss	Rhodes
Boehner	Hancock	Roberts
Bunning	Hefley	Rohrabacher
Burton	Henry	Sensenbrenner
Campbell (CA)	Herger	Stearns
Coble	Hertel	Stump
Combest	Holloway	Taylor (NC)
Crane	Hunter	Walker
Cunningham	Hyde	Zeliff
Dannemeyer	Jacobs	Zimmer
Doolittle	Kyl	

NOT VOTING—7

Fish	Sarpalius	Yatron
Hopkins	Solomon	
Lagomarsino	Weiss	

1810

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ENGEL). Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that further proceedings on the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2893, as amended, will be postponed further until tomorrow.

ADMINISTRATION GUTTING BILL TO TARGET RESEARCH FOR WOMEN'S DISEASES

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

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to join Members this morning when they talked about the effort to defeat the women's health provisions in the National Institutes of Health legislation that will come up tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the administration's quest for peace, but I sure do not applaud what they are trying to do in gutting a bill that finally, finally targets research for women's diseases.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote Secretary Sullivan, who says, "The \$50 million earmarked for breast cancer research and the development of a test for early detection of breast cancer is unnecessary."

Mr. Speaker, I want Secretary Sullivan to travel throughout this country and tell the 1 out of 9 women and their families who get breast cancer every year, the 45,000 women who will die this year of breast cancer, their children, their husbands, their daughters, their sons, their grandchildren, that we do not have to find a cure for breast cancer.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, we only give \$18 million in basic research for breast cancer with this absolutely catastrophic disease. We give billions for star wars, and \$1.7 billion for AIDS. I think it is about time we focused on this disease as well.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2507, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH AMENDMENTS OF 1991

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-160) on the resolution (H. Res. 202) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2507) to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 14, FLIGHT ATTENDANT DUTY TIME ACT

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-161) on the resolution (H. Res. 203) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the establishment of limitations on the duty time for flight attendants,

which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on Thursday, July 18, 1991. I was unable to cast the first two out of three votes on the Coast Guard authorization, inasmuch as my wife was giving birth to our baby daughter.

Mr. Speaker, had I been able to vote, I would have voted aye on Rollcall No. 214, which was to lift the fees on recreational boaters, and would have voted no on Rollcall No. 215, which was to require drug testing of Coast Guard employees.

NATIONAL DARE DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 121) designating September 12, 1991, as "National DARE Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to recognize the work of the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Joint Resolution 121, which will designate September 12, 1991, as National DARE Day. I would also like to commend the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] for his efforts in cosponsoring the companion measure in the House.

Drugs are a deadly poison infecting our society. As of 1990, nearly 56 percent of our youth had tried some illicit drug by the age of 25. Approximately 52 percent have tried marijuana and nearly 20 percent have experimented with cocaine. In addition, there are foreboding projections of a heroin use explosion. There are daily battles between our drug enforcement agents and the suppliers of these deadly chemicals. It is incumbent upon all of us to provide assistance by steering our youth away from drugs.

The Drug Abuse Resistance Education [DARE] Program provides an outstanding service to educate our children about the hazards of drug use. Initially developed in Los Angeles, DARE has been very successful in training police officers to educate our Nation's youths about drugs. Since 1983, DARE and similar programs have

spread across our Nation. DARE equips students with drug information and methods to enhance one's self-esteem. The program starts with elementary education, continues with junior high and high school students, and even performing in the community.

The DARE Program involves the entire community in its efforts to end the scourge of drug abuse, and has proven to be effective in our fight against drugs. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this measure to focus attention on the DARE programs which so effectively have been helping to save our Nation from the poison destroying our young people.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his comments. I encourage Members to seek out within their own communities and congressional districts whether or not the DARE Program has been deployed to help fight the war against drugs. It is a wonderful program. It can potentially be a very, very successful program.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly encourage Members to see to it that somewhere in their district the program is used.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 121, legislation designating September 12, 1991, National Drug Abuse Resistance Education Day. There is no greater threat to our children than drug abuse and the violence which is an integral part of the drug culture. This plague has infected young people from all ethnic and income groups throughout the Nation. It must be brought under control. The best way to do that is to get tough with the criminals who peddle drugs and educate our children about the dangers of drug abuse.

I introduce legislation identical to Senate Joint Resolution 121 with my distinguished colleague, FRANK WOLF, from Virginia. This resolution recognizes DARE as a time-tested, successful Drug Abuse Education and Prevention Program.

DARE goes far beyond traditional drug abuse programs. In addition to identifying drugs and explaining their harmful effects, DARE's unique approach lies in its emphasis on resistance. DARE gives young people skills to recognize and resist the subtle and overt pressures that too often lead to experimentation drugs and alcohol.

It prevents substance abuse among school age children by teaching assertive response styles, resistance techniques, and how to evaluate risk-taking behavior and the consequences of their choices. By building their self-esteem, learning how to manage stress and to resist prodrug media messages, students learn how to say "no".

The program is designed with four levels that target children at various ages throughout their schooling. In kindergarten to fourth grade, the groundwork is laid for the core classes taught to fifth and sixth graders. In junior high, lessons are reinforced, and at the high school level, students are taught skills which will help them remain drug free into adulthood. By having the DARE messages

continually reinforced, students become equipped to protect themselves from the onslaught of peer pressure.

DARE classes are taught by veteran police officers who see every day the carnage which results from drug abuse. Each officer undergoes special training in child development, classroom management, teaching techniques, and communication skills before entering the classroom. Cops offer their professional perspective on what happens on the street and give students practical lessons in how to stay clean. DARE provides a rare opportunity for law enforcement, teachers, and school administrators to fight the drug crisis together.

Independent research corroborates what 3,500 communities in 50 States, Australia, New Zealand, American Samoa, Canada, and Puerto Rico already know; that not only has the DARE Program helped students resist drugs, it has also contributed to improved study habits, better grades, decreased truancy, vandalism, and gang activity, improved relations between ethnic groups, and fostered a more positive outlook on the part of students toward police and school.

By realistically approaching drug prevention and education, DARE has uniquely and effectively addressed the drug problem in this country. I commend law enforcement for its willingness to sponsor and participate in innovative programs like DARE and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 121

Whereas D.A.R.E. (Drug Abuse Resistance Education) is the largest and most effective drug-use prevention education program in the United States, and is now taught to 20 million youths in grades K-12;

Whereas D.A.R.E. is taught in more than 150,000 classrooms, reaching more than 3,500 communities in all Department of Defense Dependent Schools worldwide;

Whereas the D.A.R.E. program has become a model drug prevention program for other countries and is now taught in Australia, New Zealand, American Samoa, Canada, Costa Rica and Mexico;

Whereas the D.A.R.E. core curriculum, developed by the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles Unified School District, helps prevent substance abuse among school-age children by providing students with accurate information about alcohol and drugs, by teaching students decision-making skills and the consequences of their behavior and by building students' self-esteem while teaching them how to resist peer pressure;

Whereas D.A.R.E. provides parents with information and guidance to further their children's development and to reinforce their decisions to lead drug-free lives;

Whereas the D.A.R.E. program is taught by veteran police officers who come straight from the streets with years of direct experience with ruined lives caused by substance abuse, giving them a credibility unmatched by teachers, celebrities, or professional athletes;

Whereas each police officer who teaches the D.A.R.E. Program completes 80 hours of

specialized training in areas such as child development, classroom management, teaching techniques, and communication skills; and

Whereas D.A.R.E., according to independent research, substantially impacts students' attitudes toward substance use and contributes to improved study habits, higher grades, decrease vandalism and gang activity, and generates greater respect for police officers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That September 12, 1991 is designated as "National D.A.R.E. Day", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1820

NATIONAL HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) to designate the period commencing September 8, 1991, and ending on September 14, 1991, as "National Historically Black Colleges Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to yield to my friend and colleague who is the chief sponsor of this Senate joint resolution, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Joint Resolution 40, a resolution to designate the week, September 8 through September 14, as "National Historically Black Colleges Week." I have introduced the House companion bill, House Joint Resolution 102.

For the past few years, I have been privileged to sponsor legislation commemorating National Historically Black Colleges Week, and it is certainly an honor to do so again. There is no doubt that these schools are deserving of recognition for the many years of invaluable service that they have provided to our great Nation. The 107 historically black colleges and universities, which are located in 20 States plus the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands, have long provided thousands of economically disadvantaged young people with the opportunity to obtain a college education. I am well aware of the importance of

these institutions since there are six of them in my district, all of which play a most important role in the higher education system of South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of these institutions is immeasurable. They have produced leaders in practically every profession and continue to provide the training necessary to help lead our country into the 21st century. Recent statistics show that historically black colleges and universities have graduated a majority of the black pharmacists, attorneys, and engineers in the United States as well as 75 percent of our black military officers and 80 percent of the black members of our judiciary. It is evident that throughout their existence, these schools have provided, and continue to provide, the quality education that is vital in enabling individuals to improve their lives and the livelihoods of their families.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we honor historically black colleges and universities in this way.

At this time, I would like to express appreciation to those who have been so helpful in bringing this resolution before the House today; namely, the 220 cosponsors; the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY]; the ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]; the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER]; and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE]. I would also like to thank the staffs of these Members and the committee staffs.

Mr. Speaker, again I would like to thank my colleagues for their support in the consideration of this resolution.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his words.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 40

Whereas there are 107 Historically Black Colleges and Universities in the United States;

Whereas such colleges and universities provide the quality education so essential to full participation in a complex, highly technological society;

Whereas black colleges and universities have a rich heritage and have played a prominent role in American history;

Whereas such institutions have allowed many underprivileged students to attain their full potential through higher education; and

Whereas the achievements and goals of the Historically Black Colleges are deserving of national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the period commencing September 8, 1991, and ending on September 14, 1991, is designated as "Na-

tional Historically Black Colleges Week" and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs, thereby demonstrating support for Historically Black Colleges and Universities in the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAWYER: Page 2, beginning on line 3, strike "period commencing September 8, 1991, and ending on September 14, 1991, is" and insert "week beginning September 8, 1991, and the week beginning September 6, 1992, are each".

Page 2, line 8, insert "each" after "observe".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. SAWYER: Amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution designating the week beginning September 8, 1991, and the week beginning September 6, 1992, each as 'National Historically Black Colleges Week'".

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL JUVENILE ARTHRITIS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 142) to designate the week beginning July 28, 1991, as "National Juvenile Arthritis Awareness Week," and asked for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so again, of course, to acknowledge the work of our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the chief sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like to thank the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Census and Population, Mr. SAWYER, and the ranking minority member, Mr.

RIDGE, for their support and cooperation in bringing this resolution before the House floor.

As you may know, the resolution I introduced, House Joint Resolution 252, is identical to Senate Joint Resolution 142 which was sponsored in the Senate by my friend Senator SHELBY of Alabama, to designate the week of July 28 as "National Juvenile Arthritis Awareness Week" in order to encourage an awareness of the estimated 250,000 children in the United States who suffer from one of the many forms of the crippling disease.

Arthritis is an inflammation or swelling and heating of the joints which can make even simple tasks such as tying a shoe or getting out of a chair seem very difficult and frustrating. Many arthritic children miss up to 50 days a year of school because of the severity of the discomfort. Few people are aware that, in addition to joints, the disease can attack major organs including the liver, spleen, heart, lungs, and eyes causing serious, sometimes fatal, health complications.

Arthritis will effect the child through adulthood as, unfortunately, there is no known cure for the disease at this time. Treatment can relieve or prevent discomfort for some children while others live in constant pain.

In addition to the child, arthritis has an impact upon the entire family. Coupled with the emotional stress of watching their child struggle and cope with the disease, parents have to adjust the family lifestyle to accommodate for the constant needs and sensitivities of the child.

This resolution is an expression of admiration for the courage of children who suffer from arthritis, their families, and the many doctors, hospitals, clinics, and health organizations across the country who are dedicated to treating and finding a cure for this physically and emotionally debilitating disease.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIDGE. Further reserving the right to object, I am more than happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend the gentleman from Florida. I just want to take this moment to express the gratitude of everyone who is regularly involved in this kind of resolution to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for the effort he has made to engage the support not only of those of us who serve in this body to bring recognition and national awareness to this debilitating disease, but to engage constituents around the country in support of this. It is an important means of communication, and one kind of opportunity that is too often not taken by Members in trying to share the importance of the resolutions they bring before us. The effort of the gentleman to do that is important on this

occasion, and I wanted to take this opportunity to thank him for that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I thank him very much for his generous comments and also his consideration of this resolution.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his contribution.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S. J. RES. 142

Whereas over 250,000 children in the United States are affected by the debilitating disease known as Juvenile Arthritis;

Whereas this crippling condition attacks the joints and major organs of the human body—heart, liver, spleen, and even eyes;

Whereas this disease is often lifelong, affecting children into their adulthood, making even simple tasks difficult and frustrating, affecting the quality of life for our future citizens and leaders;

Whereas Juvenile Arthritis can be controlled reasonably well in most people, but it can prove fatal in some instances; and

Whereas the commitment to research and education efforts to develop a greater understanding about Juvenile Arthritis should be encouraged and continued: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the week beginning July 28, 1991, is designated as "National Juvenile Arthritis Awareness Week". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the several joint resolutions just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### REPORT RELATING TO UNITS OF READY RESERVE OF ARMED FORCES REMAINING ON ACTIVE DUTY—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 the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, July 24, 1991.)

#### RESCISSION AND DEFERRAL OF BUDGET AUTHORITY UNDER IMPOUNDMENT CONTROL ACT OF 1974—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. Doc. No. 102-117)

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

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, July 24, 1991.)

#### COLUMBUS SOCIAL SECURITY OFFICE

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

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, we in most cases do not realize that thousands of silent public servants are quietly working their hearts out for our citizens in local, State, and National Government agencies.

I want to pay tribute today to one overlooked group—the Social Security Administrations' employees—who receive little recognition for the important jobs that they perform.

There are more than 40 million recipients of Social Security and it's a massive organization.

In particular, I want to recognize a special group today in a special office in Columbus, GA. Under the leadership of District Manager Ida Ford and Assistant District Manager Margaret Reydel, this office serves 10 counties in Georgia and 1 in Alabama, with a total population of about 250,000 persons.

Many Georgians are proud of the work of U.S. Senator Walter F. George of Vienna, GA, who was instrumental in strengthening the Social Security system. The Social Security Act became law in 1935, during the first term of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The first Social Security taxes were withheld in January 1937 and the first benefits were paid out for the month of January 1940.

The first cost-of-living allowance came in October 1950. It was a 70 percent COLA. Other COLA's occurred off-and-on until an automatic COLA began in 1975.

This office is directly responsible for 44,000 persons. It pays out over \$212,500

every month. In addition is its Supplemental Security Income Program, paying approximately 8,800 persons a total of over \$20,500 a month.

I visited this office during this year's employee appreciation week and today I wish to pay tribute to Ida Ford, Margaret Reydel and their 33 hard-working, caring staff members. This office is one of nearly 1,300 district offices, along with over 130 hearing offices in the United States, which are staffed by more than 62,000 employees of the Social Security Administration.

In commending the good people in the Columbus, GA office let me note that Social Security helps everyone. Over 24 percent of those receiving Social Security earned under \$10,000 a year while they were working. Forty-eight percent of those receiving Social Security benefits earned between \$10,000 and \$30,000. That means that over 72 percent earned under \$30,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Security law is now in its 56th year. It works. And one of the reasons it works so well is the dedicated people it has attracted, such as the ones who work in the Columbus, GA office.

Good, conscientious, caring employees are always valuable, whether in private business or in government service. I would like to include in these remarks, all of the persons who are part of the Social Security Administration's Columbus, GA, office. The list begins, as I noted earlier, with District Manager Ida Ford and Assistant District Manager Margaret Reydel. The others who work here are the following, in alphabetical order: Arlene Adams, Dianne Akin, Willie Mae Austin, Mary Frances Brown, Faye Carles, Nancy Carpenter, Sally Chadwick, Florence Champion, Rebecca Commander, Anna Cummings, Linda Gibson, Geneva Hall, Ronald Harper, Sandra Harris, Annice Johnson, Barbara Kakualua, Carole Kubik, Brenda Lewis, Debra Long, Annie Manuel, Julia Mead, Paula Middleton, Benise Mincey, Edith Mooney, Gloria Morrison, Archie Payne, Janet Perry, Karen Rhea, Ann Shaw, Donna Smith, Thomas Stafford, Betty Wargo, and Dorothy Womack.

□ 1830

#### A NICKEL FOR THE POLITICIANS

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments this evening to the so-called highway bill that we may have up sometime next week. It is a bill of great concern for both Congress and the country, and I think deserves to be examined closely by all Members. It should be examined closely, because it is a bill which is

being called in some quarters a transportation bill, in other quarters a tax bill.

It is being called a tax bill because part of the provisions of this bill are to raise gasoline taxes by a nickel a gallon. Some people in this House have come up with a slogan that that gas tax is a nickel for America. I would contend that that is not the reality of the bill, that, instead, the gas tax is going to be a nickel for the politicians.

Why do I say a nickel for the politicians? Well, in this bill there is \$6.8 billion in so-called demonstration projects, special projects allocated to the individual Members of Congress, \$6.8 billion in spending for special projects over a 5-year period.

The first year of the gas tax, the additional nickel-a-gallon gas tax will raise a total of about \$6 billion, so that means that all of America will end up paying a gas tax for an entire year simply to fund the projects that Members of Congress put into this bill. That does not sound like a nickel for America to me. It sounds like a nickel being taken away from America to pay the politicians. It is, in fact, a nickel for the politicians.

Now, it is interesting who is going to pay that tax, because we have heard a lot of talk in this particular Congress about the fact that we are going to tax the rich, that any taxes we impose should be on the rich. Well, this is a tax which comes 72 percent out of the pockets of low- and middle-income America. It is a tax specifically aimed at middle-income and low-income Americans. It does not affect the rich. It is not something which devastates the pocketbook of the rich. It comes out of the pockets of low- and middle-income America to the tune of 72 percent of all the taxes paid.

It is also a tax which is inflationary, recessionary, and regressive. You do not have to believe me on this. You can believe some of the people who helped author this particular bill. I have here a letter sent in 1989 to the President of the United States. It was sent by the leadership of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and it was sent by Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. MINETA of California, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT of Arkansas, and Mr. SHUSTER, and they say about the gas tax at that time, "We are also concerned that a motor-fuel-tax increase of this kind would be regressive, geographically inequitable; it would hurt our economy by the loss of jobs, increased inflation, and a reduction in the GNP." In other words, they say themselves in that letter to the President that gas taxes are inflationary, recessionary, and regressive, all at the same time. That is a pretty bad kind of taxation.

I would suggest also to the American people that this is a bill which they should be suspicious of if they kind of like getting out and getting in their

car and going to work or going to the grocery store or maybe even going on vacation, because this is a bill aimed at taking Americans out of their cars. Why do I say that? Well, I have here a copy of the summary of the bill.

It is not called the Highway Act. It is called something called the Intermodal Surface Transportation Infrastructure Act of 1991. I went to the dictionary to find the word "intermodal." We have a dictionary right up here in the front of the Chamber. I went there a few minutes ago to try to find this word. This word does not exist in that dictionary. Maybe it exists in some other dictionary. It does not exist in that dictionary. I wonder what it means. I went to the bill. I tried to find out what it might mean.

I will tell you what it means. It means, "Get Americans out of their cars and into some other kind of transportation; make Americans walk instead of taking their cars; make Americans ride a bicycle instead of driving their car; make Americans take mass transit instead of driving their cars; make Americans ride a bus on vacation rather than getting in their car and driving on vacation." That is what intermodal means.

They have an entire title of this bill devoted to intermodal transportation. In fact, when you look at this bill, you find out that we are setting a national goal to promote intermodal transportation. In other words, we are setting a national goal to get Americans out of their cars and into something else.

It is also interesting to note that we are setting up a whole office under the Department. They set up new duties for the Secretary of the Office of Intermodalism. That is a big, big title here, but we are going to have a Secretary now of Intermodalism. We are going to have a Secretary whose job it is to get Americans out of their private automobiles and get them into some other kind of transportation.

Then we set up a modal, I am sorry, it is a model, a model intermodal transportation plan, so we are going to have a whole plan that is aimed at trying to get Americans out of their cars into some other kind of transportation, and then to top it off, what we have in this bill is a National Commission on Intermodal Transportation, and this national commission has about nine things that it is going to be doing in order to take Americans out of their private automobiles and put them into some other kind of transportation.

I would suggest that most of the American people kind of like their car and would like to keep it. This bill ought to at least be stripped of the title that suggests to them that their cars are obsolete and that they ought to put them away.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent today that my special order for 60 minutes be vacated and that I be granted a 5-minute special order.

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

There was no objection.

#### CHILDHOOD HUNGER AND POVERTY

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Food Research and Action Center launched its Campaign to End Childhood Hunger. This effort is designed to educate the Congress and the public that hunger is a solvable problem. But, that we must exercise our political will if we are going to see an end to it. I applaud the work of this organization in bringing a new focus on our domestic hunger problems and have invited all of my colleagues in joining me today to make our commitment to ending childhood hunger a statement of public record.

On Monday, I was in the Appalachian region of Ohio. The Select Committee on Hunger, which I have the privilege of chairing, held a hearing there. We went to look at how well antihunger and antipoverty programs are working in rural America. We also wanted to find out how we might improve opportunities for poor people in isolated rural communities to move from the cycle of poverty and gain economic independence.

While we were there, we visited the Clemons family. They had a 3-year-old daughter named Crystal—cute as a button. Crystal lives in a house that has no insulation. Last fall, the family replaced the cast iron woodburning stove in the living room. Mrs. Clemons told us that the outside of that stove used to get too hot and Crystal's 4-year-old brother, Matthew, kept burning himself on it. Luckily, they found another second-hand stove that was safer for the kids to be around before the weather turned cold. You see, this stove heats the entire two-story house. They are praying to get some help weatherizing the house this year so it will be warmer during the winter, but until then, they just have to make do.

The little community where Crystal lives does not have a water system. There is an old well about 150 feet from the house from which Crystal's mom and dad draw water to flush the toilet. They travel to the next town to haul water from an underground stream that flows from the side of a hill to get water for drinking and bathing.

Her father has tried for a number of years to find a job in construction, but

there are not any. So, in order to keep the family eligible for their monthly ADC check, he works off the benefits at the local food bank.

The family is living in what I would say are pretty deplorable conditions. But, many would say that Crystal is still one of the lucky ones. She participates in Head Start. In fact, she has learned to count to 10 and say her ABC's all the way up to "F." Unfortunately, there are over 2 million other kids Crystal's age who are not enrolled in the program because it does not get enough funding to serve them all.

When Mrs. Clemons was pregnant with Crystal, she participated in WIC. She got prenatal care, a monthly food package, and nutrition education classes. These services all helped to assure that Crystal wasn't one of the 40,000 babies born in this country each year who don't live to celebrate their first birthday. She was born at a normal weight, so she escaped some of the lifelong disabilities that are linked to low birthweight. She is not mentally retarded. She does not suffer from vision or hearing impairments. Millions of mothers and babies are not so lucky. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that 8.7 million people will be eligible for WIC in fiscal year 1991. But, only 4.5 million will be served. You see, funding this program at a level adequate to serve all who are eligible to get benefits has not yet become a national priority.

The family participates in the Food Stamp Program. In fact, food stamp benefits account for almost 42 percent of their income. With so little money for other expenses such as the \$225 each month that they pay for rent, they are unable to add any other resources to the purchase of food. But, at least they get food stamps. The program currently serves fewer than 60 percent of the people that are actually eligible for benefits.

Last year, when Crystal was 2, she was up to date on all of her shots. Nationwide, in 1990, only 70 percent of all 2-year-olds had been immunized against measles, mumps and rubella.

And, even though the house Crystal lives in should probably be condemned, she has it better than the 220,000 kids reported by the Department of Education to be homeless. After all, she does have a roof over her head.

Mr. Speaker, today 1 in 5 children in this Nation lives in poverty. For black children the rate is even more catastrophic, close to 40 percent are poor. The community childhood hunger identification survey conducted by the Food Research and Action Center reports that 11 million children under the age of 12 are at risk of hunger. Research indicates that by the year 2000, nearly 50 percent of all children born in this country will have spent some portion of their lives in poverty. How many of them will suffer from hunger?

Children constitute our most vital resource. They hold in their hands the future of this Nation. In short, they are the leaders of tomorrow. We have got to do a far better job preparing them to meet this challenge. What are we going to do about this?

In May, I introduced the Freedom From Want Act. This bill seeks to combat hunger and poverty among our children by: calling for a 5-year program of full participation in WIC; creating demonstration projects for community-based education and targeted health and social services to reduce infant mortality; and creating innovative self-employment and savings programs so that parents have access to better opportunities to provide for their kids.

Our esteemed colleague, Representative LEON PANETTA, has introduced the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act. This is a bipartisan bill that would provide the greatest expansion of the Food Stamp Program since 1977. More than 90 percent of the benefits increases proposed in this bill are targeted to help families provide enough food for their children. I encourage the House Agriculture Committee to expedite action on this critically needed legislation.

Right now, Crystal's future does not look so good. The unemployment rate in her county is about 4 percent, but the poverty rate is almost 24 percent. At the rate things are going, when Crystal grows up, she will become one of the working poor in America, earning just enough to keep her in poverty for the rest of her life, and trapping her children in a cycle of poverty.

We have got to do more for the Crystals of this country. We have got to ensure that low-income mothers participate in the WIC Program, and deliver healthy babies. We have got to make sure that families get the food stamp benefits they need, so that children don't go hungry. We have got to offer hope to people. If America means anything, it means hope for a better life. If we are not offering that hope to Crystal and millions of kids just like her, then we're not doing our jobs.

Ending childhood hunger means that kids like Crystal Clemons will have a fair chance at life. America will be making a sound investment in its future by investing in Crystal's future.

□ 1840

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], the distinguished chairman of our House Select Committee on Hunger, for this special order on childhood hunger and poverty. It is extremely important that all our colleagues join in stressing the importance of this urgent issue.

Some 13.4 million American children, 1 in every 5, live in poverty. Mr. Speaker, in a nation as prosperous as our own, we simply cannot allow this to continue. It is our duty both as elected representatives and as concerned and decent people to see to it that our children are properly cared for and given a chance to grow up in a healthy environment.

It's not just a matter of compassion. It's a matter of common sense. The children of today will be our leaders of tomorrow. How can we expect to compete in the 21st century when such a substantial portion of our future generations are now suffering from a lack of food and proper care?

As members of the Select Committee on Hunger, we have taken it upon ourselves to help our youth escape the hardships of hunger and poverty. In a nation where 11 million children under the age of 12 are at risk of hunger, we cannot afford to stand by and do nothing.

Mr. Speaker, our children are an invaluable resource. As parents and grandparents, we all know the joy that a happy, healthy child can bring to a family—to the world. We also know of the limitless potential that each child possesses. It would be shameful for this resource to remain untapped.

We can ensure a bright future for our youth by confronting the issue, and doing whatever we can to give young people the chance they deserve.

Let us join in supporting the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Support Act and the other hunger and nutrition issues before this Congress.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I am happy to yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Leland hunger bill with a combination of pride and trepidation.

Pride because this bill will make a difference for millions of Americans—particularly American children—who are hungry tonight. Their plight is embarrassing, given that American agriculture is the envy of the world. We can grow more than enough food to feed every American well, but hunger remains a painful problem for the poorest of our citizens.

It is especially painful during the summer months. When I was young, I used to look forward to summer vacation. But hundreds of thousands of today's children have a very different attitude. For them, summer is a sad time because the school feeding program shuts down. Kids who are used to getting breakfast and lunch in school are left to fend for themselves.

There's no excuse for failing to feed our people. So I am proud to join with the supporters of this legislation to work for its enactment. My pride, how-

ever, is tempered by doubt. I don't know how many of those who join me tonight in saying we should solve this critical problem will also join me later when the Ways and Means Committee is asked to raise the revenues to fund this needed program.

I fear that this bill will turn into nothing more than legislative junk food, despite our good intentions, unless we are ready to back up our rhetoric with votes for a proper funding mechanism. I worry that we may be misleading the hungry and creating even deeper voter cynicism by overpromising—and then failing to deliver.

Some years ago a muckraking journalist wrote a book about the imbalance between such promises and reality. It was called, "Let Them Eat Promises." Our hungry children deserve better than that.

I have two goals today. The first is to join with my colleagues in responding to a very real problem. And the second, equally important, is to express a sincere hope that my colleagues will join me later in raising the revenues needed to fund this initiative.

These two commitments must go together. Making the first, but ducking the second will confirm the fears of critics who are already saying that we're part of the problem rather than the solution.

But those who make both commitments will do more than help the hungry. They will also be taking an important step toward restoring confidence in our Government by delivering on our promises.

□ 1850

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for his support and his most important comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS].

Mr. BACCHUS. Mr. Speaker, my district in Florida is known as a place where children smile. We have Disney World, Sea World, Space Center USA, Universal Studios, nearly 100 miles of beaches are all places that make children smile; but beyond the glamour and the glimmer, behind all the bright lights is a world in central Florida where many children never smile and many are hungry. More than 40 percent of the people who live and work in my congressional district in central Florida live in poverty. Many of them are children. Their plight is not unlike that of children throughout Florida.

The Center for the Study of Social Policy ranks Florida 45th among the 50 States in protecting, nurturing, and educating children.

I have seen this world of hungry children on my Citizens Saturdays when I go out with groups of people to try to make our community a little better

and brighter. I have seen the hungry children when I worked as a volunteer at the large Schering Center in Cocoa. I have seen them at the Daily Bread in Orlando. I have seen them at Our Lord's Table in Vero Beach.

Our Citizens Saturdays can help as we bring volunteers out to help our children to build children's playgrounds, to take children who have never seen a beach to the beaches, to work with those who have Down's syndrome. We can help these hungry children as volunteers, but we must do more. These children need a government that cares, a government that is responsive, a government that is on their side.

I have a little girl myself, a baby daughter. She is 8 weeks old. The other day she smiled for the first time. My hope is that in my service here in the Congress, working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we can make a world and especially an America in which all children will always have reasons to smile.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS] for his excellent statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day in America when 13.5 million children live in poverty and 11 million under the age of 12 are at risk of hunger. Our Nation needs to seriously reconsider its priorities when our children go hungry and live in poverty.

Can you imagine for a moment a household where very capable, caring parents offer their compassion and financial assistance to the neighbors when their own children sit at a table where there is no food? Imagine parents who live in wealth but do not provide basic health care to their own children. We, as a society, would think that those parents were irresponsible and force them to fully account for their actions. But that is exactly the way America is behaving toward its own children. This Nation is the richest in the world, yet does not take proper care of its own children.

I don't have to tell you that hungry children do not fair well in school. If we don't take care of our children because it's the right thing to do we should do it to enhance our economic well-being in the future. Teachers, scientists, doctors, and astronauts are not career paths that hungry, poverty-stricken children could even consider. The children are not the only losers—in the long run we all lose.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in the special order taken out by the gentlemen from Ohio.

Few issues come before this body which touch us more deeply than those affecting our children and their welfare. So often my colleagues on the House Select Committee on Hunger and within the House as a whole come together to legislate programs enhancing our Nation's commitment to America's most precious resource—our children. As mothers, fathers, grandmothers, and grandfathers we look for Federal means of improving the nurturing of our children and for methods of equalizing the starting points of our Nation's youngsters. We attempt to promote what

Americans have always tried to offer their children—compassion, hope, and promise.

To be sure Congress has been well intended. We have set significant objectives and we have reached many of our youth in meaningful ways. But today's percentages of homeless children, the death rates among our infants, the effects of malnutrition bequeathed by an impoverished mother to her unborn child, and the numbers of children living below poverty level all demand that we find the ways and means of providing enhanced benefits to America's youth.

Money alone is not sufficient to improve assistance to our young. And reality shows us our purse strings have only so much give with them. I urge this Congress and those following to consistently give emphasis to reviewing, to simplifying, coordinating, and integrating our already existing assistance programs, and to enriching the assistance partnership between our private and governmental sectors.

We already have 125 public assistance programs. Some of them originated more than 50 years ago. We must realize programs also need continual reviewing before they can provide maximum effectiveness for America's families and their children. We cannot expect programs which met the conditions of previous decades to be fully relevant and effective today. True enough, we have from time to time amended, patched, created, and eliminated within our assistance apparatus. But it has left us with a monstrous and costly structure we all too often seem afraid to discipline. It will be difficult, but conditions are demanding we now meet the challenge of comprehensively coordinating and integrating our assistance framework so it can impact on lives with enough power to keep our people off welfare. Presently we all too often entrap people into a welfare dependency and almost prevent their reaching self-sufficiency—and self-esteem.

Today's conditions require us to realize we have been unable to pull enough of our needy families onto their own two feet and off the subsistence standards of welfare dependency. And too often the quality of life our working poor has to tolerate is also responsible for the unacceptable conditions of our children. The impact of these realities is tragically evident in those families who are second or third generation welfare dependent.

Yes, the effectiveness of our welfare programs must be increased and must reach more of our needy children. I urge the country and Congress to realize the time has come to get on to the tough job of overhauling our public assistance programs into an integrated and powerful package. Surely this is our most powerful approach to improving our children's chances of becoming productive citizens—it is the best insurance we can give to our greatest national resource.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my support for helping poor and hungry children in America. We have heard the statistics; we have seen the reports. Half of all food stamp recipients are children; 83 percent of food stamp benefits go to families with children. In my home State of Maryland, 110,000 women, infants and children are eligible for WIC. Yet only about half of them are receiving benefits because WIC is not yet fully funded.

Who will speak for these poor and hungry children? Who will protect their interests and provide for their needs? When will the rights of children be the No. 1 priority, in word and deed? Each day we delay, another child goes hungry and starts school unprepared to learn.

Our food assistance policies, our tax and economic policies, our education policies, our health policies, and our housing policies must be coordinated and streamlined to meet the needs of the whole family. To help American children we need to redesign our poverty programs and strengthen our food assistance programs. We must help working parents. When the average family of 4 pays 24 percent of its income in Federal income tax, compared to 2 percent in 1948, when we have 31 million people with inadequate or no health insurance, it is time to reexamine our policies and their impact. Our Government's policies must be two-fold: First, programs must help our most vulnerable citizens gain independence in their time of need; second, programs must address the root causes of poverty and strengthen American families. Whenever possible we must empower the parents and provide them with the training and skills to care for their families.

This body will soon have another opportunity, I hope, to improve the condition of poor and hungry children. I, too, am a cosponsor of H.R. 1202, the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act, and I support my colleagues who have spoken in its favor. This bill would go a long way toward helping families that are struggling to get off welfare. For example, H.R. 1202 raises the food stamp benefits in stages to a level more closely reflecting the actual current cost of purchasing the Thrifty Food Plan. It gives families with children the same shelter deduction as the elderly and disabled. It relaxes the household definition to apply to families or relatives who live and eat together. And it strengthens the food stamp employment and training programs by providing higher reimbursement to recipients for child care and work-related costs.

My constituents urged me to support the Mickey Leland bill. Groups like RESULTS, Inc., which is fighting to make child survival the burning issue in Maryland public policy supports the Mickey Leland bill, and the Freedom from Want Act. Also volunteer and non-profit groups in my district who care for poor and hungry children support H.R. 1202: Delmarva Rural Ministries, the Maryland Food Committee, St. Martin's Barn in Cecil County.

Our programs designed to address their needs are making an impact, and must be expanded. The U.S. Department of Agriculture reports that we save anywhere from \$1.71 to \$3.13 in Medicaid costs, for each dollar invested in prenatal WIC participation. Programs with this type of savings, and programs like Smart Start and Head Start that prepare children for school are the types of investment my constituents support.

Finally, most important, I believe, is the attitude we must adopt. Last week, during a joint hearing of the Budget and Hunger Committees the former regional director of the Appalachian Regional Development Program emphasized again and again that the key difference between communities that prospered and failed, assuming the same resources for develop-

ment were available, was the attitude of the community and its leadership. Vision and entrepreneurial spirit are the necessary ingredients. We must take this lesson to heart, and pursue relentlessly the means to end childhood hunger and poverty. A child will best learn self-esteem and dignity when treated with respect—and ending childhood hunger and poverty are essential to this goal. I commend those who lead and continue this fight, and I urge the rest of my colleagues to join these efforts.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, today over 23 million Americans are participating in the Nation's primary feeding program—the Food Stamp Program.

More than half of the participants in the Food Stamp Program are children, and these children and their families receive over 82 percent of all benefits paid.

The Food Stamp Program makes a real and important difference for them. Without it, millions of children would be growing up in acute hunger.

I am proud to be a sponsor of H.R. 1202, the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act—the Freedom From Want Act, H.R. 2258, contains similar food stamp provisions—which targets over 90 percent of its benefits to families with children. I am proud that the Committee on Agriculture, which I chair, led the effort for similar legislation last year which won overwhelming support as part of the 1990 farm bill.

Passage of this legislation is a priority of the committee, and our Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations and Nutrition intends to begin consideration of the bill next week.

Hunger is a continuing problem in our Nation for a whole host of reasons. Fortunately, it is not the fault of our farmers who consistently produce an abundant and affordable supply of food. Whatever the cause, we must rededicate our efforts to help the less fortunate in our society who cannot afford an adequate diet. As a father and grandfather, I believe we cannot rest until we have fed the last hungry child in America. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I will do my best to ensure passage of necessary legislation to reach that goal, and I am pleased that many of my colleagues today have pledged their support toward this very worthwhile endeavor.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I see no better time, as this country attempts to refocus its priorities from a foreign front to a domestic front, than to speak to the question of childhood hunger and poverty that is rampant in our Nation. However, this is a question for which an answer has long been overdue. There is simply no excuse for the fact that 11 million children under the age of 12 are at risk of hunger. This is a fact outweighed in atrocity only by the lack of inaction of this institution to collectively address the situation.

Over the past decade there have been several attempts made to right these wrongs, whether it was through the Food Stamp Program or other nutrition programs. With each successive victory has come an equally negative defeat. During the early 1980's, the Reagan administration was successful in initiating some of the most devastating cuts of nutrition programs. We have still not fully recovered from the tremendous impact of these cuts from those years.

I have fought, and will continue to fight, for support for these programs to help our most vulnerable and our greatest resource in society, our children. My good friend and colleague, Mickey Leland, with whom I had the distinct privilege of serving on the Select Committee on Hunger, was dedicated to this cause, and it is in his spirit and sense of determination that this fight against hunger has been raised to a higher ground. Ridding this country of hunger is a moral imperative, and Mickey raised the issue to a new consciousness as a result of his zeal and tireless efforts. It is in his honor that my legislation, the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act, serves as a memorial to him.

The major themes of this bill include protecting the homeless and near homeless, reducing childhood hunger and promoting self-sufficiency. This bill will improve access to and benefits from the Food Stamp Programs. The Food Stamp Program is so very vital as 51 percent of all food stamp recipients are children, and 83 percent of all food stamp benefits go to families with children.

We must also ensure that all eligible, low-income women, infants, and children can receive assistance through the WIC Program. I worked to make sure that in the budget resolution this would be the case by 1996. In fact, at a budget hearing that I conducted, we had five major CEO's from some of the top corporate businesses in America testifying to the importance of child nutrition programs such as WIC. It is hopeful to know that the hunger and nutrition issue has encompassed supporters from a wide spectrum. Society is realizing that we must make sure our children grow up healthy, physically and mentally, with a sound education, in order to be prepared to lead the next generation into the future.

These are very basic issues, yet issues of great urgency as the recent recession has unfortunately highlighted. We cannot sit by and let this problem continue to fester. The Congress must take action. Passing the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act would be an important step in easing the hunger problem in America. Let us end childhood hunger now.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress enough that in a land of plenty, it is simply inexcusable to let children go to bed hungry. Approximately 50,000 families in Connecticut live below the poverty line of \$13,400 for a family of 4, and 78 percent of them have at least one child under age 6.

This situation must be addressed promptly and comprehensively. A study completed by the Community Childhood Hunger Identification Project concluded that 41 percent of low-income families with children in Hartford are chronically hungry. Three out of every 4 children in this city which I represent are hungry or at risk of hunger.

This is the scenario which we are facing. The immediate need for assistance is frightening. Currently we do not assure food security in our country. Monthly food stamps do not last all month. Children are forced to take turns eating breakfast.

There are pieces of legislation like the Freedom from Want Act and the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act, which address the existing hunger and poverty problems. Mr.

Speaker, we must do all we can to ensure their passage.

To paraphrase the motto of Connecticut's Foodshare, we won't stop our efforts to alleviate hunger until the hunger stops.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my Hunger Committee colleagues, Mr. HALL, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. GILCHREST for requesting this special order today to call attention to the issue of childhood hunger and poverty.

Just 2 months ago the National Commission on Children issued its final report in a volume entitled, "Beyond Rhetoric: A New American Agenda for Children and Families." If Members haven't read this report, I suggest that they—not just staff—take the time to seriously reflect on the problems and the recommendations contained in the report.

I call on this Congress to go beyond our own rhetoric to meet the needs of those who are America's future. Chilean poet Gabriela Mistral said it more eloquently than I: "Many things we need can wait, the child cannot. Now is the time his bones are being formed, his blood is being made, his mind is being developed. To him we cannot say tomorrow; his name is today."

What's happening to America's children today? Dr. T. Berry Brazelton, professor of pediatrics at Harvard and a member of the National Commission on Children, highlighted a few of the problems in a New York Times Magazine article late last year. Dr. Brazelton wrote:

Children are the poorest group in society, with more than one in five living in a household whose income is below the poverty level, \$12,700 for a family of four. Despite medical advances, the United States infant mortality rate is worse than in some Third World countries, and every day more than 100 American babies die before their first birthday. About one million teen-agers become pregnant each year, and as many as 18 percent of newborns in some city hospitals are born exposed to alcohol, crack, and other hard drugs.

On hearing all this, the press asked, "So what's new?" The panel could only reply, alas, that nothing is new. Americans have become numb to reports of the hopelessness of their children.

Are we really so cynical or are we afraid to face the problem? As the Commission has noted, the figures are widely reported but too rarely followed up by action. Taxpayers and legislators are not yet determined to insure that every child has the opportunity to grow up healthy and whole, to be secure, and to become literate and economically productive.

Certainly, the uneven face of American poverty is a factor. Although at least 21 percent of all children are needy, the problem is more intense in city neighborhoods and rural pockets. Forty-five percent of black children and 39 percent of Hispanic children were poor in 1987, compared with 15 percent of whites. More than half the children in households headed by single women are impoverished.

Employment does not guarantee escape from poverty. Forty-four percent of poor two-parent families have at least one full-time worker, and 25 percent of these households have a parent who works part time. The prevalent bias—that those who are destitute deserve it—is not borne out by the Commission's investigations.

Needy children are in double jeopardy. They have the most health problems, and the

least access to care. \* \* \* In general, the families that suffer the most social stress receive the least social support. The widening gap in this country between rich and poor makes it even more likely that these children will repeat their parents' poverty. They will not be prepared to contribute to society—except in an antagonistic, often violent, way.

Dr. Brazelton has outlined the significant, widespread problems which dramatically affect America's children today and ultimately affect their future—and ours.

Lest anyone think that the problems he raised are prevalent only in cities and some rural areas, let me share with you some evidence that comes from my own State, Minnesota. Even in Minnesota, safe in America's breadbasket, hunger is no stranger. In a study released in March by the Minnesota Food Education and Resource Center—Urban Coalition—nearly three-fifths of food shelf survey respondents reported that adult household members had to skip meals in the past month because there was not enough money to buy food. Even more troubling is the high incidence of meal skipping among children. Nearly a quarter—23 percent—of households with children reported that children had to skip meals in the past month because there was not enough money for food. Involuntary meal skipping by both adults and children was more widespread in 1990 than in a similar survey done 5 years earlier.

Earlier this year I participated in a one-meal fast as part of the observance of Minnesota Food Share Day, designed to publicize the collection of food and money to support Minnesota's food shelves. Skipping one meal was not difficult—my congressional schedule often causes me to miss meals, and besides, I knew that there was plenty of food waiting for me at home that evening. But the token fast did cause me to reflect on the many people throughout our State, our country, and our world whose only diet worry is not how to reduce their waistlines but just where and when their next bite of food might be.

It's obvious to everyone: Kids should not be skipping meals. Their healthy growth depends on sound nutrition. But more to the point, American kids should not be forced to skip meals because their family doesn't have money to buy groceries. In our land of abundance, that's simply not acceptable.

What about our Government food assistance programs? Aren't they reaching these children and their families?

The Minnesota report notes that:

Food stamps are clearly not reaching all those who qualify for and need them. Of the households surveyed at Minnesota food shelves, about three-fifths—61 percent—had received food stamps in the past month.

Many of those households not receiving food stamps had not applied for benefits either because they didn't think they were eligible or because they want to stay off welfare.

The report goes on to cite the inadequacy of the "Thrifty Food Plan" as a standard for adequate nutrition. The Minnesota Department of Human Services chose the low cost food plan because it comes closer to meeting nutritional needs.

The WIC Program—for which we recently appropriated \$2.6 billion—still does not reach

half of those pregnant women, infants, and young children who are eligible for assistance. Minnesota is among 20 States that supplement Federal WIC funding with State money. And, until June of this year, the State also received an infant formula rebate that increased their capacity to contribute to WIC.

Despite these efforts, a conservative estimate leaves 26,000 eligible Minnesotans unserved, out of over 100,000. Other estimates place the unserved at 43,000. Which ever figure we accept, this means that we are still placing the lives and futures of thousands of children at risk.

The School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs may provide these children with the only full meals of the day, but only during the school year. The Minnesota study also showed that involuntary meal skipping increased by 4 percent from January to July. In constant dollar terms, Federal school lunch funding was approximately the same in fiscal year 1990 as it was in 1981, with some 1.5 million fewer children participating.

Additionally, there is still a great need for expansion of the School Breakfast Program. In Minnesota, for example, only 75 school districts participate in the Breakfast Program—with the concentration in Minneapolis and St. Paul. All Minnesota children—rural, urban, and suburban—should have the option of eating a nutritious breakfast at school.

Finally, the greatest concern to all of us should be the conclusion drawn from the Minnesota study: That households using food shelves in 1990 were more likely to be experiencing food shortages of some duration, rather than short-term emergencies. In other words: Hunger is a chronic problem in our State, and hunger hurts.

Who does it hurt most? Hunger hurts children. It denies them the one legacy that should be theirs—the opportunity to grow and to flourish. If we really believe that ours is a land of opportunity, then we need to muster the political will to insure our children's future.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Chairman HALL's special order on childhood hunger and poverty.

It is difficult to believe that—let alone understand how—11 million of our children here in the United States under the age of 12 can be at risk of hunger. It is painfully hard to accept the fact that our infant mortality rate is among the highest in the industrialized world, and that one out of every four homeless people in the United States is a child.

It is also unpleasant to face the fact that, even as we rightfully attempt to feed the hungry overseas, we have continually denied our own youngsters their basic human right to food and medical care.

But, it is true. America's children are the victims of poverty and poor health care. A child born in Jamaica or Costa Rica has a better chance of surviving than a child born in the District of Columbia, where 23 of every 1,000 children die before, during, or immediately after birth.

Yet, we all know that our children do not have to live—and die—this way. We are capable of feeding and taking care of them. We also know that the problem is not just going to go away. We have to meet it. We can either confront it now, however, or face the con-

sequences later, when the effects have multiplied and the situation is even more out of hand.

What we lack is the commitment—commitment that is expressed by us, as Members of Congress, in the form of the antihunger legislation introduced by Chairmen HALL and PANNETTA, H.R. 2258, the Freedom From Want Act, and H.R. 1202, the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act, respectively. This legislation assumes that we have the means and the responsibility to take care of our children. It forms the foundation for providing America's children with the prenatal care, medical care, and food that they need to survive.

I urge my colleagues not only to support this legislation in the short term, but also to remember our long-term obligation to our youngsters and our country. To neglect our children is to neglect our future.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, we know the statistics all too well. Children are the largest poverty group in America. Nationwide, an estimated 5.5 million children under age 12 are hungry, and an additional 6 million such children are at risk of hunger.

This situation affects every State and district in our country. Between 1979 and 1987 childhood poverty in Wisconsin increased by 54 percent. Today, in Milwaukee County, approximately one out of every four children lives in poverty.

The reasons for these statistics are also well known. Low-income wages are not keeping pace with the increasing costs of living. In Milwaukee, nearly half of all poor households spend at least 70 percent of their incomes on housing and utilities. Many working poor families must also pay for child care and health insurance. Poor households without health insurance suffer even greater economic strains when a family member becomes seriously ill. After paying for these necessities, very little money is left for food.

We have both an economic and a moral responsibility to put an end to childhood hunger and poverty. Hungry children suffer from fatigue, dizziness, and irritability, among other maladies. In school, this results in an inability to concentrate, and therefore, to learn. They also are likely targets of specific health problems. Hungry children miss nearly twice as many school days as other students. An increase in absences leads to a decrease in education. As a result, these children are less likely to reach their full potential. Instead of contributing to our society, many become dependent on it.

More significant is what cannot be measured by statistics. Poverty robs children of their childhood—a time to explore individual capabilities and dreams. This situation is intolerable.

Successful Federal programs to eliminate childhood hunger do exist. The Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] Program provides nutrition and health benefits to low-income women and children. Studies indicate this program helps alleviate the dangers of childhood hunger while reducing Medicaid costs. The Food Stamp Program assists low-income families in purchasing adequate diets. National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs, and the Child and Adult Care Food Program, supply meals to preschool and school-age

children. Unfortunately, at current funding levels, these programs cannot accommodate all eligible individuals.

In a time of severe budget restrictions, funding for some Federal programs can wait—programs to assist America's hungry children cannot. Congress can end this problem by expanding these effective programs, and enacting legislation to provide affordable housing and national health care to all Americans. I look forward to working with my colleagues to find additional ways to ensure no child in our Nation suffers the consequences of poverty and hunger.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for America to remember its children. For too long, our Nation's leaders in government, businesses and the media have forgotten the sad fact that millions of American children are at risk of going to bed hungry each night.

It is too easy for some to forget this fact amid the exciting images of U.S. preeminence around the world. America is the key leader in efforts to achieve peace and security in many parts of the world. The administration is busy moving from one summit to the next, and I commend those who strive to resolve long standing international disputes.

Still, I would like to see our Nation focus some of this energy on solving long standing problems here at home. I believe it is time to engage in some domestic summitry to resolve the problems of childhood hunger and poverty.

We can no longer ignore this problem. In the United States, 13.4 million children—one in five—live in poverty. The distress of living in poverty has affected an increasing number of low-income families. Between 1979 and 1987, the number of children in families with incomes less than one-half the poverty level grew from over 3 million to nearly 5½ million.

It is a sad commentary on our Nation's priorities to note that while the U.S. military ranks first in the world, our country ranks 21st among industrialized nations in controlling infant mortality. We are right to offer assistance to the victims of war and natural disaster in the Middle East and Bangladesh, but we must not forget the fact that one out of every four homeless persons in America is a child.

In March, many Americans were alarmed by the results of a Community Childhood Hunger Identification Survey released by the Food Research and Action Center indicating that 11 million children under the age of 12 are at risk of hunger. Part of the explanation for this may be that while one-half of all Food Stamps Program participants are children, only 65 percent of those eligible actually receive these food assistance benefits.

We can do better. We must do better for the Nation's children. As a cosponsor of the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act, I support efforts to respond to the needs of our Nation's children. Mr. Speaker, I believe the House should make it a priority to enact this legislation and reform Food Stamp programs to ensure that American families and children do not go hungry.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, there are 12.6 million poor children in the United States today. Nearly half live in families that do not receive welfare payments. Government cash transfer programs, the principal being Aid to

Families With Dependent Children [AFDC], now lifts only about 10 percent of all poor children out of poverty. The Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] serves only half of those eligible because of funding limits and food stamps reach only 50 to 60 percent of those eligible.

While the Bush administration has proposed increases for some programs, they are insufficient. In the case of WIC funds, at the rate of increase proposed by President Bush for 1992, it would take 15 to 20 years to have enough funds for all people. The result—1 in 8 children in the United States under 12 suffers from hunger; 5.5 million of these children are hungry and 6 million more are at risk. The effects of not getting enough food permeates more facets of the child's life than poor growth. Hungry children often do not have the energy to learn, and as a result, do not do as well on tests and can be disruptive in a classroom. They also are less resistant to illness and more likely to miss school.

Our national priorities should include full participation in WIC of all eligible low-income mothers, infants, and children; and extension in Head Start to at least half of the poor 3- to 5-year-olds by 1992; improvement in food stamp benefits and investment in programs that build the academic and work place skills of disadvantaged youth. The lives of our Nation's children and this country's ability to compete worldwide depend on our support for preventative measures to help children grow up smart and healthy.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join my colleagues today in addressing the crucial issue of childhood hunger and poverty. I want to commend Congressman HALL for the work he is doing as the chairman of the House Select Committee on Hunger and thank him for organizing this special order. I also want to commend the Food Research and Action Center for taking the lead in the nationwide Campaign To End Childhood Hunger.

In Oregon, the legislature and the Oregon Food Bank have recognized the widespread and persistent hunger problem that disproportionately affects our children. They have responded by forming a Legislative Task Force on Hunger and the Oregon Coalition to End Childhood Hunger and they have found some startling facts:

Some 14 percent of Oregonians seek and receive food from hunger relief agencies each year, that includes nearly 200,000 children;

Over 50 percent of food stamp recipients in Oregon are children, and a majority of families report that benefits run out by the third week of the month;

Only half of the eligible children receive services of the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] program;

Nearly 16 percent of Oregon's children live in poverty.

Despite these alarming statistics, State and Federal Government continually fail to treat hunger as a top priority. Budget constraints consistently prevent the expansion of successful programs to fully meet the need. But what we are doing is further threatening the health of America's children. And further threatening the health of America.

This Congress has little hesitation providing billions of dollars to fund our military operation in the Persian Gulf. Maybe that is because so many lives were immediately at stake and we were able to point to concrete achievements in a short period of time. Taxpayers were able to turn on CNN and watch their tax dollars being put to use. But with 13.4 million American children living in poverty and 11 million children under the age of 12 at risk of hunger, we have a crisis here at home. It is a crisis just as vital to the future of our Nation. The difficulty is that it's social condition that is less tangible and slower to treat. These children are also in a battle. These children's lives are also at risk. These children's ability to learn in school is at risk. At-risk children create a nation at risk.

We have the tools and the programs to fight the battle, the battle of childhood hunger. The WIC Program, TEFAP, Food Stamps, the National School Lunch Program and the School Breakfast Program are all successful programs. But they only reach a limited number of children in need. They could be much more effective with stronger support from our colleagues and the Bush administration.

I want to take this opportunity to urge my colleagues to support measures which will diminish the condition of hunger in America. Support the Freedom From Want Act. Support the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act. Support increased funding for food assistance programs. Again, Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to join my colleagues today in shining the spotlight on the needs of hungry children. We need to make childhood hunger a Federal policy priority and we need to do it now.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, the United States has won the war in the Persian Gulf and the President has set out to build a new world order. I cannot help wondering how the United States can orchestrate a new world order when our own house is collapsing.

The United States has one of the most productive agricultural and industrial economies in the world, but those achievements have occurred while millions of citizens remain hungry.

American troops liberated 2 million citizens of Kuwait—to whom we are linked by petrochemicals—but what about those people to whom we are linked by the sacred bonds of blood and citizenship?

When will we liberate the more than 20 million Americans who are chronically hungry?

When will we liberate the 12.6 million American children who live in poverty?

A paper prepared by the House Select Committee on Hunger shows that, despite the fact that our country produces huge amounts of food, millions of Americans need help to get enough to eat. Four million women, infants, and children who are eligible for Federal food programs cannot be fed because we cannot finance the program. In Dallas, we are currently only serving 20 percent of those eligible for the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC]. The national average is only 50 percent.

At the same time, hunger is disproportionately a problem for African-American, Hispanic, and native American peoples in the United States. And within these groups, children and the elderly are especially affected, as are families headed by women of all races.

In the United States, there is no comprehensive nutrition monitoring system to assess di-

rectly the extent of hunger. Consequently, hunger estimates are based on private studies, such as the Community Childhood Hunger Identification Project [CCHIP] which was released in March by the Food Research and Action Center of Washington, DC. These studies have demonstrated a reliable means to accurately assess hunger among children under 12 in the United States.

In the absence of a national nutrition monitoring system, the most recent "Report on the State of World Hunger" from the Bread for the World Institute on Hunger and Development points out that an understanding of hunger trends can be examined in the context of poverty trends.

Even though the United States has experienced economic growth since the mid-1980s, the state of poor Americans in the late 1980s does not offer an encouraging outlook for future poverty alleviation. In fact, the nature of the economic growth (with proportionally more low-paying jobs and a widening gap between rich and poor) is a cause of continued hunger in the United States.

A 1990 study of Congressional Budget Office data by the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities shows that the income of the richest 1 percent of Americans has been so great that the increase in their after-tax income between 1980 and 1990 will equal the total income of the poorest 20 percent of the population in 1990. "In other words," says the study, "the increase in the after-tax income of the richest 2.5 million Americans will equal the total income of the 50 million poorest Americans will receive in 1990."

The Bread for the World's report goes on to point out that, "One of the most sobering facts concerning poverty and hunger in America is that those most affected are children"—a direct parallel to the situation in most Third World countries. And while the percentage of children affected in the United States is much lower than in the Third World, the United States does have a higher percentage of children in poverty than Canada or the countries in Western Europe.

The President's fiscal year 1992 budget would cut low-income nonentitlement programs by \$1.8 billion. At the same time, poverty is rising as a result of the economic recession, making programs that give assistance to poor people all that more important.

Persistent poverty among children results in hunger and undernutrition. While failing to invest in poor and hungry children can certainly be criticized on moral and ethical grounds, the potential economic impact on the U.S. economy in the decades to come also will be tremendous if we fail to invest in children now.

Two programs, in particular, could, if properly funded, help nourish poor children today and ensure a healthy work force to support tomorrow's baby boom retirees.

Proposals in the House and Senate call for a 5-year plan to reach full participation in WIC. Obviously, funding for community health centers and maternal and child health programs must keep pace with an expanding WIC Program in order to provide needed health services. A major new study shows that because WIC increases birthweight and use of prenatal care, it lowers Medicaid costs substantially. For every dollar invested in WIC for pregnant women, Medicaid expenses reduced by up to

\$3.13 in the first 60 days after the birth of the baby.

Second, Representative LEON PANETTA, chairman of the House Budget Committee, has sponsored the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act, H.R. 1202, in honor of Houston's former Representative and the founder of the House Select Committee on Hunger, who died on a trip investigating hunger in Ethiopian refugee camps 2 years ago. H.R. 1202 would make a number of changes in the earnings tests required for food stamp programs with the intention of significantly reducing hunger, especially hunger among children.

While the new budget rules do not allow much flexibility one thing is certainly clear: In terms of practicality and humanity it is important to invest in all children, and especially poor children.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in discussing the devastating problem of childhood hunger. It deeply saddens me that hunger is so prevalent across the globe and in the United States. According to Bread for the World Institute on Hunger & Development, between 7 and 8 million American children were hungry year round in 1990, meaning that they were chronically short of the nutrients necessary for growth and good health.

In my home State of Wisconsin, despite its reputation as a prosperous State, thousands of children go hungry every day. The Food Research and Action Center estimates that 97,015 Wisconsin children under age 12 are hungry and an additional 210,301 Wisconsin children under age 12 are at risk of hunger. In 1990 Milwaukee's Emergency Food Pantry Network provided food assistance to an average of 33,000 people a month, of which 22,000 were children.

The effects of hunger on children are serious and far-reaching. Hungry children have a greater inability to concentrate, are more irritable, and have a greater tendency to be sick. Good nutrition is essential for young children. There is a clear link between proper nutrition, good health, and cognitive development. Poor nutrition can also result in growth retardation and an increased risk of infections. These long-term consequences can stay with children long after hunger has past and prevent them from ever reaching their full potential.

Attacking the problem of hunger is one of the most crucial and urgent issues facing our Nation. This problem needs to be addressed from two different angles. First, we have to ensure that the United States has strong food programs that have adequate resources to serve everyone that needs them. The United States has some wonderful programs to assist the hungry—WIC, school food programs, Food Stamps, et cetera—but these programs need more funding. Second, we need to look at the basis of hunger which is poverty. In order to end hunger we need to improve our economy and specifically the situation for the poorest in our Nation.

During the 1980's there were several disturbing trends which contributed to hunger in the United States. The number of people falling below the poverty line and the disparities in wealth greatly increased while at the same time government assistance programs de-

clined. In 1979 the poverty rate was 11.7 percent and in 1988 it increased to 13 percent—the unemployment rates in both years were almost identical. From 1979 to 1986 the average market value of noncash benefits received by poor families decreased from \$4,221 to \$4,088.

Real income declined in the 1980's and at the same time living costs increased. Most low-income budgets have become dominated by housing and utility costs thus leaving few dollars for food and other necessities. Faced with the hard choice of shelter or food many families are forced to go hungry.

We must address the issue of hunger now. Children should not be robbed of their future. It is not only immoral that there are hungry children in this country, but it is also unwise. Our children are our Nation's future and we cannot remain economically competitive if we don't ensure that they are healthy and strong. We are a strong Nation and we have the resources to eliminate hunger in the United States. We need to set our priorities and by doing so make policy changes that will end poverty and hunger.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the poor and the hungry, especially our children, is a national issue of great importance to me, both as an American and as a Congressman who represents one of the poorest congressional districts in America. I come from a State:

First, where almost 26 percent, or 664,000, of our citizens live in poverty.

Second, where more than one-third of our children live in poverty.

Third, where some county infant mortality rates rival those in Third World countries.

Fourth, where unemployment rates in some of the counties I represent approach 26 percent.

And, according to a recently published FRAC study on childhood hunger, 19.4 percent of families with children under 12 in Mississippi experience hunger; and 42.8 percent of families with children under 12 in Mississippi are either hungry or at risk of hunger.

These statistics are not just numbers—they describe the reality of the lives of poor children, many of whom will never have the opportunity they deserve to grow and become productive citizens. They are the newborn babies who weigh less than half of what they should. They are the children who suffer from much more than their fair share of fatigue, headaches, irritability, and illness.

Hunger and poverty lowers our resistance to disease, stunts growth and development, hinders the ability to concentrate, and compromises the ability to learn. Poor and hungry children today compromise our Nation's ability to compete in an international marketplace tomorrow if we raise a generation of children unprepared for the world of work.

Today, despite America's preeminence as one of the wealthiest nations in the world, we have demonstrated little progress in our battle against poverty. Compared to 20 years ago, we have as many poor people as ever and the poor are poorer. Our child poverty rates are high in comparison to other countries. And, our future generation of leaders, our youngest children, are the poorest of the poor, and the most vulnerable of our citizens.

Why is it, I wonder, that we have not taken care of this problem which is destroying our children? What has happened to our sense of humanity, our ability to be compassionate? Has it been obscured by the politics of poverty? We are a great nation. And, great nations have great responsibilities. It seems to me that we, as a nation, are falling short of meeting those responsibilities.

When individual parents fall seriously short of their responsibilities to their children, when they neglect or abuse their children, there are oftentimes consequences to face. The State department of human services might step in and remove the children from the home. A physically abusive parent, depending upon the severity of the abuse, might be criminally prosecuted and incarcerated.

Are we as Americans not collectively guilty of some neglect and abuse of our children? How much longer will we:

First, bury babies, at a comparatively high rate, before their first birthday because access to prenatal care is not what it should be?

Second, subject children to preventable physical and cognitive disabilities?

Third, pour money into neonatal intensive care units and into disability payments to treat and support those with preventable disabilities?

Fourth, allow children to live in shelters for the homeless, in the streets, or in substandard housing?

Fifth, pour money into the building of juvenile detention centers, training schools, and prisons, instead of into preventive programs?

Sixth, relegate some children to special education programs when their only disadvantage is an economic one?

Seventh, allow children to go to bed hungry?

Many Americans, both inside of and outside of the Congress have been frustrated in their attempts to improve the conditions in which many of our children live and are being raised. In more recent years, the budget deficit has been used as the reason that we cannot increase funding for successful existing programs, such as WIC and Headstart, or for new or expanded services.

It does seem that the demands of our resources are surging while resources are shriveling, at both State and national levels. And, many human needs are competing with each other for what dollars are available.

Our budget agreement sets maximum limits for categories of spending and currently prohibits the transferring of savings from one area to another area. There can be no increases in any programs without either an offsetting savings in another program or the raising of revenues. Those are the rules, but exceptions were provided for in cases of emergency.

When we needed money for Operation Desert Storm, we passed a supplemental appropriations which was off budget. When money was needed to bail out the savings and loan industry, those dollars were found too, to the tune of three-quarters of a trillion dollars over 10 years, with \$50 billion needed right away. And, we will no doubt find the money for other apparent priorities.

Priorities—maybe how we define those is a big part of our current problem. For many years, we have supported our defense indus-

try with approximately \$290 billion annually. And, we have watched the deterioration of our country's infrastructure and many human services programs. Certainly, our children need to be among our highest of priorities. And, meeting basic biological needs, such as hunger and the need for food should be right up there at the top of our list.

There are some programs that can and do make a difference. One of those programs is our Food Stamps Program, a major line of defense in fighting childhood hunger. More than 82 percent of food stamp benefits go to households with children. But many persons remain unserved—only 65 percent of those eligible for benefits actually get them.

There are two other child nutrition programs which are also very important. The WIC Program, a very successful preventive program that has demonstrated cost benefits, unfortunately, serves only 55 percent of those eligible for services. The National School Lunch Program serves approximately 24 million children daily. However, the Breakfast Program, despite its proven effectiveness in improving school attendance and academic performance, only served about one-fourth of those needy children who receive lunches.

I think that our choice as a nation in responding to childhood poverty and hunger is an obvious one. Today we can either invest in Child Nutrition, WIC, Head Start, health and other programs we need or tomorrow we can continue to borrow the money to build more prisons, expand welfare, and try to cope with the other problems which could have been prevented.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address one of America's greatest tragedies—childhood hunger.

The community childhood hunger identification project conducted by the Food Research and Action Center, one of the most comprehensive studies ever conducted in this country on childhood hunger, estimated that 5½ million American children under 12 are hungry, and twice that number are at risk of hunger.

The catastrophic effect of these findings not only weighs heavily on the present but also on this Nation's future. Hunger contributes to a number of negative health and educational consequences for children which will result in enormous social costs for all of us down the road.

Hungry children suffer from two to three times as many individual health problems, such as unwarranted weight loss, fatigue, headaches, irritability, inability to concentrate, and frequent colds. The community childhood hunger identification project found that these children are more often absent from school, compared to low-income children whose families do not experience food shortages.

The Centers for Disease Control reports that anemia remains a significant health problem among low-income children. Iron-deficiency anemia in children can lead to adverse health effects such as developmental and behavioral disturbances and increased susceptibility to lead poisoning.

Consequently, hunger has a negative impact on children's ability to learn. Recent research shows that low-income children who participate in the School Breakfast Program

showed an improvement in standardized test scores and a decrease in tardiness and absenteeism compared to students who did not eat breakfast at school.

And yet, the Federal assistance programs that are designed to help children who do not receive adequate food and medical care—like food stamps; Womens, Infants, and Children [WIC]; and Head Start—reach only slightly more than half of those individuals eligible for the program.

We have a tremendous opportunity in Congress to demonstrate our commitment to ending childhood hunger in America by passing the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act and the Freedom From Want Act. These bills will help ensure that the Federal assistance programs reach all eligible individuals they are designed to help.

In my own district, a coalition of business leaders and child advocacy groups have invested in the local Head Start and WIC Programs to facilitate the creation of two new projects designed to promote nutrition and prenatal and early childhood care.

In Cumberland, Gloucester, and Salem Counties in New Jersey, the WIC and Head Start offices have joined forces to launch a farmers market coupon project. Each month, families receive with their WIC checks a \$10 coupon redeemable for fruits and vegetables at local farmers markets. WIC and Head Start counselors provide on-site nutrition counseling and activities in addition to providing transportation to the farmers market.

In Atlantic County, NJ, a WIC Program has been established to instruct pregnant teenagers and school-aged mothers in prenatal and early childhood health care. Any student who completes the course instruction will earn a \$50 savings bond in the name of her baby for each quarter she is able to meet specified program goals such as keeping program appointments, ensuring the baby is up to date on immunizations, and attending high school regularly.

The Federal food assistance programs are good investments in our Nation's future and provide the first line of defense against hunger. I again urge my colleagues to join me in support of the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act and the Freedom From Want Act. Passage of this legislation will send a clear message to the American people that we will not ignore this country's hungry children.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, America's children, our Nation's future, need help. Many of them are poor, hungry, homeless, and ill. One in five American children lives in poverty and one of every four homeless persons is a child.

During the 1980's the number of children living in poverty grew significantly. The child poverty rate was higher in 1987 than any time during the 1970's. The number of children living in extremely poor households grew from 3.4 million in 1979 to 5.4 million in 1987. What do these numbers mean? They often mean poor academic skills, poor workers, and early parenthood, resulting in a lifetime of poverty for the next generation.

We, as a nation, must eradicate this scourge of childhood poverty. Actions must be taken to ensure all children have a fair chance in life. Although the family remains the main influence on children, communities and gov-

ernments can play a vital role. Communities must pay attention to the plight of children. And governments must invest in the health, nutrition, housing, and education needs of our Nation's youngest citizens.

The Federal Government has developed several programs that help in improving the lives of American children. It is essential that these programs receive the funding they so richly deserve until every eligible child is served. Further efforts must be made to end the erosion of working wages and to keep families from slipping into poverty. As Members of Congress we must all continue to work with our friends in communities around the Nation to find creative solutions to this problem.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HALL of Ohio. 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 the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

#### COMMEMORATING 135TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTHDAY OF NIKOLA TESLA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] for his excellent presentation on the problems concerning our children. I would join with him and our other colleagues who spoke on this today and say, yes, we need to do something about it. I do want to commend the gentleman for it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate this month the 135th anniversary of the birthday of one of America's greatest inventors and scientists, Nikola Tesla.

He was born at the stroke of midnight between July 9 and 10 in the year of 1856 to Serbian parents, in a hamlet which is a part of Yugoslavia today.

As one of the greatest physicists this world has ever known, he performed one of his first experiments at the age of 4. He improvised a water wheel from a crude disk, without using paddles like most water wheels built at that time. It showed his ingenuity and genius, two characteristics which best described this man from early childhood until his death. The paddleless water wheel remained in Tesla's mind and became the underlying principle many years later for his invention of the smooth disk turbine without buckets.

After having completed his education in Europe, Tesla displayed tremendous ability for math, he fluently spoke five

languages, and had a knack for everything else. He moved to Budapest and while working for the American Telephone Co., he made a telephone repeater which became the ancestor of today's loudspeaker. This, which might have brought him millions, was among the first in a series of inventions for which he failed to file a patent and, therefore, did not receive any recognition. Tesla often was cheated out of the benefits of his accomplishments. He would be so caught up in the joy of discovery that he would forget to patent his inventions, which then would be stolen and patented by those with whom he worked.

Tesla came to the United States in 1884 to work for the electrical giant of the day, Thomas Edison. In Tesla's eyes, America was a land of golden promise, and he knew he would fulfill his dreams there. He arrived in New York with 4 cents in his pockets, a book of poems he had written, and the calculations for designing a flying machine. As he left the immigration office, Tesla marveled the New World which he felt was a century behind Europe in civilization. Mr. Speaker, little did he sense that his own inventions would set America a century ahead of Europe and the rest of the World.

He worked for Edison, but from the moment the two of them met, they never got along. Tesla's way of creating something by planning, calculating, and then putting it all together to gain success from the first try was the sheer opposite of Edison's practice of the trial and error system, which was longer and not as practical. When Tesla met Edison, he wondered whether obtaining his education was a waste of time, as Edison, who did not have any education, still accomplished many things. He soon realized that all the years he spent in school were well worth the effort and never again regretted it. The tremendous number of his inventions was the best proof that he was right in doing so.

Even with all their differences, Tesla and Edison would have been able to work together had it not been for their greatest altercation—that over the currents. Edison believed in the direct current, while Tesla patented the alternating current system. Tesla's whole purpose of coming to America was to prevail in using the alternating current, but Edison hated the idea. Tesla needed the money to pursue his dream, and when Edison said that if he could improve his dynamos he would get \$50,000, Tesla set to work. He came up with the design of 24 different types of standard machines, short cores, and uniform patterns which were to replace the old ones. Edison was very pleased with the results but never paid Tesla, so Tesla left the company and opted to open his own laboratory in 1887. Four years later, 100 years ago, on July 30, 1891, he became a U.S. citizen. A proud

American, Tesla always cherished his naturalization certificates, keeping it in a safe where only he could look at it with reverence and joy.

Tesla is credited with some 700 inventions. Among the more notable ones were the invention of the Tesla coil, which is an integral component in radios and television sets. Tesla created many inventions by using wireless transmission. He first demonstrated the feasible long-distance transmission of electrical energy. It was he who invented the use of radio in controlling torpedoes and model boats. In effect, Mr. Speaker, it was Tesla, not Marconi, who first demonstrated the wireless radio set. This was known as the great radio controversy, when in 1943 in the case of the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. of America versus the United States, the Supreme Court ruled that it was Nikola Tesla who invented radio. And it was Tesla who demonstrated the precursor to the fluorescent light bulb.

His designs and inventions for the alternating current system resulted in his being awarded 40 patents. Then came a competition between Tesla and Edison, known as the battle of the currents. Westinghouse, an entrepreneur and an inventor himself, was very interested in Tesla's alternating current. He promised Tesla \$1 million in cash plus royalty—\$1 for each horsepower produced, if he would completely develop the alternating current. Hard times came, however, and Westinghouse couldn't afford to pay the royalties. Tesla opted to tear up the contract, but he still was to handle the patent. Alternating currents were a success, and Tesla received worldwide recognition. He deprived himself of an enormous wealth so that America and the world could continue their progress to a modern society.

In May 1883, Westinghouse opened a fair where alternating currents were to be publicly demonstrated. Although the scientific world already had accepted them, the final battle, the one where the people had to accept Tesla's inventions, now took place. Tesla's multiphase system was exhibited at the fair, along with many other of his inventions. One of these was the spinning egg made of metal. The egg was placed on top of a velvet covered round platform, and when the switch was closed the egg stood on end and rotated rapidly. Tesla tried to explain the principle of the rotating magnetic field by this, but to the wide-eyed crowd it was only a trick. Another popular demonstration was when 1 million volts of alternating current of high frequency passed through his body. It was an answer to Edison's accusations that alternating current was deadly. Westinghouse was rewarded in Chicago for his foresightedness with Tesla, as his company was now in line for consideration—and ultimate success—in har-

nessing the power of Niagara Falls, through utilization of Tesla's polyphase system. In April of 1895, the Westinghouse Co. completed the powerhouse on the Niagara Falls, and turned on the lights. The installation of the three generators with a combined capacity of 15,000 horsepower became the supreme electrical engineering accomplishment of all time. Soon, thereafter, the entire American industry was revolutionized as it hooked up to the new alternating current system. Requests came in faster than they could be granted. The high voltages that could be supplied only by alternating current made possible the large scale production of aluminum and alloyed metals necessary for the aircraft industry. Had it not been for Tesla, the airplane may never have been constructed.

Tesla did not stop at this invention though. He didn't reveal what he was working on at that time, and only later did the public learn that Tesla was working on x rays. He never laid claim to inventing them, but he achieved pictures with similar results. He called his invention the shadow graph technique. When Roentgen announced the discovery of x rays, Tesla sent him his pictures. He then gave full credit to the German scientist for discovery of the x ray. He also related the application of the rays to surgery and gave his own theories of danger to the skin when the rays are used.

Tesla also planned to make little robots and other machines which could move and perform their duties even independently of human will. Truly, Mr. Speaker, Tesla was a man out of his time. When he moved to Colorado, he discovered stationary waves in the Earth. He also duplicated celestial lighting by manmade means. This lasted for only a couple of minutes, however, because the electric company cut off his power. Still, for those few minutes, Tesla had wrested the power of heaven from the sky. As one man noted, "Tesla had stood for a fleeting moment with lightning in his hand." He soon was supposed to be rewarded for his endeavors.

In 1915, Tesla and Edison were to receive the Nobel Prize in physics. However, they did not want to share the prize, and it went to two other people. Tesla was in a desperate financial situation at that time and it hit him very hard that he did not receive the prize. He was full of many other ideas, but he was not able to realize them. He did not regret that he had torn up the contract with Westinghouse, for it was most important to him to be able to realize his plans and ideas, and not to earn large sums of money.

Nikola Tesla is the true example of the fulfillment of the American dream. Born and raised in a poor land, this man took giant steps and overcame the greatest barriers to accomplish his goals and put into effect his ideas. Mr.

Speaker, each Member of this Congress may be very proud that our Nation has had and continues to have resources and opportunity needed to promote scientific research and exploration. It was these things that enabled a poor immigrant to develop a system of electrical power used throughout the entire world. Although Tesla did not receive the proper recognition that a genius of his sort should have had, Tesla still was able to overcome all difficulties imposed on him and continue to contribute to mankind. Thanks to his patience and vehement willpower, Tesla won the respect of American leaders in all fields of life. His good sense of humor and amiable character were admired and loved by many Americans.

Although he never again had the adequate financial resources needed to develop and create more of his inventions, Tesla continued to work and develop inventions until his death. In 1940, he suggested that the U.S. military could build a system of death rays that would melt enemy airplanes at a distance of 250 miles. Although the War Department rejected this invention at that time, it is Tesla's plans and sketches that provided the basis of star wars. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, Tesla's invention was a prelude and the foundation for the Patriot missiles which saved so many lives during the recent gulf war. We have yet to discover and put into effect all the ideas which originated from Tesla's amazing intellect.

Truly, Nikola Tesla was a man who changed the world. It is thanks to him that we can all enjoy in the luxuries of modern day life, by utilizing the tremendous assortments of electrical appliances which have been created since Tesla's innovation of the alternating current system. Certainly the United States would not be enjoying its standard of living had it not been for the prodigal genius, Nikola Tesla. And as Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt wrote in behalf of herself and the President of the United States when Tesla passed away:

The President and I are deeply sorry to hear of the death of Mr. Nikola Tesla. We are grateful for his contribution to science and to this country.

As a first generation Serbian-American, I, too, admire and revere the great scientist. I hope that in doing so I convey the gratitude and pride of the Congress and my fellow American citizens to the memory of Nikola Tesla for his contributions to our society and the human civilization.

#### CHILDHOOD HUNGER AND POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ENGEL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the special order on childhood hunger and poverty brought to our attention by my distinguished colleagues Mr. HALL, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. GILCREST. It focusses on our world's most precious asset, our children.

I need not remind you that the future well-being of humanity depends on the present well-being of our children. Children throughout the world suffer from living conditions that can only be termed obscene. Here in America a baby is born into poverty every 35 seconds. Eleven million children under the age of 12 are at risk of hunger in our own country. One out of every four homeless persons in America is, in fact, a child.

These are statistics. But the children they represent are not statistics. We should pause for a moment and picture the children described by these cold numbers. Look into these children's faces. They are children, just like our own, who want to laugh and play; children born with the desire to partake in the wonder of life. They are brimming with curiosity and creativity.

But these children, unlike our own, will not have the opportunity to laugh and play because they are too busy trying to find something to eat. Imagine them having to rummage through a garbage can hoping to find a scrap of food. Their hope lies inside of a trashcan. Imagine them sleeping underneath a bridge surrounded by foul smells, broken glass, unprotected from the cold. And then imagine one of your own children in their place.

This nightmare vision is a living reality for many children in this land. One out of every five of our country's children lives in poverty. And for these children, survival is their main concern. Our country's infant mortality rate ranks 21st among the world's industrialized nations. In my State alone there are over 10,000 hungry children. Almost 25 percent, one-quarter of the families of New Hampshire with children who are under the age of 12 are either hungry or at-risk of hunger.

It is a disgrace that in this land of plenty, children still go to sleep at night feeling the pangs of hunger.

We should ask ourselves what our priorities are. Should not children be our No. 1 priority? Remember your own children. Picture them in your mind. Imagine their smiles as they play. And think of the millions of other children who are crying out in need.

Most of us in this Chamber have been very lucky. We were not born into the poverty and hunger that steals the smiles away from so many of our Nation's children. We therefore have an obligation. Let us commit ourselves to returning their missing smiles. Let us commit ourselves to ensuring that these children can dream again. They can not do it on their own. They need our help.

□ 1910

#### CHILDHOOD HUNGER AND POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ENGEL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on the subject of childhood hunger and poverty, I think we all agree that it is both a scourge and an embarrassment in our wealthy industrial society to permit children to grow up hungry, homeless, and poor. It is unfortunate that except for South Africa, ours is the only industrialized nation without a national health plan. Our infant mortality rate, once the third lowest in the world, now ranks 22d. And over the past 10 years, defense expenditures have increased by 100 percent, while at the same time, nondefense spending has been cut 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the only reason children in America go to bed hungry at night is because we have not deemed them a priority. We have not decided that they deserve the long-term investment of good health, good education, and safekeeping.

We have, inadvertently perhaps, done just the opposite.

In America, children are twice as likely to be poor as any other age group—including the elderly. That amounts to over 12 million children who grow up in poverty. According to the children's defense fund, more children are hungry in the United States than there are total children in such countries as Angola, El Salvador, Haiti, or Cambodia.

For children of color poverty is even more prevalent. Almost half of the all African-American children and more than a third of all Latino children live in poverty. Their chances of surviving through the first year of life only 10 blocks from this Capitol are worse than if they lived in Czechoslovakia or Cuba.

We are here to talk about childhood hunger and poverty, but I am concerned that perhaps we don't see the big picture. Hunger is only one of the most immediate and heart wrenching aspects of childhood poverty, albeit a crucial one. I know because there are nearly 300,000 children in my home State of New Jersey who fall below the poverty line and frequently go hungry. I also know there is hunger in my district because only one-third of eligible children received food supplements provided through WIC, the Women, Infants, and Children Program.

But Mr. Speaker, as I said I am concerned all the more about the long-term results of 12 million children in poverty; 12 million children in poverty does not only mean 12 million hungry children; it means 12 million children without decent housing or clothing. It

means 12 million children who may not receive educations adequate enough to deliver them out of their depressed economic condition once they grow up. It means 12 million children without health care. It means 12 million children hopeless and helpless.

I know the faces of the poor in my district of Newark, NJ, and I cannot believe we allow children to go without proper nutrition, dental care, or other basic health care needs. Recently we've seen a trend among our poor children to become permanently injured or die from tuberculosis, whooping cough, and measles: Diseases easily prevented with inexpensive immunizations. These epidemics are but a small testimony to the cruel way in which we deny our children the benefits of the basic health achievements in modern medicine.

The recession which has stifled our economy will most certainly drag more of our children into poverty. Recessions affecting our Nation have always affected children most, but the assumption most of us make is that the economic recovery impacts the poor in equal proportion. It is both unfair and unrealistic to adopt the philosophy that a rising tide lifts all boats. The last few recessions have dropped their boats more than any others while the recovery period seemingly has benefited them the least. In our last period of economic recovery, the numbers of poor children actually rose.

In essence our poor will remain poor. They will raise their children as best they know how: Having to deny them the luxuries of birthday presents, college educations, and perhaps most tragically of all the luxury of choice about one's future. Unless we take it upon ourselves to make children a top priority, we will surely seal their fate in this Nation as a mass of second class citizens who are denied access to all the benefits of a wealthy society.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, to the old adage which I hear all too often that one should "pull yourself up by your bootstraps." I must respond that 12 million American children literally have no boots. We must give our poor children, all 12 million of them, boots, food, decent housing, clothing, and whatever else it takes to ensure that our future and theirs is more bright with hope than that bleak with despair.

I urge my colleagues to join me in setting issues of childhood hunger and poverty at the top of their agenda for this session in Congress.

#### 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 Mrs. BENTLEY) to revise and

extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 5 minutes, today and July 26.

Mr. WALKER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes each day, on September 11, 12, and 13.

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

Mr. KLECZKA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BACCHUS, for 5 minutes, on July 25.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, for 60 minutes each day, on July 31, and August 1 and 2.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SWETT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. GRADISON.

Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. ARCHER.

Mr. SUNDQUIST.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. RINALDO.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. HORTON in two instances.

Mr. BLAZ.

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

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. WEISS in two instances.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. LAROCCO.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. GRAY.

Mr. BOUCHER.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. SOLARZ.

Mr. DELUGO.

Mr. TRAXLER.

Mrs. MINK.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. TALLON.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

Mr. LEVINE of California in two instances.

Mr. ORTIZ.

Mr. BACCHUS.

Mr. KILDEE.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2525. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to codify the provisions of law relating to the establishment of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to restate and reorganize certain provisions of that title, and for other purposes.

□ 1920

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 25, 1991, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1821. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a statement with respect to a transaction involving United States exports to the USSR, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(ii); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1822. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease renewal of defense articles to Norway (Transmittal No. 12-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1823. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Parker W. Borg, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to the Union of Burma, and members of his family; of James F. Dobbins, of New York, to be Representative of the United States to the European Communities, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1824. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a list of all reports issued by the GAO during June 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1825. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting a report concerning the employment discrimination protections of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 to employees of the CBO,

pursuant to Public Law 101-336, section 509(c)(3) (104 Stat. 375); to the Committee on Housing Administration.

1826. A letter from the Assistant Secretary—Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's notice on leasing systems for the Chukchi Sea, sale 126, scheduled to be held in August 1991, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(8); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1827. A letter from the Treasurer, the Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America, transmitting the annual financial report of the society for calendar year 1990, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(19), 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1828. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report outlining the Social Security Administration's program for notifying blind SSI recipients, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1383 note; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1829. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the President's determination (No. 91-46) relating to assistance to Jordan, pursuant to Public Law 101-513, section 5860; Public Law 102-27, section 502(c); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

1830. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on abnormal occurrences at licensed nuclear facilities for the first calendar quarter of 1991, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5848; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEE 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:

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 201. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2507, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-160). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALL of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 203. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 14, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the establishment of limitations on the duty time for flight attendants (Rept. 102-161). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 3006. A bill to provide for the development of a systems architecture that can begin providing the essential data needed to understand and respond to global warming by 1995 in a cost-effective manner, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 3007. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make changes related to the old-age,

survivors, and disability insurance program and the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BENTLEY:

H.R. 3008. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a program of scholarships to individuals who agree to study civil engineering and to work with a public agency for 4 years following graduation; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. McCANDLESS, and Mr. LEWIS of California):

H.R. 3009. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish two divisions in the Central Judicial District of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 3010. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the income ceiling for qualified Medicare beneficiaries from 100 percent to 133 percent of the poverty level beginning in 1993 with respect to payment of coinsurance and deductibles and beginning in 1995 with respect to payment of premiums; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BYRON (for herself, Mr. MFUME, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. FROST, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RAY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. CARDIN, and Mrs. BENTLEY):

H.R. 3011. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the American Discovery Trail for study to determine the feasibility and desirability of its designation as a national trail; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. SCHULZE):

H.R. 3012. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic River Act by designating the White Clay Creek in Delaware and Pennsylvania for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 3013. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any compensation received from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 3014. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from the penalty tax on early withdrawals from individual retirement plans distributions used to acquire the first home of a child or grandchild of the beneficiary of the plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 3015. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of expanded respite care services for Medicare beneficiaries receiving hospice care; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Georgia (for himself, Mr. APPLGATE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 3016. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the targeted jobs credit for hiring economically disadvantaged veterans who are discharged involuntarily as a result of budget cuts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H.R. 3017. A bill for the relief of Henry Johnson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3018. A bill for the relief of Dorris Miller; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 3019. A bill to authorize appropriations for grants to States to demonstrate whether confinement in boot camp prisons rehabilitates, and reduces recidivism of, juvenile offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase to \$150,000 the amount of group-term life insurance which may be provided by an employer and excluded from the gross income of an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3021. A bill to establish a Presidential Commission on Insurance; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 3022. A bill to prevent theft of motor vehicles by establishing a national framework for a program under which law enforcement officials are authorized to stop vehicles operated under specified conditions, such as during certain night hours, when operation of the vehicle under those conditions, according to a certification signed voluntarily by the owner, establishes a reasonable suspicion that the vehicle is being operated unlawfully; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 3023. A bill to terminate the programs for lease and sale of single family properties acquired by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for use by the homeless; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 3024. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding sentencing for capital offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3025. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the deductibility of losses attributable to disasters for which assistance under the disaster loan program of the Small Business Act is available; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. WELDON):

H.R. 3026. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to protect citizens, municipalities, and other generators and transporters of municipal solid waste and sewage sludge from lawsuits equating these substances with industrial hazardous wastes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 3027. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to modify the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission under part 1 of the act with regard to fresh waters in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 3028. A bill to require that imports of fresh papaya meet all the requirements imposed on domestic fresh papaya; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Ways and Means.

## MEMORIALS

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

224. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Eighteenth Special Session of the Palau National Congress, Republic of Palau, relative to the occasion of the Honorable George Miller's assumption of the chairmanship of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

245. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to H.R. 1223; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 74: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 123: Mrs. BYRON.

H.R. 127: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HUTTO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 213: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MFUME, Mr. WEBER, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 357: Mr. EWING, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 416: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 640: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 722: Mr. GREEN of New York.

H.R. 723: Mr. GREEN of New York.

H.R. 791: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 812: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BEILEN-SON, Mr. YATES, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. PETERSON of Florida.

H.R. 815: Mr. JENKINS and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 842: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 962: Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 997: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1110: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. SYNAR, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 1135: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 1181: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1237: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. BROWDER, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1345: Mr. McDADE, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 1422: Mr. EVANS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. YATES, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. ESPY, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 1457: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. LUKEN.

H.R. 1473: Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 1484: Mr. DOOLEY and Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 1485: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 1652: Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1739: Mr. REED and Mr. FISH.

- H.R. 1750: Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 1774: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. DYMALLY.  
 H.R. 1782: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ROWLAND.  
 H.R. 1790: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.  
 H.R. 1800: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. HASTERT.  
 H.R. 1900: Mr. HYDE, and Mr. GINGRICH.  
 H.R. 1969: Mr. TRAFICANT.  
 H.R. 2012: Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. QUILLEN.  
 H.R. 2059: Mr. LENT.  
 H.R. 2065: Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ROE, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 2071: Mr. STUMP, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. HYDE.  
 H.R. 2106: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DERRICK, and Mr. TALLON.  
 H.R. 2142: Ms. MOLINARI.  
 H.R. 2149: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. SHAW, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. DICKINSON, and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.  
 H.R. 2164: Mr. CONDIT, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.  
 H.R. 2172: Mr. FISH.  
 H.R. 2231: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. ESPY, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 2241: Mr. UPTON.  
 H.R. 2243: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. FROST.  
 H.R. 2257: Mr. COX of California and Mr. DORNAN of California.  
 H.R. 2290: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. SHAW, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. BENNETT.  
 H.R. 2350: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FROST, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. ROE, Mr. MFUME, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. EVANS.  
 H.R. 2382: Mr. ECKART.  
 H.R. 2463: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. STENHOLM.  
 H.R. 2515: Mr. REED and Mr. SARPALIUS.  
 H.R. 2540: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. STARK, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. ROSE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. MAVROULES.  
 H.R. 2541: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. STARK.  
 H.R. 2588: Mr. PALONE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ROE, and Mr. HORTON.  
 H.R. 2646: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. ZIMMER.  
 H.R. 2672: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. GREEN of New York.  
 H.R. 2715: Mr. ROE, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. TOWNS.  
 H.R. 2717: Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. LLOYD, and Ms. KAPTUR.  
 H.R. 2743: Mr. HORTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, and Mr. ECKART.  
 H.R. 2744: Mr. HORTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, and Mr. ECKART.  
 H.R. 2768: Mr. HANCOCK.  
 H.R. 2818: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 2871: Mr. ECKART, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. POSHARD.  
 H.R. 2872: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. GOSS.  
 H.R. 2880: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. WHEAT.  
 H.J. Res. 22: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.  
 H.J. Res. 67: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ECKART, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. ZELIFF, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Ms. NORTON.  
 H.J. Res. 69: Mr. POSHARD.  
 H.J. Res. 102: Mr. MORRISON, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. KLECZKA.  
 H.J. Res. 142: Mr. HOBSON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RANGEL, and Mrs. BOXER.  
 H.J. Res. 191: Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DICKS, Mr. STARK, and Mr. FORD of Michigan.  
 H.J. Res. 215: Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. TALLON, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. DAVIS.  
 H.J. Res. 237: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. TRAFICANT.  
 H.J. Res. 252: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. HOBSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. PAXON, Mr. DELAY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. STUMP, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. PACKARD, Mrs. MINK, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. RAY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CARR, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. RICHARDSON.  
 H.J. Res. 280: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. WISE, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. ECKART.  
 H.J. Res. 284: Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ROE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BUNNING, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. DE LUGO.  
 H.J. Res. 293: Mr. BRUCE, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. LEWIS of California.  
 H.J. Res. 294: Mr. EVANS, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROWLAND, and Mr. DONNELLY.  
 H.J. Res. 299: Mr. STOKES, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SABO, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ROGERS, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. RITTER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. RANGEL.  
 H.J. Res. 305: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ERDREICH, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. PRICE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. BRYANT.  
 H.J. Res. 308: Ms. SNOWE, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. HOLLOWAY.  
 H.J. Res. 309: Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SABO, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SKORSKI, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. FORD of Tennessee.  
 H. Con. Res. 176: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. JONTZ.  
 H. Res. 106: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. OBERSTAR.  
 H. Res. 175: Mr. HERTEL, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. PORTER.