HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, October 1, 1991*

The House met at 12 noon.

Rev. Dr. Wallace Charles Smith, senior minister, Shiloh Baptist Church, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Our gracious God, we offer up thanksgiving for this moment in our Nation's history filled with incredible challenges and extraordinary opportunities. We are thankful that we live in a global community which offers us the possibility to partner with nations of the world to ease hunger, and further economic development.

We are grateful for those global neighbors who seek freedom and the right to democratic government. Please bless their efforts. In our own land we ask Your blessings on the poor, the jobless, the disheartened, but we also pray for those who may live in mansions but whose hearts due to loneliness and alienation have become like empty cells.

And finally Lord, we pray for the President and the Congress; help them to lead this Nation and the world to a just and lasting peace. 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.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 282, nays 108, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

YEAS—282

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
Atkins
Bacchus
Barnard
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Dreier
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gradison
Green
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Manton
Markey
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCollum
McCurdy
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Morrison
Mrazek
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Patterson
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Quillen
Rahall
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Richardson
Rinaldo
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schulze
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Washington
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NAYS—108

Allard
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bunning
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Chandler
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Goodling
Goss
Grandy
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hobson
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Kolbe
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lowery (CA)
Machtley
Marlenee
McCandless
McCrery
McDade
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Murphy
Nussle
Paxon
Pursell
Ramstad
Regula
Rhodes
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Sikorski
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—42

AuCoin
Burton
Crane
Dellums
Derrick
Dooley
Dymally
Eckart
English
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Gephardt
Guarini
Hancock
Holloway
Hopkins
Jacobs
Jefferson
Kaptur
Klug
Lehman (FL)
McCloskey
Myers
Olin
Owens (NY)
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Rangel
Ridge
Ritter
Sanders
Savage
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (OR)
Stenholm
Thornton
Torricelli
Waters
Weber
Weiss
Wylie
Zeliff

□ 1225

Mr. SKAGGS and Mr. BRYANT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Will the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT] please lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SWETT 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.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

OFFICIAL MAJORITY OBJECTORS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR AND PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the official objectors for the majority side for the 102d Congress are as follows:

For the Consent Calendar: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee; Mr. LEWIS of Georgia; and Mrs. PATTERSON of South Carolina.

For the Private Calendar: Mr. BOUCHER of Virginia; Mr. MFUME of Maryland; and Mr. HUBBARD of Kentucky.

OFFICIAL MINORITY OBJECTORS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR AND PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce the official objectors from the Republican side for the Consent and Private Calendar.

The Republican official objectors for the 102d Congress for the Consent Calendar will be the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the gentleman from California [Mr. MCCANDLESS], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

For the Private Calendar, the Republican official objectors for the 102d Congress will be the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE].

THE HIGHWAY BILL

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the 1991 fiscal year has ended and the highway bill has not been reauthorized.

While the Democrats complain the President does not have a domestic agenda, they put a stop sign to a highway bill that will create jobs and improve our infrastructure. And then they give the green light for another unemployment bill.

The President wanted the highway bill passed by June 14. It is now October 1. The country is still waiting for the Congress to act.

I do not want to be a back seat driver, but the Democrat-controlled Congress is steering the country down the wrong road. The President does have a domestic agenda. The Democrats just refuse to turn on the ignition.

The Congress spends too much time spinning its wheels while tooting its horn about dubious accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, put the pedal to the metal and speedily bring forth the job-creating surface transportation bill.

□ 1230

WELCOME TO REV. DR. WALLACE CHARLES SMITH

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that Shiloh Baptist Church, one of Washington's oldest and most distinguished churches, would attract a new minister who has had an especially outstanding career of service.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to welcome to Washington and to this House the Reverend Dr. Wallace Charles Smith, only the sixth pastor in the 128 years Shiloh has served this city.

Reverend Smith has been a full-time professor as well as a minister, and it should be noted, has reached an even wider audience as a winner of four Emmy awards for his weekly television commentaries. Reverend Smith has been called to a historic church, revered in this city for its long tradition of spiritual and civic service. He is a leader with the outstanding qualities to carry on the Shiloh tradition.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

CRAIG A. KLEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 238) for the relief of Craig A. Klein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 238

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

SECTION 1. SATISFACTION OF CLAIM AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Craig A. Klein of Jacksonville, Florida, the sum of $25,000 for damages incurred as a result of the search and seizure of his sailboat, "Pegotty", by the United States Customs Service in April 1989.

(b) CONDITION OF PAYMENT.—The payment of this sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of Craig A. Klein against the United States in connection with the search and seizure described in subsection (a).

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No more than 10 percent of the sum appropriated by section 1 shall be paid to or received by any agent or attorney for services rendered in connection with the claim described in such section.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—Any person violating the provisions of subsection (a) shall be fined not more than $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 1, strike "$25,000" and insert "$8,947."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRUCE C. VEIT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 454) for the relief of Bruce C. Veit.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 454

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

SECTION 1. ENTITLEMENT TO REIMBURSEMENT FOR TRAVEL EXPENSES.

Bruce C. Veit of El Paso, Texas, an employee of the Department of the Army, shall be reimbursed for the costs incurred by him as a result of his relocation from Memphis, Tennessee, to El Paso, Texas, during October and November 1984, as provided by his official travel authorization issued on October 23, 1984.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORMAN R. RICKS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 478) for the relief of Norman R. Ricks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 478

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

SECTION 1. REIMBURSEMENT FOR REAL ESTATE EXPENSES.

The relocation of Norman R. Ricks by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in June 1989 shall be considered to be a transfer from 1 official station to another for which reimbursement is permitted under section 5724a(a)(4) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON AGENTS AND ATTORNEYS FEES.

No amount exceeding 10 percent of a payment made pursuant to section 1 may be paid to or received by any agent or attorney in consideration for services rendered in connection with the payment. Any person who violates the provisions of this section shall be guilty of an infraction and shall be subject to a fine in the amount provided under title 18, United States Code.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDGARDO ROMAN AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 590) for the relief of Edgardo, Ismael, Juan Carlos, and Edilliam Cotto Román.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 590

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Edgardo, Ismael, Juan Carlos, and Edilliam Cotto Román, the

children of Edgardo Cotto Miranda, a member of the Puerto Rico Army National Guard who became a tetraplegic as a consequence of an auto accident in 1987 in Puerto Rico, shall for the purposes of section 6(c) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 241), be considered to be children residing with a parent employed by the United States and thus be eligible to receive free public education arranged by the Secretary of Education under such section.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUAN LUIS RAMIREZ AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 655) for the relief of Juan Luis, Braulio Nestor, and Miosotis Ramirez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 655

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Juan Luis, Braulio Nestor, and Miosotis Ramirez, children of Elizabeth Ramirez, a member of the United States Army who died of cancer in 1990, shall for the purposes of section 6(c) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 241), be considered to be children residing with a parent employed by the United States and thus be eligible to receive free public education arranged by the Secretary of Education under such section.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLOTTE S. NEAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1279) for the relief of Charlotte S. Neal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1279

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

SECTION 1. ELECTION TO PROVIDE ANNUITY.

For purposes of determining the eligibility of Charlotte S. Neal, of Lynchburg, Virginia, former spouse of the late Lieutenant Commander Michael D. Christian, United States Navy retired, to an annuity under the Survivor Benefit Plan, Lieutenant Commander Christian shall be deemed to have made an election under section 1448(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, to provide an annuity to Charlotte S. Neal in accordance with the separation agreement incorporated into their divorce decree of August 19, 1983. Such election shall be deemed to have been made as of September 24, 1983, notwithstanding the death of Lieutenant Commander Christian on September 4, 1983.

SEC. 2. LUMP SUM PAYMENT.

The Secretary of Navy shall pay in a lump sum to Charlotte S. Neal the aggregate amount to which she is entitled by reason of section 1 for the period beginning on October 1, 1983, and ending on the last day of the month in which this Act is enacted.

SEC. 3. DEFINITION.

For purposes of this Act, the term "Survivor Benefit Plan" means the program provided under subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF TRANSCRIPT OF COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCIDENT TO PRESENTATION OF PORTRAIT OF HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 216) authorizing the printing of the transcript of the Committee on the District of Columbia incident to presentation of a portrait of the Honorable RONALD V. DELLUMS, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Illinois to please explain the resolution.

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

Mr. WALSH. Further reserving the right to object, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is sponsored by the Honorable PETE STARK. The resolution provides for the printing of the transcript of the Committee on the District of Columbia's portrait presentation ceremony of the Honorable RONALD V. DELLUMS. Mr. DELLUMS has been a distinguished Member of Congress since 1970 and has served as the outstanding chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia since 1979. The portrait of Chairman DELLUMS was presented by the members of the District of Columbia Committee to the House during ceremonies on February 28, 1991.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 216

Resolved, That the transcript of proceedings of the Committee on the District of Columbia on February 28, 1991, incident to presentation of a portrait of the Honorable Ronald V. Dellums to the committee, shall be printed as a House Document with illustrations and suitable binding.

SEC. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed, for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia, 60 casebound copies of said document, the allowable balance in paperback.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. ANNUNZIO

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. ANNUNZIO: Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following: That the transcript of the proceedings of the Committee on the District of Columbia on February 28, 1991, incident to the presentation of a portrait of the Honorable Ronald V. Dellums to the committee, shall be printed as a House document, with illustrations and suitable binding.

SEC. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed, for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia, such number of copies of the document as does not exceed a cost of $1,200, of which 60 copies shall be casebound.

Mr. ANNUNZIO (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO].

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing the printing of the transcript of the proceedings of the Committee of the District of Columbia incident to the presentation of a portrait of the Honorable RONALD V. DELLUMS.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 216, the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1722, EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 1991

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI submitted the following conference report and statement on the Senate bill (S. 1722) to provide emergency unemployment compensation, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 102-228)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1722)

to provide emergency unemployment compensation, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991".

TITLE I—EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM

SEC. 101. FEDERAL-STATE AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any State which desires to do so may enter into and participate in an agreement under this Act with the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary"). Any State which is a party to an agreement under this Act may, upon providing 30 days written notice to the Secretary, terminate such agreement.

(b) PROVISIONS OF AGREEMENT.—Any agreement under subsection (a) shall provide that the State agency of the State will make payments of emergency unemployment compensation—

(1) to individuals who—

(A) have exhausted all rights to regular compensation under the State law,

(B) have no rights to compensation (including both regular compensation and extended compensation) with respect to a week under such law or any other State unemployment compensation law or to compensation under any other Federal law (and are not paid or entitled to be paid any additional compensation under any State or Federal law), and

(C) are not receiving compensation with respect to such week under the unemployment compensation law of Canada, and

(2) for any week of unemployment which begins in the individual's period of eligibility (as defined in section 106(2)).

(c) EXHAUSTION OF BENEFITS.—For purposes of subsection (b)(1)(A), an individual shall be deemed to have exhausted such individual's rights to regular compensation under a State law when—

(1) no payments of regular compensation can be made under such law because such individual has received all regular compensation available to such individual based on employment or wages during such individual's base period, or

(2) such individual's rights to such compensation have been terminated by reason of the expiration of the benefit year with respect to which such rights existed.

(d) WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT.—For purposes of any agreement under this Act—

(1) the amount of emergency unemployment compensation which shall be payable to any individual for any week of total unemployment shall be equal to the amount of the regular compensation (including dependent's allowances) payable to such individual during such individual's benefit year under the State law for a week of total unemployment,

(2) the terms and conditions of the State law which apply to claims for extended compensation and to the payment thereof shall apply to claims for emergency unemployment compensation and the payment thereof, except where inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, or with the regulations or operating instructions of the Secretary promulgated to carry out this Act, and

(3) the maximum amount of emergency unemployment compensation payable to any individual for whom an account is established under section 102 shall not exceed the amount established in such account for such individual.

(e) ELECTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law (and if State law permits), the Governor of a State in a 7-percent period or an 8-percent period, as defined in section 102(c), is authorized to and may elect to trigger off an extended compensation period in order to provide payment of emergency unemployment compensation to individuals who have exhausted their rights to regular compensation under State law.

SEC. 102. EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACCOUNT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any agreement under this Act shall provide that the State will establish, for each eligible individual who files an application for emergency unemployment compensation, an emergency unemployment compensation account with respect to such individual's benefit year.

(b) AMOUNT IN ACCOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount established in an account under subsection (a) shall be equal to the lesser of—

(A) 100 percent of the total amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) payable to the individual with respect to the benefit year (as determined under the State law) on the basis of which the individual most recently received regular compensation, or

(B) the applicable limit times the individual's average weekly benefit amount for the benefit year.

(2) APPLICABLE LIMIT.—For purposes of this section—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this paragraph, the applicable limit shall be determined under the following table:

In the case of weeks beginning during a:	***The applicable limit is:***
8-percent period	*20*
7-percent period	*13*
6-percent period or other period	*7.*

(B) APPLICABLE LIMIT NOT REDUCED.—An individual's applicable limit for any week shall in no event be less than the highest applicable limit in effect for any prior week for which emergency unemployment compensation was payable to the individual from the account involved.

(C) INCREASE IN APPLICABLE LIMIT.—If the applicable limit in effect for any week is higher than the applicable limit for any prior week, the applicable limit shall be the higher applicable limit, reduced (but not below zero) by the number of prior weeks for which emergency unemployment compensation was paid to the individual from the account involved.

(3) REDUCTION FOR EXTENDED BENEFITS.—The amount in an account under paragraph (1) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the aggregate amount of extended compensation (if any) received by such individual relating to the same benefit year under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970.

(4) WEEKLY BENEFIT AMOUNT.—For purposes of this subsection, an individual's weekly benefit amount for any week is the amount of regular compensation (including dependents' allowances) under the State law payable to such individual for such week for total unemployment.

(c) DETERMINATION OF PERIODS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the terms "8-percent period", "7-percent period", "6-percent period", and "other period" mean, with respect to any State, the period which—

(A) begins with the second Sunday of the month after the first month during which the applicable trigger for such period is on, and

(B) ends with the Saturday immediately preceding the second Sunday of the month after the first month during which the applicable trigger for such period is off.

(2) APPLICABLE TRIGGER.—In the case of an 8-percent period, 7-percent period, 6-percent period, or other period, as the case may be, the applicable trigger is on for any week with respect to any such period if the average rate of total unemployment in the State for the period consisting of the most recent 6-calendar month period for which data are published—

(A) equals or exceeds 6 percent, and

(B) falls within the applicable range (as defined in paragraph (3)).

Subparagraph (A) shall only apply in the case of an 8-percent period, 7-percent period, or 6-percent period.

(3) APPLICABLE RANGE.—For purposes of this subsection, the applicable range is as follows:

In the case of a:	*The applicable range is:*
8-percent period	*A rate equal to or exceeding 8 percent.*
7-percent period	*A rate equal to or exceeding 7 percent but less than 8 percent.*
6-percent period	*A rate equal to or exceeding 6 percent but less than 7 percent.*
Other period	*A rate less than 6 percent.*

(4) SPECIAL RULES FOR DETERMINING PERIODS.—

(A) MINIMUM PERIOD.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if for any week beginning after October 5, 1991, an 8-percent period, 7-percent period, 6-percent period, or other period, as the case may be, is triggered on with respect to such State, such period shall last for not less than 13 weeks.

(B) EXCEPTION IF APPLICABLE RANGE INCREASES.—If, but for subparagraph (A), another period with a higher applicable range would be in effect for such State, such other period shall take effect without regard to subparagraph (A).

(5) NOTIFICATION BY SECRETARY.—When a determination has been made that an 8-percent period, 7-percent period, 6-percent period, or other period is beginning or ending with respect to a State, the Secretary shall cause notice of such determination to be published in the Federal Register.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), no emergency unemployment compensation shall be payable to any individual under this Act for any week—

(A) beginning before the later of—

(i) October 6, 1991, or

(ii) the first week following the week in which an agreement under this Act is entered into, or

(B) beginning after July 4, 1992.

(2) TRANSITION.—In the case of an individual who is receiving emergency unemployment compensation for a week which includes July 4, 1992, such compensation shall continue to be payable to such indvidual in accordance with subsection (b) for any week beginning in a period of consecutive weeks for each of which the individual meets the eligibility requirements of this Act.

(3) REACHBACK PROVISIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If—

(i) any individual exhausted such individual's rights to regular compensation (or extended compensation) under the State law after February 28, 1991, and before the first week following October 5, 1991 (or, if later, the first week following the week in which the agreement under this Act is entered into), and

(ii) a period described in subsection (c)(2)(A) is in effect with respect to the State for the first week following October 5, 1991,

such individual shall be entitled to emergency unemployment compensation under this Act in the same manner as if such individual's benefit year ended no earlier than the last day of such following week.

(B) SPECIAL RULE.—A State not meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be

treated as meeting such requirements if such State met them for the first week following August 31, 1991.

(C) LIMITATION OF BENEFITS.—In the case of an individual who has exhausted such individual's rights to both regular and extended compensation, any emergency unemployment compensation payable under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be reduced in accordance with subsection (b)(3).

SEC. 103. PAYMENTS TO STATES HAVING AGREEMENTS FOR THE PAYMENT OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be paid to each State which has entered into an agreement under this Act an amount equal to 100 percent of the emergency unemployment compensation paid to individuals by the State pursuant to such agreement.

(b) TREATMENT OF REIMBURSABLE COMPENSATION.—No payment shall be made to any State under this section in respect of compensation to the extent the State is entitled to reimbursement in respect of such compensation under the provisions of any Federal law other than this Act or chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code. A State shall not be entitled to any reimbursement under such chapter 85 in respect of any compensation to the extent the State is entitled to reimbursement under this Act in respect of such compensation.

(c) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT.—Sums payable to any State by reason of such State having an agreement under this Act shall be payable, either in advance or by way of reimbursement (as may be determined by the Secretary), in such amounts as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this Act for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any amount by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made on the basis of such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency of the State involved.

SEC. 104. FINANCING PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds in the extended unemployment compensation account (as established by section 905 of the Social Security Act) of the Unemployment Trust Fund shall be used for the making of payments to States having agreements entered into under this Act.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payments to the State in accordance with such certification, by transfers from the extended unemployment compensation account (as established by section 905 of the Social Security Act) to the account of such State in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

(c) ASSISTANCE TO STATES.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation, such funds as may be necessary for purposes of assisting States (as provided in title III of the Social Security Act) in meeting the costs of administration of agreements under this Act.

SEC. 105. FRAUD AND OVERPAYMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If an individual knowingly has made, or caused to be made by another, a false statement or representation of a material fact, or knowingly has failed, or caused another to fail, to disclose a material fact, and as a result of such false statement or representation or of such nondisclosure such individual has received an amount of emergency unemployment compensation under this Act to which he was not entitled, such individual—

(1) shall be ineligible for further emergency unemployment compensation under this Act in accordance with the provisions of the applicable State unemployment compensation law relating to fraud in connection with a claim for unemployment compensation, and

(2) shall be subject to prosecution under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

(b) REPAYMENT.—In the case of individuals who have received amounts of emergency unemployment compensation under this Act to which they were not entitled, the State shall require such individuals to repay the amounts of such emergency unemployment compensation to the State agency, except that the State agency may waive such repayment if it determines that—

(1) the payment of such emergency unemployment compensation was without fault on the part of any such individual, and

(2) such repayment would be contrary to equity and good conscience.

(c) RECOVERY BY STATE AGENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The State agency may recover the amount to be repaid, or any part thereof, by deductions from any emergency unemployment compensation payable to such individual under this Act or from any unemployment compensation payable to such individual under any Federal unemployment compensation law administered by the State agency or under any other Federal law administered by the State agency which provides for the payment of any assistance or allowance with respect to any week of unemployment, during the 3-year period after the date such individuals received the payment of the emergency unemployment compensation to which they were not entitled, except that no single deduction may exceed 50 percent of the weekly benefit amount from which such deduction is made.

(2) OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING.—No repayment shall be required, and no deduction shall be made, until a determination has been made, notice thereof and an opportunity for a fair hearing has been given to the individual, and the determination has become final.

(d) REVIEW.—Any determination by a State agency under this section shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in that manner and to that extent.

SEC. 106. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The terms "compensation", "regular compensation", "extended compensation", "additional compensation", "benefit year", "base period", "State", "State agency", "State law", and "week" have the meanings given such terms under section 205 of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970.

(2) ELIGIBILITY PERIOD.—An individual's eligibility period shall consist of the weeks in the individual's benefit year which begin in an 8-percent period, 7-percent period, 6-percent period, or other period under this Act and, if the individual's benefit year ends on or after October 5, 1991, any weeks thereafter which begin in any such period. In no event shall an individual's period of eligibility include any weeks after the 39th week after the end of the benefit year for which the individual exhausted his rights to regular compensation or extended compensation.

(3) RATE OF TOTAL UNEMPLOYMENT.—The term "rate of total unemployment" means the average unadjusted total rate of unemployment (as determined by the Secretary) for a State for the period consisting of the most recent 6-calendar month period for which data are published.

TITLE II—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM TO PROVIDE JOB SEARCH ASSISTANCE

SEC. 201. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM TO PROVIDE JOB SEARCH ASSISTANCE.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—The Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Secretary") shall carry out a demonstration program under this title for purposes of determining the feasibility of implementing job search assistance programs. To carry out such demonstration program, the Secretary shall enter into agreements with 3 States which—

(1) apply to participate in such program, and

(2) demonstrate to the Secretary that they are capable of implementing the provisions of an agreement under this section.

(b) SELECTION OF STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In determining whether to enter into an agreement with a State under this section, the Secretary shall take into consideration at least—

(A) the size, geography, and occupational and industrial composition of the State,

(B) the adequacy of State resources to carry out a job search assistance program,

(C) the range and extent of specialized services to be provided by the State to individuals covered by the agreement, and

(D) the design of the evaluation to be applied by the State to the program.

(2) REPLICATION OF PRIOR DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—At least 1 of the States selected by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be a State which has operated a successful demonstration project with respect to job search assistance under a contract with the Department of Labor. The demonstration program under this title of any such State shall, at a minimum, replicate the project it operated under such contract in the same geographic areas.

(c) PROVISIONS OF AGREEMENT.—Any agreement entered into with a State under this section shall—

(1) provide that the State will implement a job search assistance program during the 1-year period specified in such agreement,

(2) provide that such implementation will begin not later than the date 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act,

(3) contain such provisions as may be necessary to ensure an accurate evaluation of the effectiveness of a job search assistance program, including—

(A) random selection of eligible individuals for participation in the program and for inclusion in a control group, and

(B) collection of data on participants and members of a control group as of the close of the 1-year period and 2-year period after the operations of the program cease,

(4) provide that not more than 5 percent of the claimants for unemployment compensation under the State law shall be selected as participants in the job search assistance program, and

(5) contain such other provisions as the Secretary may require.

SEC. 202. JOB SEARCH ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of this title, a job search assistance program shall provide that—

(1) eligible individuals who are selected to participate in the program shall be required to participate in a qualified intensive job search program after receiving compensation under such State law during any benefit year for at least 6 but not more than 10 weeks,

(2) every individual required to participate in a job search program under paragraph (1) shall be entitled to receive an intensive job search program voucher, and

(3) any individual who is required under paragraph (1) to participate in a qualified intensive job search program and who does not satisfactorily participate in such program shall

be disqualified from receiving compensation under such State law for the period (of not more than 10 weeks) specified in the agreement under section 201.

(b) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this title—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term "eligible individual" means any individual receiving compensation under the State law during any benefit year if, during the 3-year period ending on the last day of the base period for such benefit year, such individual had at least 126 weeks of employment at wages of $30 or more a week with such individual's last employer in such base period (or, if data with respect to weeks of employment with such last employer are not available, an equivalent amount of employment computed under regulations prescribed by the Secretary).

(2) EXCEPTION.—Such term shall not include any individual if—

(A) such individual has a definite date for recall to his former employment,

(B) such individual seeks employment through a union hall or similar arrangement, or

(C) the State agency—

(i) waives the requirements of subsection (a)(1) for good cause shown by such individual, or

(ii) determines that such participation would not be appropriate for such individual.

(c) QUALIFIED INTENSIVE JOB SEARCH PROGRAM.—For purposes of this section, the term "qualified intensive job search program" means any intensive job search assistance program which—

(1) is approved by the State agency,

(2) is provided by an organization qualified to provide job search assistance programs under any other Federal law, and

(3) includes—

(A) all basic employment services, such as orientation, testing, a job-search workshop, and an individual assessment and counseling interview, and

(B) additional services, such as ongoing contact with the program staff, followup assistance, resource centers, and job search materials and equipment.

(d) INTENSIVE JOB SEARCH VOUCHER.—For purposes of this section, the term "intensive job search voucher" means any voucher which entitles the organization (including the State employment service) providing the qualified intensive job search assistance program to a payment from the State agency equal to the lesser of—

(1) the reasonable costs of providing such program, or

(2) the average weekly benefit amount in the State.

SEC. 203. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) FINANCING PROVISIONS.—

(1) PAYMENTS TO STATES.—There shall be paid to each State which enters into an agreement under section 201 an amount equal to the lesser of the reasonable costs of operating the job search assistance program pursuant to such agreement or the State's average weekly benefit amount for each individual selected to participate in the job search assistance program operated by such State pursuant to such agreement. Funds in the extended unemployment compensation account (as established by section 905 of the Social Security Act) shall be used for purposes of making such payments.

(2) PAYMENTS ON CALENDAR MONTH BASIS.—There shall be paid to each State either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this subsection for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made on the basis of such method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

(3) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this subsection. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment to the State in accordance with such certification, by transfers from the extended unemployment compensation account (as established by section 905 of the Social Security Act) to the account of such State in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

(4) SPECIAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, amounts in the account of a State in the Unemployment Trust Fund may be used for purposes of making payments pursuant to intensive job search vouchers provided pursuant to an agreement under this title.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) INTERIM REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit 2 interim reports to the Congress on the effectiveness of the demonstration program carried out under this title. The 1st such report shall be submitted before the date 2 years after operations under the demonstration program commenced and the 2d such report shall be submitted before the date 4 years after such commencement.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than the date 5 years after the commencement referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit a final report to the Congress on the demonstration program carried out under this title. Such report shall include estimates of program impact, such as—

(A) changes in duration of unemployment, earnings, and hours worked of participants,

(B) changes in unemployment compensation outlays,

(C) changes in unemployment taxes,

(D) net effect on the Unemployment Trust Fund,

(E) net effect on Federal unified budget deficit, and

(F) net social benefits or costs of the program.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this title, the terms "compensation", "benefit year", "State", "State agency", "State law", "base period", and "week" have the respective meanings given such terms by section 106.

TITLE III—OTHER PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. PAYMENTS OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION TO FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (c) of section 8521 of title 5, United States Code, is hereby repealed.

(b) REDUCTION IN LENGTH OF REQUIRED ACTIVE DUTY BY RESERVES.—Paragraph (1) of section 8521(a) of such title 5 is amended by striking "180 days" and inserting "90 days".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. ADVISORY COUNCIL ON UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.

Section 908 of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"ADVISORY COUNCIL ON UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

"SEC. 908. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than February 1, 1992, and every 4th year thereafter, the Secretary of Labor shall establish an advisory council to be known as the Advisory Council on Unemployment Compensation (referred to in this section as the 'Council').

"(b) FUNCTION.—It shall be the function of each Council to evaluate the unemployment compensation program, including the purpose, goals, countercyclical effectiveness, coverage, benefit adequacy, trust fund solvency, funding of State administrative costs, administrative efficiency, and any other aspects of the program and to make recommendations for improvement.

"(c) MEMBERS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Council shall consist of 11 members as follows:

"(A) 5 members appointed by the President, to include representatives of business, labor, State government, and the public.

"(B) 3 members appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, in consultation with the Chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance.

"(C) 3 members appointed by the Speaker of the House, in consultation with the Chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

"(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—In appointing members under subparagraphs (B) and (C), the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House shall each appoint—

"(A) 1 representative of the interests of business,

"(B) 1 representative of the interests of labor, and

"(C) 1 representative of the interests of State governments.

"(3) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in any Council shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(4) CHAIRMAN.—The President shall appoint the Chairman.

"(d) STAFF AND OTHER ASSISTANCE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Each council may engage any technical assistance (including actuarial services) required by the Council to carry out its functions under this section.

"(2) ASSISTANCE FROM SECRETARY OF LABOR.—The Secretary of Labor shall provide each Council with any staff, office facilities, and other assistance, and any data prepared by the Department of Labor, required by the Council to carry out its functions under this section.

"(e) COMPENSATION.—Each member of any Council—

"(1) shall be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Council, and

"(2) while engaged in the performance of such duties away from such member's home or regular place of business, shall be allowed travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government employed intermittently.

"(f) REPORT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 1 of the second year following the year in which any Council is required to be established under subsection (a), the Council shall submit to the President and the Congress a report setting forth the findings and recommendations of the Council as a result of its evaluation of the unemployment compensation program under this section.

"(2) REPORT OF FIRST COUNCIL.—The Council shall include in its February 1, 1994, report findings and recommendations with respect to determining eligibility for extended unemployment benefits on the basis of unemployment statistics for regions, States, or subdivisions of States.".

SEC. 303. REPORT ON METHOD OF ALLOCATING ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS AMONG STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall submit to the Congress, within the 12-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, a comprehensive report setting forth a proposal for revising the method of allocating

grants among the States under section 302 of the Social Security Act.

(b) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include an analysis of—

(1) the use of unemployment insurance workload levels as the primary factor in allocating grants among the States under section 302 of the Social Security Act,

(2) ways to ensure that each State receive not less than a minimum grant amount for each fiscal year,

(3) the use of nationally available objective data to determine the unemployment compensation administrative costs of each State, with consideration of legitimate cost differences among the States,

(4) ways to simplify the method of allocating such grants among the States,

(5) ways to eliminate the disincentives to productivity and efficiency which exist in the current method of allocating such grants among the States,

(6) ways to promote innovation and cost-effective practices in the method of allocating such grants among the States, and

(7) the effect of the proposal set forth in such report on the grant amounts allocated to each State.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PERIOD.—The Secretary of Labor may not revise the method in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act for allocating grants among the States under section 302 of the Social Security Act, until after the expiration of the 12-month period beginning on the date on which the report required by subsection (a) is submitted to the Congress.

SEC. 304. ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN DISLOCATED WORKERS.

For the purposes of determining the programs and activities to be funded under part B of title III of the Job Training Partnership Act in program years 1991 and 1992, the Secretary of Labor shall give special consideration to providing services to dislocated workers in the timber industry in the States of Washington and Oregon.

TITLE IV—BUDGET PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. TREATMENT UNDER PAY-AS-YOU-GO PROCEDURES.

(a) DESIGNATION AS EMERGENCY.—The provisions of (and amendments made by) this Act shall be treated as provisions designated as emergency requirements by the President and the Congress under section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(b) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY, ETC. NOT CONSIDERED.—Any amount of new budget authority or outlays resulting from the provisions of (and amendments made by) this Act shall not be considered for any purpose under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 402. EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FROM SEQUESTRATION.

Payments under title I of this Act (relating to emergency unemployment compensation) shall be exempt from any order issued under part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
THOMAS J. DOWNEY,
HAROLD FORD,
BARBARA B. KENNELLY,
MICHAEL A. ANDREWS,
Managers on the part of the House.

LLOYD BENTSEN,
GEORGE MITCHELL,
DON RIEGLE,
BOB PACKWOOD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1722) to provide emergency unemployment compensation, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991 (S. 1722), as agreed to by House and Senate conferees, has three major objectives. First, it establishes a time-limited program of emergency unemployment compensation benefits to assist unemployed workers who have exhausted their benefits under the current unemployment programs. Second, it corrects an inequitable situation whereby unemployed, former members of the armed forces must wait longer to receive regular unemployment benefits and receive fewer weeks of benefits than civilians who become unemployed. Finally the conference agreement establishes an unemployment compensation advisory council which will meet every four years to review the status of the unemployment program and recommend needed improvements.

In addition, the conference agreement establishes a demonstration program to test the effectiveness of providing job search services to unemployment compensation claimants, and directs the Secretary of Labor to report to the Congress on an improved method of allocating unemployment compensation administrative funds among States.

The conference agreement provides that all provisions of the Act shall be treated as provisions designated as emergency requirements by the President and the Congress under the terms of the Budget Act, and no spending resulting from the Act shall be considered for any purpose under the Budget Act. The agreement also provides that payments for emergency benefits are exempt from sequester. The cost of emergency unemployment compensation benefits is Federally financed from existing balances in the Extended Unemployment Compensation Account of the Unemployment Trust Fund.

TITLE I.—EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Present law.—Under current law, the Extended Benefits program provides for the payment of a maximum of 13 additional weeks of benefits after an unemployed worker has received that 26 weeks (maximum) of regular benefits provided under State law. The extended benefits program is activated when: (1) a State's insured unemployment rate has averaged at least 5 percent for 13 consecutive weeks, and (2) that rate is at least 20 percent higher than the State's average insured unemployment rate for the corresponding 13-week period in the 2 preceding years. At their option, States may apply an alternative trigger mechanism. Under the alternative, extended benefits can be paid if a State's insured unemployment rate is at least 6 percent, even though the rate is less than 20 percent higher than the rate in the preceding 2 years. Thirty-seven States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have adopted this alternative trigger mechanism.

Fifty percent of the benefits paid under the Extended Benefits program are paid for with State funds. The remaining 50 percent are paid from Federal funds drawn from the Extended Unemployment Compensation Account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

Senate bill.—The bill establishes a temporary program of emergency unemployment compensation benefits, to be in effect from October 6, 1991 through July 4, 1992. The program would pay Federally-funded benefits to unemployed workers who had exhausted their benefit rights under the regular unemployment compensation program, and to certain workers who had exhausted the additional benefits available to them under the Extended Benefit program.

A. Scope and duration of emergency benefits

Beginning in October all States would be eligible to provide emergency unemployment compensation benefits financed entirely by the Federal government. The bill would establish three levels of weeks of eligibility for these emergency benefits. The number of weeks of benefits payable to an unemployed worker who had exhausted regular unemployment benefits in a particular State would be determined by the average total unemployment rate, or TUR, in that State for the most recent six months for which data are available:

States with a TUR of 8 percent or higher would be eligible to provide 20 weeks of benefits;

States with a TUR of 7 percent up to 8 percent would be eligible to provide 13 weeks of benefits;

All other States would be eligible to provide 7 weeks of benefits (including the Virgin Islands).

At any time that a State was not eligible for one of the two higher levels of benefits, unemployed workers in the State who exhausted their regular unemployment benefits would be eligible for 7 weeks of emergency benefits.

B. Eligibility for emergency benefits

Emergency unemployment compensation benefits would be paid to unemployed workers who exhaust their regular unemployment benefits during the effective period of the program, October 6, 1991 through July 4, 1992.

The bill also "reaches back" to aid workers in States with higher levels of unemployment who exhausted their regular employment benefits in the six-month period prior to the start of the emergency program. Unemployed workers who exhausted benefits after March 1, 1991 and before the first week beginning after October 5 would be eligible to receive 7, 13, or 20 weeks of benefits in eligible States. The "reach back" would not be available in States that do not have a six percent TUR period in effect as of September 1 or October 6, 1991.

Some unemployed workers who had received extended benefits and exhausted their eligibility for them, either during the effective period of the program or during the "reach back" period, would also be eligible for emergency benefits. The bill provides that the number of weeks of extended benefits the worker received would be deducted from the number of weeks of emergency benefits available in the State. The number of weeks of emergency benefits that remained, if any, would be paid to the worker.

C. Other benefit provisions

The Senate provision is structured to ensure that an unemployed worker receives the maximum number of weeks of benefits to which the worker is entitled, and to prevent any sudden and unexpected removal of a

worker from benefit status if a State "triggers off" while the worker is in the middle of a benefit period. Once a State's average TUR has caused it to "triggler on" for a 13- or 20-week period of emergency benefits, the State would remain triggered on for at least 13 weeks, even if its TUR declined during this period.

Alternatively, if a State's average unemployment rate were to increase so that the State qualified for a higher number of weeks of benefits, workers in that State would receive the additional benefits. Further, once an unemployed worker became eligible for 7, 13, or 20 weeks of emergency benefits, the worker would be paid benefits for all weeks to which he or she was entitled, even if the State "triggered off" or the program expired before the worker had received the full number of weeks of benefits.

D. Measure for triggering benefits

To determine the number of weeks of benefits which may be paid in the State, the bill requires the Secretary of Labor to use the average unadjusted total rate of unemployment for a State for the most recent 6-calendar month period for which data are available.

E. Funding source for emergency benefits

All benefits are fully Federally-funded out of the Extended Unemployment Compensation Account.

House amendment.—The House amendment establishes a new permanent Federal Supplemental Compensation program that would replace the current Extended Benefits program. It would provide three tiers of benefits added to the 26 weeks of regular State benefits. A temporary provision would add a fourth tier during fiscal year 1992.

A. Scope and duration of benefits

Beginning the month after the month of enactment, all States would be eligible to provide supplemental benefits financed entirely by the Federal government. The number of weeks of benefits payable in a State would be based on the State's seasonally-adjusted total unemployment rate for the most recent three months.

States would be eligible for the following weeks of benefits:

20 weeks if the TUR is at least 8 percent and is at least 120 percent of the average in the same three-month periods during the last two years;

15 weeks if the TUR is at least 7 percent (plus at least 120 percent); and

10 weeks if the TUR is at least 6 percent (plus at least 120 percent).

In addition, in fiscal year 1992, all States not otherwise eligible for a higher benefit period would be eligible for five weeks of benefits if the three-month moving average of the seasonally adjusted national TUR is at least 6 percent.

B. Eligibility for benefits

Benefits would be paid to unemployed workers who exhaust their regular unemployment benefits under State law after the effective date of the program.

In addition, workers who have exhausted regular benefits before the effective date, but on or after January 1, 1991, would be eligible under a "reach back" provision for 5, 10, 15, or 20 weeks of benefits depending on the number of weeks activated in their States upon enactment.

C. Other benefit provisions

The House amendment includes provisions that are similar to those in the Senate bill.

D. Measure for triggering benefits

To determine the number of weeks of benefits which may be paid in a State, the House amendment requires the Secretary to use the three-month moving average of the State's seasonally adjusted total unemployment rate. However, until the Bureau of Labor Statistics is able to adjust State rates for seasonal fluctuations, a six-month moving average of unadjusted rates would be used instead.

E. Funding source for benefits

Most benefits are paid out of Federal funds in the Extended Unemployment Compensation Account. Benefits for employees of nonprofit organizations and governmental agencies are paid out of general revenues.

F. Repeal of existing program

The existing Extended Benefits program is repealed the month after the month of enactment.

Conference agreement.—The conference agreement follows the Senate bill, modified to provide an effective date for the "reach back" provision of March 1, 1991. It also clarifies that the data to be used in determining a State's TUR would be for the most recent six calendar month period for which data have been published.

TITLE II.—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM TO PROVIDE JOB SEARCH

Present law.—Federal law is silent on eligibility conditions for unemployment benefits. However, under State laws, all States require claimants to be able to work and available for work. Also, most States require the claimant to register with a local employment office and to seek work actively or to make a reasonable effort to obtain work.

Senate bill.—No provision.

House amendment.—The House amendment authorizes three state demonstration projects to assess the cost-effectiveness of intensive job search services for unemployment compensation claimants. Claimants who have at least 126 weeks of employment at $30 per week with their last employer in the last three years may be required to participate in an intensive job search program after they have received 6 to 10 weeks of regular State benefits. However, no more than five percent of the claimants for unemployment compensation in a State could be selected to participate. Workers with definite recall dates or those hiring out of union halls would not be eligible to participate.

Lack of compliance could lead to disqualification of up to 10 weeks of benefits. However, States may waive the requirement for participation if the individual shows good cause.

Participants would be entitled to a voucher worth the lesser of the average weekly benefit (about $167 nationwide) in their State of residence or the reasonable cost of providing the services. Costs of operating a job search program would be funded out of the Federal Supplemental Compensation Account.

Intensive job search assistance would include all basic employment services such as orientation, testing, a job-search workshop, and an individual assessment and counseling interview. Additional services would involve periodically contacting the intensive job search assistance program staff, receiving followup assistance, and using resource centers and job search materials and equipment, such as telephones, job listings, and word processors for resume writing.

Demonstration projects would last for one year. States would be required to evaluate their programs and to submit interim reports to the Congress, with a final report due no later than five years after the commencement of each project.

The provision would be effective upon enactment.

Conference agreement.—The conference agreement follows the House amendment.

TITLE III.—OTHER PROVISIONS

A. Payment of unemployment compensation to former members of the Armed Forces

Present law.—Under current law, regular unemployment compensation benefits are payable to unemployed ex-service members who (1) are separated under honorable conditions (and in the case of officers, did not resign for the good of the service); and (2) have completed the first full term of active service. Ex-service members who are separated prior to completing their first full term of active service can also qualify for unemployment compensation benefits if they are separated under honorable conditions: (1) for the convenience of the Government under an early release program; (2) because of medical disqualifications, pregnancy, parenthood, or any service-incurred injury or disability; (3) because of hardship; or (4) if they have served for 365 continuous days, because of personality disorder or inaptitude.

Through most of the history of the Unemployment Compensation program, ex-service members received the same number of weeks of benefits as civilians, and benefits were payable to service members after waiting the same length of time as civilians had to wait. In 1982 the law was amended so that ex-service members must wait four weeks from the date of their separation from the service before they may receive benefits. Civilians serve a one-week waiting period. Ex-service members can receive regular unemployment compensation benefits based on employment in the military for a maximum of 13 weeks. Civilians receive regular unemployment benefits for up to 26 weeks.

To be used as the basis for paying unemployment compensation benefits, active duty service by a member of a reserve military component must have been for not less than 180 consecutive days.

Senate bill.—The Senate bill would repeal the provision enacted in 1982 requiring ex-service members to wait four weeks before being eligible for unemployment compensation benefits, and limiting the duration of their benefits to 13 weeks. It would also reduce from 180 to 90 the number of consecutive days an individual in a reserve military component must serve on active duty before that service may be counted for purposes of eligibility for benefits.

House amendment.—The House amendment is the same as the Senate bill.

Conference agreement.—The conference agreement follows the Senate bill and the House amendment.

B. Advisory Council on Unemployment Compensation

Present law.—Title IX of the Social Security Act requires the Secretary of Labor to establish a Federal Advisory Council on unemployment compensation. The number of members must not exceed 16, including the chairman. The Council's purpose is to review the Federal-State unemployment compensation system and to make recommendations for change to the Secretary.

The Council is appointed by the Secretary, and members must consist of representatives of employers and employees, in equal numbers, and the public. The Council held its last formal meeting on April 22 and 23 of 1981. Its charter expired in 1986.

Senate bill.—The bill would repeal present law and establish a new Advisory Council on Unemployment Insurance. The Council

would be patterned after the advisory councils established for the Social Security program.

The Secretary of Labor would establish the first Advisory Council on Unemployment Compensation not later than February 1, 1992. Subsequent Advisory Councils would be appointed every fourth year after the appointment of the first Council. Each Advisory Council would be comprised of 11 members: three members appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, in consultation with the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Finance; three members appointed by the Speaker of the House, in consultation with the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and five members appointed by the President. The Chairman would be appointed by the President.

Selections made by the President would be required to include representatives of business, labor, State government, and the public. The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House would each appoint one representative of business, one representative of labor, and one representative of the interests of State governments.

The function of each Advisory Council would be to evaluate the unemployment compensation program, including the purpose, goals, countercyclical effectiveness, coverage, benefit adequacy, trust fund solvency, funding of State administrative costs, administrative efficiency, and any other aspects of the program, and to make recommendations for improvement. The bill specifically directs the first Advisory Council to include in its report findings and recommendations with respect to determining eligibility for extended unemployment benefits on the basis of unemployment statistics for regions, States, and subdivisions of States. The report of the first Council is due February 1, 1994.

Each Council would be authorized to engage any technical assistance required to carry out its functions, including actuarial services. The Secretary of Labor would provide each Council with any staff, office facilities, and other assistance, and any data prepared by the Department of Labor, that are required by the Council to carry out its functions.

The Senate provision would be effective upon enactment.

House amendment.—The House amendment is similar to the Senate bill. It repeals present law and establishes a new Advisory Council on Unemployment Insurance modeled after the quadrennial advisory councils established for the Social Security program. The Council would report to the Congress on the counter-cyclical effectiveness, benefit adequacy, solvency, and administrative efficiency of the unemployment program.

The Council would have 16 members plus the Secretary of Labor. The President would appoint eight members and the Congress would appoint eight members. There would be four members each from the Congress, business, labor, and State government. The Secretary of Labor would serve as chairman.

The provision would be effective upon enactment.

Conference agreement.—The conference agreement follows the Senate bill.

C. Report on method of allocating administrative funds among States

Present law.—Federal law authorizes appropriations to assist States in the administration of their unemployment compensation laws. The Secretary of Labor certifies to the Secretary of Treasury for payment to States such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of unemployment compensation during the fiscal year for which the payment is made. The Secretary of Labor's determination must be based on the population of the State, an estimate of the number of persons covered by the State's unemployment compensation law and the cost of proper and efficient administration of such law, and such other factors as the Secretary of Labor finds relevant. The Secretary of Labor may not certify for payment a total amount which exceeds the amount appropriated for the fiscal year.

Senate bill.—No provision.

House amendment.—The Department of Labor would be required to send a report to the Congress with a proposal for revising the method for distributing administrative grants to States. The report would be required to include an analysis of various factors such as productivity, cost, workload levels, and simplicity.

The provision would be effective upon enactment.

Conference agreement.—The conference agreement follows the House amendment.

D. Assistance to certain dislocated workers

Present law.—Under Part B of Title III of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), the Secretary of Labor has discretionary authority to spend funds on employment and training services for dislocated workers in certain circumstances, such as unforeseen mass layoffs for which regular Title II State allocations are inadequate. The Secretary may target such assistance on specific industries.

Senate bill.—The Senate bill directs the Secretary of Labor to give special consideration to providing services to dislocated timber workers in Oregon and Washington for purposes of determining the programs and activities to be funded under Part B of Title III of JTPA.

House amendment.—No provision.

Conference agreement.—The conference agreement follows the Senate bill.

TITLE IV. BUDGET PROVISIONS

A. Emergency designation

Present law.—The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Gramm-Rudman-Hollings), as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, provides that new outlays to meet an emergency requirement may be exempted from spending caps and from causing sequestration as a result of failure to meet pay-as-you-go requirements. Part C of the Act, in sections 251(b)(2)(D) and 252(e), provides that if the President designates a provision as an emergency requirement, and the Congress also so designates in statute, then the spending authorized by any such provision will not be counted for purposes of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings enforcement procedures.

Senate bill.—The bill provides for designating all direct spending amounts and all appropriations authorized by the bill as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. However, the bill also stipulates that no provisions will take effect unless, not later than the date of enactment, the President submits to the Congress a written designation of all spending authorized by the bill as emergency requirements within the meaning of the Budget Act.

House amendment.—The House amendment provides that its provisions would constitute an emergency within the meaning of section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended. Notwithstanding the cost estimate, any amount of new budget authority, outlays, or receipts resulting from the bill would not be considered for any purpose of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Conference agreement.—The conference agreement follows the House amendment with a technical correction.

B. Exemption of Federal supplemental compensation from sequestration

Present law.—The Federal half of Federal-State Extended Benefits is subject to sequestration under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

Senate bill.—No provision.

House amendment.—Benefits provided under the new supplemental benefits program would be exempted from sequestration.

Conference agreement.—The conference agreement follows the House amendment.

PROVISIONS NOT INCLUDED IN THE CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

A. MODIFICATIONS TO FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNTS

Present law.—Generally, State accounts in the Federal unemployment trust fund earn interest on funds not required to meet current withdrawals at a rate equal to the average rate of interest of all interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming the public debt.

The Federal unemployment tax on employers is 0.8 percent on the first $7,000 paid annually to each employee. It flows into three Federal accounts: (1) the Employment Security Administration Account (ESAA); (2) the Extended Unemployment Compensation Account (EUCA); and (3) the Federal Unemployment Account (FUA).

The ESAA holds funds for the administration of the Unemployment Insurance and Employment Services. The EUCA holds funds to cover the Federal half of the Extended Benefits (EB) program. The FUA holds funds to lend to States who run out of money in their accounts to cover State benefits and the State half of the EB program.

Currently 90 percent of the 0.8 percentage point (0.72 percentage points) Federal unemployment tax flows into ESSA. The remaining 0.08 percentage point is transferred monthly to EUCA. Up to 95% of the estimated net revenue after this transfer is available to be appropriated for State administrative costs.

The remaining balance is available for Federal administrative costs. At the end of the fiscal year, any excess above 40 percent of the appropriation for the prior fiscal year is transferred to EUCA.

EUCA receives the 0.08 percentage point of the Federal unemployment tax plus any overflows from ESAA. It has a ceiling of 0.375 percent of total wages in covered employment in the prior calendar year. If the ESAA and EUCA are full, any excess at the end of the fiscal year is transferred to the FUA. If the ESAA is not full, the excess is transferred to ESAA and then any remaining funds go to FUA or EUCA to the extent that they are not full.

FUA does not receive Federal unemployment taxes directly. If ESAA and EUCA are full at the end of the fiscal year, FUA receives the excess funds. If all three accounts are full, the excess is allocated to the State accounts in the unemployment trust fund in proportion to each State's share of Federal unemployment taxes paid in the prior calendar year.

Senate bill.—No provision.

House amendment.—The provision would authorize a tiered interest rate structure to reward States for maintaining adequate balances. Interest rates on State balances would earn premiums of 5, 10, and 15 percent higher than the current interest rate if their "high-cost multiples" in the previous quarter exceeded 0.5, 1.0, and 1.5 respectively. The high-cost multiple equals a State's current trust fund balance expressed as a percent of total wages paid in the State divided by the highest ratio of benefit costs to total wages for a 12-month period in the State's experience.

The provision would change the flow of Federal unemployment tax revenue into the three Federal Accounts such that ESAA would receive 80 percent. EUCA and FUA each would receive 10 percent of the annual revenue. The overflows would continue to work as under present law. Interest-free borrowing would be authorized between the accounts. The ceiling in the loan account would be lowered from 0.625 to 0.375 percent of total annual wages. The ceiling on EUCA would be raised from 0.375 to 0.625 percent of total annual wages, and it would be renamed the Supplemental Compensation Account.

Conference agreement.—The conference agreement does not include the House amendment.

B. COST ESTIMATE

Present law.—Section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, provides that the Office of Management and Budget shall determine and report on amounts to be sequestered to enforce spending limits, pay-as-you-go targets, and deficit targets. If in its final sequestration report OMB estimates than any sequestration is required, the President shall issue an order fully implementing without change all sequestrations required by the OMB calculations set forth in that report.

Senate bill.—No provision.

House amendment.—As required by House rules, the total dollar amounts of outlays and receipts resulting from the provisions of the bill in fiscal years 1991 through 1995, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, are written into the bill.

Conference agreement.—The conference agreement does not include the House amendment.

C. INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

Present law.—The International Coffee Agreement is a multilateral commodity agreement, first negotiated in 1962, between consumer and producer countries. Its objective is to stabilize coffee prices and assure adequate supplies of coffee to consuming nations. Negotiations on the renewal of the agreement were broken off in 1989. The statutory authority for U.S. participation in the agreement expired on October 1, 1989.

Senate bill.—The bill contains a Sense of the Senate resolution stating that the International Coffee Organization, through its export quota system, acts like a cartel and directly against the interests of American consumers by keeping prices at artificially high levels.

The resolution expresses the sense of the Senate that the United States should not be a party to any coffee agreement which will increase the price of coffee to the American consumer.

House amendment.—No provision.

Conference agreement.—The conference agreement does not include the Senate provision.

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
THOMAS J. DOWNEY,
HAROLD FORD,
BARBARA B. KENNELLY,
MICHAEL A. ANDREWS,
Managers on the part of the House.

LLOYD BENTSEN,
GEORGE MITCHELL,
DON RIEGLE,
BOB PACKWOOD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1330

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 1330.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 194

Mr. WALSH Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of House Resolution 194.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill on Monday, September 30, 1991:

S. 296. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for special immigrant status for certain aliens who have served honorably (or are enlisted to serve) in the Armed Forces of the United States for at least 12 years.

WE CARE ABOUT WELL-BEING OF WORKING MEN AND WOMEN

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

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity today to let the American people know that we really understand what is going on in these United States.

We have a very serious situation. Many American people are desperate, and they need help, they need their Government's help. Some of these people have never asked for that help before.

The statistics speak for themselves: 9 million people looking for work; 6 million people working parttime because they cannot find a full-time job.

My own State of Connecticut has 40,000 people who have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits, and we have the highest per capita income in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the White House threatens to veto this bill. But I can only say that anyone who threatens that veto has never looked in the eyes of someone who is desperate; someone who does not know how they are going to pay the mortgage, pay the car payment, or even pay the bills.

I urge my colleagues today to come together and make it known, very loud and very clear, that we have the votes to override a veto, that we understand that there are people who have worked for 10 or 20 years, never needing the help of their Government, but they need it today. This is when their Government should be with them.

I urge a loud, clear override vote.

OUR NATION'S UNEMPLOYED NEED SMALL BUSINESS JOBS

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

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, today we will consider the conference report to S. 1722, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act.

This bill is not the answer to the problems of the unemployed. If we really wanted to help our Nation's unemployed, we would enact unemployment benefits that are paid for by identifying offsetting savings. At the same time, we would pass measures that would stimulate small business job creation.

But Mr. Speaker, we will not be given that choice. Instead, Members are faced with the option of voting for a bill that will throw the country deeper in debt, thereby causing more Americans to lose their jobs—or voting for nothing at all. The vast majority of our Nation's unemployed would much rather have a permanent job than long-term access to unemployment benefits.

As we vote today on this conference report I urge my colleagues to remember that it is easy to say that you are all for small business job creation, and our Nation's unemployed, but it is how you vote that really counts.

□ 1240

PRESIDENT SHOULD SIGN UNEMPLOYMENT EXTENSION

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress is going to vote to pass extended unemployment benefits and the President said he will veto that bill again, and he will talk about growth policies, and let us have some growth around here.

Well, let us look at some figures from the administration, the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Let us see how those growth policies have worked for working Americans.

George Bush promised us 30 million jobs, as candidate Bush. The result, according to this chart, George Bush has 300,000 jobs less than we had when he became President. Every other President, back to Ike, had positive job growth every month; 200,000 under President Carter, 175,000 a month under President Reagan. George Bush is losing us 10,000 jobs a month.

The only growth rate this administration knows is negative growth rate, and those are the people who are suffering and need the extended unemployment benefits. Let us put faces in front of the chart, in front of the people below this line. They are the men and women, working Americans, who have car payments to make, tuition payments, and children and doctor bills to pay. They are the people who want to work, have worked before and want to work again.

If George Bush's policies are costing Americans below this line their jobs, at least I would urge him to sign the unemployment bill to help them get back above this line.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, today, October 1, 1991, is the first day of "Breast Cancer Awareness Month." During this month, women throughout the United States will be looking to the Congress and cancer organizations for guidance on how to improve their health. Groups, such as the Komen Foundation and the American Cancer Society, have developed activities to improve knowledge about this disease and how early detection can save lives.

As we have discovered, Members of Congress and their loved ones are not exempt from this disease. I know, as a breast cancer survivor myself, it is a scary and trying time. I pray for the quick recovery of Priscilla Mack, wife of Senator CONNIE MACK, and am encouraged by the successful recovery of Congresswoman MARILYN LLOYD.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues "What are you doing to recognize Breast Cancer Awareness Month?" Later this month, I will be hosting a Breast Cancer Public Education Fair in my district. This event, sponsored by the American Cancer Society, will provide the public with education about early detection and the need for a routine mammogram after the age of 40. I urge my colleagues to take similar action. If you have not done so already, cosponsor legislation to increase the availability of mammography screening for women or make public service announcements about the importance of early detection, but somehow let your constituents know you care. Hopefully, this knowledge will save lives—many, many lives.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REFORM ACT

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the House has an opportunity to help millions of unemployed Americans in their greatest hour of need.

Just over one-third of the 8.5 million unemployed Americans are receiving unemployment benefits. The remaining two-thirds have spent months seeking a job that will put food on their families' table. Their unemployment benefits have run out with no economic recovery in sight.

The Congress has tried to address this tragedy, but the President says no. Over $8 billion surplus sit idle in the unemployment fund, a fund dedicated to unemployment compensation, while more than one million Americans have been unemployed for over 6 months. Yet, President Bush would rather use those funds to make the deficit appear smaller than help those Americans make it through this difficult period.

It is time for this President, in his big White House, to think about the unemployed American in his little white house. President Bush will not have to pay a heating bill, or rent, this winter for his house, but the unemployed American does. Without an extension of benefits, he may not be able to heat his house, or to even pay his monthly rent. To some folks, these benefits make the difference between shelter and homelessness.

Today, let us set a kinder and gentler example. Support the conference report.

DEMOCRATIC REFORMS NEEDED IN KUWAIT

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, later this week President Bush will meet with the Emir of Kuwait. I hope the President will remind the Emir of a basic belief held not only by Americans, but all free peoples throughout the world: The press must be free.

Seven months after Operation Desert Storm liberated Kuwait from tyranny, the Kuwaiti press—which used to be free—remains gagged through official censors stationed at every newspaper. The censor's aim? To assure no real criticism of the Al-Sabah government is printed. New papers, like February 26 which spread the fires of freedom during the Iraqi occupation, are denied registration for printing in today's free Kuwait because of possible negative articles it could print. For those of us who supported Desert Storm, this is unacceptable.

Last, October—before the United Nations or the United States voted on using force—the Emir of Kuwait promised his people and the world that a liberated Kuwait would return to its constitutional foundations. While he has announced elections for October 1992, this is not enough since no election can truly be "free and fair" if the people cannot express their views in a free, unrestricted press. It's time to live up to these promises.

I stood 100 percent behind President Bush's actions to free Kuwait. I helped craft responsible legislation in the House to support democratic reform in Kuwait—not bash the Emirate. So, I stand here today as a true friend of Kuwait to say, "Remove all censorship of the press, Sheikh Jaber."

The time has come for the Kuwaiti Government to allow a free and vibrant press to set an example for the whole region and remove this ugly reminder of Iraq's occupation and Saddam Hussein's dictatorial policies.

TIME FOR PRESIDENT TO DO SOMETHING GOOD FOR AMERICANS: SIGN THE UNEMPLOYMENT BILL

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the President is doing many good things for the world. He has reduced the terrible nuclear threat by his speech of last week to abandon short-range nuclear missiles. He is providing much needed assistance to Eastern Europe and the peoples of the Soviet Union who are suffering much at this time.

The President has moved forward resolutely on finding a peaceful solution to the crisis in the Middle East. These are good things for the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to do something good for the people of this country. I hope that the President will sign into law the extended unemployment compensation benefits bill which will be sent to him today.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to Kentucky, we would qualify for 13 weeks of unemployment benefits because our unemployment rate is above 7 percent. In my own community of Louisville, it is above 6½ percent.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, the President has done many laudable and important and good things for the world. Now I hope he does a laudable, important, and good thing for America.

RUBBERGATE, THE CHECK WRITING SCANDAL

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, it is time to take the mask off this institution. It is time to expose the check writing scandal that I like to call Rubbergate. It is time to bring some honor back to this institution.

Nine months ago, I stood on this floor with other freshmen and took the oath of office for the very first time in my career, and it was probably one of the most important days of my entire life. I have never been so proud; but to go home to my district over this weekend and to have people laughing at Congress, laughing at Congressmen, laughing at this institution, brings dishonor on all of us.

I will give you a couple examples. I was out at a Pizza Hut this weekend with my son, Mark, and my daughter, Sarah, my wife, Leslie, and a gentleman from the booth behind me asked me, "Are you going to pay for this with a check, Congressman?"

That is not the kind of jokes that we need. We need to expose this.

Mr. Speaker, announce the list of names.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair would like to advise the gentleman from Iowa, the gentleman is not supposed to use the exhibit as he did. The Chair should have caught it. The Chair knows the gentleman will respect the rules of the House.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY WMUR

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

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a decade of fine service provided to the people of New Hampshire by WMUR-TV. Owned and operated by the Imes Group and led by President Birney Imes, Jr., WMUR continues to be the only network affiliated station within New Hampshire's borders, carrying a full-time news operation with five newscasts each day. Congratulations to the entire news team on providing the kind of up-to-the-minute information that allows our citizens to keep pace with the steady flow of events.

WMUR's entire staff—70 people strong—has also created a tradition of public service that has set an example for all of us in the Granite State. WMUR continues to serve New Hampshire by visiting schools around the State and by donating air time to New Hampshire public service organizations. In addition, WMUR has raised millions of dollars in telethons to support the Muscular Dystrophy Association, the Easter Seal Society, and the Arthritis Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the Congress to join me in congratulating WMUR on its 10th anniversary and to wish the staff many more years of service to the good people of New Hampshire.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, did I mishear the Speaker about the exhibits? Could the Speaker clarify the admonishment of the gentleman from Iowa about the exhibits?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By the rules of the House, Members may not use an exhibit the way the gentleman did. The Chair will call Members to order on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry: Is charts and the use of the easel and charts an exhibit?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Charts are not included in that admonition.

Exhibitions on the floor such as the gentleman utilized in the well are prohibited.

Mr. DELAY. I have a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, I did not quite understand it. I am sorry I am a little dense. Do you use—you can use charts but do not those charts require permission of the House to use them?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Parliamentarian advises that if a Member wants to challenge the use of a chart in the well, that that could be done and then the Chair puts the question on the use of that exhibit to the House.

Mr. DELAY. So the Chair will not admonish a Member for using the charts but will admonish a Member to the discretion of the Chair, the kinds of exhibits that the Member uses, if it brings ridicule on the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. To maintain proper decorum in the House, the Chair used his discretion with the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DELAY. I have a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, are bouncing checks bringing ridicule to the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not hear what the gentleman said. Will he repeat?

Mr. DELAY. I was asking a parliamentary inquiry, whether bouncing checks was bringing ridicule to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will refer the gentleman to the Speaker's very strong statement on last Wednesday.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 2935. An act to designate the building located at 6600 Lorain Avenue in Cleveland, Ohio, as the "Patrick J. Patton United States Post Office Building".

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

H.R. 2521. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2521) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. INOUYE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SASSER, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. GARN, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mr. HATFIELD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 1722) entitled "An act to provide emergency unemployment compensation, and for other purposes."

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

S. 1773. An act to extend for a period of 31 days the legislative reinstatement of the power of Indian tribes to exercise criminal jurisdiction over Indians.

CONGRESS SHOULD LIVE UP TO ITS RESPONSIBILITY TO PASS BILLS ON TIME

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, today is the beginning of a new fiscal year, and yet this Congress is practicing its old habits of grandstanding about issues and not doing the sensible thing to fix it. Mr.

Speaker, this Congress needs accountability and a sense of responsibility.

Members are posturing on an unemployment benefits bill which they know will be vetoed, and yet we have not reauthorized the highway program that would put thousands of construction workers to work. Here we have the opportunity to move ahead with jobs, move ahead with the transportation program, but instead it is delayed, the new fiscal year starts and the highway contracts are stalled and people are without jobs. All this could be avoided if Congress would live up to its responsibility to pass the bills on time.

Mr. Speaker, the irony of this is sharp, and I hope Members will pause to think about the consequences for jobs because Congress missed the deadline of the new fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, if the leadership would spend as much energy toward helping develop jobs, passing a highway reauthorization, as it does toward posturing itself for the 1992 Presidential election, we would all be further ahead.

OCTOBER IS BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the beginning of Breast Cancer Awareness Month. I don't think there is a person in this House who hasn't been touched personally by breast cancer.

The good news is that breast cancer survivors have become politically active on this issue and demanded that Congress put the funding of breast cancer research as a top priority. We in Congress met that demand in the NIH Reauthorization Act in spite of President Bush's veto threat.

Now I ask you to join me and MARILYN LLOYD in sponsoring legislation to strengthen the key to the early detection of breast cancer—mammograms.

Our legislation, the Breast Cancer Screening Safety Act, requires national quality standards for all mammography facilities in the area of equipment, personnel, oversight quality control, and enforcement.

As we continue to urge women to get their annual mammograms, we must also guarantee them that their mammogram will be safe and accurate. This legislation gives women that assurance.

Too many tragic cases have occurred where a woman has a mammogram, receives a clean bill of health, and a few months later learns she has breast cancer. The Breast Cancer Screening Safety Act can help avoid such tragedies.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS IS PARTISAN POLITICS

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, after the President exercised his authority over the first unemployment compensation bill, the Democrats in a brave show of partisan politics cried that the President and the Republicans don't care about the unemployed. Why then, one might ask themselves, weren't the Democrats complaining when President Jimmy Carter refused to extend unemployment benefits during his Presidency while unemployment was at 7.1 percent? The answer is simple, Jimmy Carter was a Democrat, George Bush is a Republican. The Democrats claims are pure, unadulterated, partisan politics.

The Democrats maintain that there is enough money in the unemployment trust fund to pay for this bill. Unfortunately, Congress has already spent that money someplace else. If the bill before us today passes it will add to the deficit, and it will break the pay-as-you-go provisions in last year's budget agreement.

If we want to help the unemployed, let's give businesses the tools to hire them back, let's pass an economic growth package and not just pass along more government spending.

This class-warfare campaign tactic of the Democrats is always ugly, but it is especially distasteful when they play politics with the hopes and lives of those who have unfortunately lost their jobs in a recession brought on by Congress' insatiable appetite to spend.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

(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, October is Breast Cancer Awareness Month. But every day ought to be Breast Cancer Awareness Day.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that during the Vietnam war era we lost 50,000 men and women. During that same period we lost 330,000 women who died of breast cancer. One woman every 11 minutes finds out she has breast cancer.

So it is true that every year 45,000 women die of this disease, and yet we have not done what we should be doing comprehensively about this disease.

What should we be doing? Three things: We ought to have women understand the nature, and have their families understand the nature of the disease; we ought to have informed decision laws passed all over the country, including in this Congress, so that women are aware of their options of treatment. The second thing we ought to do is really have every private and public policy have mammography coverage for women over 35. Women certainly ought to understand self-examination. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not enough. We should have a cure for breast cancer by increasing the research dollars. I only hope I do not have to get angry again when that bill comes to the floor relative to research.

□ 1300

THE HOUSE BANK SCANDAL

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would request that we have a full disclosure of the matter pertaining to the House Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have seen a number of expressions of public concern about this matter. William Safire in the New York Times expressed the idea most significantly when he wrote in yesterday's editorial: "For a score of Representatives real money, and perhaps real crime, is involved * * *."

Mr. Speaker, he is referring to the 24 Members who, without having sufficient funds in their accounts, wrote at least one check per month in the amount of $1,000 or more. Although the House Bank was ultimately fully reimbursed, some Members waited up to 4 weeks before depositing sufficient funds into their accounts.

There is a taint on the membership of this House occasioned by this scandal. We can remove the taint by full disclosure. As Mr. Safire states in his commentary:

> We are not talking about the inadvertent overdrafter who quickly corrected a mistake; at large are officials who willfully and frequently abused their privilege. All should be exposed. Some should be made to pay substantial taxes with penalties; a few deserve censure.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for full disclosure of the facts in this matter.

BREAST CANCER SCREENING SAFETY ACT

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

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my friend and colleague, Congresswoman SCHROEDER in introducing today the Breast Cancer Screening Safety Act of 1991. This bill will establish Federal quality standards for mammography.

Currently, early detection of breast cancer remains women's best chance of survival. Mammography, an x ray of the breast, is currently the most effective detection measure as it can detect lumps which cannot be felt.

Unfortunately, the General Accounting Office [GAO] revealed wide variation in quality standards of mammography. These standards include image quality, radiation dose, using dedicated equipment, ensuring that only trained medical staff read the results, and directing proper oversight and regular inspections. These standards are vital because a mammogram is one of the most difficult images to read, requiring maximum clarity. The GAO found that failure to meet any one of these standards can compromise the quality of the results. This can result in an unnecessary mastectomy, delayed diagnosis, and even death.

The Breast Cancer Screening Safety Act of 1991 will require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop quality standards for all mammography facilities in the area of equipment, personnel, oversight, quality control, and enforcement.

Voluntary standards have not worked in this area. Less than 1 in 4 of the mammography units in this country currently meet the voluntary professional standards established by the American College of Radiology. Only 13 States have enacted quality assurance legislation.

This body began to ensure quality mammography by approving provisions in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990, which required the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish minimum standards for mammography as a condition for Medicare reimbursement. These standards, however, have yet to be implemented and lack sufficient oversight and quality control.

The Breast Cancer Screening Safety Act would require the Secretary to develop national quality standards for all mammography facilities.

Certain women in this country deserve to know that the mammogram they seek is the highest quality technology that can be provided. Support the Breast Cancer Screening Safety Act.

I am submitting the following analysis of the legislation to be included in the RECORD.

ANALYSIS OF BREAST CANCER SCREENING SAFETY ACT OF 1991

Title.—The bill is entitled "Breast Cancer Screening Safety Act of 1991."

Certificate.—After December 31, 1993, no facility may conduct a mammogram without a certificate issued by the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services. Each certificate is valid for a period of 2 years and is renewable.

A facility must provide assurances that it meets the standards for quality in the areas of equipment, personnel, and quality control established by the Secretary in order to receive certificate. A facility may apply directly to the Secretary for a certificate, or if the facility is accredited by an approved accreditation body, the accreditation body may submit the application on behalf of the facility to the Secretary. The Secretary will prescribe the manner of applying for a certificate for facilities.

Examinations and Procedures: Certificates will be issued to facilities in order for facilities to operate equipment in performing mammography, interpretation of screenings, performance of needle localization, and for on-going quality control procedures.

Accreditation: A mammography facility may receive accreditation from an accreditation body that has been approved by the Secretary. The accreditation body may submit the application for certification on behalf of the facility. Accreditation bodies shall assist facilities in meeting—at a minimum—the quality standards established by the Secretary.

Accreditation bodies may inspect facilities on behalf of the Secretary to determine if the facilities are in compliance with the standards set by the Secretary.

The Secretary shall evaluate annually the performance of accreditation bodies. In the event that approval of an accreditation body is withdrawn, the certificate will remain in effect for 60 days following notice of withdrawal.

Federal Standards: The Secretary shall establish federal quality standards for mammography facilities, including quality of equipment and personnel. In developing standards, the Secretary shall consult with the American College of Radiology.

Certification of Personnel: The Secretary, by regulation, shall identify the organizations and boards that may certify individuals to perform radiological procedures, to interpret screening mammograms, and to inspect equipment. The Secretary will also establish qualification standards.

Inspections: The Secretary shall conduct inspections of certified facilities, announced or unannounced, at least once a year. Each facility shall maintain records of inspections for a minimum of 7 years.

Intermediate Sanctions: If the Secretary determines that a facility has not complied with federal standards, or if the approval of an accreditation body is withdrawn or revoked, the Secretary may impose intermediate sanctions. Such sanctions will be imposed not earlier than 90 days after notification of noncompliance with standards or withdrawal or revocation of accreditation approval.

Intermediate sanctions include a directed plan or correction; civil damages not to exceed $10,000 for each failure or each day of noncompliance; or payment for the cost of onsite monitoring.

Suspension, Revocation, Limitation of Certificate: The Secretary may suspend, revoke, or limit a certificate, if after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing, the facility has misrepresented information, failed to comply with standards, failed to comply with the Secretary's requests, or has refused a reasonable request of a federal officer or of the Secretary.

Injunctions: If the Secretary determines that the activity of a facility constitutes a significant health hazard to the public, the Secretary may bring suit in federal district court to enjoin the continuation of that activity.

Appeals: An owner or operator of a facility may file an appeal in U.S. Court of Appeals for judicial review of the imposition of an intermediate sanction.

Criminal Sanctions: It will be a criminal offense to intentionally violate any provisions of this Act or accompanying regulations. Sanctions will include imprisonment for not more than one year, or in the event of a second offense, for not more than 3 years.

Fees: The Secretary shall require fees for certificates and inspection if they lead to a withdrawal of approval.

Information: No later than April 1, 1994 and annually thereafter, the Secretary will compile and make available to physicians and the general public information for evaluating facilities, including a list of facilities with revoked, suspended or limited certificates, those subject to sanctions, withdrawn or revoked accreditation.

State law: This Act shall not affect the power of any state to enact and enforce laws consistent with this Act. If a State enacts a more stringent law, the Secretary may exempt the facilities in that state with compliance with this Act.

Research Grants: The Secretary will make grants to entities to conduct research on new methods of establishing a Mammography Registry, including mammography images, physician reports, outcome and followup information. Grants may be used to improve methods of film duplication, archiving, access and confidentiality of data, and pilot testing.

Grant recipients must report to the Secretary results of studies and tests along with recommendations for establishing a Mammography Registry.

Information to Registry: The Secretary may require facilities to provide data to the Registry that will assist research of the causes, characteristics, prevalence of, and potential treatments for breast cancer.

Medicare: The Social Security Act will be amended so that screening mammography at a certificate facility complies with this Act.

MISPLACED OUTRAGE

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, some Members and former Members are outraged because their conversations with the Communist dictators of Nicaragua were allegedly overheard by the CIA.

Mr. Speaker, their outrage is misplaced. Would they have been upset if they had been taped speaking to Saddam Hussein last spring, or Adolph Hitler 50 years ago?

Mr. Speaker, the Sandinistas were a Communist revolutionary force hell-bent on enslaving Central America. If Members of Congress had their telephone conversations with them intercepted, tough stuff. If they want to assure the American people that they were doing nothing wrong, then they can waive the Privacy Act and make the transcripts public. We deserve no less than that, Mr. Speaker.

So, where is the investigation?

THE START OF NATIONAL BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH—OCTOBER 1, 1991

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week the House passed my legislation designating October 1991 as Na-

tional Breast Cancer Awareness Month. I want to mark the start of this month by reiterating just why we felt this particular commemorative was so important. First and foremost, breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death for American women and it is estimated that one of every nine women in our country will develop breast cancer at some point in her life. In light of these striking statistics, the House, the Senate and cancer advocacy groups nationwide have joined forces to set aside this month to call attention to the disease and stress the need for early detection and treatment.

While the spread of breast cancer and its mortality rate are distressing, there is hope for improvement. But to realize the potential for reversing the current trend, all women must be made aware that early detection is the key. Around the country this month, events are planned to raise our collective conscientiousness and encourage every woman to perform routine self-examination, have their physicians perform breast exams, and get mammograms. It has been medically proven that by detecting the breast cancer early, we can significantly reduce not only the mortality rate, but the devastating effects of the disease and its treatment.

It is my sincere hope that in a few short years, we will see the positive results of a series of National Breast Cancer Awareness Months in the form of a significant drop in the breast cancer mortality rate in this country and the world. After all, saving lives is what this commemorative is all about.

WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO HIDE?

(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, what are we trying to hide from the American people? What do we have to fear?

Mr. Speaker, release the names of those Members who have overdrawn their accounts at the House bank. Do this to remove the cloud of suspicion hanging over the heads of those of who have done nothing wrong.

Do this to restore confidence in this body. Do this because, as the American public knows and are letting us know, it is the right thing to do.

We owe it to ourselves to make public these records. We owe it to the integrity of this institution.

But most importantly, we owe it to the citizens who placed their trust in us by electing us to Congress.

CITIZENSHIP FOR SALE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. The President has kicked off his domestic policy: Rich foreigners will be allowed to invest $1 million, and then they become American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is a twofold plan. No. 1, someone has to hire the 9 million laid-off American workers; and, No. 2, someone has to pay for a new batch of immigrants, 140,000 of them with 120,000 of them immediately going on welfare.

Now tell me, Mr. Speaker, how do we go home as Members of Congress and justify a President that will let in 120,000 people who are not even American citizens and give them welfare, but vetoes an unemployment compensation bill?

I say there should be a new verbiage written on the Statue of Liberty: Send us your rich, your entrepreneurs, your millionaires, and we'll send you our second-class citizens, formerly known as middle class.

WANNABE SECRETARIES OF STATE AIDED AND ABETTED THE SANDINISTAS

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express to you my concerns that some of the Members of this body apparently have been caught playing at being Secretary of State. Those of us who were in the Congress during the struggle for freedom in Nicaragua are not surprised at the revelations of the Democrats' Managua connection.

It was President Reagan's determination to resist the Soviet threat around the world, including such surrogates as Cuba and the Sandinistas of Nicaragua, that brought us victory over communism. Yet nowhere was his correct and courageous policy so opposed by people in this body who ought to have known better than in Nicaragua.

Some of our colleagues took their efforts to the extreme of providing advice and counsel to the Ortegas on how to defeat the policy of the U.S. Government. Not satisfied to hamstring this Government legislatively, these wannabe Secretaries of State gave help and comfort to the enemy—thereby aligning themselves with the same leftist totalitarians who have just gone down to defeat around the world.

The voters are entitled to know who these Members are, and I join my colleagues in demanding a thorough examination of the record on this matter. The reputation of this body requires us to establish which Members improperly and illegally aided and abetted the Sandinistas.

□ 1310

RTC REFORM AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Mr. COX of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this week the Financial Institutions Subcommittee will consider legislation to provide the RTC with another $80 billion from American taxpayers. In March, with great reservation, I voted to give the Corporation $30 billion. At that time, I sent a loud message that I hoped the RTC would improve its performance.

Seven months later, I see no visible evidence of improvement. The RTC is sitting on 156 billion dollars' worth of assets acquired from failed savings and loan institutions—and now it's time to sell these assets. The RTC has not provided Congress with an audit for its 1990 operations—and now it is almost 1992. And further, managers that were once employed by fraudulent savings and loan institutions are now enjoying cushy jobs within the RTC—so it is time to abolish their level of comfort.

Last week my friend and colleague, JIM BACCHUS, and I introduced the RTC Reform and Accountability Act. Among other features, the bill will not give the RTC any further funding until the RTC quickens its pace and starts selling its massive asset inventory. It's time to prove we mean what we say, and provide the RTC with the proper incentives to clean up its act, and complete its task.

I will vote for no further funding for the RTC until we have a firm commitment that, this time, things will improve within the Corporation.

RELEASE INFORMATION ON MANAGUA SURPRISE

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, we must have the truth about the Democrats' Managua connection, in which we hear how some Members of this body were providing aid and counsel to the Marxist Sandinistas.

For one very important reason, especially: It seems obvious that these Members and/or their staff were operating on the basis of information that could only have come from privileged material in the possession of the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Now, rule XLVIII of the House of Representatives, governing the operation of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, provides very clearly that classified information provided the Committee by the Intelligence Agencies may be shared only after a vote of the select committee. Further, records are kept detailing such disclosures.

A breach of this rule requires investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. In both these cases we are talking about matters

that can't go unexamined. Further, we are dealing with a situation which will grow by leaps and bounds if we don't get the actual information out for scrutiny sooner rather than later.

I urge my colleagues to join in demanding that this information be released. If we do not, then it will be another example of how the Congress can't even play by its own rules. If we do, and we must, we will have the truth, to which our constituents are entitled.

RTC MUST BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE

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

Mr. BACCHUS. Mr. Speaker, everyone is weary of the savings and loan cleanup. The press is weary, the Congress is weary, the President is weary, and certainly the taxpayer's are weary. We cannot afford this weariness.

Yesterday I sat with members on the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, in a hearing room on the first floor of the Rayburn Building here in Washington. We listened as a parade of teenagers from around the country came before us to tell us all that they need in the way of programs for children and young people.

They told us there is no money for child nutrition programs or Head Start; they told us there is no money for drug treatment; they told us there is no money to help us prevent dropouts from school; they told us there is no money for job training. Mr. Speaker, we heard an endless parade.

Tomorrow in that very same room I will sit with members on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and deliberate over a request by the Resolution Trust Corporation for $80 billion more from the taxpayers of this country. This is in addition to the $80 billion they have already spent.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COX] and I have introduced legislation that will for the first time make the Resolution Trust Corporation accountable for how they have spent these dollars. Through auditing requirements, through performance based financing, and through other reforms, we will at last get some accounting of how the RTC is spending this money.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford weariness on this issue. We must be diligent, we must be vigilant, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COX] and I intend to be.

PASSIVE LOSS CORRECTION FOR REAL ESTATE

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, as a realtor and former real estate developer, I rise today in strong support of the passive loss correction bill, introduced on June 11, 1991. I am one of more than 300 cosponsors of this important legislation.

This Congress has the opportunity to address the primary source of our troubled financial industry, and in a large part, our troubled economy. The collapse of the real estate market has been the largest force behind the near collapse of the savings and loan industry, a near collapse which has already cost the taxpayers $100 billion, and, considering the $745 billion in commercial mortgage debt still held by American banks, could potentially cost the taxpayer billions more.

The real estate industry has traditionally led our economy out of past recessions. However, since the 1986 Tax Act, this industry has been burdened by unfair taxes, and will remain so unless Congress acts to remove this handicap. We must adjust the 1986 Tax Act in order to halt the downward spiraling of nationwide property values.

H.R. 1414 does this by encouraging competent industry professionals to purchase and efficiently run rental properties, effectively keeping them out of the portfolios of our financial institutions. At the same time, it keeps intact the preventive measures set forth in the 1986 Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that this bill be enacted by this Congress.

THE REAL VICTIMS IN HAITI

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the army is in charge again in Haiti. A military coup has removed President Aristide from power.

Earlier this summer, members of the Select Committee on Hunger visited Haiti. We met with President Aristide. We saw poverty that was overwhelming; people living in conditions that are unbelievable. President Aristide told us he was committed to changing those conditions. As the first democratically elected leader Haiti has had in a hundred years, Aristide should be returned to power immediately. In the meantime, I call upon the coup leaders to respect the fundamental human rights of the Haitian people, as required by international law.

Mr. Speaker, the people are the real victims of this coup. President Aristide has said, "When the people are hungry, I am hungry." Today, the Haitian people are hungry. Right now, Haiti is not just the poorest country in this hemisphere. It's not just the country with the highest infant mortality rate, or the lowest daily calorie intake. Haiti is the latest battlefield of democracy. What's at stake is more than the Haiti presidency—it's the Haitian people, who've been robbed of their first elected leader, and of their democratic future.

SUPPORT BREAST CANCER SCREENING SAFETY ACT

(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 am pleased to join my colleagues who are speaking today in support of the Breast Cancer Screening Safety Act. This important legislation, introduced by my colleagues, Congresswomen SCHROEDER and LLOYD, would establish national quality standards for all mammograpy facilities and provide legal mechanisms to ensure their enforcement.

This bill is critical in view of the fact that only nine States have enacted quality assurance standards. A recent General Accounting Office report indicated that standards in mammography units vary widely, with less than one in four currently meeting the standards established by American College of Radiology. At a time when one in nine women in this country will develop breast cancer in their lifetimes, we must ensure that mammograms are of the highest quality. Early detection continues to be the best chance for survival.

October is Breast Cancer Awareness Month, and I also urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to cosponsor the Women's Health Equity Act, a package of bills to address the current gaps in research on women's health. It is critical that we work together for increased funding for breast cancer research, expanded health insurance coverage for mammograms, and quality breast cancer screening.

PROGRESS ON HUMAN RIGHTS NEEDED IN GUATEMALA

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

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, this week, President Serrano of Guatemala is in the United States to discuss his Government's application for United States aid. In a pitch for assistance, he will attest to improvements in human rights. But what he won't tell us is that his is a government whose own judges are forced to flee the nation in fear of their lives. This is exactly what happened to Judge Roberto Lemus, who had to escape the country after receiving death threats. Guatemala is a nation where extrajudicial executions, disappearances, and torture continue unabated. In fact, by the Guatemalan Government's own admission, there

have been 116 confirmed disappearances and political killings this year alone.

Mr. Speaker, President Serrano has made a rhetorical commitment to human rights. But words are not equal to a real record of human rights. Before we consider sending aid to Guatemala, we ought to demand an end to the threats against human rights workers such as Amilcar Mendez and real progress toward solving the 172 cases of disappearances still under investigation. Whatever his good intentions President Serrrano has not yet made this kind of progress, and he does not yet deserve our praise.

□ 1320

PEACE DIVIDEND SAVINGS SHOULD BE USED FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, like so many of my colleagues I praise the bold leadership President Bush has shown in reducing the nuclear threat which hangs over the world.

I am sure that many in this body spent this weekend thinking of new ways to spend any peace dividend money which might be available as a result of these defense reductions. Congress is very good at spending money. But I rise today to call on the Congress to put this money toward deficit reduction, not new spending.

Many of us speak about the need to address domestic concerns. There are few more pressing domestic problems than the monstrous budget deficit. Getting America's fiscal house in order ought to be a top priority for both the Congress and the President, before we drown in a sea of red ink. The savings from the defense budget present us with an opportunity to cut the deficit, and I say we ought to be doing just that, not finding new ways to spend this money.

We have an opportunity to do something about the deficit. I will support efforts to put any peace dividend toward deficit reduction and call on my colleagues to do the same.

MORE REPRESSION IN EL SALVADOR

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw attention to yet another instance of the refusal of the military of El Salvador to respect the most elementary principles of human rights.

On July 28 of this year, four women and their driver connected with the Women's International Network for Development and Democracy in El Salvador [WINDS] were abducted and held incommunicado for more than 30 hours by the Salvadoran Armed Forces in Cuscatlan.

These women broke no law, violated no orders. Yet they were terrorized by armed thugs trained and equipped by the United States. How many more incidents of this kind—and worse—will it take before we face up to our responsibility? How much longer will we play the role of mentors, paymasters, and supply store for killers and gangsters?

Enough. It is time, Mr. Speaker, to cut military aid to El Salvador until its armed forces evince some respect for international standards of common decency in the field of human rights.

In the case of the murdered Jesuit priests, the judge has announced he must flee the country.

The only way to support the negotiated peace settlements is to eliminate military aid.

AMERICAN PUBLIC DESERVES MORE INFORMATION ON MEMBERS' USE OF HOUSE BANK

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I get a lot of constituents calling my office complaining about the Internal Revenue Service. Would it not be nice if I could tell them, "All you have to do is tell the IRS that you are not going to make records available to them so they cannot investigate you?"

What am I talking about? I am talking about here in the House Bank. The Speaker of the House has determined that we are not going to make the records available to anybody to investigate.

Why would the IRS be interested one might ask? If we have, as the GAO report has indicated, Members borrowing basically thousands of dollars without paying interest on the money, that is imputed income and that is taxable income which should be available to the Internal Revenue Service to determine whether they owe any money to the Federal Government for using the money in the House Bank.

This is Federal tax dollars that are being used in this situation, tax dollars that should go into the IRS and into the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, it is time. We stood here 5 days ago and asked for the release of the names. The American public is demanding it. Please do it.

AMERICANS WANT GOOD JOBS

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

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, President Bush does not like unemployment compensation benefits, but then that is easy when one is born in the lap of luxury. He says jobs are the answer. If jobs are the answer, and I agree with him, why does he want to send them out of the country?

He wants to give China most-favored-nation status so as to allow slave labor products to come in. He wants to give it to Russia. He wants to give free access to our markets for cheap labor out of Mexico, and then he wants to continue to allow Japan to stop American products from going into Japan.

Then we continue to send more money to foreign countries to help them with their economy so that they can produce products to send into the United States.

Americans do want jobs, but they want good jobs, not minimum wage jobs. We cannot keep jobs and we cannot get them if we continue to give them away.

I must say this to you, Mr. President: That you better start listening to the people of this country about jobs and the economy or you are going to hear from them next year at the election polls. Then you will know what unemployment is, and you will know how to get down to collect your unemployment compensation.

HOUSE MUST REGAIN CREDIBILITY

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, an article appeared in my home town newspaper that said, "Riggs Says Bad Check Image Hurts."

I guess a headline tells the rest of the story because really what my concern is—that all of us in the House—and that includes the great majority of Members who did not take advantage or abuse the check-cashing convenience offered by the Sergeant of Arms Bank, are being painted by the same broad brush.

The article also quoted an anonymous Democratic House aide as saying that those of us who participated in the press conference last week, all Republican freshmen, were participating in a "typical grandstanding situation."

Let me point out to this anonymous and rather cynical Democratic aide that this is not a partisan witch hunt of any kind, that what is at stake here is nothing less than the credibility and the prestige and standing of this body with the American people as a self-policing institution.

If we are to regain the credibility of the American people, we must be able to hold ourselves accountable and not look the other way.

The only way to put this issue behind is a prompt and complete disclosure so that all Members guilty of such abuses can be held accountable for the press

and the American voters to see. As we said last week, we strongly commend the Speaker for his action in implementing procedures to stop any further abuse, but that is only the first step of a two-part process. We must have those names. We must stop the stone wall.

A CALL FOR BETTER MANAGEMENT OF FORESTS JOBS AND HEALTH

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

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, we have just received news that the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Lujan, has accepted the Bureau of Land Management's request to convene a Cabinet-level endangered species committee on 44 timber sales in the Pacific Northwest.

In requesting "God squad review" the Interior Secretary has hardly solved the Northwest timber crisis, but he has put a lie to the contention of some politicians in Oregon that there is no place in the Endangered Species Act for people. That has been untrue in the past. That statement is untrue today, and Secretary Lujan has found the section in the Endangered Species Act which proves that it is untrue.

Whether or not it works, the God squad is no substitute for completed forest plans from owl recovery plans or allowing the Forest Service instead of the courts to manage our forests in the Pacific Northwest.

The administration track record on all of those counts leaves a lot to be desired. Oregonians are being torn apart by the powerful interests waging war over our public lands and our forests. So far we have seen absolutely nothing from the environmental President or from the pro-jobs President, when it comes to leadership on this issue, either for the environment or for the jobs from those forests.

A frantic yank on the emergency rip cord of the Endangered Species Act cannot and should not be a substitute for a sound, long-range forest policy which allows us to manage the forests for jobs and for forest health.

□ 1330

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR PROMPT WITHDRAWAL OF SOVIET TROOPS FROM BALTIC STATES

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce a resolution to call upon the Soviet Union to begin immediate negotiations with the leaders of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia for the prompt withdrawal of Soviet troops from the Baltic States.

Almost 1 month has passed since the Soviet Government officially recognized the rightful independence of the Baltic States. Yet the Soviets have not even begun negotiations for the withdrawal of over 100,000 Soviet troops that remain within Baltic borders. Although the power of the vast Soviet Army has diminished in the wake of the failed coup, the continued presence of Soviet troops threatens the place and independence of the Baltic States.

I urge my colleagues to join with me and cosign my resolution to call for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the three Baltic States.

THE SAD DEFEAT OF DEMOCRACY IN HAITI

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a very sad day for democracy in this world. The President of the United States has tried to convince everyone that he is for a new world order and wants to see democracy flourish everywhere.

Yesterday he had an opportunity to demonstrate that he would be willing to stand up in this hemisphere for democracy and he failed the test. He was in Disney World yesterday, and then he was in Miami, as close as he could get to Haiti. He never said a word, not a word, while the Haitian democracy, the first duly elected democratic President of Haiti was being forcibly removed from office by a military coup. Not a word in any of his speeches. All he would bring himself to say was that we need to pass a capital gains reduction. That is what he was interested in yesterday, not in democracy being humbled, taken to its knees and removed off the face of the Earth.

A word from the President, a move of some soldiers to protect the Presidential palace in Haiti. No combat. Today the President of Haiti, Mr. Aristide, would still be in power, and we would have a democracy in that poor, terribly distressed country. But no, not the Secretary of State, not the President, nobody, Mr. Speaker, was willing to stand up yesterday for Haiti, a democracy that we have helped create.

This is truly a sad day. One of those points of light, Mr. President, went out yesterday.

STRANGE RHETORIC ON AMERICAN AID

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

Mr. SOLOMON. That was a rather strange statement coming from our colleague from Florida, especially when I believe he voted against giving our President the authority to go into the Persian Gulf to establish a democracy there. A very strange statement indeed.

Let me just say concerning some of the other statements that have come from that side of the aisle about President Bush giving away our tax dollars to foreign countries, we are going to have a bill before this House this week. It is called the foreign aid bill. It is the massive giveaway bill where we are going to give away 25 billion of the taxpayers' money. With all of the rhetoric that has come out of that side of the aisle, I want to see how they are going to vote on that bill. I am going to vote against it.

There is going to be another bill coming later this year or early next year which is a $10 billion loan guarantee for Israel. Another giveaway. Then there is going to be another one sometime this year giving away $10 billion for IMF. I want to see how all of you on that side of the aisle are going to vote for these $40 billion giveaways.

What rhetoric.

NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION ACT

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

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing companion legislation to that introduced in the other body by Senators BOREN, NUNN, and WARNER. This bill, the National Security Education Act, is a significant step toward ensuring that America's youth become competitive in language, area, and international studies necessary for maintaining a strong national defense.

This legislation would create graduate fellowships in critical foreign language, and international studies. It would provide grants to universities to organize, maintain, and improve international and area studies and foreign language programs. And, by providing scholarships for undergraduate students to study abroad in important countries that are currently neglected, it will expose our talented young people to the economic, cultural, and military challenges that face America in the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, our world has changed, not only in the last year, but even more significantly, in the last month. America must be ready to capitalize on these changes. Now, especially, our progress depends upon our ability to compete effectively in the international arena. To improve our economic position both domestically and abroad, and also to maintain our position as the world's democratic leader, Americans must learn foreign languages and customs. This legislation creates a program to do just that.

I have no claim of authorship of this legislation. It is identical to that of Senator BOREN. However, I believe it is essential that this House seriously consider this legislation and I urge your support.

DEFENSE LETS JAPANESE GET AMERICAN COMPANY

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today I spoke to you about Salvatore Monte, president of Kenrich Petrochemicals, Inc., of Bayonne, NJ. At that time I told the story of Sal's longstanding fight with the Japanese over trademarks and royalties for his remarkable work in a new field of chemistry.

It distresses me to have to say today that the Japanese are winning the fight because our own Defense Department does not care whether Americans or Japanese own the 26 Kenrich patents for products used in safe munitions, stronger steel, stealth technology, and many more areas. To take claim to the patents, the Japanese went so far as to buy the bank where Sal had placed the patents as collateral for a loan—and then began the squeeze play on his account. DOD has declared Kenrich products critical for the national defense but has been unwilling to step in and save the company for the country.

One statement from DOD was "what difference does it make if the Japanese own the patents" and another "if the Japanese own the patents we will just pay them for their use." It is a good thing that the Defense Department did not have this attitude 50 years ago when we were attacked at Pearl Harbor.

THE MILITARY COUP IN HAITI

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been a setback for democracy. Haiti's Government, elected by its people for the first time in 200 years, has been forced out in a bloody military coup.

Earlier this year, I had the privilege of meeting with President Aristide. I was impressed with his compassion and his concern for the people of Haiti. He was committed to making their lives better. And they were committed to him.

Jean Bertrand Aristide came into power in a way unprecedented in Haiti's history—he was elected by an overwhelming majority. But he has gone out the old way—with the barrel of a gun at his back.

The Select Committee on Hunger travels periodically to greatly troubled places. We meet with all sorts of leaders. Too often, it's with leaders who are reluctant to take responsibility for the needs of their people. Chairman HALL, Congressman WHEAT and I met with President Aristide several months ago. President Aristide was different. He put the needs of his people first. His priorities were justice, food, and work. That's what the select committee likes to hear, Mr. Speaker. But we don't hear it enough.

We had hoped to invite President Aristide to America, to meet with the leaders of this House, because we believed him to be the kind of leader who could join in the new world order to help his people out of hunger and poverty. Haiti's future should be in the hands of people like President Aristide, whose honesty and compassion earned him the people's votes and supportive sentiments.

□ 1340

CHIN UP, PRESS ON

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, this is October 1. The situation is not too bad on appropriation bills. Three have gone to the White House out of 13. We have Defense and the foreign aid bill not yet in conference. All the rest are in conference.

We have passed one of those Mussolini continuing resolutions that buys us time until October 29.

Things are bad in Haiti. Ireland is not yet reunited. Kazakhstan has hundreds of nuclear-tipped missiles pointed at us still. Ukrainia has over 1,000 nuclear-tipped missiles pointed at us.

Things are desperate, but, folks, 50 years ago on October 1, the world had been at war 2 years and 1 month. We were about to join that war in 2 months and a week, and 55 million people were to die fighting fascism, and it had a more imperfect ending than Desert Storm, because communism continued to kill at a rate beyond Adolf Hitler's death toll.

Our Postal Service came out with a sheet of stamps that is a fascinating reminder about how bad it was 50 years ago compared to whatever we face today. It says, "1941, a world at war." There is Roosevelt and Churchill. There is our maneuvers. There is Pearl Harbor in flames.

I would recommend that Members get this, look at it carefully, and then think to yourselves: "Things are not so bad. Chin up, press on."

KEEP NATIONAL AEROSPACE PLANE PROJECT ALIVE

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the aerospace industry is America's No. 1 exporting manufacturing industry, and we are under great attack now to keep this the most competitive and high-technology aerospace industry in the world.

This is because we are cutting back on defense as the cold war ends, and that is understandable.

But there is a project that has been quietly taking place, a research project being financed by the Federal Government, that is imperative to a healthy aerospace industry in the next century. It is called the national aerospace plane, which will make possible taking off from a runway and flying directly into space, which will dramatically bring down the cost of putting things into orbit.

The aerospace plane program, the future of the aerospace industry, is in jeopardy. It may be canceled by this Congress. If that happens, we will be handing to the Japanese the aerospace industry of the future. We will be taking research that we have spent billions of dollars on and basically handing it to the Japanese on a silver platter and saying, "You will be the dominant power in aerospace in the next century."

Let us save America's aerospace industry. Let us keep the national aerospace plane project alive.

SUPPORT DECENNIAL CENSUS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1991

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

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 3280, the Decennial Census Improvement Act of 1991. This legislation would provide for a study to be conducted by the National Academy of Sciences, on how the Government can improve the decennial census of population.

In the 1990 census, approximately 5.2 million Americans were not counted, with my home State of New York accounting for approximately 314,000 of this figure. Unfortunately, those groups that can least afford it—minorities and the homeless—suffered the brunt of this injustice, with approximately 1.5 million African-Americans, 1.2 million Hispanics 200,000 Asian-Americans, and nearly 100,000 native-Americans overlooked in the final census count.

Mr. Speaker, the 1990 census was unprecedented in that it was the very first time an undercount has measurably worsened from one census to the next. To prevent this from recurring, I encourage my colleagues to support and pass H.R. 3280.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1722, EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 1991

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 230 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 230

Resolved, upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill (S. 1722) to provide emergency unemployment compensation, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are hereby waived. The conference report shall be considered as having been read when called up for consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, during consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a constituent of mine from Mount Clemens, MI. He had lost his job, and his unemployment benefits had run out.

Listen to what he has had to say about his family:

We are educated people. I have an electrical engineering degree.

To serve my country, I did a tour in Vietnam. Now I need help. With a wife and three children, we are living with shattered dreams and fright from day to day. My savings are gone, and we may soon have to put the home we worked 18 years for on the market. Is there any hope in sight?

□ 1350

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my constituent that there is help on the way.

Mr. Speaker, since this matter came to the floor last July, we have had only delays, irrelevant objections, parliamentary tricks, veto threats designed to bludgeon us into a compromise, and when it comes to helping people who are out of work this administration stalls more than a junkyard Hyundai. They do not care about Americans.

I am thinking about Mr. Darman who said the recession ended in May. I am thinking about Mr. Brady, who said this recession was no big deal.

You know, my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished minority whip, talks about the need for economic growth. Of course, he is right. Under this administration growth has been the slowest of any administration since the Second World War.

And what about jobs? Remember the famous pledge by President Bush, 30 and 8 he said. We will be able to produce 30 million jobs in 8 years. Well, where are the jobs?

I ask my pro-growth colleagues on the other side of the aisle, where are these jobs?

The fact is this administration has the worst record on job creation since the Second World War. President Jimmy Carter created 209,000 new jobs a month. Under Reagan, we had 175,000 new jobs a month. Under Johnson, 137,000 new jobs a month. Under Eisenhower, we even got 43,000 jobs a month.

This administration is losing 9,400 jobs a month, 300,000 jobs so far, behind Eisenhower, behind Kennedy, behind Johnson, behind Ford, behind Carter, behind Reagan, 30.8 million. We would like to see one job, just one job.

Here is the irony. This is a middle class recession. Look at the news just this week in your paper today. The State of Maryland sent out 1,700 layoff notices Monday. In the District of Columbia, the mayor begins cutting 620 jobs from the city payroll.

I hope my distinguished counterpart, the minority whip, noticed that the University of Georgia laid off 120 workers yesterday, and in Oxford, GA, Hercules is cutting 250 jobs.

This recession is not over. It is not over there. Ford is shutting down in Lorain, OH, their plant in Lorain, because sales are slow.

The auto industry is in a terrible, terrible recession.

Kodak has laid off 1,800 workers. Frito Lay has laid off 1,800 workers. Dupont cut 2,200 jobs.

The people, Mr. Speaker, that we are talking about are not welfare queens of Ronald Reagan's imagination. These are people who have worked hard to build America. They are getting up early, punching in, lunch at the desk, volunteering for overtime, working second jobs kind of people. How can the President turn his back on these people? They are the backbone of this country.

Oh, the other side says, well, we have to pay for these benefits, but this only perpetuates the same exercise in myth-making hoax we have been listening to all month from them.

We asked the CBO to examine the alternative offer by the other side just last week. They found the funding mechanisms so nebulous that it was impossible to even estimate how much money was raised.

Last week on the floor the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from New York argued that their bill would not require the President to declare an emergency.

Read the bill, we said to them. I hope they found time now to read it.

The CBO says there is no dispute. Title 6 in their bill requires the President to do what he has already said he would do.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BONIOR. When I am done, I will yield, Mr. Speaker.

The CBO says there was a dispute. The CBO bill requires the President to do what he has already refused to do, declare an emergency.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SOLOMON. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BONIOR. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SOLOMON. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask for regular order. There is no point of order. I am making a speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman from New York has made a point of order, and he is entitled to his point of order. The Chair will certainly respect the gentleman's wishes, but the Chair thinks the gentleman is entitled to a point of order. It should be addressed to the Chair.

The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am addressing it to the Chair.

I previously had respectfully asked the gentleman if he would yield for a parliamentary inquiry, and he chose not to.

Therefore, I would lay my point of order before the Chair and ask permission to explain the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SOLOMON. Again, Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the gentleman. I have great respect for him; but Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the gentleman's remarks are not relevant to the subject at hand, namely, the rule on the conference report on S. 1722 and are, therefore, in violation of House Rule 14, which states:

When any Member desires to speak or deliver any matter to the House, he shall confine himself to the question under debate.

Mr. Speaker, I would make that point of order.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the question under debate here is unemployment and people out of work in the gentleman's district and the district of the gentleman from Georgia and people all across this country. If we are going to have continued dawdling, delaying tactics like that, we are not going to be able to debate one of the most fundamental issues that faces this country today.

It is this type of activity, Mr. Speaker, it is this type of tactic, it is this type of delay that is taking away from people the right for an education, the right to feed their families, the right to pay their mortgages.

The objection by the gentleman from New York is unconscionable, given the light of the importance of this issue.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, may I have a ruling?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair will rule and make a statement. The rule is that debate should be confined to the merits of the rule and to the conference report made in order by the rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if I may continue to be recognized, I just want to thank the Chair for this very helpful ruling. I intend to take full advantage of it when it is my turn to speak. I was hoping the Chair would rule that way, because we really do want to get into and discuss this, and I did not want to be ruled out of order.

I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have seen and the American people have seen what has taken place here over the last several months.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not want to face this issue, do not want to face the fact that we have literally 10 million people, hard-working people who through no fault of their own have been put out of work. We have a bill to take care of their needs. We have a bill to provide them with extended unemployment benefits until we can get this economy moving again, this economy that is in terrible decline, no growth, no jobs, the worst recession we have had in a number of years, and we continue to see tactics of delay, tactics of parliamentary maneuvers not to get this issue before the President of the United States.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are going to get it before the President of the United States. We are going to do it within a short period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to further elaborate on my remarks on their alternative. The other side overlooks the fact that these benefits are already paid for. They have been paid for by insurance premiums taken out of the paychecks each month and put into a trust fund, set aside exactly for this purpose. People have had money taken out of their paychecks over the years in case of emergencies like this. The money is there. It is there for this purpose. Families all over America need it and they deserve it.

Now, are we so bereft of resources that we cannot help them? Are my friends on the other side of the aisle so dazzled by emergencies in Kurdistan or Turkey or the Soviet Union or Bangladesh that they are blind to the emergencies of our own people right here at home?

Mr. Speaker, no more delays, no more phony alternatives, no more options riddled with loopholes like the other side offered last week.

My constituents ask if there is hope in sight. I want to tell that man who served in Vietnam, with a wife, who has worked hard all his life, that he is going to get some help, that he is not going to lose his home, that his kids are going to have an opportunity for a future in education.

Let us give him and the millions like him more hope. Let us give them some help. They have earned it. They have paid for it. It is heartless to keep it from them any longer.

Mr. Speaker, this is the issue that divides the Democrats from the Republicans. This is the issue that cuts at who we are and who they are. This is the issue that the American people want us to address today.

□ 1400

And the insensitivity and the callousness of the other side on this issue speaks to that difference.

Mr. Speaker, we are giving the President a second chance to do what he should have done in July. And I ask the President to use his second chance to give hard-working Americans a second chance as well.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am a little amazed that the gentleman from Michigan would use time on this conference report rule to discuss our alternative legislation, H.R. 3400; but since he is so anxious to debate that matter, I have sent to the desk an amendment to the rule that would make that bill in order under an amendment process immediately following the disposition of the rule.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Will the gentleman from New York yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would, respectfully. The gentleman did not do so for me, but I would yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, when I took the time and was given time by the Chair on the rule, I yielded for purposes of debate only and not for purposes of amendment. I think that is clear in my opening statement. I would ask the gentleman from New York to recognize that fact, and I ask for a ruling.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would recognize it. Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that my amendment be considered at this time, which is an appropriate unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hears an objection.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has the time.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the Speaker. If I may continue on my time, I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, apparently the gentleman wishes to have it both ways. He wants to debate a bill which he does not want to consider on the floor of the House. That is probably why he voted against our attempt last week to have it made in order following House action on this bill and why the Committee on Rules has repeatedly turned down our efforts to have an open rule and to make other amendments in order.

Mr. Speaker, since the Chair did not rule the gentleman out of order in discussing a bill that is not germane to the pending conference report, I assume that I may respond to this specific comment on the CBO cost estimate, and I would do so at this time.

First, I would point out that the conference report that the gentleman now supports would spend close to $6 billion and yet it would not raise one plugged nickel to pay for it.

For the gentleman to criticize the Republican bill because all of the receipts will not come into the Treasury during fiscal 1992 is disingenuous at best, even if the pay-as-you-go amendment offered to H.R. 3040 by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means did not kick on the tax side until 1993, a year after the expenditures began to take place. But the gentleman from Michigan, who now poses as a great stickler for pay-as-you-go rules, did not seem to be concerned about that time lag then. In fact, he voted against the Rostenkowski pay-as-you-go amendment.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the Republican unemployment insurance bill would bring in money enough in revenues in fiscal 1992 and in 1993 to cover the cost of this bill because although under our bill receipts may fall a little short of costs in fiscal 1992, they would exceed total costs by fiscal year 1993. Therefore, we have retained the emergency designation which Members are trying so hard to do here. This is necessary to prevent a sequester in the first year and to prevent the extra revenues from being spent in the second year. You all understand that. Those excess receipts should go toward deficit reduction and not toward new spending schemes.

Mr. Speaker, while I have been critical of the ambivalence of the gentleman from Michigan toward the Republican legislation and his reluctance to consider a bill which he is anxious to selectively debate, I am delighted that he is beginning to realize that there is a need to compromise and discuss legislation that can be signed into law.

At least, Mr. Speaker, there is light at the end of the tunnel.

Mr. Speaker, by my count, this is the fourth rule we have reported on unem-

ployment insurance legislation this session, and I suspect it will not be the last.

This particular rule provides for House consideration of the conference report on S. 1722. And like all the other rules we have had, it waives all point of order for failure to comply with any rule of the House on any provision of the Budget Act.

Mr. Speaker, blanket waivers of House rules and budget enforcement provisions really go the heart of what this is all about. And it is not some minor, nitpicking procedural point we are talking about here today.

What that blanket waiver says is that you Democrats are willing to lay aside all the established rules of this House, including the budget enforcement agreement reached last fall, in order to have a political issue instead of a bill that can be signed into law.

That is the same budget agreement under which Democrats voted for the biggest tax increase in history. Democrats promised the American people they would live by that budget agreement.

Well, my colleagues, here we go again.

This rule and all the previous ones say loud and clear, "Damn the torpedoes, damn the budget agreement, damn the taxpayers, full speed ahead," to more and more deficit spending adding even more to this year's deficit of $350 billion. That, my colleagues, is even greater than all the money we spend in 1 year on the defense budget.

What the Democrats do not say directly but what everyone knows is that the Democrats have intentionally charted a collision course with the administration instead of wisely crafting an acceptable bill that could and would be signed into law today. Mr. Speaker and Members, the biggest victims of this crash course are not the Democrats, they are not the Republicans, they are not the President of the United States and they are not this Congress; they are the victims, the unemployed who could be getting extended benefits now if we just passed a pay-as-you-go bill that the President would gladly sign.

In closing, let me say, members, we all know that a few minutes ago the other body failed to pass this conference report by the two-thirds vote necessary to override a veto. Do you all know that? Therefore, each of you know that this bill will not become law. You know and, more importantly, your constituents will know that you Democrats, by passing this dead bill in an attempt to politicize the unemployment issue, are deliberately delaying unemployment checks from reaching the unemployed. If Democrats really want an extended benefit bill that will start the checks flowing immediately, they can vote down this rule so that both houses can take up and pass the compromise Dole-Michel-Solomon-Gingrich extended benefits bill. The President will sign it. And this Congress will get back to work on an economic growth package that will create not unemployment checks but paychecks for all our constituents. For God's sake, vote down this rule and let us get to work for the American people.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman from yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], a very respected Member of the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, am I correct that if we pass this bill that is before us—and I know that the gentleman does not like it and he has an alternative too—but notwithstanding the fact that it did not get two-thirds vote in the Senate, and it goes to the President and he signs it, under those circumstances will the unemployed get extended benefits, those who have run out of benefits?

Mr. SOLOMON. No, he will not, and the reason he will not is because we are going to have to start this process all over again 3 weeks from now. We will have brought up the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh bill to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman from New York perhaps did not hear my question.

Mr. SOLOMON. Why don't you agree to the compromise? They get their benefits if you agree to the compromise.

Mr. HOYER. If the President signs this bill, will the unemployed get benefits, those who have now run out of benefits? I understand what the gentleman is saying. I understand the gentleman's hypothesis.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman knows the President will not sign the bill, he cannot sign it.

Mr. HOYER. If he signs it, would they get relief, if he signed it?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr Speaker, reclaiming my time, the answer to the question of the gentleman from Maryland is obvious: Yes, they will get benefits if he signs the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], the chief deputy whip.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule. I rise because the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act is needed now more than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, I was in my district last weekend. While walking in downtown Atlanta, a young businessman came up to me and said:

> Mr. Lewis, when you get back to Washington, please tell your colleagues in the Congress that the recession is not over.

Yes, the recession is not over. In the State of Georgia between January and August of this year, more than 76,000 people exhausted all of their unemployment benefits. During the month of July alone, 13,000 workers exhausted their benefits.

We have an opportunity to help the American people. We have an opportunity to extend a helping hand in time of need to that segment of our work force which is out of work. This legislation will provide much needed help to the hardest hit victims of the recession.

Mr. Speaker, our President needs to come home—come home and pay attention to the hurt and the pain of the American people. Instead of putting the needs of foreign nations ahead of the United States, he should begin to deal with the pain and agony of our own people.

By passing this bill, we will be acknowledging that there is real misery, real pain and real suffering, and we want to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, the President needs to know that the American people are crying out and demanding leadership. Jobless Americans want help—not next year, not next month, not next week, but now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule, pass the bill and let us send it to the President's desk with more than all deliberate speed.

□ 1410

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the honorable whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], who has a plan that will put Americans back to work if we could only vote on it.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding.

Let me say, first of all, that we are back once again at the soap opera of Democratic desperation. The Democratic leadership knows, as we sit here today, that their bill will be vetoed and the veto will be sustained in the other body. They know that. This is not a theory; they know that. Therefore, the Democratic leadership knows that their bill will not produce a single check to the unemployed. They know that.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are in a situation where, even though they know the President will veto the bill, they know that not a single check will go out, we are going to hear a number of speeches today about how urgent it is, how vital it is, how immediately we must get checks out, and let me say this:

The Democratic leadership also knows that the Dole-Michel unemployment bill would extend unemployment checks for 10 weeks and would be signed by the President, and so the unemployed would actually get real checks. They would not just get press

releases. They would not just get speeches. They would get 10 additional weeks of checks. The Dole-Michel unemployment bill, unlike the Democratic bill, pays for the unemployment checks, meets the budget agreement, and keeps the Congress' word with the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic leadership knows these facts. So, if the Democratic leadership really cared about the unemployed rather than the politics, if the Democratic leadership really wanted the unemployed to get checks, they could bring up the Dole-Michel unemployment bill. We would pass it with a huge bipartisan majority, and President Bush would sign it, and, by the end of this week, unemployment checks would be going to precisely the people the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], my good friend, just described.

But beyond the immediate problem of getting checks to the long-term unemployed, and it is a real problem, and we should pass a signable bill and have those checks going out; beyond that problem the real answer to unemployment in America is employment. The real answer to the concern of people who do not have a job is to create a job, and for week, after week, my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Rules, has been asking the Committee on Rules to make in order the Economic Growth Act.

Mr. Speaker, the Economic Growth Act is a bill that Senator PHIL GRAMM and I have introduced. Economists estimate it would create 1,200,000 new jobs. It would lead to 220,000 additional home sales a year. It would do precisely the things we need to do to have the kind of economic growth to create the employment so the unemployed could look beyond the next check to actually going back to work, to having a chance to make a decent living.

I find it astonishing that the Democratic leadership has for over a month now refused again and again every request to make in order an economic growth bill. I find it hard to understand. We have been engaged in this debate, and I believe the first time I went up to see the Committee on Rules was over 10 weeks ago. So, for 10 weeks we could have been creating jobs. For 10 weeks we could have been doing the right thing for Americans to put Americans back to work, and for the life of me I cannot understand why the Democratic leadership refuses to make in order economic growth and why the Democratic leadership insists on being in a position of deliberately passing a bill they know will be vetoed and blocking the bill that would in fact create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], my friend, for yielding to me.

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

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the questions of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] are quite obvious.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has the worst growth record since the Second World War. We are losing 9,400 jobs a month. We lost 300,000 jobs recently in this country. They have a terrible job-creating record.

The gentleman talks about his growth package. He did not tell my colleagues how much it would cost. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates a 5-year cost of $20 billion for his program. I ask, "Where are you going to get the money, Mr. Whip?"

The point here, Mr. Speaker, is that they have no program. What they have offered is a fraud. The Michel-Solomon, whatever they call that thing he wants to sell; wants to sell air wave frequencies to take care of the unemployed who have already put money aside for it. It is a fraud. It is already there, the money that they paid for through negotiations and through their employer. The question here is what is real and what is not.

Mr. Speaker, what is real is that we have a bill that we will send to the President, and, if he signs it, people will get help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would observe to my colleagues that only in the Land of Oz or in the mind of a rightwing Republican must Democrats bear the blame for a President who is prepared to veto a bill that the vast majority of Members, in this House, and in the other body, support.

It is true, as the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, that there were not enough votes in the other body in this last vote to override a veto. But there is one other opportunity for some of our Republican colleagues in the other body to reassess their vote.

On Friday, the numbers about who is and who is not unemployed in this country will come out again, and I am afraid those numbers are going to have bad tidings for this country, that more workers will be out of work, and then possibly on reflection some of our Senate colleagues might decide to reassess their vote and override, if that is what the President chooses to do.

Let me make a point about the most recent entry into the unemployment sweepstakes, the Dole-Michel alternative. I have worked for 3 years as the acting chairman on the Committee on Ways and Means' Subcommittee on Human Resources and Unemployment. Not one time in 3 years, not one time in the deliberations in this body, have our Republican friends shown up with an alternative. The only time they came up with an alternative was when they realized the level of pain and suffering in this country and they needed to have some political cover so that they could say they were for extended benefits as well.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats, Independents and, yes, Mr. Speaker, even Republicans are out of work.

I did something I do not normally do in my district. It is always a hazard politically to get introduced at a sporting event. But I did, and I was waiting for the usual tepid applause or the chorus of boos that accompanies a politician being recognized at a high school sporting event. But what happened in Copiague, Long Island, was truly astonishing. As I walked out on the field, people yelled, "Pass the unemployment bill, Congressman. I need your help. Pass the bill."

On the Delta shuttle back to Long Island the flight attendant leaned over to me, and she said, "What are the chances of passing your bill? I'm from Huntington, Long Island, and my husband is a pilot, and he has exhausted his benefits. He needs your help. He needs your bill."

We need to see unemployment benefits extended, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope you would pass this message on to the President: "You're a decent man, Mr. President. Hear what these people are telling you around the country. Feel their pain. See their suffering. Put aside the question of partisanship. Put aside the issue of how you feel so strongly about the Budget Act of 1990, and recognize one plain and simple fact: That the people who elected you President of the United States need your help."

□ 1420

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], who will yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to answer the distinguished whip on the other side on two levels.

First of all, President Bush asked the Congress to pass an economic growth bill in 1989; the Democratic leadership killed it. President Bush asked for economic growth measures in the budget negotiations of 1990; the Democratic leadership killed it. President Bush asked for economic growth measures in the State of the Union in 1991; the Democratic leadership has blocked it.

The Gramm-Gingrich bill, according to Treasury, is revenue neutral. It is only by the weird, bizarre scoring of the Joint Committee on Taxation, which I think frankly ought to be abolished as an intellectually obsolete, medieval institution, that you would argue there are no behavioral changes. Every economist in the private sector knows that if you have an IRA for every American, you will increase sav-

ings and lower interest rates. If you have a capital gains tax cut, you will increase investment and create jobs. It is only in the leftwing-dominated Joint Committee on Taxation, which has a Jimmy Carter Treasury official as its head, that you would have the kind of bizarre scoring the Democratic whip has suggested.

So I think the record is clear. The Democrats in Congress have consistently killed economic growth measures that for 3 years in a row the President of the United States has asked for.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Connecticut yield? I will give him more time if he needs it.

Mr. SHAYS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I will tell my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, and my friend, the gentleman from New York, that if the President asks again for an economic growth packet of capital gains without taking care of the middle class in this country, we will block it again.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleague has said he would give me time if I need it, and I thank him for that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule. I remember well last year that Congress and the White House worked very hard to come to a budget agreement. There was great gnashing of teeth. I looked at this agreement last year, and I said, "Is this the best we can do?"

I was not prepared to vote for it. I wanted something stronger, but the more I thought about it, I realized that was the best we could do. It capped defense spending, it capped foreign aid, it capped social domestic spending, and it provided for the first time what was so important, pay as you go for entitlements. Fifty percent of our budget is entitlements, and it also provided for a tax increase. I voted for this agreement in spite of warnings from Members on my side of the aisle who said that this side of the aisle would not keep the agreement. In fact, they were right. We are not keeping the agreement, and we are only 1 year into this agreement. They said that as soon as there was a chance to break the agreement, they would break the agreement.

Opponents pointed out that it front loaded taxes and back loaded savings. And now before the savings can take effect Congress is breaking the agreement.

Our Nation has more than a $300 billion deficit this year. It has more than a $400 million deficit next year before it goes down, and our national debt is over $3.2 trillion, representing a fourfold increase in just 12 years. That is a four-fold increase. What concerns me the most, however, is that the interest on the national debt is greater than all social domestic spending. The interest on our national debt is greater than all domestic social spending, all the judicial branch of Government, all the legislative branch of Government, all the executive branch of Government, all the various departments and agencies, and all the programs and services they provide. The interest on the national debt is greater than that.

So what are we doing? We are going to add to our national debt. Our past has caught up with us. And yet as weak as this budget agreement is, we cannot keep faith with it.

I understand my colleagues on this side of the aisle and on that side of the aisle who recognize that we must do something, but I also recognize that if we did not have to spend so much on the interest on the national debt, we would not even be debating this issue; we would have the money to do what we need to do, and that is to help the people who are in need.

The bottom line for me is that if I vote for this, I am breaking that budget agreement. I am adding $5.9 billion to the national debt, I am increasing the annual interest payments on the national debt, and I am denying future generations what they deserve.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the bottom line for me is that we spend more on interest on the national debt because of what we have done for the last 12 years, and I am not going to be part of that.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr LEVIN], a member of the committee.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we should take up the economic growth issue, but that is not going to help the people who are exhausting their benefits.

I voted for the budget agreement, but we cannot hide behind that today. I detect some real discomfort on the minority side, and let me tell the Members why. I think it exists because maybe there is a bit of empathy, but there is also some political discomfort because this is a middle-income as well as a low-income issue.

Earlier today I talked to a suburbanite Royal Oaker a single mother, with a kid in college, in her forties. She was off work for 2 years. She called me, and I talked with her on her first day back to work. Why would she call to talk to me? She is just back to work. She called because she looked for 2 years and could not find a job. She has a college degree. She called because she said she sent out 400 résumés and received back zilch in terms of a response. She called because she said she had never been laid off before, had never been in an unemployment compensation office before, and because when she had exhausted her benefits earlier during the 2-year period, she had to go on ADC. She said to me "I don't want that to happen to the hundreds of thousands of people who are exhausting their benefits."

And what is the answer of the President? It is to punish the victims of the recession. They say, "Get lost" to hundred of thousands of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. Let us vote for this bill in an overwhelming sense and keep faith with the working people of this country, with those who have started small and middle-sized businesses and who have seen them lost. We must vote for this bill and do so by more than a two-thirds vote today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair wishes to state that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has 13 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the richest 1 percent of Americans have seen their incomes doubled, from $300,000 to $600,000 a year in the last decade. In the last year, per person income has dropped by $430 in this country. Yet the Republicans are hyperventilating on this floor today in order to prevent a few dollars in desperately needed help from getting to the people in this country who have lost their jobs and need some temporary help.

That issue may seem academic to some people, but it is personal to me. I will never forget the week I went away to college, because that was the week my father lost his job. I remember that. He was scared, and I was scared. We had no idea whether he would be able to provide me any help or not. We had no way to plan, and he was humiliated.

There are millions of people in that same position today, and we ought not forget them because of parliamentary or budgetary niceties. You talk about economic growth. Let me simply point out that there are 300,000 fewer jobs in this economy today than there were the day George Bush walked into the White House. The administration has not produced on jobs, and now it will not deal with the consequences by helping the people who need help because there are not those jobs.

You talk about economic growth, and what is your answer? Another fat tax benefit for millionaires in your capital gains tax. If it was not so tragic, I would laugh.

□ 1430

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just say something to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] who just spoke, whom I really do have a great deal of respect for because he stands his ground in the Committee on Appropriations. But

when he says fat cat tax, that bothers me a little bit. Because not only is the issue about capital gains, what is fat cat about individual retirement accounts?

The gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY] was on the floor before saying that no Republican had come before the Committee on Ways and Means with any part of this economic growth package. Well, individual retirement accounts for all Government employees and for all private sector employees are badly needed. There is nothing fat cat about that. What is fat cat about tax credits for research and development for companies like General Electric and International Business Machines, owned by little old ladies, by widows, by Members, by me? I have some stock, I think, in IBM, and I am no fat cat.

Mr. Speaker, the first time homebuyer tax credit for young Americans who need assistance to be able to buy a home, and lifting the cap on Social Security, is that fat cat?

Mr. Speaker, all of these things are in the Dole-Michel-Solomon economic growth package, in the Gingrich growth package that is pending, that Democrats will not let come on this floor.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Let me yield to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, by all means.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, what is in the President's budget for tax relief? You have got a nice fat tax break, 82 percent of which goes to people who make more than $150,000. You have got table scraps for the middle class, and nothing for the poor.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me just conclude by saying as I said earlier this morning that this week I am hearing a lot of rhetoric from that side of the floor about the President giving money to the Kurds, Bangladesh, or what have you. That same kind of rhetoric coming from the Democrats side of the aisle is going to be put to the test in a few days.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] that a foreign aid authorization bill that has giveaways to all of these foreign countries is coming to the floor. I think it is 24 or 25 billion dollars' worth. Then we have the Israeli housing guarantees. I think that is about $10 billion. That brings us to about $35 billion.

Then there is the IMF thing which I have never voted for since I came to this Congress 13 years ago. I think that is $12 or $13 billion.

Do you know what? You on the Democratic side of the aisle are going to vote for every nickel on it. I am going to vote against it.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is talking to the chairman who blocked the Bush request for the IMF funding.

Mr. SOLOMON. That is why I say you are not all bad.

Mr. OBEY. Let me also ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], will the gentleman support the President in his request to delay the request for the $10 billion Israeli loan guarantee fund? Will the gentleman support that request? I am supporting it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I think I am going to be with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and I admire the gentleman for standing up.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that on that one issue, the gentleman is on the right side.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I can think of at least 10 reasons why the President should sign this bill.

No. 10, not everybody gets paid to play golf like the Vice President;

No. 9, totaling the President's domestic accomplishments is not even a part-time job;

No. 8, watching the President fish does not put food on the table;

No. 7, Sununu only needs so many drivers;

No. 6, 1,000 points of light does not pay the electric bill;

No. 5, the President has already hired too many spokesmen to say "The recession really is over";

No. 4, 9 million out-of-work Americans have not gotten the President's attention by moving to either Kurdistan, Kuwait, or Mount Pinatubo;

No. 3, the only dependable jobs in this country are as the President's travel agent and the boat-waxer at Kennebunkport;

No. 2, the booming pork rind industry has not made up for the loss of jobs in the broccoli business;

No. 1, those 9 million unemployed Americans do not have Millie's lucrative book deal.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to those 10 reasons, and, most importantly, 9 million Americans are out of work today, thanks to the Republican recession. The money is there to help them keep food on their tables and a roof over their heads until they find new jobs. It is their money, out of their paychecks and their employers' contributions. It has nothing to do with the balanced budget amendment or with the Budget Act of 1990 or anything else. It is their money, trust funds that cannot be used for any other purpose except as the President wants to do, to mask the deficit. That is why he will not spend this money. He will not declare an emergency, because then he would have to admit that his economic policies have been a total failure. That is why he will not do it.

Mr. Speaker, voting for this rule and signing the bill, as the President should do, is without question the right thing to do for the 8.2 percent of Floridians who are out of work through no fault of their own.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, millions of deserving Americans are wondering why the President is so fiercely opposing Congress on an issue that is so fundamental to their survival, the extension of unemployment benefits. The President is wrong on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I hold office hours on weekends in shopping malls. This weekend a constituent of mine captured the frustration of many Americans when she said, "I wish people in Washington would put their feet in our shoes sometimes and understand what our lives are about."

It is time for the President to recognize that the extension of unemployment benefits is not a handout. It is simply giving Americans, who have spent their lives producing for this country, paying taxes from their hard-earned dollars, their due. It is a matter of survival for American families.

Another of my constituents sent me a letter expressing her despair. She said, "We are a middle-class family who can hardly pay all of our expenses now. We have a 16-year-old high school junior for whom we have no college fund. We have no savings to fall back on in emergency situations and no means of earning extra income."

Mr. Speaker, middle-class families are struggling so desperately to make ends meet. How on Earth do we expect them to survive? What happens to these families when their unemployment benefits run out?

My State of Connecticut is in the depths of a 2-year recession. Prospects for a quick recovery are dim. Some 123,000 people in Connecticut are unemployed; 40,000 have lost their unemployment benefits this year alone.

The people of Connecticut are not experiencing the recovery that the President has talked about. They cannot find other jobs because job growth under this President's watch is the worst this country has seen in half a century. There are now 300,000 fewer jobs than when President Bush took office.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are hurting. Congress will pass this legislation for

the second time, not because of politics, but because of need. I urge the President to sign it for the same reason.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, in listening to the debate here, we know where we are, we know where we are going, we know what the rules are going to be, and we know what is going to happen in the Senate. This bill will pass by an overwhelming majority here in the House. It has already passed in the Senate, but by less than the two-thirds necessary to override the veto of the President. This simply means we are going to pass another bill, send it down Pennsylvania Avenue, the President is going to veto it, and his veto will be sustained. So there will be no relief out there for the unemployed people.

Mr. Speaker, why is it that we keep playing this same scenario over and over again? Why is it speaker after speaker has come up here to the microphone and talked about an $8 billion surprise?

Mr. Speaker, that surplus is gone. It is like old Mother Hubbard's cupboard; it is empty. There is no money in it. There is nothing but IOUs in there, because Congress has spent it all.

We are facing deficits of over $300 billion, and still we are wrangling in here over a bill which will admittedly bring relief, much-needed relief, humane relief, to many Americans, but is never going to become law.

□ 1440

Why not join together in a partnership and go after the causes of unemployment and not feed the systems of unemployment? Why not create jobs instead of extending benefits?

The package is out there. The President has already put his hand out and he would certainly compromise. He would compromise, I am sure, with this bill if there was some light at the end of the tunnel.

To pass bill after bill that is going to do absolutely nothing but increase the deficit and, yes, the trust funds are all included in the deficit, including this one, because that is the way the law is written, that is the way we wrote it, that is our law. That is not Bush's law. It is our law.

It is included in the deficit. We are spending money that we do not have, regardless of all the rhetoric we hear about the $8 billion sitting there in the trust fund as if it is dollar bills sitting on a shelf, dollar bills that we have already spent.

I would hope that following the passage of this and the veto of this bill that Democrats and Republicans can at least try to solve some of the problems of unemployment, form a new partnership and together go down. There is no partisan politics in unemployment. All the Congressmen and women in this Hall, all the Senators, we all want full employment. We want a stronger economy.

This is no more a Bush recession than it is a Congress recession. We all have enough responsibility to go around, but together we can solve the problems.

I would call upon the Congress, after the passage of this bill, that we do start a new decade of trying to work together in solving the problems of this country instead of debating what separates us.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I rise in support of the rule and in support of the conference report.

There are now 10 million Americans out of work and since January of this year 2 million of those Americans have exhausted their unemployment benefits. About 300,000 a month have exhausted their unemployment benefits. This year alone 80,000 Georgians have lost their jobs, and I hear my good friend from Georgia, the minority whip, say, "Well, the cure for unemployment is employment."

How cavalier. We know that. Working people know that. One doesn't have to be a rocket scientist to figure that one out.

While Americans and Georgians are seeing the American dream in many cases become a nightmare, they are talking about a supply-side growth package, Laffer curve, trickle-down voodoo economics. They are talking about then; we are talking about now.

They are saying that we will not declare an emergency, do not need to declare an emergency. There is no emergency. There is no emergency here.

Mr. Speaker, I would have to ask my friend from Georgia, if he were out of work and if this recession continues a lot of us are going to be out of work next year. If he were out of work and if he had exhausted his unemployment benefits and he could not pay mortgage and he and his family were losing their home if his folks were sick and he had lost his health insurance and if he was up against the wall like millions of working Americans are today, would it be an emergency then? You bet your sweet Reagan-Bush recession it would be an emergency.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule, vote for this conference report and vote for middle-class working Americans.

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

Mr. Speaker, the former speaker in the well from Georgia is, I consider, a great friend. He is certainly a good Member of this House. But when he starts talking about voodoo economics and these things, that really does not help us get to the point here.

I do not think that individual retirement accounts for all Americans represents voodoo economics. I do not think tax credits for research and development that are so desperately needed by American industry today to compete with all of these Japanese firms and all of those other subsidized firms represents voodoo economics.

I mentioned before first-time home buyer tax credits and lifting the cap on senior citizens' earnings. Those things are very, very serious matters. They are meant to stimulate the economy.

Even the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], my good friend, during the Committee on Rules debate on one of these rules, I cannot remember which one because this is the fourth or fifth one we have had, but even the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], contradictory to what he said here on the floor, told the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] to his face that his economic program was meritorious, had good merit, but this was not the time. This was not the time for that and the Democrats would be coming up with a similar package at some appropriate time.

I tell my colleagues, the people who work for General Electric and IBM, those same middle-class Americans, those engineers we were talking about, think the time is now for economic growth. That is what we are looking for.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman claims his own time.

Mr. BONIOR. It does not look like the gentleman has a lot of Members over there that want to talk on this issue. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman has refused to yield to me three times. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] in my discussions with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], I did say that he had some very good features in his package. I did not agree with his total package. I did not agree with capital gains as a means to deal with this issue by itself.

I just want to clarify that, that there were parts of that package that obviously we all agree with over here.

Mr. SOLOMON. And if we had an open rule today, Mr. Speaker, we would be able to take up those good portions that the gentleman thinks are good and we could pass them on this floor and put people to work.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first commend Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI, and the members of the House Ways and Means Committee, for their persistence and commitment to assuring extended unemployment compensation benefits for the 334,321 Americans that have exhausted their benefits. I do not know what it is going to take to convince this administration that workers and their families are suffering.

In 1935, as the Congress considered the Social Security Act, it authorized short-term income aid to employed workers who have shown loyalty to the labor work force by maintaining an acceptable work history. The unemployment insurance system simply provides protection against the relentless turns of the business cycle.

The downturn of the current business cycle continues to wreak havoc on this Nation's weak economy. Caught in this protracted economic turbulence are hard-working men and women who's earnest wish is to provide food, shelter, education, and medical needs for their loved ones. These workers need help.

Yet, President Bush hides behind the law, only to deny benefits to those who are in need. Under the budget law, the President can request, and receive, emergency spending for war, recession, or national disasters. President Bush applied a very liberal reading of the law when he requested, and received, emergency spending for everything from aid to the Kurds, to the evacuation of various citizens during the Iraq crisis. Much to the dismay of those thousands that have exhausted their 26 weeks of unemployment benefits, President Bush applied a strict reading of this law stating that, "the last thing we want to do is break the budget agreement and spend outside to increase the deficit." Such a denial of basic assistance sends the message that it is better to be a Kurd than a working, taxpaying, American.

Instead, President Bush has once again prescribed the so-called panacea for the problems of the unemployed. He says that, the best prescription for the problems of the recession are to create new jobs and to get people back to work. The President's so-called alternative legislation promises to create nearly one-half of a million jobs in just 5 years. Could someone tell me, how can this administration create one-half of a million jobs in 5 years, when there has been no serious commitment to this issue since President Bush moved into the White House.

To designate the need for extended unemployment compensation funds as emergency, is not outlandish or unconscionable. I believe that unemployment emergency funds are in sync with the rate of long-term unemployment and the problems that come with it. There is no doubt, in my mind, that the 93,672 unemployed workers in Illinois who have exhausted their benefits are having extreme difficulties dealing with day-to-day life. I've been there, I know.

An expansion of unemployment insurance conforms exactly with the definition of a circumstance requiring emergency designation. People are suffering and are in need of extended benefits. I ask all of my colleagues to support the passage of the conference report to the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act. The workers of this Nation are relying on us today.

□ 1450

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] a new Member of this House.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have only been a Member of this Congress now for about 8 months, and in that time I have seen a lot of different bills come forth which both sides knew the President was going to veto. It is kind of discouraging, as someone who is action oriented, to say that the other side has its points and we have our points, but why can we not sit down and negotiate these things out and pass a bill that will help people?

That side of the aisle is so stubborn that they will not change. This side of the aisle is so stubborn that they will not change. We need to sit down and help people.

It is like having a liferaft in a river. You throw somebody a liferaft when they are drowning, and all of a sudden they begin to like the water. They lose the liferaft. So you throw them another one.

So I think this side of the aisle is of the same mind. We would like to throw them a liferaft, but we would like to have it with a rope and to pull them out. That rope means jobs and opportunities as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] just told us. It is the President's economic package that has been denied by the other side of the aisle, and quite frankly, it is quite disturbing to me to see things like civil rights bills and economic packages that help people that cannot be passed by both sides of the aisle.

I think that is why the people of this country are saying throw the rascals out, and I think maybe they need to do that, Mr. Speaker. It is an impasse, and it is discouraging as a freshman Member of this Congress to see that.

I have people in my district, the last shipbuilding industry called Nayco on the west coast, and they are hurting for money also. But to vote for this bill, because of its formula, would cost the State of California over 13,000 jobs. We would raise taxes by over $6 billion, or increase the deficit by $6 billion, which hurts business. The other side of the aisle I think, 70 percent of the other side of the aisle, could not make a payroll if they had a business because they do not understand the things that they try and pass on this floor and how it affects business and kills jobs.

You kill jobs and then you cry because there is no money to pay for it. Let us just sit down and be able to create jobs and pay for those things.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, let me respond to my good friend from California. I have been in this House for 8 months as well. But the reason we are having this debate is because, apparently, we have more confidence in our President to exercise good judgment and to recognize the condition of the American families who elected him to leadership.

The gentleman was telling us that we should vote against this rule because the President has already made up his mind, he is not going to change his mind regardless of the condition that afflicts American families today. The fact is that much of the information we have been told cannot be right. We have heard from the gentleman from Florida, a previous speaker on the other side of the aisle, that the unemployment insurance trust fund is bankrupt. I hope it is not bankrupt, because it was authorized for only one purpose. As the gentleman on the other side of the aisle know, it was not authorized to bail out any budget deficit. It was authorized to be paid by the employers of this country solely for American families who have lost work, not families who have quit their jobs, but American families who have lost their jobs and who are looking for jobs and whose benefits have now run out.

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

Mr. MORAN. They cannot pay their mortgages, they cannot feed their families. They are not going to be able to keep their children in college.

And we are as responsible as you are, and we want to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, today I want to speak in support of the rule and join my responsible colleagues on both sides of the aisle, in support of legislation which would extend unemployment benefits for more than 2 million Americans who ask only that they have an opportunity to work hard to strengthen our economy.

We have been through this debate before. In July, we sent the President a good bill—a fair bill—that would have provided relief for those men and women who had exhausted their unemployment benefits. The President needed only to sign the bill and declare an emergency to set this extension in motion. While he showed great symbolism in signing the bill, he showed no compassion in refusing to declare an emergency.

While the administration obfuscated the fact, denied that there was a recession back in August, 8.5 million Americans were out looking for a job. While the President denied that there was an economic emergency, and refused to enact the unemployment extension,

316,000 individuals exhausted their benefits; 316,000 Americans who would have been covered by our efforts in July must now worry about feeding their families, paying their bills, and meeting their mortgages. Those 316,000 Americans, who could have been protected then, are now watching their benefits run out and their hopes for the future dissipate.

Today we have an opportunity to right that wrong and to pass another good, fair bill that protects the American families hardest hit by this prolonged recession. I hate to imagine the repercussions our failure to act might have on the 316,000 Americans who have exhausted their benefits in September, or the 316,000 who will exhaust their benefits in October.

We have the money to protect those families suffering extended unemployment—there is over $7.6 billion in the unemployment trust fund—we need only the courage and the compassion to spend it for the purposes for which it was established. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the rule, and then supporting the conference report, and in extending unemployment benefits.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman from Virginia to yield but he chose not to do so. I asked him to yield because he just absolutely misquoted me.

Nowhere in my remarks did I use the word "bankrupt." I simply said that the cupboard is bare. Congress has spent the trust fund on other matters, and there is nothing in there with the exception of Government obligations in the form of IOU's.

This whole thing, and I am sure the gentleman after 8 months understands, is in the unified budget, which includes the trust fund. Perhaps it should not. I would like to see them all go off budget. But the highway fund is in here, this is in here, and other funds are in here that ought to come out.

Mr. MORAN. There is $7.6 billion of surplus in that trust fund authorized for only one purpose.

Mr. SHAW. There is not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] has expired.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the issue today is are we going to take care of things here at home.

I give President Bush some major credit for some accomplishments in foreign affairs. In some areas he has done an awfully good job.

He also is responsible, it seems to me, for some big failures, and this is one of them. The President has traveled to 32 foreign countries in his 2½ years in office. He has traveled on Air Force One the equivalent of three times around the equator creating a new world order.

Why is this relevant? Because while he has been out creating a new world order, we have had some trouble here at home. We have had a recession. Unemployment has increased and a whole lot of American families are in trouble.

We debate today for those who have lost their jobs during the recession and cannot find another job during a recession, whether we will trigger extended unemployment benefits to help those families. But the President says no.

He does not say no to everybody. When he travels he always says yes. I have a list, and this is not foreign aid, but this is just debt writeoffs. I have a list of the debts written off for these countries, $11 billion to 30 countries in the last 24 months. He says yes to Poland, yes to Egypt, yes to Libya, yes to a writeoff for Jamaica, yes to Senegal, yes to Chile, and yes to nearly two dozen others, we want to write off your debt. But here at home he says no. You American families, we do not want to give you extended unemployment benefits when you are out of work.

Something is wrong with a yes abroad and a no here at home. There is $8.1 billion in the extended unemployment benefit trust fund that has been collected just for this purpose. It is collected for the purpose of paying extended unemployment benefits during a recession to those families who are struggling.

So, will an administration that says yes to everybody around the world finally say yes to American families here at home, just once?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I intend to sum up on our side, and I have no other speakers besides myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 2 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I therefore yield myself the balance of our time.

My colleagues, when I came to this Congress 13 years ago the toughest thing for me to learn was the art of compromise, because I really felt if I was giving in I was giving up on my principles. But there is a Democrat Party and there is a Republican Party. We have to get along, and we have to do what is right for America, and we have to compromise.

The Democrats have a package which is on the floor again today. We tried to offer a substitute for that, but we were denied a vote on the floor for the Gingrich-Gramm economic growth package. Democrats refused to allow it.

So we compromised again by saying we will support your package of unemployment benefits if you will give us the economic growth package. Let us couple it, pass it, and send it to the President and he will sign it. But Democrats would not do that. They refused that compromise.

Then we offered the Dole-Michel-Solomon compromise, which is 10 weeks of benefits, the same thing you are asking for, only we do not make the law permanent. Again, Democrats refused to compromise.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Senate has just killed this bill. They will not override the President's veto. This bill is dead. Why do Democrats not accept that fact, and why do they not compromise and accept the Dole language? Those checks would reach the people tomorrow if we would all vote down this rule. I ask Members to vote it down so that we can get a compromise that is going to help the American people today, not 3 weeks or 4 weeks from today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has expired.

To close debate, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my friend from Rhode Island to close debate, let me say the President has an opportunity, a historic opportunity to sign this bill that we will send him, and if he decides not to do that, we will have this bill back before us again and again and again until he faces the need of the people of this country.

I do not believe this bill is dead. In fact, I believe the President fails to recognize his responsibility and the needs of the American people on this most urgent issue. This House and the other body will see to it that those people are taken care of.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time remains in debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] is recognized for 1 minute.

□ 1500

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third time in as many months that I have been here on the House floor urging the passage of the extension of unemployment benefits for working Americans.

I come from Rhode Island. Frequently in newspapers, Rhode Island is cited as the only State that qualifies for extended benefits, and unless we pass this legislation, Rhode Island, with a 9.1-percent unemployment rate, will not qualify for extended benefits.

This is a matter of urgency. This is a crisis which we must address today. We must stand up and support working Americans throughout this country and vote for this legislation.

There is a human face to this crisis. People come into my office. They are people who have worked all their lives, many graduates of fine universities, professional people who have always

had a job and are now without employment with families to support, desperately needing the help of their country. They are baffled. They do not understand why the President of the United States can go around the world, seize the initiative in international affairs, but ignore a crisis at home that is destroying the families of America.

It is our responsibility and our obligation to stand up for these families today.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SOLOMON) there were—yeas 12, nays 3.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 270, nays 147, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

YEAS—270

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Barnard
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Horton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Jacobs
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McGrath
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Patterson
Payne (NJ)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Rahall
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rinaldo
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NAYS—147

Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Broomfield
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Chandler
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Fish
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Hobson
Houghton
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (TX)
Kasich
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Leach
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lowery (CA)
Marlenee
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McEwen
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison
Nichols
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Ramstad
Rhodes
Ridge
Riggs
Ritter
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Weldon
Wolf
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—15

Allard
Crane
Derrick
Dymally
Ford (TN)
Holloway
Hopkins
Kaptur
McCloskey
Myers
Olin
Payne (VA)
Rangel
Serrano
Waters

□ 1521

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rangel for, with Mr. Allard against

Mr. McCloskey for, with Mr. Crane against

Mr. GUNDERSON and Mr. GILCHREST changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TORRES changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 230, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1722) to provide emergency unemployment compensation, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Georgia). Pursuant to House Resolution 230, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of earlier today, Tuesday, October 1, 1991.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the pending conference report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support for the conference report on S. 1722, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991.

Last week, the House passed S. 1722 by an overwhelming 294 to 127 vote. During the debate on S. 1722, we promised to work swiftly to complete the conference, and send this important bill to the President. Today, we keep that promise, and provide an emergency extension of unemployment benefits to over 3 million unemployed American workers.

S. 1722 would establish a temporary emergency unemployment compensa-

tion program beginning next week and extending through July 4, 1992. The bill would cost about $6.4 billion, and would be funded from nearly $8 billion previously credited to the unemployment trust fund to cover the cost of the extended benefits program. An estimated $6 billion would be spent in fiscal year 1992, which would help maintain consumer demand and stimulate the economy.

Benefits would be available prospectively not only to those exhausting their regular benefits during this period, but would be paid also to those still unemployed who ran out of benefits after February 1991 in States with unemployment rates of at least 6 percent.

The number of weeks available to unemployed workers under the conference agreement would depend on the "total unemployment rate" in their respective States.

States with unemployment rates of 8 percent or higher would be eligible to provide up to 20 weeks of benefits;

States with unemployment rates of 7 percent to 8 percent would be eligible to provide up to 13 weeks of benefits; and

All other States would be eligible to provide 7 weeks of benefits.

Under this new trigger mechanism, 7 State programs would provide 20 weeks of benefits; 14 State programs would provide 13 weeks of benefits; and 32 State programs would provide 7 weeks of benefits.

In addition, the bill would make permanent changes in unemployment benefits for exservicemembers to equalize their benefits with civilians:

Unemployed veterans of Operation Desert Storm and other veterans would be able to get 26 weeks of benefits instead of the current 13 weeks;

Veterans would have to wait only 1 week for their checks instead of 4 weeks; and

Reservists would have to serve continuously on active duty for only 90 days instead of 180 days.

Other provisions of the conference agreement include a three-State job search demonstration project; a Department of Labor report on allocating unemployment insurance administrative funds to States; an unemployment compensation advisory council; and special consideration under the Job Training Partnership Act for dislocated timber workers in Oregon and Washington.

Finally, the conference agreement would treat the provisions of the bill as an emergency under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. If the President signs the bill, he in effect will be declaring an emergency at the same time. If he vetoes the bill and Congress overrides his veto, the bill will take effect because of Congress overriding his veto.

Mr. Speaker, recent economic news bears out what unemployed American workers have known for months—the recession is far from over.

The index of leading economic indicators was flat last month.

Real gross national product fell a half percent in the second quarter of 1991.

Durable goods orders dropped nearly 4 percent in August.

Consumer confidence fell for the third consecutive month.

Sales of U.S. cars and trucks were down 16 percent in mid-September compared to a year ago.

The number of poor persons increased by 2 million in 1990 and the official poverty rate rose from 12.8 percent in 1989 to 13.5 percent in 1990.

The insured unemployment rate rose again in early September from 3 percent to 3.2 percent. This suggests the overall unemployment rate for September could rise again from last month's 6.8 percent when it is announced on Friday.

Opponents have made many shallow arguments against this bill, including crying foul as if the emergency designation in the bill creates some kind of grave legal or constitutional crisis. Clearly, there is no such crisis.

If the President chooses not to sign this bill, S. 1722 simply preserves the constitutional prerogative Congress has to override a Presidential veto. Opponents argue the bill should give the President the authority to sign the bill, but not declare an emergency. In effect, they argue Congress should give up its right to override a Presidential veto. But Congress tried this approach in August, and it didn't work.

Mr. Speaker, the President's economic advisers promised the American worker a short and shallow recession. What they got instead was short shrift. Our constituents did not send us to Congress to give up constitutional rights to the President of the United States. They sent us here to look out for their best interests, and exercise the powers vested in this institution by the Constitution.

My colleagues, let us put an end to the domestic politics of indifference. The economy is down and unemployment and poverty are up. I strongly urge support for the conference report on S. 1722. It provides a much-needed extension of unemployment benefits to millions of unemployed American workers who have waited long enough for government to act.

□ 1530

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have several objections to the conference report on unemployment insurance.

The first and most important is that we are running roughshod over last year's budget agreement. A year ago, headlines in all the Nation's major newspapers reflected deep concern about the Federal deficit. Here in Congress, we fought a very divisive and difficult battle to hammer out the budget agreement. And all because we were determined to reduce the deficit.

Now, having created a budget agreement that has the potential to reduce what last year was perceived as the Nation's most serious problem, the Congress is about to smash a fundamental tenet of that agreement. If this bill is passed, the President will lose his independent right under section 252(e) of the Budget Act to participate in declaring an emergency.

I think all of us know very well what happens once the slightest crack appears in any agreement such as this.

By this time next year, the crack will be a chasm, and even the monstrous CBO budget deficit estimate of $360 billion for 1992 will be too low. Have we already forgotten last year's crisis? Are we willing to kill the 1990 agreement and renew all the partisanship and bitterness that will accompany another battle to solve the deficit?

My second objection to this bill is its timing.

Like Democrats, Republicans recognize and deplore the suffering induced by unemployment. Unlike Democrats, we attend carefully to the history of unemployment in this Nation, and in doing so realize that 6.8-percent unemployment does not constitute an emergency. Today's 6.8-percent unemployment is actually lower than the unemployment level when we ended supplemental benefits after the last recession.

Yes, the situation for those who are unemployed is serious. But does it constitute an emergency worthy of scrapping our deficit reduction effort instead of focusing on economic growth and job creation?

One reason the majority in Congress is ready to declare an emergency is that Members may not have reflected on some important statistics about the American economy. This debate has been driven primarily by the unemployment rate figures.

While I agree that the unemployment rate is an important number, another important number we should consider is the percentage of adult Americans who are employed. When President Carter left office, about 59 percent of Americans had a job. In February of 1983, during the depth of the last recession, the percentage of adult Americans with jobs declined to 57.1. By contrast, today over 61 percent of Americans have a job.

So even though our unemployment level is up, we still have many more Americans earning money than in any previous recession and even more than in most previous nonrecessionary periods. Shouldn't these numbers make

people at least wonder how great an unemployment emergency we face as we tear up the budget agreement?

Third, despite the fact that we exempt ourselves from Budget Act requirements and give away money we don't have, Members of Congress should realize that there's no free lunch when it comes to financing benefit programs. Sooner or later, this legislation will result in higher taxes. We cannot go on building up debt forever. When the bill finally comes due, American taxpayers will once again pick up the tab for benefits that Congress led them to believe were free.

Violating the Budget Act, creating an unnecessary program, and creating pressure for future tax increases are all good reasons for opposing the conference agreement.

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

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, it is with much regret that I rise in opposition to this legislation. This bill has the laudable goal of helping the victims of the recession who have lost their jobs and have exhausted their unemployment benefits. These people need help, and we should find the means to provide it. However, I cannot support legislation that will increase Federal spending by $6.4 billion without any offsetting spending cuts.

I strongly support the goals of this legislation. Like the rest of my colleagues, I have recently returned from a tour of my district. I can tell you that there is a problem out there. The people in west Texas are hurting. More than 16,000 of my constituents are unemployed, and many businesses can barely meet their payroll. I can sum up the situation in my district with one word—survival.

I agree with my colleagues who have argued that this is an important issue that demands congressional action. But I would say to those who argue that we must declare an emergency to provide the money for it—why can't we find $6.4 billion in spending to cut out of a $1.4 trillion budget to pay for it? If the Members of this body believe that it is important to spend money to assist unemployed workers—and I believe that it is—then we should be willing to find programs that are not as important that we are willing to cut to pay for it. I do not believe that every dime of the Government's $1.4 trillion budget is absolutely vital and there is not room to cut spending.

I believe that a national debt of $3.6 trillion and a deficit of more than $350 billion is the most serious problem facing the country today. This problem will only worsen unless we bite the bullet and admit that governing sometimes requires making sacrifices. We simply cannot afford to spend money on every problem or idea that comes before Congress. We must learn to set priorities. To me, the restraints on spending that were intended to force us to set priorities was the key to last year's budget agreement. I believe that providing assistance to unemployed workers should be a priority of this Government. I was willing to put my vote behind these words by voting to make the cuts to pay for it. Unfortunately, I never got that chance. As a result, I cannot support this bill.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE].

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] for yielding this time to me.

When is a recession not a recession? Well, I guess it is living in the lap of luxury and riches, where one's education is paid for, having all kinds of influence, and where one does not have any fear of unemployment. There is good food on the table and there is good health care.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States presides over a declining economic and social structure, and then he looks down his nose at people whom he presides over, the people who pay the taxes, the people who elected him, who also have now become sick of being unemployed and being poor. And the answer to that is: "We don't have any recession. Go get a job."

They say there is no recession. Well, I say to my colleagues, "We've heard about this no recession stuff for a long time."

They stated that they are going to give us 30 million new jobs. We are losing 10,000 a month. They are going overseas to other places. We are sending all of our jobs overseas, allowing all this foreign stuff to come into the country—from slave labor.

Mr. Speaker, we have the fastest rate of unemployment, the slowest growth, since World War II, and I think it would be a cruel hoax if the President vetoes and Congress fails to override this veto.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] reaches his last speaker.

□ 1540

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill and to suggest that recently the President has been doing very good things for the people of the world. Through his speech last Friday, we have less fear of nuclear holocaust. He has provided aid and assistance to people of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union who are certainly hurting, and he has resolutely pursued the cause of peace in the Middle East. He does good things for the people of the world, but now, Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to do equally good things for the people of this Nation.

I do hope that when we send this bill to the President, this compromise package of extending unemployment benefits to long-term unemployed American people, the President will do good things for Americans and sign this bill into law.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we are seeing a tragedy played out here today, a tragedy for the people who are unemployed, because out of this process they are going to get no check. We already know that the vote in the Senate is such that this bill is going to be vetoed and the veto is going to be sustained.

So it is a tragedy. We are going to have more politics talked about, but the unemployed are going to get no check.

It is a tragedy also because the people who have concocted this bill and who bring it here, have concocted a bill that will in fact make us less capable of competing in the world, not more capable. Why? Because if this bill were enacted, if the President did not have the courage to veto this bill, the fact is that we would have to borrow the money from the Japanese in order to pay the cost. The trust fund out of which these moneys come was already committed in last year's budget deal to other spending, so there is no money to pay for this bill. The only way we have to pay for this bill is to go out and borrow at least 20 percent of it from the Japanese. So for those who are concerned about our position in the world and what the President is doing in the world, the tragedy that we see playing out here is that we will be more committed to debt in the world when this happens.

Finally, it is a tragedy because we are not doing what we committed ourselves to last year. With this bill we are making a specific attempt to break last year's budget agreement. We are making a specific effort to overcome what many people promised.

I have heard Democrats in the last few days talk about a 10-year budget deal. The 5-year budget deal we had last year did not even last a year, and we are here on the floor trying to break out of it. Those deficits are killing the economy, they are killing our budgets, and if we do not stop playing out this kind of tragedy on the House floor on a regular basis, we are going to see more jobs killed.

Mr. Speaker, we need an economic growth package. We need something that really produces real jobs in this country. We do not need any more unemployment tragedy. We do not need any more unemployment bills that will not do the job.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry we have this tragedy today, but the right vote now is a no vote.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate very attentively, and I barely can believe what I am hearing. We are told that more people are working now than before. We are told that the unemployment rate is not really as high as we are saying it is. Try telling that to the person who is unemployed. Try telling that to the person whose unemployment benefits are running out and they cannot pay their mortgage or send their kids to school or buy food.

What we are doing is simply saying to the Americans who have worked hard all their lives and find themselves, through no fault of their own, out of a job, is that we will not help them. We have many, many programs. We help many, many people over the world, as we should, but we ought to start helping our people back home.

Mr. Speaker, we have lots of programs. There are lots of things that Congress does. Let us not start hurting the people in our country who need help the most. We should pass this bill and override the President's veto.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. It is a tragedy that we are not paying long-term unemployment benefits right now, as a result of the veto that occurred a little over a month ago.

When people in Kuwait lost their jobs through the savage aggression of Saddam Hussein, there was no question about where we would borrow the money. It was deemed an emergency situation, and we moved. Now the savage consequences of recession undermine the lives and welfare, the nutrition and housing of Americans.

The foreign policy issues the President has been attending to are more critical than the ones that will benefit the American public. But this President must also remember that he is the President of the United States, and that the health and welfare of the United States is also his responsibility.

The ranking member of the Rules Committee said that Democrats will play politics and the President is going to veto this bill and, therefore, no unemployed will be benefited. I agree with him that this is tragic. It is a tragedy that Americans are not perceived to be as important to act upon as those across the seas.

We are here to pass the conference agreement on unemployment which will automatically implement provisions of the bill without the President's declaration of an emergency.

I hope that we will pass this bill.

It wasn't long ago that people generally believed that the Washington area was recession-proof. Today's Washington Post is rife with State and local budget cuts, layoff and furlough notices, and a rising unemployment rate. In my own State of Maryland, 1,700 workers have been sent layoff notices to comply with spending cuts and thousands more may lose their jobs as a result of the domino effect. In my home county of Prince Georges, county employees will be forced to take a 2-week furlough without pay because of revenue shortfalls which directly result from the recession.

Police personnel, health care workers, and education employees will suddenly find themselves unemployed and unable to provide for their families once their initial unemployment benefits run out.

Yes, I understand we had an agreement that we would mask the deficit. Senator MOYNIHAN talked about that with respect to Social Security. That is what we are doing. There is a trust fund that was established for the purposes of helping these people who have lost their jobs, working Americans who have families, who have medical bills, and who have college expenses for their kids, and who need to keep food on the table. We have a fund to pay for those people, but, no, we dealt them out of the ball game. Why? To mask the deficit, because if we spend out of this trust fund, after all, we would not be able to count it as revenues to offset expenditures.

President Reagan signed an economic growth package in August 1981. He said that this will solve the economic problems of America, and we will have a balanced budget 8 years later. Under Republican administrations a $362 billion deficit is confronting us, and hundreds of thousands, 300,000 a month, are added to the unemployment rolls, and we say we cannot help.

Mr. Speaker, this Democratic Congress is determined to see that Government works for people in need. This Democratic Congress wants to make sure that President Bush's callous disregard for the working American and their families is not the last word. This Democratic Congress will, if necessary override the President's carelessness and ensure that the direct victims of this Republican recession will receive extended benefits to tide them over until this recession is indeed on an upswing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the President to sign this bill and help these people.

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

Mr. Speaker, the two previous speakers spoke, of course, in a heart-warming way about the concerns of those who are unemployed, and certainly there is sensitivity to that. But the mere fact that there is a reason to spend more money does not justify trashing the budget agreement of last year.

Many of these same speakers speak with intensity about the so-called Reagan deficits. There are many, many justifiable reasons to be supporting new spending programs, whether they are for education, whether they are an antidrug activity, whether it is for prenatal care, or whether it is all of these very, very seductive issues. This is another one. But the question is whether we will be financially responsible, fiscally responsible to the taxpayers of this country and to our children and their children.

□ 1550

We hear that often on the floor, from the same people who speak out now and say don't worry about the deficit. Spend more. Start a new spending program.

Mr. Speaker, we have to draw the line. We must be serious about these deficits. This is the first chink in the armor, to move forward with a very appealing new spending program.

Let us keep the budget agreement. It is not going to get us back to a balanced budget, but it at least will move us in that direction, and let us be fiscally responsible for the taxpayers of this country.

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] to close debate on this side.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, this morning we met with the President of the United States to congratulate him for the arms control proposal he made Friday night. I urged him to go further—as we surely can—in this new world of greatly reduced instability and anxiety.

America's role as the peacekeeper in the last half of the 20th century will be much heralded and studied by historians. But this much is clear: Our unstinting acts of protection for freedom were also acts of sacrifice. As we rebuilt our weaponry, our competitors rebuilt themselves economically. We did not. And now we are in a recession.

The great casualties of the 1980's will be remembered as communism, whose passing we do not lament, and the American standard of living, whose future we must revive.

As we seek to define our future, we must ask the President this question: Where do working Americans fit in your new world order?

While he extends his hand outward to help those in need overseas, he slams it down on working families here at home.

He stops us from cutting their taxes, and insists we raise taxes on the middle class.

He stops us from helping them find health care.

He stops us from helping them send their kids to college.

And, with one stroke of his pen, the President's hand will stop us from providing them unemployment benefits when the Republican recession cost them their jobs.

This is the truth: Working Americans have no place in the President's new world order.

This morning the President's allies will make a superficial argument about a dividing line between Democrats and Republicans, between growth and recession, efficiency and compassion. But this is really an argument between reality and denial.

For the Republicans want to get us out of this recession by reenacting the very policies that sent this economony plummeting into recession.

Worse, they want to adopt these failed policies—such as cutting the captial gains tax rate for the rich—instead of helping the unemployed as they look for work. They are asking for more of the same. But I ask: Can we afford more of the same?

Can we afford more of the same when the economy has grown only 0.7 percent since President Bush took office?

Can we afford more of the same when the average person has $350 less to spend than he did in January of 1989?

Can we afford more of the same when jobs in this country are disappearing at the rate of 9,400 per month?

Can we afford more of the same when new unemployment claims are surging to nearly half a million, when more than 2 million workers have exhausted their longterm benefits?

We cannot make the same mistakes in the 1990's we made in the 1980's. We have to change direction. We have to find a place for the American worker in the new world order. We have to learn these new lessons, and we have to remember some essential truths.

Unemployment compensation is not welfare; it is insurance, bought and paid for.

Unemployment compensation helps the economy recover from recession, because it restores the purchasing power of the unemployed.

Most of all, unemployment compensation is just: It permits workers who are looking for new jobs to feed their families after they have lost their old ones.

Our bill responds to their needs. And now we ask the President to do the same. Just as you have heeded the calls of the Egyptians, the Iraqis, the Kurds, and so many others—won't you now heed the calls of the American people?

This debate is not about unblemished veto records, it is about saving American lives.

It is not about welfare, it is about keeping faith with people who work. It is not about a false choice between growth and equity, it is the essence of growth with equity.

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI and Chairman DOWNEY have cut through the politics and rhetoric and asked us now for months to do the right thing for millions of unemployed Americans.

Now we must rise to the occasion, join their fight, and adopt this legislation. I urge support not just for this legislation but for the idea that Congress—if not the President—will take care of the American people because emergencies at home matter just as much as emergencies abroad.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today we are presented with the compromise reached by the Democrat-controlled conference between the two Houses on unemployment legislation. And, as I predicted last week, it is unacceptable to the President.

The bill contains a major repudiation of last year's budget agreement.

In that agreement, Congress and the President decided that for an emergency to be declared and spending to occur outside of the agreed-upon limits, both the President and Congress would independently have to declare such an emergency.

This legislation takes away the right of the President to independently decide whether the spending in this legislation should be declared an emergency and does it for him.

Has the majority decided the budget deal no longer meets their partisan needs?

Will we now be faced with more legislation adding to our projected $350 billion deficit for 1992?

The majority knows its approach will be vetoed. Why do they persist in it?

I would like to remind my colleagues that Senator DOLE and I have presented both Houses with an alternative which the President says that he will sign.

This alternative provides 6 weeks of additional benefits for all States and up to 10 weeks for States with higher unemployment rates.

This alternative is completely paid for with a spectrum auction and additional debt collection measures. Therefore, it complies with the budget agreement requirement that new spending should be offset.

We have worked on technical changes to the bill since it was introduced last week to ensure that the offsets match up with the spending.

Most importantly, this alternative does not add to the deficit and does not saddle future generations with more debt.

I must oppose the costly, Democrat proposal presented to us today. I hope that we can quickly move this process forward to consideration of the Dole-Michel-Solomon proposal—so that the unemployed may receive the added benefits they deserve.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, President Bush, at the 1988 convention said that his Presidency would produce 30 million new jobs. Nearly 3 years into his term, George Bush has created fewer jobs than any other President since the Great Depression.

It is hard to fathom how Republican Members can summon the courage to vote today against extending unemployment insurance when we just learned that the average income for American families fell almost 2 percent last year. At a time when the number of Americans in poverty has increased for the first time since 1983.

When will the Republicans and their President face up to the fact that this recession is not over and it's not going to be over anytime soon? When will their professed compassion for millions of struggling American families be matched by their actions here on the House floor?

Republicans who oppose this measure, especially those who switch their votes to oppose it, will live with this vote for a long time to come. Their constituents will know that in the most dire of economic time that their families have known, their Member of Congress voted against extending a hand to help.

Republicans—a dedicated, domestic agenda-oriented party or a party whose President's vision of a new world order doesn't include a plan to dig Americans out of the recession here at home?

Today we'll have more evidence to make that call.

Mr. Speaker, one of my Vacaville, CA, constituents called me to say that "It's about time we did something for the people of this country and stopped sending all our money overseas."

And Mr. Phillips, a Woodland, CA, resident wrote:

> I feel like an old dishrag left on the clothesline just to blow in the breeze. I am one of those people who is unemployed and has run out of benefits at the end of my 26 weeks and have not found work yet. So, what do I do? Oh yeah, I know about the extended benefits legislation that was passed and signed by George Bush and that George will not implement. I'm sorry, Vic, but your good intentions just don't spend to well at the local grocery store. I need those extended benefits.
>
> You Congressman and Congresswomen need to figure a way to convince Mr. Bush that he and you need to concentrate on the problems facing the workers of this country, instead of worrying about sending money all over the world to bail out other governments' failures. You folks have enough economic failures right here at home to keep you busy fixing for a long time. I'm not impressed by Mr. Bush's supposed accomplishments in the world arena, although he seems to be pretty proud of himself.

Once more, the words of a constituent cut through to the heart of the issue. These people are only 2 of the nearly 9 million Americans who remain out of work, in spite of the wishful forecasting of the current administration. Although President Bush promised to create 30 million new jobs during the 8 years he hoped to spend in the White House, there are now 300,000 fewer jobs in America than there were when President Bush took office. Contrary to his campaign promises of economic growth and prosperity, President Bush has led us into economic decline.

And, even though 1 in 7 jobless Americans lives in California, the 300,000 unemployed Californians who exhausted their State benefits through July are still ineligible for extended benefits. As a result, my constituent received his last unemployment compensation check in August. His benefits are now exhausted, as he joins the ranks of middle class Americans who are slowly slipping into poverty.

We must offer aid and relief to the millions of American workers who, like Mr. Phillips, have lost their jobs in this sluggish economy.

We cannot turn our backs on American workers as they attempt to dig their way out of this Republican recession.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on S. 1722, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act, which would offer an extension of benefits to jobless American workers.

Little has changed since I spoke over 1 month ago in support of extending benefits. The administration has continued to send aid overseas, while characterizing the helping hand we are extending to our own citizens as "garbage." The unemployment picture in my State of Michigan has worsened, with seven more WARN notices in September, and hundreds of families in my district slipping off the unemployment rosters and through the cracks in the system. Mr. Chairman, I hear from people in my district every day regarding this extension, people who have lost their homes, their hope, and their faith in their Government's ability to offer them any kind of relief.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on S. 1722 is not perfect. I would have preferred to make the permanent changes that our unemployment benefits system so desperately needs, rather than just passing a temporary measure until July 4, 1992. I also would have like to have paid for this measure by increasing the Federal unemployment taxable wage base, rather than putting it on a credit card.

I support the agreement before us today because it will provide the additional benefits my constituents so badly need. In addition to the regular 26 weeks of benefits currently available, this legislation will offer 7, 13, or 20 more weeks of help, depending on the jobless rate in each State. This agreement also makes benefits after March 1, 1991, and for people who live in States like Michigan, where the unemployment rate was at least 6 percent in August or September. S. 1722 will also make workers in all other States who have already exhausted their benefits eligible for at least 7 more weeks of aid.

Mr. Speaker, when the working people of this country turn to us for help, they deserve more than empty promises. When they ask for a hand, they deserve better than a veto message. We must act, and we must act now. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report and the extension of unemployment benefits.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of the conference report, and I request permission to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, here we are again trying to decide what will become of America's unemployed, and again, our choices aren't particularly pleasant, thanks to the gag rule on the part of the majority party.

The question put to us is as follows: Do we support legislation which provides the unemployed with transient relief and mortgages their future in the process, or do we ignore them entirely? And however the majority party may try to dress the issue up, that is the issue.

We can provide our unemployed constituents with a brief relief from the hardships they face, and by the way, unlike most Members of this House, these hardships aren't something I've read about; they're something I've lived. But the Democrats have seen to it that we cannot do this without increasing Government borrowing, worsening the deficit, slowing the economy, and hurting these people's chances of reemployment.

Or we can vote against this program and hope that someday, somehow, the majority will give us a chance to pass something better. If I believed, even for a minute, that this debate was about helping unemployed people, I'd probably hold out and see if this would happen. But it is increasingly obvious that there is no wish on the part of the proponents of this bill to pass legislation that the President might sign.

Senator DOLE provided us with a means whereby we could help our constituents without violating the budget agreement. This idea so offends the majority that they will not allow it to be discussed. Congressman GINGRICH wants us to modify the Tax Code in order to create jobs and reduce unemployment. However, the Democrats respond that in a discussion of unemployment, job creation is irrelevant.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot ignore the needs of my constituents waiting for the majority to let us discuss a better package. I have to vote for anything which might help the unemployed people in my district, even if it is just a political ploy. However, it offends me that these people's plight is being played as a political card, and that their welfare is a secondary consideration in this discussion.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure.

This is our second attempt at providing relief to millions of Americans who have been ravaged by the recession, and I hope it will not meet again with Presidential resistance.

I am amazed when I hear people proclaim that the recession is over and the economy rebounding. They argue that we don't need to spend money to help the jobless because everything is sorting itself out on its own.

I don't know what balance sheet they are looking at, but they're not looking at the world around them. Maybe our economy is on the mend—I pray in fact that it is. But right now, there are nearly 9 million Americans without jobs.

There are families who have been forced into the street for lack of jobs and assistance. And in the short month and a half since we first tried to extend jobless benefits, an estimated 300,000 more Americans lost their jobs.

My own home State of Michigan has suffered the second worst decline in the Nation. And, as winter approaches, there are an estimated 170,000 people there whose jobless benefits are about to expire.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this Congress for trying so hard to help those who have suffered so badly in this recession, and I echo the pleas of my colleagues for President Bush to join us in this effort.

The President has been considering foreign aid to Russia and Eastern Europe, where people face hardships because of political and economic turmoil.

But I would urge him, while he considers this foreign aid, to also remember the nearly 9 million Americans here at home who face equal hardship and despair.

For their sakes, for the sake of their families, I urge him to bring his focus back home.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

The unemployment rate in many western Pennsylvania counties is unfortunately far above the national average. In fact, two of the counties I represent have seen their unemployment rates top 15 percent in recent months.

In rural areas like Pennsylvania's 23d Congressional District, job opportunities are limited. A job that is permanently eliminated by a plant closure or a merger is not easily or quickly replaced.

In other words, the idea that these unemployed workers will have no problem finding work as the economy picks up is simply not applicable in many parts of rural America.

To give you an example from my own district, North American Philips manufactured lightbulbs in my hometown for decades. This past spring, the company closed its Warren operation and 190 people were suddenly out of work. Their unemployment benefits are now almost exhausted. The real rub is that because of the lingering recession new job opportunities to make up for this plant closing have not emerged. The 130,000 square foot facility where these people used to work remains empty. Company representatives and local economic development officers are exploring options to install a new enterprise in the plant, but it is not likely to be filled anytime soon.

Many families saw their children return to school last month. That means new shoes at the very least. Winter will be here soon. In the northeast, that means heating bills. It also means flu season and doctor bills. To a good many Pennsylvania families on the verge of exhausting their benefits, the legislation before us today offers their only hope. I urge an aye vote.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the conference report on S. 1722, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a recession. The recovery that the President has promised the Nation has failed to show. For the third quarter in a row, the Nation's gross national product has declined; 8.5 million hard-working Americans are without jobs, and with little prospect for finding new ones any time soon.

While the President has put in long hours on his foreign policy agenda, he has forgotten about the United States. In the 3 years that the President has been in office, the total number of Americans working has decreased. The American economy, suffering from neglect, has slipped into recession, a recession that gives no indication of ending any time soon. The President has clearly indicated that he will do nothing to help American workers; if this is truly the case, then we here in Congress must act.

The measure before us is a modest one. It is the very least that we can do. As the recession drags on more than 2 million Americans have had their unemployment benefits expire, and with each delay in passage the number increases.

In New York State the numbers are frightening. With an unemployment rate of 7.5 percent, over 200,000 unemployed workers have exhausted their benefits. Nearly half of these workers live in my home of New York City,

where, in August alone, more than 16,000 workers had their benefits expire, and there is no reason to expect that the numbers for September, to be released in a matter of days, will be anything but a continuation of the current situation.

Mr. Speaker, the recession continues. With millions of Americans jobless through no fault of their own, with the prospect for new employment dim, and a Government that seems to say that it does not care about them, it is time to act. Let the President show his level of concern for American workers; we in the House will do what must be done, and will override his promised veto.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I can hardly believe that we are being asked by the minority to delay and deny unemployment benefits to the unfortunate working people of this Nation in order to promote another tax giveaway to the richest Americans.

Once again we are being fed the typical line about capital gains tax cuts—it is apparently the panacea, the solution to every problem in America.

I wonder if there is any problem facing this Nation that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle think cannot be solved by lowering taxes on the richest Americans?

Lest you have forgotten, let me review a few facts for you about broad-based capital gains tax cuts.

More than any other policy idea, broad-based capital gains tax cuts symbolize the idea of trickle-down economics. Middle America is rightfully wary of this formulation for improving their lives after losing economic ground for the last decade.

In 1988, for example, capital gains income made up 25 percent of the income of the richest 1 percent of U.S. households in 1988. These are the people that would reap the greatest benefits from the proposed amendment. Households earning more than $200,000 would receive 66 percent of the benefits.

But for 90 percent of the population, from the very poor to the middle income to the upper-middle income, capital gains contributes less than 1 percent of their income.

This is a typical approach to solving problems for many Republicans.

There are ways to get tax breaks directly to those who need it most, without reliance on trickle down. Expanding use of IRA's to include education and downpayments is one idea many Democrats have been pushing.

We are also working on a middle-income tax relief plan that will put money in the pockets of the millions of working families that have lost ground in the last decade.

Finally, I will soon be introducing, along with my colleague, Mr. MATSUI, a targeted capital gains tax cut that encourages new investment and new job creation; it does not give a windfall to old investments as the minority whip's plan would do. Moreover, our plan targets smaller businesses, those that have the most difficulty in gaining access to traditional sources of capital.

Mr. Speaker, we have gone months without action while our unemployed workers suffer. The President has cynically refused to act on the last bill we sent him, though he signed it into law. Let us reject these delaying tactics and support final passage of the unemployment benefits bill, today.

Our unemployed need help now. It is time to stop playing politics. It is time to stop looking for fig leaves for a budget agreement that has become woefully out of date, especially when working men and women are in such pain now.

We must pass this bill, and we must urge the President to sign it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, working Americans need our help and they need it now. Despite the administration's claim that the recession ended in April, long-term unemployment continues to rise rapidly. Many people have reached the end of their unemployment benefits and many others face that problem in the near future.

The President claims that he has a domestic agenda. He also claimed, when he was nominated for President, that he would create 30 million new jobs during 8 years in the White House. The reality is that there are now 300,000 fewer jobs in America than when George Bush took office.

At a time when there are no new jobs being developed and many people are losing their current ones, the President refuses to provide needed unemployment benefits to American workers. We in Congress have a chance today to help American workers. The agreement we are considering would make unemployment benefits available for up to 20 additional weeks, depending on the unemployment rate in the State. The bill would also provide at least 7 additional weeks of benefits to all workers who have exhausted their benefits.

Until the President figures out how to jump start our ailing economy, the least he can do is provide unemployment benefits to people who are suffering from his policies. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report and to work to override the President's expected veto of this important bill.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, once again the Congress is going to send the President a bill to extend jobless benefits for those unemployed whose benefits have run dry, and once again President Bush has threatened to veto this, as he would put it, "garbage." Mr. Speaker, I'm still trying to figure out what we have to do to get some relief for the working men and women of this country. Maybe the Seventh District of Illinois should secede from the Union and then we'll get a little bit of the President's attention.

The President claims that this bill is not necessary because we are on the road to a robust economic expansion. And anyway, there are plenty of jobs out there if someone really wants to work. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a little difficult to raise a family on the money earned peddling slurpies at the local 7-Eleven.

I am glad to see the President is getting out around the country a little more. What a beautiful scene that was with the President in front of the Grand Canyon. Unfortunately, we don't have very many attractive photo opportunities in my district these days. What we do have, Mr. Speaker, are a lot of people who are down on their luck and having difficulty buying in to the President's economic plan.

The great recovery of 1991 has yet to reach inner-city Chicago. In fact, unemployment is running over 60 percent in some pockets of my district. And, while the administration keeps singing its song of economic expansion, the unemployment lines continue to snake their way out the doors of the local benefit offices and down the street.

Mr. Speaker, let's forget about the budget agreement, and economic indicators, and housing starts, and statistics for a moment. What this issue boils down to is a matter of simple compassion for those working men and women who have put their faith, and their tax dollars, into the unemployment system in the hope that it would be there for them in their time of need.

S. 1722 would allow up to 20 weeks of extended unemployment compensation for those long-term unemployed whose benefits have run out. We cannot simply pass over these Americans in the name of preserving the budget agreement. While the need to keep last year's budget accord intact is important, it is, after all, just a scrap of paper. Just a scrap of paper that sits on a shelf collecting dust. Those unemployed Americans and their families, however, are living, breathing flesh and blood. We did it for the Kurds, and the Israelis, and the Bangladeshis. Sometimes, you just have to break the rules, Mr. Speaker, and I'd say now is the time. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference agreement to S. 1722 which extends unemployment benefits to those who are experiencing economic hard times.

While I still do not agree fully with the procedures involved with passing this bill, I feel under this conference agreement we are moving in the right direction. I feel it is important to extend these benefits, but only through this recession cycle.

Let me briefly describe what S. 1722 would do. The legislation is a temporary program with three tiers of benefits beyond the regular 26 weeks of benefits. A State which is experiencing a total unemployment rate of 8 percent or greater would receive 20 additional weeks of benefits. A State whose total unemployment rate is at least 7 percent would receive an additional 13 weeks of benefits. All other States will receive an additional 7 weeks of benefits. This legislation would become effective from October 6, 1991, to July 4, 1992, and it would reach back to qualify those who have exhausted benefits since March 1, 1991. The legislation goes on to allow ex-servicemembers the same 1-week wait and 26 weeks of regular benefits as civilians receive.

Mr. Chairman, many people in my State of Connecticut and my Fifth Congressional District have been hit hard by this economic downturn. I hear many stories of how my constituents are being adversely impacted.

For instance, a single mother who had a promising career is laid off and now has to make the choice between a mortgage payment and food for her children. A small businessman who has been a good credit risk and who makes payments cannot get a needed loan to buy new equipment. These are the individual problems people face each day in my community. We in Congress must make it our responsibility to take the lead and look to find legislative solutions for these adversities.

Extension of jobless benefits is a temporary, but critical, step to allow more opportunities to

find work. But we must not allow this to become a bandaid approach. This extension is only part of the solution. It is vital that we look toward the future and bring legislation to this floor which will be a catalyst to the economy and create jobs. We must plant the economic seeds now to generate real long-term growth and opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement and urge my colleagues to join me and initiate legislation to spur our economy and alleviate the unemployment dilemma.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 300, nays 118, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

YEAS—300

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Camp
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Jacobs
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McGrath
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moody
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Pallone
Panetta
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Pease
Pelosi
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Rahall
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Washington
Waxman
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NAYS—118

Allard
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Billirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Broomfield
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Campbell (CA)
Chandler
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Cox (CA)
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Gallegly
Gingrich
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Hall (TX)
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hobson
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Johnson (TX)
Kasich
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lowery (CA)
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McEwen
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Montgomery
Moorhead
Nichols
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Penny
Petri
Porter
Quillen
Ramstad
Rhodes
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Roth
Santorum
Sarpalius
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Skeen
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Wolf
Wylie
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—14

Crane
Derrick
Dymally
Engel
Ford (TN)
Holloway
Hopkins
Kaptur
McCloskey
Myers
Olin
Payne (VA)
Rangel
Waters

□ 1618

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I unavoidably missed rollcall vote 285, the conference report on the extension of unemployment benefits. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

I spoke in favor of this bill on the floor just before the vote, and last week I voted for it as well. If the President should veto this bill, I will vote to override his veto.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district in Los Angeles. Unfortunately, I missed three rollcall votes. For the record, I would like to state that, had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall vote 283—"aye."
Rollcall vote 284—"aye."
Rollcall vote 285—"aye."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3039, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1991

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (H. Rept. No. 102-230) on the resolution (H. Res. 231) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3039) to reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2508, INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ACT OF 1991, AND AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF SUCH CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (H. Rept. No. 102-231) on the resolution (H. Res. 232) waiving all points of order against the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2508) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to rewrite the authorities of that act in order to establish more effective assistance programs and eliminate obsolete and inconsistent provisions, to amend the Arms Export Control Act and to redesignate that act as the Defense Trade and Export Control Act, to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes, and against the consideration of such conference report, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1620

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2608, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight, Tuesday, October 1, 1991, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 2608) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2622, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight, Tuesday, October 1, 1991, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 2622) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, on September 16 I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes 258, 259, and 260. Today my plane was late and I missed the vote on rollcall vote 283. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on all of those rollcall votes.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3334

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 3334.

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

There was no objection.

NOTIFYING MEMBERS OF PLANS OF COMMITTEE ON RULES WITH RESPECT TO H.R. 3371, OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1991

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to notify Members of the Rules Committee's plans with respect to H.R. 3371, the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1991.

The Rules Committee plans to meet Thursday, October 10, to take testimony on the bill. To assure fair consideration, the Rules Committee is considering a rule that may structure offering of amendments.

Mr. Speaker, any Member who contemplates offering an amendment to H.R. 3371 should submit 55 copies of the amendment by 5 p.m. on next Monday, October 7. The committee offices are in H-312 in the Capitol.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the Judiciary Committee will make available in their offices advance copies of the bill to Members and staff preparing amendments. An advance copy will be available as early as Thursday, October 3.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a "Dear Colleague" letter to all offices explaining our intentions on this bill. We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in our effort to be fair and orderly in granting a rule.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have not seen a letter or a request for a rule. Has there been one yet? If so, what kind of rule is being asked for?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, we have not received it. We have been notified that a rule will be forthcoming.

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will yield further, our committee will take it up on Thursday, October 10. And when did the amendments have to be in, filed?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Monday, October 7.

Mr. SOLOMON. Monday, October 7?

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for letting us know.

CORRECTING ENROLLMENT OF S. 868, VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1991

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make technical corrections in the enrollment of the bill S. 868, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I do so to yield to our distinguished chairman for a brief explanation of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. STUMP. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this concurrent resolution is to make purely technical corrections in S. 868 as passed by the Senate on August 2 and the House on September 16. The references in that bill to sections of title XXXVIII, United States Code, do not reflect the changes made in the numbering of title XXXVIII sections by Public Law 102-83, which was signed into law on August 6, 1991. This resolution would update the bill in order to make the necessary corrections in those references.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 63

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring,) That, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 868), to amend title 10, United States Code, and title 38, United States Code, to improve the educational assistance benefits for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who served on active duty during the Persian Gulf War, to improve and clarify the eligibility of certain veterans for employment and training assistance, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Senate shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 2(a), strike out "section 1413" and insert "section 3013".

(2) In section 2(b)(1), strike out "section 1631(a)" and insert "section 3231(a)".

(3) In section 2(b)(2), strike out "section 1631(a)(2)" and insert "section 3231(a)(2)".

(4) In section 2(c), strike out "section 1711(a)" and insert "section 3511(a)".

(5) In section 4, strike out "section 2014(b)(2)(A)(i)" and insert "section 4214(b)(2)(A)(i)".

(6) In section 5, strike out "section 2011(f)" and insert "section 4211(4)".

(7) In section 6, strike out "section 1780(a)" and insert "section 3680(a)".

(8) strike out "section 1795" each place it appears and insert "section 3695".

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter on Senate Concurrent Resolution 63, the Senate concurrent resolution just concurred in.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 30, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House at 2:30 p.m. on Monday, September 30, 1991 and said to contain a message from the President on Budget Authority Deferrals in accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

DEFERRALS OF CERTAIN BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 102–143)

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 Monday, September 30, 1991, at page S 13975.)

□ 1630

VACATING SPECIAL ORDER AND GRANTING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate my 60-minute special order this evening in lieu of a 5-minute special order forthwith.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO MILES DAVIS

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, on Saturday one of the great musicians of the 20th century passed away. I am talking about Miles Davis, the trumpet player, composer, and teacher.

Miles Davis probably had a greater influence on contemporary American music in this century than anyone. Certainly his innovations, his constantly changing styles, have had a profound influence on American musical culture. America is really the world leader in musical culture, and in that sense Miles Davis was a world leader as well.

I would hope that Members of this body could join me on Wednesday evening after the conclusion of House business for a special order taken on behalf of Miles Davis to call attention to the tremendous contributions that he made to the United States of America and to music in this century.

[From the (Allentown, PA) Morning Call, Sept. 29, 1991]

JAZZ LEGEND MILES DAVIS DIES AT 65

PNEUMONIA AMONG CAUSES OF FAMED TRUMPETER'S DEATH

(From Call News Services)

SANTA MONICA, Calif.—Miles Davis, one of America's finest jazz trumpeters and the most consistent trendsetter in jazz history, died yesterday. He was 65.

Davis died of pneumonia, respiratory failure and stroke, Dr. Jeff Harris said in a statement read by Pat Kirk of St. John's Hospital and Health Center, where Davis was admitted earlier this month.

Davis was the most famous trumpeter in his generation, in the line that stretched from Louis Armstrong to Dizzy Gillespie to Wynton Marsalis.

He was the innovator of more distinct styles than any other jazz musician. He pioneered in cool jazz, hard bop, modal playing, free-form explorations and use of electronics.

"You can really say he turned the whole jazz world around," said Leonard Feather, a longtime friend and author of "The Encyclopedia of Jazz."

"He just had a guiding principle: Move ahead . . . Don't do what you were doing yesterday," Feather said.

"He played some of the most musical passages ever played on the trumpet, some of the most beautiful, intervals you just don't hear any more," said trumpeter Clark Terry, who took Davis to jam sessions in St. Louis when Davis was a teen-ager.

"He seemed to be able to turn anything into something good," said drummer Max Roach, a long-time friend. "He was musically one of the restless ones, constantly seeking."

He was an astounding spotter and developer of talent, providing the springboard that brought many players to prominence. Tony Williams was just 18 when Davis hired him in 1963; Herbie Hancock was 23 when he joined the same year.

Davis has the respect and admiration of musicians but every time he changed direction his audience divided between loyal and disenchanted listeners. He ignored them.

In his 1989 autobiography, "Miles," he wrote: "To be and stay a great musician you've got to always be open to what's new, what's happening at the moment. You have to be able to absorb it if you're going to continue to grow and communicate your music."

Davis was a fascinating figure because of his enigmatic personality, seemingly remote and arrogant; his thin body and striking face; his angry statements about white people though he often hired white musicians; his whispery, raspy voice—which came after he yelled at somebody following 1956 surgery to remove polyps on his vocal cords.

"A lot of people thought he was a salty, cool cat," Terry said. "He was totally a real pussycat. Once you got past that facade of 'Don't touch me, get away from me,' he was a pussycat."

Davis was plagued by illness much of his life, at various times battling diabetes, pneumonia, a stroke, and hip joint problems caused by sickle cell anemia. He broke both legs in an auto accident in 1972. He wrote in his autobiography that he overcame heroin addiction in the early '50s but continued to use cocaine until 1981.

Miles Dewey Davis III was born in Alton, Ill., on May 25, 1926, son of a dentist and a music teacher. When he was 2, the family moved to nearby East St. Louis, Ill.

He got his first trumpet from a family friend as a child and was playing professionally at age 15.

Davis moved to New York in 1944, at 18, to locate Dizzy Gillespie, one of his early trumpet heroes, and saxophonist Charlie Parker. When Gillespie left Parker's combo, Davis replaced him. He also attended the Juilliard School for a year.

In 1947, he began a long and successful relationship with Gil Evans, an arranger who knew how to provide a framework for Davis' distinctive sound.

In 1948 he left Parker and, looking for a lighter, subtler, tuneful sound in jazz, he established a nine-piece band, including Gerry Mulligan, Lee Konitz, John Lewis and Roach. They recorded "The Birth of the Cool."

That influential album ushered in cool jazz and set the stage for the chamber jazz that followed. It included Davis' best composition by that time, "Boplicity."

But when cool jazz became popular, Davis turned his back on it and surrounded himself with bebop players. He became the founder of hard bop.

In the 1950s he played spare jazz with all irrelevance purged. And he made records with lush orchestral settings, some of the earliest successful orchestral jazz.

In 1955 his sensational improvisations, lyrical and tonally pure, creating excitement without screaming, made him the hit of the Newport Jazz Festival.

He then created a groundbreaking quintet with drummer Philly Joe Jones, bassist Paul Chambers, pianist Red Garland and saxophonist John Coltrane. Saxophonist Cannonball Adderley later made it a sextet.

By 1959, he had tired of bop. He made records that used scales instead of chords as structure, which greatly influenced jazz of the 1960s.

In 1963, he brought in Williams on drums, Hancock on piano, Ron Carter on bass, and later added saxophonist Wayne Shorter. This combo, recording on electric instruments, became as influential as the 1955 quintet. Their "Bitches Brew," the album that sparked the jazz-rock or fusion of the 1970s, became Davis' best-selling album and brought jazz record sales out of the doldrums.

His trumpet played melodic improvisations or fragment bursts over electronic instru-

ments and rock-influenced rhythm, creating the climate for much of what followed in popular electronic music.

Davis' strength in early and middle years came from a singing tone—soft, rich, intimate, best in the middle register, his ability to put intensity and tension in the music and original rhythmic and melodic ideas. Later, he increasingly played in the upper register.

After 1968, the personnel in Davis' groups became less stable, because of his temperament and periods of inactivity. He didn't play at all between 1975 and 1980. He brought in some fine experimentalists, Chick Corea, Joe Zawinul, Dave Holland, John McLaughlin, Keith Jarrett, Airto Moreira, Billy Cobham and Jack De Johnette.

Many listeners weren't as thrilled by the musicians he used in the 1980s. And many didn't like his detachment from the audience during concerts, his refusal to acknowledge applause, going offstage between solos, pointing the trumpet at the floor and turning his back on the audience, not announcing musicians or titles.

"I play for myself and I play for musicians," was all that Davis would say publicly about his antics.

In August he was made a chevalier in the French Legion d'Honneur. Minister of Culture Jack Lang called him "the Picasso of jazz."

In what could well be an epitaph, Land said that Davis "has imposed his law on the world of show business; esthetic intransigence."

Davis married and divorced dancer Frances Taylor, singer Betty Mabry and actress Cicely Tyson. Survivors include a daughter, Cherly; sons, Gregory, Miles IV and Erin; brothers Vernon and Joseph; sister Dorothy Davis Wilbur; and four grandchildren.

Memorial services were being planned for New York and East St. Louis, Ill., Kirk said.

TRIBUTE TO BRIG. GEN. CLARA LEACH ADAMS-ENDER

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, Fort Belvoir is a large, sprawling Army base just across the river in Fairfax County. Fort Belvoir just got a brandnew commanding general.

General West was an exceptional leader, but there is something exceptional about this new commanding general. For one, this commanding general is an African-American, and for another, even more newsworthy, this commanding general is a woman, now the highest ranking woman in the U.S. Army.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the distinct pleasure of a visit from Brig. Gen. Clara Leach Adams-Ender, commanding general of U.S. Army Post Fort Belvoir and deputy commanding general of the Military District Washington.

General Adams-Ender is an extraordinary individual who can truly be considered as a trailblazer for women serving in the Armed Forces of our Nation. A graduate of the North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, she was commissioned as a 2d lieutenant in the U.S. Army Nurse Corps in 1961.

As a Nurse Corps officer she enjoyed a superior career, serving in various staff positions in the Medical Department of the Army and rising through the ranks in instructional and administrative billets. She found time to improve herself through pursuit of higher education by obtaining a masters in surgical nursing from the University of Minnesota and masters in Military Science from the prestigious U.S. Army Command and General Staff College. Her skills in both nursing and administration were recognized by her superiors when, in 1987, she was promoted to the rank of brigadier general and was selected as the Chief of the U.S. Army Nurse Corps.

As Chief of the Nurse Corps, she directed the efforts of over 20,000 Army nurses in the Active Duty, Guard, and Reserve and her efforts in coordinating the efforts of over 25,000 Army medical personnel stationed in theater during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm have been well-documented. Her leadership as Chief of the Army Nurse Corps resulted in her being awarded the Legion of Merit and the Distinguished Service Medal.

Her brilliant career did not end here—although by normal standards it should have. Because by law the Chief of the Army Nurse Corps is a 4-year tour of duty—with retirement the end result—General Adams-Ender was facing the end of a long and exemplary career after over 30 years service. But her expertise and leadership skills were of such quality that her retirement was put on hold for the good of the Army, and she was selected by (then) Army Chief of Staff Carl Vuono to command the U.S. Army Post at Fort Belvoir.

It is not unusual for any of the military services to promote individuals of exceptional ability to positions of greater authority. But for the U.S. Army to select—for the first time—a nurse to command one of their premier line facilities is a tribute to both the skills of General Adams-Ender and the wisdom of the U.S. Army.

General Adams-Ender is the best advertisement available that the U.S. Army is truly a place where one can "be all they can be." As we continue to debate the role of women in our military, we should hold out individuals like her—individuals who, when given the chance, can perform at the very highest levels of professionalism and dedication. I look forward to working with her in her role as commanding general at Fort Belvoir on issues of mutual importance to the U.S. Army and the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia.

GALLEGLY INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO STOP ILLEGAL ALIENS

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

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, America is a land of immigrants. Our proud cultural heritage and democratic traditions are the product of a rich blend of peoples gathering here from all over the world. In my native California, our way of life has been enhanced by the influx of Latinos, Asians, and other foreign immigrants who have settled there. The enactment of major immigration reforms in recent years attests to our continuing strong commitment to equal opportunity and our belief that newcomers legally entering our shores will benefit America's economic, social and cultural future.

Immigration, however, is not always a positive force for our country. In spite of improvements in the immigration law and stepped-up efforts to police the border and arrest undocumented aliens, the problem of illegal immigration is a serious one throughout southern California and the border States, as well as in many other areas throughout this country. After several years of decline, largely as a consequence of the ban on hiring illegal aliens and stiff penalties on employers who flout the provisions of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, the number of arrests of illegals is rising to the pre-1986 level of 1.8 million a year. INS officials have told me there may be as many as 3 million illegal aliens residing in southern California alone.

Many cities and towns are being overrun with immigrants, both legal and undocumented, who pose additional economic and law enforcement problems. Congregating groups of out-of-work immigrant day laborers seeking temporary or nonexistent jobs in suburban communities have created public disturbances, disrupted small businesses, jammed traffic and, in some instances, endangered the physical safety of women and children.

Many illegal aliens are involved in drug trafficking across the border and violent gang activities in our communities, posing a major threat to families and neighborhoods and straining the capacities of immigration authorities and local law enforcement. Other illegals place themselves on the welfare rolls, largely through the use of fraudulent documents, further burdening community facilities and depleting already strained county resources.

The illegal alien problem is essentially economic. If conditions of poverty were improved south of the border or jobs were not available in the United States, there probably would not be a crisis today in many States. Many of us in the Congress believe that the North American Free-Trade Agreement now being negotiated by the Bush administration will help to stimulate the economy of Mexico and improve United States trade with that country, thereby creating more jobs in both countries.

There is no question that the INS lacks the resources necessary to perform its job properly. Despite Federal budgetary constraints I do not understand the consistent opposition of many of my colleagues to providing adequate funding so that the Border Patrol can stop the flood of illegal aliens crossing our borders.

The easy availability of fake birth certificates, driver's licenses, Social Security cards and other documents contributes to this crisis, enabling millions of aliens to enter this country

illegally, to drop out of sight in many American cities and to steal jobs and benefits at the expense of citizen workers and taxpayers. In addition, some employers make no real effort to check documents, preferring instead to take advantage of cheap labor.

Finally, illegal aliens are able to obtain unemployment insurance and educational, medical and welfare assistance unlawfully—benefits and free services far more generous and more accessible here than in their native lands. Taking adequate care of their own legal residents is difficult enough for local communities and taxpayers, without the added burden of providing assistance to illegals.

Mr. Speaker, in order to address this difficult and complex issue, I am offering today a legislative package designed to tighten our immigration laws. The five bills I am introducing tackle five basic problem areas.

First, they will strengthen Federal resources by increasing Border Patrol manpower and training, stepping up wage and hour enforcement, adding Assistant U.S. Attorneys assigned to illegal alien cases, enhancing penalties for harboring, and promoting negotiations with our neighbors to stop the smuggling of illegals.

Second, they will crack down on document fraud by requiring secure new "green" cards and new Social Security cards only for those immigrants eligible for employment in the United States.

Third, they will provide needed assistance to employers by authorizing education programs on the law and simplifying their responsibilities by reducing and improving required identification documents.

Fourth, they will cut off welfare and other benefits to illegal aliens.

And finally, they will discourage illegal day laborers by permitting the impoundment of vehicles used in the transportation of illegals for employment purposes.

Let me describe my bills in greater detail.

First, the Immigration Document Fraud Prevention Act of 1991 would require new counterfeit-resistant and tamper-proof registration and identification cards to be issued to all permanent resident aliens eligible to work in the United States. Replacing the old "green" cards, these cards must be renewed every 5 years upon surrendering the old cards and payment of a $35 user fee. The card must contain the bearer's photograph or other identifying information.

Under this bill the Justice Department, in conjunction with the Labor Department, the Small Business Administration and the Internal Revenue Service, would provide a nationwide program to educate employers on the uses of the new cards and their legal responsibilities.

The penalty for immigration fraud would increase from 5 to 10 years' imprisonment, plus fines.

The Attorney General, working with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, would conduct a demonstration project to determine the feasibility and effectiveness of a computerized call-in worker verification system for employers.

Second, the Improved Immigration Law Enforcement Act of 1991 would strengthen the Border Patrol by increasing the positions from about 3,800 at present to 6,600 by 1993 and by increasing funding for equipment and support services and improving inservice training.

The bill would strengthen enforcement of the wage and hour laws by adding 250 positions in the Labor Department's Wage and Hour Division assigned to areas of high concentration of undocumented aliens.

The penalty for harboring illegal aliens would be increased from 5 to 10 years in prison and/or fines.

The bill would also direct the Attorney General and the Secretary of State to undertake negotiations with our neighboring countries to establish programs to stop the illegal smuggling of undocumented aliens into the United States.

Third, the Employer Sanctions Improvements Act of 1991 would require new tamper-proof Social Security cards for immigrants authorized to work in the United States on a temporary basis only. The new cards would be provided upon application, proof of identity, verification of status and payment of a $25 user fee. The new card is not to be considered a national identity card and would only be presented to verify an alien's work eligibility.

Under the bill the Justice Department, working with the Department of Labor, the Small Business Administration, and the IRS, would conduct a nationwide program to educate employers on the new card's uses and their legal responsibilities.

Fourth, the fourth bill would prohibit giving any Federal benefits, including unemployment and welfare, to illegal aliens. An almost identical bill has been introduced in the other body by Mr. EXON of Nebraska.

A study by the Center for Immigration Studies estimates that U.S. taxpayers paid at least $5.4 billion in direct benefits in 1990 for illegal aliens nationwide. That study did not even include such abused government programs as Social Security, Medicare, food stamps, and unemployment compensation. Nor did it include the extra costs for police, fire, courts, parks, and transportation services that are spent on illegal aliens. When those major costs are included, the total bill to the taxpayers skyrockets.

In Los Angeles County alone, the estimated net cost of illegal aliens rose by almost $70 million during the past 2 years to $276.7 million—a 34-percent increase largely caused by lax enforcement of employer sanctions, the lack of adequate forces to patrol our borders, and the other factors I have tried to address in this legislation.

Fifth, the Illegal Alien Transportation Prevention Act of 1991 would add language to current law to prohibit the transportation of illegal aliens for purposes of employment by anyone with the knowledge or reckless disregard of the fact that the alien is in this country in violation of the law and cannot be hired legally. This proposal will help to stop the widespread problem created by illegals who congregate in California communities such as Agoura Hills and Santa Clarita looking for day work who are picked up and dropped off at various locations by suburban residents and contractors seeking temporary cheap labor.

A brief word about the costs of this legislation. I believe that the new tamper-proof registration and identification cards and Social Security cards will be paid for largely through user fees of $35 and $25 respectively. I estimate that employer education will cost around $5 million and the additional personnel and inservice training programs for the Border Patrol will cost slightly in excess of $50 million for fiscal year 1993. However, I also believe that the problems created by illegal aliens are of such magnitude that the expenditure of Federal funds is justified. Moreover, the savings that should be realized from enactment of these bills, especially the costs of police, housing, education, health care and other services, unemployment compensation, and welfare benefits that are imposed on hard-pressed government at all levels, should more than pay for the measures I am proposing.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the INS, at my urging, has established a task force in my district of agents who will target for investigation both illegal aliens seeking employment and the homeowners and small contractors who routinely hire them.

While such a task force will help to eliminate impromptu job centers for illegal day laborers in many areas and reduce tensions between unemployed legal immigrants legitimately seeking work and the communities, much more must be done to combat the increasing problem of illegal immigration and illegal aliens. I believe that my five bills will help to alleviate the crisis in California and elsewhere. I hope that the House will take prompt action and pass this legislation.

THE REALITY OF ABORTION

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, about 10 days ago I came to the well of the House with a guest article or editorial by a southern California doctor named Dr. Flesh, a rather unusual name for a doctor of medicine. He had been an abortionist for years and had done abortions up through the second trimester. To use Supreme Court terminology, that would be the 4th, 5th, and 6th months of pregnancy.

I said there had been a furor at the Los Angeles Times in the editorial office because combined with his very thoughtful article as to why he would no longer do any abortions of any kind whatsoever because he wanted to go back to practicing his Jewish faith in good conscience, they had put a picture with this article of a 4½-month fetus, looking for all the world like a growing baby in the mother's womb. This had caused great consternation, both the guest editorial by Dr. Flesh and the fact that according to some people in the L.A. Times offices, they said that this adds insult to injury to show this picture.

Well, last week I did not have the opportunity on the floor to show the cover of Time magazine, dated September 30, that is yesterday, but we all know that the news magazines, except for Aviation Week, date their maga-

zines 1 week ahead to keep them current on the newsstands; so there is a new provocative Time magazine cover about the beginning of the end of nuclear confrontation between the world's two superpowers. So this is a week old and you will not see it on the stands, but this is the September 30, yesterday's date.

It says, "Bush's Shoving Match With Israel," that is the small title above the Time banner.

Then it says, "How a Dazzling Array of Medical Breakthroughs Has Made Curing Infertility More Than Just a Dream."

There is a picture, almost an identical picture, the way we use poor unprofessional camera coverage on this House floor, Mr. Speaker, both planning an empty Chamber when we know a million and a half people are watching and bad camera work when we have charts and graphs up here, to satisfy the desires of two Speakers ago to cripple the distinguished Member, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] who will be following me with a special order. Stay tuned. So I have to hold this in real close to my face.

Do you see that, America?

Do you see that, Mr. Speaker?

Do you see that, any people in the Chamber here? Looks like a human being, does it not?

Do you know why this little 4½-month-old fetus looks like a human being sucking its thumb? Do you know why it looks like a human being? Because it is a human being, because if you believe in God, the soul is probably already there, meaning God has ordained into existence, with the parents in cooperation with God either willingly or unwillingly to create a human being with an immortal soul.

Take a look at that, I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE]. Look at that human being on the cover of Time magazine.

For eternity this child's immortal nongenderized soul is brought into existence, sucking its thumb. The heart has been beating since day 18 to 20. The brain waves have been showing since day 40, and that little human being—are you listening, SUSAN MOLINARI, if anybody in SUSIE MOLINARI's office is watching, call her to the television, Mr. Speaker, so she can see this. The same in TOMMY CAMPBELL's office, one of our California freshmen.

Look at this. That is a human being, TOM, SUSIE. There it is, a real human being sucking its thumb, and we kill this baby in that month, the next month and the next month and the next month, the next month and the next month, right up to the ninth month, especially in Wichita, KS, if ex-Navy pilot, Dr. Killer Tiller, has anything to say about it. You heard it here in this well. He is going to give up doing abortions. He does not like the grief, he told another Member of Congress, but he does not want to give it up right away. He will kill a few more of these for 3 or 4 months before he gives up the practice, so that the pro-life rescuers will not get credit for Dr. George Killer Tiller's giving up his two abortuaries in Wichita where he specializes in killing 5-, 6-, 7-, 8-, and 9-month pregnancies that look at lot more developed than this little fetus infant sucking its thumb, alive and healthy in its mother's womb.

Remember, and I will close on this, Mr. Speaker, that what medical researchers who are into Frankenstein fetal research, what they want are not spontaneous, that is, what we call miscarriages, we lay people. They want perfect little persons, perfect fetuses, and the more in development, the more they are beyond this image into the fifth, seventh, eighth, and ninth month, the more they want to abort those little fetuses to get at their bone marrow, to spin down their livers into a puree to inject into people with no hope of success, since they never saved anyone with that process at Columbia or UCLA. That is what we are up against in America, and we are not changing our Republican Convention platform next year, Mr. Speaker, not if this Member has anything to do about it.

THE DEFENSE MANUFACTURING AND CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HORN. Mr. Speaker, our manufacturing sector continues to lose jobs. Worker productivity remains constant. Our trade imbalance soars. In the meantime, our international competitors continue their aggressive efforts—often assisted by their governments—to move forward in high-technology industries. We must stop getting in the way of our businesses and industry and move forward with constructive measures to develop critical technologies.

We as a nation have excelled in expanding the frontiers of science. But we have fallen behind in applying these scientific discoveries to consumer products and to increasing industrial efficiency and productivity. Because of this, our international competitiveness has suffered.

Last week, I introduced the Defense Manufacturing and Critical Technologies Act of 1991. This represents a first step toward closing the gap between us and our competitors in the manufacturing sector. It will strengthen manufacturing technology in defense-related industries by establishing a broad manufacturing extension program to aid small- and medium-sized businesses.

It also will help us to retain and augment our position in the 22 critical technologies as essential to advanced technology in the 1990's and the 21st century. These technologies, identified by the Office of Science and Technology Policy, represent the cutting edge of high-technology areas from aerospace to computers to biotechnology. Critical technology partnerships and application centers will help to secure our ability to utilize high technologies. In addition to large companies, small- and medium-sized firms must be able to determine which high-technology discoveries are available to help their firms become more efficient or competitive.

The time to act on this is now. During the past decade or more we have lost the consumer electronics market to Japan. VCR's, walkmen, stereo components, and televisions represent inventions discovered in America, but manufactured elsewhere. Our basic manufacturing industries have likewise been allowed to decay. This legislation will provide industries with the help they need to develop American inventions into marketable products here, where our businesses can reap the profits of these inventions and our workers can find productive good paying jobs. We cannot afford to lose more products invented here, and the markets and profits that go with manufacturing them, to our international competitors. Our future prosperity and standard of living depend on producing our own. In addition, our national security and foreign policy independence rely on our ability to manufacture critical weapons components within our borders. We must ensure that we are able to supply our defense needs here.

With this legislation, our Nation can regain its world leadership in advanced technology and essential manufacturing. To do nothing is to write off our Nation's, and our children's, future.

HONORING HOMEBUILDER NAOMI SMITH

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a truly outstanding woman, Naomi Joyner Smith.

A native of Mississippi, Mrs. Smith made quite a name for herself in my hometown of Meridian, where she became known as the first female homebuilder in the State of Mississippi.

Thanks to her hard work, and management abilities, there are several hundred homes in Meridian today which provide affordable housing for the local citizens. One of the most popular areas she developed is Druid Hills subdivision.

Throughout her life, Mrs. Smith has been dedicated to her church and family. She also has been a successful real estate agent.

I wanted to make my colleagues aware of the entrepreneurial spirit, and accomplishment, of Mrs. Smith.

LEGISLATION TO DECLARE 1991 AS THE YEAR OF THE BAY AND OCTOBER 1991 AS NATIONAL SEAFOOD MONTH

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

tleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce two House joint resolutions, one designating 1991 as the "Year of the Bay" and one designating October 1991 as "National Seafood Month." I am pleased to introduce these resolutions in conjunction with the 10th annual Morro Bay Harbor festival which will focus public awareness on the importance of preserving our sensitive bays and estuaries, like Morro Bay, CA.

One of the most significant marine ecosystems along the Nation's west coast, Morro Bay's diverse and extensive habitat provides for numerous marine invertebrates and migrating birds. These habitants include threatened and endangered species, such as the California sea otter, seven endangered species of whales, and four species of sea turtles which deserve special attention from the community and Government.

Since 1870, when the city of Morro Bay was established, the bay has played a significant part in providing for the surrounding community. the bay's public piers accommodate not only local fishermen and pleasure boats, but also support many other industries such as commercial fishing fleets, electric generation, and tourism. The protective environment and plentiful resources that the bay provides are crucial to the community's economic stability.

Unfortunately, Morro Bay is threatened by a variety of pollutants and serious sedimentation. The festival, with its theme "Bounty of the Bay," will help promote the maintenance of this delicate environment and highlight the unique qualities of the bay. As local and nationwide organizations interact with individual citizens at the festival, all participants will become increasingly aware of the special value of the bay.

Due to its exceptional qualities, and its importance to the community and Nation as a whole, Morro Bay has gained much recognition. Its unique and sensitive environment has led Congress to consider legislation I have introduced that would include the bay in the National Estuary Program and would designate the area as a national marine sanctuary.

I am also introducing legislation to acknowledge October 1991 as National Seafood Month. Protecting and promoting seafood is directly related to the concern and importance of bays across the Nation. Morro Bay is one of the few natural harbors and active fishing villages on the west coast, and provides for many dedicated, hard working fishermen. Contaminants threatening the health of the bay are a serious danger to their livelihoods.

The fishing industry also remains an important part of our Nation's heritage and commerce. As the Nation grows more health conscious, an increasing number of Americans are turning toward the nutritious benefits of seafood. This new awareness reflects the industry's ability to grow and play a significant role in our Nation's commerce.

Declaring 1991 the Year of the Bay and October 1991 National Seafood Month will serve to raise awareness across the Nation as to the importance of preserving our sensitive marine ecosystems and developing comprehensive solutions to the problems which threaten the health of our bays. While individual bays are unique and special in their own ways, they all possess qualities that contribute to the Nation and deserve the recognition of Congress. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort by supporting these resolutions.

A copy of the resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 338

Whereas the Congress recognizes the spectacular scenic, aesthetic, and recreational value of the Morro Bay estuary in California;

Whereas Morro Bay promotes the economic viability of commercial fishing fleets by offering protective habitat and nutrient sources essential to the productive fisheries of the region and supports many other industries which are dependent on the health of the Bay, such as tourism, electric generation, and mariculture;

Whereas Morro Bay is an unusually diverse estuary that supports one of the largest bay wildlife habitats on the California coast, offering refuge to about 25 threatened or endangered species of Pacific fish and providing a critical sanctuary along the Pacific flyway for migratory birds;

Whereas the health of the Morro Bay estuary directly affects the quality of life on the central coast of California;

Whereas the California ship "Californian" will make port at the Morro Bay Harbor Festival to promote the Year of the Bay and conduct Coastal Awareness Day to promote bay stewardship;

Whereas Bounty of the Bay, the theme of the 10th annual Morro Bay Harbor Festival, will focus public awareness on one of the few natural harbors and active fishing villages on the west coast by highlighting seafood, the fishing industry, and the diversity of Morro Bay marine life and coastal lifestyles;

Whereas the festival will serve as the commencement for the week-long State of the Bay conference, which will focus on the past, present, and future of the Morro Bay estuary and watershed;

Whereas Morro Bay has been nominated by California Governor Pete Wilson for inclusion in the National Estuary Program; and

Whereas designating 1991 as the Year of the Bay will raise awareness across the Nation as to the importance of preserving sensitive marine ecosystems and developing comprehensive solutions to the problems which threaten the health of the Nation's bays: now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, These 1991 is designated as the "Year of the Bay", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the year with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

H.J. RES. 339

Whereas Congress recognizes that seafood is a "nutrient-dense" food offering large quantities of protein and significant amounts of vitamins and minerals, without high levels of fats and calories;

Whereas the commercial fishing industry employs more than 350,000 workers in the United States;

Whereas the most recent figures show that the commercial fishing industry contributed more than $16,000,000,000 to the nation's annual gross national product;

Whereas the 10th Annual Morro Bay Harbor Festival will be held the first weekend in October to celebrate one of the few natural harbors and active fishing villages on the west coast by showcasing seafood, the fishing industry and the diversity of Morro Bay marine life and coastal lifestyle: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of October, 1991 is designated as "National Seafood Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on all Government agencies and the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

SAVE WOMEN'S LIVES—FIGHT BREAST CANCER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. LOWEY is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we kick off national Breast Cancer Awareness Month. Across the Nation, Americans will take time out to learn about this deadly disease, which is the most common form of cancer in women. One of nine women born in the United States will develop breast cancer in her lifetime. In 1991, an estimated 175,000 women will develop breast cancer and 44,500 women will die from this ruthless killer.

These statistics are devastating, so much so that many choose to ignore them. But Breast Cancer Awareness Month is not about ignorance; it is about taking action, and one of the most positive actions we can take is teaching women how to detect breast cancer early, when we know that treatment is more successful. In fact, it is estimated that, with early detection, breast cancer deaths could be reduced by 30 percent. That's 10,000 lives a year.

One of the best early detection methods available to us is mammography. While public education efforts are helping convince women that mammograms are an important early detection tool, a recent General Accounting Office study revealed wide variation in quality standards of mammography.

I can think of no better way to achieve the goals of national Breast Cancer Awareness Month than by being an original cosponsor of legislation which will ensure that mammograms are safe, reliable, and of the highest quality.

The Breast Cancer Screening Safety Act will require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop national quality standards for all mammography facilities. In doing so, there is little doubt that women's lives will be saved. That, coupled with a renewed commitment by Federal health care agencies to finding treatments for breast cancer, will help make the dream of eradicating this disease a reality.

Women have waited far too long for their Government to respond to critical health care needs. In the process, families have suffered the loss of mothers, sisters, and daughters which could have been avoided if health research had given these problems the attention they deserve. This year, we have an opportunity to turn that around. For the sake of our families, we should not let this opportunity escape.

PRESENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL FOR LAURENCE ROCKEFELLER

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, last Friday at an impressive ceremony in the Roosevelt Room at the White House, President Bush bestowed the Congressional Gold Medal on the Honorable Laurence Rockefeller for his outstanding service to our country.

This is the first Congressional Gold Medal for a conservationist, and it could not go to a more deserving American. Laurence Rockefeller has lived a noble life as one of America's premier conservationists, as well as participating in joint ventures that stressed the strengths of our free enterprise system.

Not content to enjoy a family fortune, Mr. Rockefeller has invested in America in a hundred ways, especially in the Caribbean and at the Yosemite National Park and, along with Lady Bird Johnson, in the beautification of our Nation's Capital. His service has been unique, quiet, profound, productive, and caring.

Generous to a fault, Mr. Rockefeller has given of his talents and resources to make America a more livable and enjoyable Nation.

Mr. Speaker, 100 years from now we will look back on the contribution of Mr. Laurence Rockefeller—and all the Rockefeller family—and praise the goodness of this family.

President Bush saluted Mr. Rockefeller for his outstanding service and complimented him personally for his dedication to American principles in his unassuming and dignified manner. Mr. Rockefeller responded in an impressive, poised, and dignified manner. For the RECORD, I am including both the remarks of President Bush and Mr. Rockefeller, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT

A thousand apologies for keeping you waiting. One of Pickle's colleagues and Jay's colleagues up there. Good to see you, sir.

Well, please be seated and welcome all, and again, apologies for keeping such a distinguished group waiting. But let me just salute our distinguished visitors. We have with us a member of our Cabinet Secretary Lujan; Chrm. Bill Reilly; Senator Rockefeller; and Jack Pickle, Congressman; and all of you.

But today we gather to bestow a rare honor on a splendid American. Fewer than a 100 times in our nation's history has the Congress ordered a unique gold medal struck to honor one of our citizens. This is the first time America presents a Congressional Gold Medal to recognize a leader in natural resources conservation and historic preservation.

We honor a loving husband, father and grandfather. We honor a quiet, gentle man whose life and work sum up a century of American civic virtue.

Laurance Rockefeller, as everyone here knows, including me, shies away from the limelight. Though his modesty ennobles him, I regret that young Americans don't yet know as much as they should about him. As our young people learn more about Laurance Rockefeller's life and example, they will feel the excitement of seeing a hidden national treasure come to light.

From his earliest years, he's combined enthusiasm for conserving our heritage with brilliant entrepreneurial talents. His imagination and steadfast effort have transformed some technological commonplaces of our lives. For Laurance Rockefeller is this America's century's foremost trailblazer in the venture capital business.

At the dawn of commercial aviation, he invested the seed money that turned Captain Eddie Rickenbacker's dream into a pioneering passenger airline. And then a young engineer in St. Louis named James McDonnell had an idea for a jet fighter with an air-cooled engine. Mr. Rockefeller provided "Mr. Mac" with venture capital that grew into one of the world's first and greatest aerospace corporations.

Even our youngest generation will recognize a more recent triumph of Laurance's venture capital philosophy. Not many years ago, his partnership helped discover and launch a young dreamer with an offbeat name for a personal computer. I refer, of course, to Apple's founder, Steve Jobs, one of the heroes of young American enterprise.

If anything surpasses his love for innovation, it is his passion for conserving priceless national treasures and historic legacies of our civilization. As a policy leader and philanthropist, Laurance Rockefeller has enabled millions of Americans to enjoy the beauty of the Virgin Islands National Park, the Grand Tetons of Wyoming and the Palisades Interstate Park System.

He also has labored to make our city parks and buildings and boulevards a special kind of "great outdoors." He's done tremendous work for the environmental quality of New York City, notably in his efforts for Central Park, the Bronx Zoo, the New York Aquarium.

And I have a personal reason for gratitude to him. When I first came to Washington as a freshman congressman in the '60's, our great capital city suffered from a certain air of neglect in this regard. And that was when he, Laurance Rockefeller, was joining our gracious First Lady, Lady Bird Johnson, in efforts to beautify our Nation's Capital.

Over the years since then, it's been my pleasure to witness firsthand their magnificent work in making Washington truly a beautiful world capital. In all of his conservation efforts, Laurance Rockefeller has been emphatic in believing that our natural resources are for both conservation and use; they're the setting in which people can develop and strengthen their own humanity.

Completing the expansive scope of his work is the compassion and generosity that he's shown over many years as a board member and a benefactor of memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center. Victory over once-deadly forms of cancer owe much to his selfless philanthropy.

So, sir, on behalf of Congress—normally I don't speak for Congress—laughter—but on behalf of Congress—I'm permitted to do that in this regard—I present you this medal because your life and work do give honor to America. And as long as this piece of gold glistens, may grateful Americans remember how you devoted mind and soul to labors of love for our great country. Congratulations, sir.

REMARKS BY LAURANCE S. ROCKEFELLER

Thank you, Mr. President. I am deeply grateful to you for taking time to present this Medal to me on behalf of the Congress of the United States.

I accept it gratefully and humbly—and on behalf of those who helped so much to make it possible—Grandfather, Father, my brother, Nelson, my wife, Mary; and, more recently, our son, Larry; as well as my distinguished associates who, over many years, have been an all-important factor in any achievements recognized today.

In fact, as of now, I am but one member of the Family whose heritage of conservation spans five generations.

This, I am told, is the first Congressional Gold Medal to be awarded to a conservationist. It underscores the fact that it honors not primarily an individual—but also recognizes the environmental movement come of age.

Conservation has increasingly become a part of the Nation's agenda over the past half century. It was not long ago when concern for the land, air, and water was considered important, but not as a high, priority.

Now we know that concern for the environment and access to parks and open space is not frivolous or peripheral; rather, it is central to the welfare of people—body, mind and spirit.

In response to this now deep-felt public awareness, the Congress for more than two decades has enacted dramatic environmental legislative achievements. You, Mr. President, more recently and importantly, have shown the way by your leadership in the new Clean Air Act, your support for an increased Land and water Conservation Fund, your goal to plant one billion trees a year for ten years, and other important accomplishments.

But we cannot rest on our laurels. Much remains to be done. Environmental quality should be high on our national agenda, for we face new and urgent challenges around the world.

In these times of budget austerity, we must seek, as you have said, Mr. President, new and innovative ways to involve the private sector.

For example, in Woodstock, Vermont, Mary and I are working with Secretary of the Interior Lujan and National Park Service Director Jim Ridenour in combining public-private resources to create the marsh Billings National Historical Park. The Vermont Congressional delegation is cooperating with us in a fully bi-partisan manner.

If Congress approves, the park will interpret the contributions of George Perkins Marsh and Mary's grandfather Frederick Billings, to the creation of a conservation ethic in America. It is our hope that the Park will become a center for interpreting the evolution of such values.

Mr. President, I thank you for adding so greatly to today's event, and I thank the Congress of the United States for making it possible.

I accept the Congressional Gold Medal as eloquent evidence of our long-term commitment as a nation to conservation and a quality environment world-wide.

Thank you!

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it is good that we take time to thank people who have given so generously of their time and their talent and their resources.

□ 1640

This was the occasion last Friday that was good for our country, for our

President, to say "Thank you" to a family that has meant so much to this Nation.

ECONOMIC GROWTH ACT: EMPLOYMENT, NOT UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HAYES of Illinois). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] will be recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak today on employment and unemployment because I think the American people need to see two parallel activities that are going on in the Congress today. One activity is the question of how power works in a legislative body, what bills are allowed to come up, what bills cannot come up.

The other activity is two philosophies about how you create jobs, how you encourage people to work, and how you have a healthy economy. I think it is fascinating, if you have been watching the last few weeks, the Democratic leadership has clearly decided that they want to make unemployment an issue. They believe that they have President Bush in trouble on unemployment and if only they talk about unemployment long enough somehow they will once again be the party that cares and the party that takes care of people and that folks will not look below the surface slogans.

And yet, if you look at what has been going on, there are two big questions to ask. One is: If the No. 1 goal is to take care of the people who are unemployed, why is the Democratic leadership refusing to bring to the floor a bill offered by the Republican leader in the House, Mr. MICHEL, and the Republican leader in the Senate, Senator DOLE, a bill which would be signed by the President which would extend unemployment for 10 weeks, which would send the checks out, which would actually help people who currently do not have a job and which would be passed tomorrow?

I am absolutely confident that the Republican leadership would be willing to work with the Democratic leadership to pass a 10-week unemployment bill, the Dole-Michel bill, to get it out to the country, to pass a bill which, by the way, happens to pay for itself.

One of the major differences between the Republican bill and the Democratic bill is that the Democratic leadership bill does not pay for itself. It is just another $5 billion in the deficit. But the Republican bill actually has a fee to pay for it, a spectrum fee of new radio frequencies that are going to be made available by the Defense Department as part of the process of going through the changes we are now going through. That part of the spectrum was going to be auctioned off for a fee, and that fee would pay for the unemployment.

So the Republican bill is absolutely fiscally responsible, pays for the unemployment that is going to be sent out, meets the budget agreement and at the same time would actually give 10 weeks of payments to the unemployed.

But there is a deeper issue. How are we going to get the economy growing again? How are we going to make sure that when the unemployment is extended and finally runs out and—and nobody is suggesting we are going to have unemployment in perpetuity—nobody is suggesting we just send checks forever, so sooner or later we are going to come to the end of the unemployment checks.

What proposal do we have to create jobs?

Now, the President had a job creation proposal in January 1989 in his State of the Union. It would have created about 500,000 new jobs. It was defeated by the Democratic leadership in October and November 1989. The President came back in 1990, and he had two job-creating proposals. He had an initial proposal in January in the State of the Union; the Democratic leadership killed it. Then during the budget negotiations they proposed a separate, different approach which would set aside $12 billion to invest in new factories, new plants, and creating new jobs. Again, the Democrats killed it.

This January the President proposed another Job Creation Act. It has not gotten anywhere. The Democrats keep bottling it up.

So, in order to try to break out of that, Senator PHIL GRAMM and I introduced the Economic Growth Act.

The Economic Growth Act was designed to meet all of the objections about helping everybody. First of all, it helps senior citizens. The Economic Growth Act would allow senior citizens to earn an additional $8,000 a year without being punished by social security if they want to keep working, something which most senior citizens feel strongly about. At 65 years of age they have been punished by Social Security when they want to keep working.

So the Economic Growth Act has a provision for taking care of senior citizens, allowing them to keep working.

Second, we have a tax credit for families under $43,000 income, we provide a tax credit of up to $1,000 against the cost of their down payment on their first home.

Well, $43,000 is hardly rich. $1,000 tax credit is a lot of money against the down payment on that mortgage. It is estimated by the home builders that the Economic Growth Act would lead to 220,000 additional sales a year.

Now, 220,000 additional families moving into their first home is a big change in the economy; it creates more jobs and, equally important, it gives that working couple something to look forward to, something to dream about, to allow them to be in a position where they can take care of themselves and where they can actually become part of a stable community, owning a home, having a place to raise a family.

Third, we allow in the Economic Growth Act the Gramm-Gingrich bill, we allow everybody in America to have an individual retirement account with after-tax money which is a tax-free buildup. That is, the interest would be added on without any taxes being paid on the interest. Everybody could have one. And if you kept your account for 5 years, you could use it for health, education, housing or retirement.

So the Economic Growth Act allows you, in effect, to have a savings account with a tax-free buildup of your interest without having to pay any taxes on the interest and you could spend it on health, education, housing, or retirement if you kept it in the account for 5 years.

We go a step further as part of our pro-family policy and as part of our pro-housing policy: We allow parents and grandparents to take their individual retirement account out and loan it to their children or grandchildren so they can buy their first home.

But there is a step further: We also extend permanently the research and experiment tax credit which allows American companies to invest in the scientific research which is necessary if we are going to compete in the world market, if we are going to compete with Germany, Japan, and Korea.

But there is another step: We add to all of that a cut in the capital gains tax to encourage building new factories, to encourage people to go out and to invest in new jobs, buy new machinery, create new businesses, to have new savings. It is estimated that that provision would create 1,100,000 additional jobs, and we index future investment so that people would never again pay tax on inflation. We provide that in the future, if you save, if you invest, if you create, you do not have to pay tax on the inflation.

That again would encourage people to do the right things to create economic growth.

Beyond that we create 75 enterprise zones, an idea which has been sent up to this Congress and killed by the Democratic leadership for at least 15 years. For 15 years now we have been saying, "Now, look, if you truly want to help the poorest Americans in the inner city, if you truly want to help the poorest Americans in rural America, then let's create some enterprise zones where there is a tax incentive to build factories, to create jobs, to locate offices, to do the things that will put people back to work," because the best answer to unemployment is employment. The best answer to unemployment is not a check from the Government; the best answer to unemployment is a job, a real job, a permanent job, a job that will last.

In addition, the Economic Growth Act contains a provision called an economic growth dividend. What that suggests is very simple: If the economy is stimulated by all the different things I have described, if the economy starts to really grow again, if we get above 3 percent real growth, under the economic growth dividend, you would have the additional revenue to the Government and, as the economy grew, as more money came into the Government, everything above 3 percent real growth would go back to the individual as an increased personal deduction.

Now, why do we do that? We do it for two reasons: First of all, we believe, as Congressman FRANK WOLF has said, in the bill he has introduced that has many, many cosponsors, that is a pro-family bill, it is that if you increase the personal deductions, start moving back toward the level back in Harry Truman's day and in constant dollars related to real income, it would be about $7,000 apiece today. You would be able to get a $7,000 deduction to truly offset taxes, if we had the same kind of pro-family, pro-child deduction we had when Harry Truman was President.

So we first of all want to have a pro-family part of this bill that encourages people, enables families to stay together, that enables families to take care of their children.

Second, we want to establish the precedent that money that you create by your hard work, by your savings, by your investment, does not automatically belong to the Washington bureaucracy.

We want to establish the precedent that economic growth, as it creates more revenue, should not automatically lead to you seeing your money go into more welfare state, more bureaucrats, more redtape, more Washington offices.

□ 1650

So, we establish the precedent for the future that above 3-percent real growth in the economy; all the additional money comes back to them as an increased personal deduction.

To summarize: the Economic Growth Act would create about 1,100,000 new jobs according to economists. It would stimulate the economy, getting us moving again, get us out of this recession. That, by the way, is more new jobs than the hard-core unemployed. So, it would actually do more to help the hard-core unemployed by creating jobs than the Democratic effort to extend unemployment.

In addition, the Economic Growth Act would lead to 220,000 additional home sales a year, helping couples buy their first homes, get to live in a neighborhood, giving them a chance to begin to create a little nest egg for their own future to help raise their family.

Now we come to the Democratic leadership. With the help of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking member on the Committee on Rules, we came to them again and again. We have now gone three times asking them to please make in order the Economic Growth Act so we can both extend unemployment with the bill the President would sign, the Dole-Michel bill, and we could create new jobs so, as the unemployment began to run out, we would be in a position for people to get real jobs, to have a chance to go to work. The Democratic leadership seems committed to stopping any economic growth created within the framework of the free enterprise system.

I find it absolutely fascinating that we live at a time when in Russia, and Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia we now see centralized bureaucratic command economies disintegrating. We see people beginning to talk about private property, and free enterprise and having incentives for work, and for investment and for savings. I find it intriguing that the Poland, and in Hungary and in Czechoslovakia people are beginning to talk about free enterprise, and how do we create jobs, and how do we build factories, and how we have incentives for new investment to buy new machinery.

Even in Sweden—for my entire lifetime Sweden has been the hallmark of the modern bureaucratic welfare state, and people have looked at Sweden, and academics have said, "Oh, Sweden is the model. Sweden is where the welfare state has really been tried." Well, several Sundays ago the Swedish Socialist Party suffered its worst defeat since 1928. That is right. In Sweden, the heartland of modern socialism, the absolute showcase of the welfare state, the centerpiece of bureaucratic government in its modern form; in Sweden today the taxpayers are saying:

"Hey, wait a second. Taxes are too high. Government is too inefficient. Redtape is too infuriating. The whole system isn't working. We're not creating enough new jobs, enough new take-home pay," and there is now a taxpayer revolt in Sweden, and the Swedish Socialist Party just suffered its worst defeat in 63 years.

Then we come to America, and in America tragically the Democratic Party just does not seem to be able to understand what is happening. We now live in a world where the mayor of Moscow is to the right of the mayor of New York, or, to put it differently, the mayor of New York is to the left of the mayor of St. Petersburg, since that is what we are now once again calling a city which was temporarily called Leningrad.

I happened to read over the weekend an absolutely fascinating book called "Minority Party, Why Democrats Face Defeat in 1992 and Beyond," by Peter Brown. I recommend this to everybody, but I just want to cite a couple of quotes in here, from Democrats by the way.

> Peter Brown understands the middle class Democratic exodus as well as anyone in America. Unless we radically change our ways, we are potentially looking at an unbroken string of Republican presidencies.—Bruce Babbitt, 1988 Democratic Presidential candidate, former Arizona Governor.

Second example:

> Traditional Democratic voters have abandoned the party in droves to vote for Republican presidents because they believe the Republican Party will protect them and their economic interests.—Senator Joseph Lieberman, Democrat of Connecticut.

What is he talking about in this book? Talking about a very simple fact. Most Americans know that, if we have a free enterprise system, and we encourage people to work, and we cut taxes, and we encourage people to have take-home pay, and we encourage people to build new factories, and we encourage people to own family farms, and we encourage people to go out on their own and have the courage to invest for 20 and 30 years to build a small business so that they have a little nest egg, that that is what drives America, that this is not a country driven by its bureaucracy, and, frankly, in the long run it is not a country driven by unions and big corporations. Big corporations, which is the center of unionism, tend to shrink the total number of jobs.

I say to my colleagues, if you read the newspapers, whether it's IBM, or General Motors, or Ford, or any set of large corporations, large corporations over time hire fewer people. They tend to replace people with computers, and machinery and finding ways to slenderize, if you will, their payroll. The creators of jobs in America are entrepreneurs and small businesses, the baby businesses that become the real businesses of the future, and I think it is in that setting you have to ask the question: What are the policies that create growth? What are the policies that encourage people to save, and invest and have a better future? And the tragedy, I think, of the modern Democratic Party and the Democratic leadership in the Congress is that they are too jealous of job creators to encourage them to create jobs. They are too worried about stopping people from creating wealth to allow people who are creating wealth to create jobs, and the result has been that for almost 3 years now, for over 2½ years, the Democratic leadership has stopped every effort President Bush and the Republicans have made to pass an economic growth package and to try to stimulate the economy to grow, and the result is we now have the slowest growth rate of a Presidential term since Franklin Roosevelt's first term.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I could not help but listen to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] discuss his view of economics in America, his sense of history in the country and his sense of direction about where we ought to be going. Once again he tends to always give credit for everything that is right to the White House and ascribe blame for everything that is wrong to the U.S. Congress.

I was over here just a little while ago speaking on the subject of extended unemployment benefits, and I was hanging around and listening to the debate afterwards. I realized that a lot of people were talking, and really not anyone was connecting very much.

Some of what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] says I agree with. Unfortunately, we generally do not select the best of all idea in this House. I say to the gentleman, "I agree with you that we ought to have a package that deals with growth economics. I don't disagree with that at all and I don't think that replaces our responsibility to respond to today's problems. But should we be concerned about growth? You bet we should. Where we disagree is not on IRA's or the deductibility of interest on loans for education. There's a whole range of things that I think we should probably do to try to help people. Where we disagree is that your package of growth economics is most often a package that has as a hood ornament driving this big vehicle capital gains. Perhaps you now call it something different, but it's still capital gains."

Mr. GINGRICH. No, I call it capital gains.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. OK, and, if I might just describe once again for those who listen the effect of capital gains:

If you go back to the kind of proposal that's been offered by the White House and been supported by you and others, it's going back to the same old notion that it we simply will help the rich, the rest will all be better off. Now, I have asked for study after study on this, and the results are exactly the same. If you go back to the old capital gains approach, it's not cutting taxes for mom and pop businesses. Over 80 percent of the capital gains tax cut benefits will go to those who have capital gains year after year in multiple transactions. The tax cuts will go to Donald Trump and other folks who are involved in that kind of business who already make an enormous amount of money. Yet, your proposal says what we ought to do to stimulate economic growth in America is give these folks even more money because they'll use it in a productive way to make all of us better off.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] a question. I do not disagree with the hypothesis that we ought not be taxing inflation generally, nor do I disagree with the hypothesis that the rich have had plenty of tax cuts in the last decade. And it seems to me that we ought not rush to see how quickly we can decrease their taxes even more. What about a proposal that I have offered in bill form and have talked about on the floor of the House that says, "You think capital gains is stimulative, you think capital gains treatment for at least the sale of some assets that people have held for a long period of time makes some sense. What about suggesting that we will allow a $200,000 bracket of income in a taxpayer's lifetime to be treated as preferential income for capital gains?"

In my judgment, this approach will give most of the folks out there some benefit when they sell a capital asset like a farm or business, that they have held for 20 years. But it's not going to give away the bank vault to the richest of the rich in the country.

Would the gentleman entertain an approach like that that I think would make some sense and would not cost nearly the kind of revenue which your proposal is estimated to lose. Would the gentleman think that would have some stimulative effect on this country's economy?

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me just say a couple of things, and then I will yield to my friend from Florida.

First of all, I have proposed and suggested strongly today that we do have immediate problems of unemployment, and that is why I was hoping that the Democratic leadership would agree to pass the Dole-Michel bill, which would in fact be signed by the President. As the genteleman knows, the Democratic bill is going to be vetoed by the President and sustained in the Senate, and, therefore, it is not going to become law. So, I agree we have real problems. I was hoping we could pass a real bill that could be signed.

Second, I offered the Economic Growth Act in the Committee on Rules and on the floor of the House as an amendment to the unemployment bill, not a substitute. In other words, we would send down both extended unemployment and a job creation bill, and the Democratic leadership blocked that.

□ 1700

Third, I am a little surprised when you described the capital gains advantage purely as that of people who own stock, because my impression is that small farmers——

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I did not say that.

Mr. GINGRICH. Or that the major advantage went to people who were very, very rich.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I mentioned farmers and small businesses.

Mr. GINGRICH. As good things.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. GINGRICH. I would just suggest to you that what we do in our bill is modestly reduce the capital gains to around 19 percent and index it for the future so we are not taxing inflation. But I think what is fascinating and what you have to confront—and this, I think, is a fundamental disagreement—is that under the Treasury accounting and under almost every private accounting I have seen, capital gains changes make money. They create more jobs, and they create more wealth. They increase the revenue to the Government; they do not cut the revenue of the Government. And in fact, it is only on Capitol Hill where the Democrats hire and fire the staffs, where the Joint Tax Committee and the Congressional Budget Office have the kind of computer model that implies that people do not change their behavior. The Joint Tax Committee, which has a Jimmy Carter Treasury official as its head, has a model which is the equivalent of having a model which says that airplanes cannot fly, they are all made of lead.

So I would argue—and the Treasury agrees with this—that the capital gains proposals in the Gramm-Gingrich bill and the Economic Growth Act actually would increase revenue to the Government by about $6 billion, so we would actually have more money coming in because we would be encouraging the right behavior.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me yield to the gentleman from Florida first, and then I will yield further to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, and just address this question: I keep hearing this on the House floor. We keep talking about capital gains for the rich.

Any person in America who works hard and saves his or her money and delays gratification, after 20 or 30 years, is going to build up a certain amount of money, and we want to encourage that. When you say, "the rich," and you keep talking about or you may be insinuating it is a Wall Street broker or somebody who is a Donald Trump, it is the average person who at one time in his life is going to be rich. He is going to be rich that one time when he is going to sell his or her assets so they can retire. They can either move from up north and come down to Florida, because everybody in America maybe one time in their lives, if they delay gratification, if they work hard and save something, is going to be rich. And why not give them a break? Why should the Government take 33 percent of their money after you add

the broker's fee and then you add the lawyer's fees, and in some States, for example Connecticut, there is a 7-percent capital gains tax? So 51 to 55 percent of whatever they get is going to some State, local or Federal Government.

So here we have a case where a person has worked all their life, for 30 years, and they are selling maybe their two-family home that is going to give them a little asset, or maybe they are going to sell their stocks and bonds they have, so maybe once in their life they are going to be rich. But you keep talking about rich folks. We are not just talking about rich folks.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me say one thing along that line, and then I will yield to the gentleman from North Dakota, because I appreciate very much his coming over and participating, because this is frankly the kind of dialog that we ought to have more of in the Congress.

We are going to check on the exact number, but my memory is that something like 75 percent of the people who take a capital gains had less than $50,000 average gross income the year before they did it. I think that is the approximate number.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I think that is absolutely true if you would take into consideration their capital gains.

Mr. GINGRICH. How about the year before, though? These are relatively normal Americans, not necessarily poor, but somewhere in the middle class, who happen to be either selling their home or selling a business or at one time selling their stocks. But they are not rich people.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes, go ahead.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. The data demonstrates exactly the opposite. It is a graph that's been shown around your side of the aisle forever. It says that if you don't consider capital gains income, then people who have capital gains do not really have much income. That is like saying if you do not consider the income from investment banking as relevant income, then investment bankers do not make much money. So what?

Mr. GINGRICH. No. We are going to check this with the Ways and Means Committee staff. My understanding is that the year before their AGI, which, as I understand it, and again, you serve on the committee and I do not, means what, their gross income?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Not in the year they make the capital gain but the year before, something like 75 percent of the people who, let us say, in 1991 were to take a capital gain, in 1990 something like 75 percent of those people would have had $50,000 or less in income.

All right, go ahead.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Let me just use another statistic that I think is important. And I do want to correct one thing you mentioned because you moved along so quickly that I was not able to stop you. You surely do not suggest that the leadership of the Joint Tax Committee or the Congressional Budget Office is leadership that is selected only by Democrats and operates on behalf of Democrats?

Mr. GINGRICH. Oh, sure, absolutely.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Is that your position?

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, we would not have accepted the current head of the Joint Tax Committee. We would have never picked him. He was in Carter's Treasury.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Haven't we had people running the CBO who were Republicans in the past?

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. During the past decade?

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes, at times.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Do you trust them?

Mr. GINGRICH. But I would argue that if you look at the computer models of CBO and Joint Tax, they are literally the equivalent of an aerodynamic model that says airplanes cannot fly.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. But my question was, in cases where the leadership or the people that run CBO and Joint Tax are selected generally with the assent of the leadership on both sides?

Mr. GINGRICH. No, I would have to say in a House which has been controlled by the Democrats for 5 years longer than Fidel Castro has been in power in Cuba, I do not think we ought to have any games about who makes the decision about hiring somebody like this. The fact is that from the time the Republicans lost control of the Senate, the Democrats controlled these kinds of positions.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I know that the head of at least one of those institutions has been a Republican since I have been here. Of course, I did not go on the floor to suggest that the information that comes from that organization is necessarily slanted toward the Republican side.

Mr. GINGRICH. No, I think it is intellectually obsolete. I think if you are a serious intellectual, you would agree that Joint Tax is obsolete.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. But that is a different issue to make, and probably it is more than constructive.

Let me just make this point: It is a creative point that you make that the average person is rich at least once. Most average people are never rich. They wish they could be rich at least once, but they are not.

The study I was going to refer to bears directly on that point. The study says, "Let's look at who gets capital gains." Is it, as you suggest and as is suggested most often by the President and others, the ones who once or twice make an occasional sale of an asset they have accumulated over an entire lifetime such as a business or farm? Or is it the people who are involved in the business of converting capital gains?

What the study shows is interesting. Eighteen percent of the benefit of a capital gains cut will go to those people who are selling an asset once in their lifetimes. Eighty-two percent of the benefit goes to those people who have recurring capital gains transactions in every year.

So my point is that I do not disagree with you at all. I think when someone owns a farm or a small business they have held for 20 years, I would like to do something about it. That's why I have introduced legislation which says, "Let's produce a capital gains preference for a $200,000 basket of income, in addition to the $125,000 that you can now flow through without any tax obligation on the sale of your home, which incidentally is the largest capital asset most people will ever have in this country. Statistics show that is their major asset. They can now move $125,000 through after they have reached age 55 with no adverse tax consequences. I say, let us add to that. Let us put $200,000 on top of that to respond to this issue.

I would like to make one other point, and let me say I appreciate very much the indulgence of the gentleman from Georgia. When you talk about growth and the economic future of this country, I do not think there is anything more destructive to the economy or the health of the American economy than the kind of binge of hostile takeovers and LBO's that we have seen in the past decade. It has been a literal orgy that is destructive to this country. It is a form of economic cannibalism, an abuse of credit, a scourging of America's assets. Highrollers misusing credit to take companies apart and selling them. The gentleman knows that I have been on the floor often on the issue of junk bonds and a whole range of other things to try to shut down the mechanism by which we finance this kind of economic activity which I think fundamentally damages the private sector of this country. And I would very much hope, as we talk about growth economics, that one of the things we all agree on is to shut down that kind of destructive activity in the private sector. It just doesn't make any sense.

□ 1710

Mr. GINGRICH. I agree with you. But let me use that one for just a moment to make the point and illustrate why I believe in all fairness, I believe intel-

lectually, that liberals have a very hard time getting out of the box.

The way you would dramatically cut off those kind of leveraged buyouts, if you really wanted to create economic growth, is you eliminate the double taxation of dividends. If you eliminated the double taxation of dividends, it would no longer make sense under our Tax Code for people to borrow massive amounts of money in terms of taking over the corporation.

You would in fact be doing something economically which both stopped leveraged buyouts and which created an incentive for new jobs and new factories and new companies.

But I doubt if it would be possible to have any hope of bringing to the floor a bill which eliminated the double taxation of dividends, even though I think every theoretical economist would agree that that is a very powerful way to both increase the value of investing in new jobs and to cut off leveraged buyouts.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. The history of the 1980's denies the statement the gentleman just made. Even as tax rates have come down in the 1980's, we have seen a burgeoning activity in this LBO and hostile takeover area.

One would think if there is in fact a tax incentive, that as the tax incentive diminishes, you would see a diminished activity in LBO's and hostile takeovers.

Exactly the opposite happens. Why? I think it has to do with much more than the Tax Code. I think we have regulators who are hostile to the notion of regulating in this town, in dozens of areas.

They just close their eyes and plug their ears and say, "I will watch nothing and I will hear nothing and you do what you want." Regrettably, it just brought this economy to its knees. I agree that we have major responsibilities.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me see if I understand this correctly. You think one of the major problems in our economy is not that we have a credit crunch because of overregulation, and not that we have small businesses being strangled by too much regulation and red tape, you think in fact the regulators are too lax and we do not have a tough enough regulatory environment on business and small business?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Let me rephrase this, if I might. The answer, of course, is yes, but not with respect to small business.

The answer is when a savings and loan is allowed to be loaded up with junk bonds so that it chokes and dies, then somebody is not minding the store. Somebody is not regulating the kind of investments those institutions are making.

My point is that in agency after agency where there is supposed to be responsible regulation, responsible regulation was denied by people who were hostile to the need to look after the public interest. The answer clearly in the area of financial institutions and some other areas, including airlines, is yes.

Mr. STEARNS. Let me just answer that. You are trying to insinuate that capital gains is the cause of the S&L and the cause of junk bonds and the cause of leveraged buyouts? Are you suggesting capital gains is the reason for all of that?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. No, I do not think so. Did the gentleman from Georgia hear that?

Mr. STEARNS. No, that is what you seem to indicate.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. No, not at all. Nothing of the sort. I was disconnecting the subject by saying in addition to the growth economics the gentleman from Georgia was discussing, I would like to know whether he agrees that this orgy of hostile takeovers and LBO's is destructive to the American economy and long-term growth. And, in my judgment, these activities have cannibalized the corporate assets of this country.

Mr. STEARNS. Let me just ask my distinguished colleague a question. In Japan and Germany, they have very little if no capitol gains. Is that not true?

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes. Absolutely.

Mr. STEARNS. So here are two countries that have been dynamite in their economic growth. They have little to no capital gains. How do you explain that?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. It is interesting you raise the question of the Japanese. First you couldn't do a hostile takeover in Japan because it's prohibited. They understand it is destructive to economic interests.

Second, the effective corporate tax rate in Japan is much, much higher than the effective corporate tax rate in America.

If you pull out capital gains, yes, you might make that case on capital gains. But if you pull out one piece and another piece and refuse to look at the whole picture, you create, in my judgment, a distorted picture.

The fact is that, Japan has a higher effective corporate income tax rate than this country. So the question is how would Japan have a higher rate of economic growth if in fact it has a higher effective corporate income tax rate?

Mr. STEARNS. You cannot have it both ways. You are just trying to argue that the capital gains is bad and you are talking about leverage buyouts. Now you just told me that in Japan, where they have no capital gains, that they have different kinds of laws. Perhaps we need different kinds of laws here. But it has nothing to do with the capital gains.

My whole argument is that what you are trying to insinuate, you are tying the capital gains to all the evils that have happened in the last 4 or 5 years, and I do not think that is a fair case.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. The gentleman is not listening carefully.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me just read one section of this book. It is a little bit long, but let me read this for a second.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. May I just clear this up? I appreciate the response of the gentleman to me, but you were not listening carefully. I did not intend to tie capital gains to the issue of leveraged buyouts and hostile takeovers. I intended to talk about capital gains and also to say that there are other issues relevant to the economic growth in this country. That was the purpose of may comment. It was not to tie capital gains to that.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me read you a passage. It is a little bit long, but if you will tolerate it for a minute. It is from Peter Brown's new book, "Minority Party," which is actually an effort I think on his part to try to reach the Democratic Party, not attack it.

He says the following:

The only strategy Democrats have had for the last decade is to pray for a Republican scandal or a deep recession.

Americans, for one, do not believe in redistributive economics, which is at the heart of the time-honored Democratic strategy that seems to be making a comeback. Of course Americans want the rich to pay their fair share of taxes, but that is the political equivalent of supporting motherhood. When New Jersey Gov. Jim Florio in 1990 tried a tax program aimed at implementing that idea, he was hit by a middle-class revolt. His programs raised levies on individuals who made $35,000 and couples who earned $70,000. Despite all his charts and graphs explaining that the middle class wouldn't be forking out any more in taxes, they didn't believe him. The bulk of those who were hit didn't consider themselves rich, and those below the threshold figured the Democratic tax man would get them next as they climbed the economic ladder.

Democrats confuse the generally popular notion that those with higher incomes should shoulder a greater burden of the cost of government services with the much les accepted idea that all incomes should be equal. In fact, America is by far the least likely of the seven Western industrialized nations to believe great disparity in incomes is bad. Only 28 percent of Americans feel that way, half the rate of strongly capitalist West Germany and a smaller fraction yet of Great Britian, Holland, and Italy.

Class warfare no longer works politically because it seems to the middle-class voter that the Democratic party is bent on punishing him for his success. These voters look at programs like Florio's as punitive redistribution. To the millions like Mark and Pam Blips, Democrats, having failed to raise the incomes of the poor, seem bent on trying to legislate equality by limiting their upward mobility.

"'Soak the rish' will not suffice as a message for 1992" because "it's not clear to the voters that Democrats are on the side of the middle class," Democratic pollster Mark Mellman believes.

In conceptual form it is egalitarianism, not capitalism, that the Democrats are proffering at a time when the rest of the world

has decided that the high standard of living available to most people under capitalism is worth the inequities the system entails.

Even if a populist cycle is underway in America, as many Democrats contend, it isn't like the old days. To say that the Republicans are letting a few people get very rich doesn't work by itself. The middle class doesn't believe the rich are getting richer at their expense because the American economy is no longer driven from the top by Fortune 500 companies, those big fat cats with inherited wealth. The engine now is smaller—entrepreneurial companies, created by middle-class people like themselves who are seeking to climb even higher.

My point is just this: I am not particularly worried about Donald Trump, because I think he has gone broke. I am not particularly worried about a lot of people who may have gone by in passing briefly, because I think those kind of speculators in the long run do not last.

My concern is how can I in the middle of a recession, in a free enterprise environment, where we have rejected socialism, we have rejected communism, we have rejected centralized planning, how can I stimulate the kind of savings and investment and hard work that creates jobs and creates factories and encourages people to go to the future?

What I hear you saying, and I am going to give you a chance to respond, but what I hear you saying is look, we will help you for the first couple hundred thousand dollars, but don't get too successful. The minute you start to get too successful, we are going to punish you. Don't create too many jobs, don't build too big a factory, don't hire too many people.

I feel just the opposite. If the price I have to pay for a Ford Motor Co. is Henry Ford, then in a free enterprise system I think, frankly, that is the price you pay.

If the price I have to pay to have an Apple computer is Steve Jobs, then I am prepared to pay that price.

But what I want to do is create an environment where every child in America can go out and say, by George, I have a fair chance to go out here, to work hard, to save, to invest, to go into my garage as Steve Jobs did, to go into my basement as Polaroid did with Land, who created the Polaroid Co. I can create the future. I could someday get rich.

What I hear the gentleman saying is, OK, if you get to be a little upper middle class. But let's not go crazy here. Let's not take the chance of getting too rich.

My question to you would be, where are you going to get the jobs? Tell me any economic theory that creates jobs that starts off by punishing the rich?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. When did the gentleman from Georgia come to Congress?

Mr. GINGRICH. I came to Congress in the middle of the Carter disaster in 1978.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Do you know what the top income tax rate was in 1978?

Mr. GINGRICH. It was around 70 percent, I think. Not that it was paid very often by wealthy people, but that was the theoretical top rate, I believe, wasn't it?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Are you asking me?

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. GINGRICH. You are on the Committee on Ways and Means. I am not.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. It was 70 percent.

Mr. GINGRICH. By the way, can I tell you one quick anecdote? John F. Kennedy, in 1961, when the top rate was 90 percent, as President, asked the IRS how many rich people paid the 90-percent top rate? The answer was zero, because, in fact, if you raise taxes enough, you create the incentive for rich people to hire CPA's and attorneys who promptly figure out how not to pay any taxes.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. So what is the top tax rate today? If it was 70 percent when you came here, and the Democrats, which have been in control of this institution since Millard Fillmore was President have been ruining most everything, what has happened to the tax rate today? Seventy percent to what?

□ 1720

Mr. GINGRICH. With tremendous effort by Ronald Reagan and a coalition of Republicans and Democrats, we actually lowered the tax rate.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. To what?

Mr. GINGRICH. I think it is 31 percent the way you have now rerigged it, having started back up the ladder.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Let me recap, if I may.

When you came to Washington the top statutory tax rate was 70 percent. It is now 31 percent for the people in this country who make the biggest incomes. We have some people that make some good incomes, and God bless them. If a person can make $30 million a year, I have no idea what that personal situation is, but if you do that, God bless you.

I would also like to make sure that you have a full opportunity to invest in this country's future by paying a fair tax as well. So it is 31 percent.

Now you'd say to us that what we need to do is reduce even further the 31-percent rate for people paying that who are largely in the upper income groups. We need to reduce by another third because many of them will have capital gains. If you do not go along with that, Democrats, you are punishing success.

Mr. GINGRICH. Not just punishing success; you are killing jobs. You are killing the jobs of the future.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. If you extend that logic, then why would you support any income tax for someone who makes over $1 million a year?

Mr. GINGRICH. Wait a second. There is a difference between a tax on capital gains, and you can make a good argument that the Japanese model, which is 1 or 5 percent, depending whether you do gross or net, or the German model, which is the correct capital gains model, that is not income tax. That is a tax on whether or not you save and invest, whether or not you want to encourage massive savings and massive investment to create the most modern factories in the world with the highest take-home pay and the best standard of living. That is a very big difference.

The margin you want to get to with rich people is simple. You want a tax which is high enough, an income tax which is high enough that you get a pretty good bit of money but low enough that they do not hire a tax lawyer. You want to find exactly the margin where it is cheaper for them to send a check to the Treasury than to send a check to their CPA because the minute you go past that, they are going to start finding a way not to pay taxes.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. If your vision of the country's future is to use the rich as instruments for economic progress——

Mr. GINGRICH. I did not say just the rich. I do not happen to have as much antipathy to the rich as Democrats do in between fundraising dinners.

My point is not helping somebody who is currently wealthy. I could not care less. I think they will protect themselves.

JAY ROCKEFELLER and all the rest of the Rockefellers are going to be able to find a way to protect themselves no matter what you do to the Tax Code.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. When you come to the floor and propose policies, you are struck with the results of what they show.

Mr. GINGRICH. The whole country is richer, including rich people. Everybody is richer. The result of yours is everybody is poorer, including rich people.

The question is, Would you rather raise everybody and have everybody poorer?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. When you came to Congress the top statutory income rate was 70 percent and it was reduced to 31 percent. You are now coming to us and Congress with a new economic idea. It is not really new, but you call it new so we will accept that. It is a new idea.

Let's cut taxes, the bulk of which will be cut for the rich. What you are saying in effect with your policies is that for the average person in America making $200,000 a year in income, I am going to cut about $20,000 of their tax liability.

Mr. GINGRICH. The question I would ask is, Who do you believe, all of the private economists who say that a capital gains cut would actually raise revenues? Or do you believe the Treasury Department, which says that it would raise $6 billion in revenue?

It does not cost any money; it raises money.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. The Treasury Department would jump off a 20-story building for you. They are of your party. You are fighting for what they propose to us. So why wouldn't they give you the answers you want?

Mr. GINGRICH. You happen to have economists you hire who are liberals who tell you that this will cost money. I have economists that favor business and favor job creation and are conservative who think this would gain money. We do not know it for sure.

My point is, we do know that in 1978, when under Jimmy Carter we actually cut the capital gains tax, it did work. We do know that it actually increased the Government revenues despite the fact that Treasury said it would not.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. GINGRICH, you are wrong about that. The Treasury Department demonstrated in its own study that that is not a correct statement. It just is not correct.

Mr. GINGRICH. It is not correct that the Staggers bill increased revenue?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. GINGRICH. I will be back in another day or two. I will get the data. I would love to see that.

Everything I have heard from every economist I have talked to is that the Staggers bill clearly increased revenue.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Let me go on for a second and ask you this question: Let us assume that you disagree that my proposal to provide $200,000 in capital gains relief for the average person during their lifetime. Let us assume that you think $200,000 is not enough because, as your friend said, the average person is rich at least once.

I am hoping at one point that happens to me, and I hope it happens to all my constituents. I doubt it will happen to all of us.

Let us assume everybody is rich at least once. What is an appropriate figure? Is $500,000 or $1 million or is there no appropriate figure for you?

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me say two things:

First of all, the number of people who in 1987 had less than $50,000 income the year before they paid a capital gain was 71 percent. So 71 percent of the people the year before they paid a capital gain, this is not some exclusion of capital gain income, had less than $50,000.

First of all, a capital gain cut relates to a lot of people, not just the rich.

Second, let me ask you this: Let us say a man came to you and said, "I understand there is a town in North Dakota that is sort of poor. I am prepared, if you will give me a tax advantage, I am prepared to put 3,000 jobs in that town. You have to give me a tax advantage. Otherwise I will put those jobs in Hong Kong or put them in Poland."

Would you say to him, "You know, I don't mind if you put the first 100 jobs in, but that other 2,900 jobs, I don't know if we can do that. I think if we were to let you have all 3,000 jobs there and hire all 3,000 families, boy, that would be pretty charitable because look how big your tax advantage would get. Maybe you ought to take 100 jobs in North Dakota, but why don't you take the other 2,900 jobs and take them to Mexico or to Hong Kong or take them to Poland?"

Is that not the essence of your policy? As long as people do not get too successful, as long as they do not create too many jobs, as long as there is not too much growth happening, it is OK. But if they start to really take off, that would be scary?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. No. That is where we have a major misunderstanding.

Mr. GINGRICH. Or a disagreement.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I am not sure that you understand my point that I think there is a responsibility that everybody has to make a certain payment for this Government of ours.

Mr. GINGRICH. I agree.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Not very many people agree or we would not have a $420 billion deficit in this coming fiscal year. It is not the $348 billion deficit as Mr. Darman says, for next year. You are probably well aware that it is $420, are you not?

Mr. GINGRICH. In August of last year, I made a speech at the Heritage Foundation and said, "If we raise taxes going into a recession, we will lay off more people and we will increase the deficit."

I would suggest to you, if you go back and read that speech at Heritage and you look at the budget deal last year, which I opposed, and you look at the effect of the States that are raising taxes and you look at the effect of the Federal Government raising taxes and you look at the impact on Beechcraft in Kansas of the luxury tax or you look at any of the boat costs and the impact of the luxury tax, we have been killing jobs and raising taxes, lowering the revenues.

We have fewer revenues today because of the recession. The recession killed more revenues than every tax increase we passed last October.

Would you not agree with that? That that is technically true? That the increased unemployment and the loss of income tax and profit from corporations actually costs us more revenue than the total tax increase in the Budget Act?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I taught some economics in college but have been able to overcome that. You have not been able to overcome your history teaching experience.

Mr. GINGRICH. You do not think that the recession killed more revenue than the tax increase gained?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Economics 101 teaches you that you have a major decrease in revenue when you have a recession. You are asking if I accept you as a visionary based on your Heritage speech.

Mr. GINGRICH. I do not want to overreach that. Let me ask a narrower question here.

Would you not agree technically that the total revenue loss due to the recession is greater than the total revenue increase from the tax increases we passed last October?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. It may be, but the implication, is that the tax increase caused the recession.

Mr. GINGRICH. It just deepened the recession. Do you not agree that a tax increase going into a recession deepens the recession?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I do not have any idea, and I sort of agree with old Harry Truman on this. He said, "Get me a one-armed economist. I am tired of this on the one hand and on the other hand."

Who knows? We know that we have reached a recession. We know that we had some economic growth.

I might tell you that we had no economic growth in my State of North Dakota. It has been a decade. If you asked somebody if you are better off now than you were 10 years ago, they'd probably say no. We have had a price collapse in energy and agriculture.

□ 1730

And I only wish those family farmers and those Main Street folks in North Dakota are able to be rich once in their life. Unfortunately, most of them are now losing money and in desperate condition.

That's why I said when I started. I would like very much——

Mr. GINGRICH. Do you think tax increases will help them?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. No, I do not think tax increases will ever help anybody unless we finally have some kind of responsible approach of spending and tax increases and cuts to put the country back on track.

Mr. GINGRICH. But did you not just do that, did not the Democrats just pass an unemployment bill that breaks the budget? When I talk about responsible, did you not in fact explicitly break the deal which you made with the President last year to control spending?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. No, not at all.

Mr. GINGRICH. You did not pass a bill today that breaks that budget deal?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. No, we did not, and you know very well we did not. You know that this bill declares an emergency if it is signed by the President.

Mr. GINGRICH. Which is, by the way, explicitly contrary to the budget agreement, because this bill does not give him the choice. This bill explicitly does it upon signature.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. There is probably not much sense in us spending much time here debating what happened today. The Kurds were an emergency, the Shiites were an emergency, everybody is an emergency except for the American people who are out of work. The Democrats wrote this bill that will not break the budget to help those Americans who need help, and if you sign this you declare an emergency.

Mr. GINGRICH. My point is that Democrats are desperately for and willing to be responsible when we are about to raise taxes, but then 6 months later when we try to control spending, they are not.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. In my judgment, nobody in this Chamber likes to raise taxes. And I do not consider myself an FDR Democrat; I consider myself more of a Jeffersonian.

I really think that long-term broad-based economic ownership is crucial in this country to long-term political freedom.

Mr. GINGRICH. I agree with that entirely.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. That is why I believe very much we need to find ways to expand the economic base in America. We must find some common ground on growth economics. Yet, that makes sense.

As a term it does not mean much to me. But some of the things you said I agree with. I think we ought to work on common elements that we could achieve to help put this country back on track. I think most Americans believe, if you ask them that we are losing our competitive edge. They believe just as power shifted from England to us, it is now shifting from here to the Pacific rim, probably never to return. And they want somehow for us to recapture some economic momentum. They want us working on the kinds of things needed to do that. I do not disagree with you on that.

You and I simply disagree on specific elements of your policies and how it would inure benefits to the richest of the rich. But I believe we can get past some of that, sit down and talk about the common elements of a growth package that will put this country back on track for the good of Republicans, Democrats, and everybody that lives here.

Mr. GINGRICH. Of course, but I think the central problem your party faces is if you dislike job creators so much that you do not want to encourage them to create jobs, you cannot then turn and ask them where the jobs are. You are a little bit like the party who wants to beat the goose that laid the golden egg all day long, and then scream at it in the evening because it did not lay three eggs.

We know historically that Germany, Japan, Korea, the United States, all sorts of places around the world, we know approximately how to create jobs. And if you will listen carefully, when we start talking to the Russians, what are we going to be telling the Russian Government? Less bureaucracy, private property, tax incentives to work, save and invest, and use all sorts of general phrases which if you came right back to this Chamber and you brought in a bill which fit what we are going to encourage the Russians to do, your side would not let it come to the floor, because by definition what do you hear when you talk to people about Russia? They tell you, boy, you know, if you are an entrepreneur in Russia you are in big trouble because people think anybody who tries to get ahead is doing bad things. What do you think? You say oh, my goodness, this person is doing too well, let us punish them for a while.

All I am suggesting is that in a free enterprise system you know how to get the economy to grow, you know how to create new factories or to create new jobs. What I do not know how to do is how to punish everybody who is trying to do that, and at the same time create it.

I would have to say frankly, based on the Carter administration's track record, and based on what your leadership has done for the last 3 years in stopping the President's growth packages, I do not see any evidence that the Democratic Party has any understanding of how to create real jobs and put people back to work. But I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I just think you disserve the issue when you suggest that our approach is to punish those who do well.

Mr. GINGRICH. That is what you have been saying for the last hour.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. That is not true. I do not come here to talk about party so much, but you spend most of your time talking about everything that is wrong in America. And that every wrong ought to be tattooed on the chest of the Democrats and everything that is right in America ought to be hoisted on the sword of the Republicans. I just get a little tired of that sometimes.

Mr. GINGRICH. I have not said that.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. The fact is that our party, the Democratic Party, stands for and fights for the interests of the entrepreneur, the mom and pop businesses opening up in the morning and closing in the evening, people struggling to milk cows today in North Dakota, people putting in a crop and taking it out in the fall. I guarantee people who I work with on this side of the aisle fight for and stand for these people, and it disserves their motives in my judgment, for you to suggest somehow our career is bent on punishing them. That is nonsense. That is a characterization. It's just as if I were to say that you spend your life down there trying to make the rich richer because you do not care about anybody else. I do not say that, but I could, and it would be the same characterization that you paint about us.

Mr. GINGRICH. I am not suggesting that it is mean spirited. I am suggesting that it is a consequence, and I am suggesting that when you spend the amount of time, not you personally, but when you have people such as several of your candidates for President who spend the amount of time they spend explicitly on class warfare, who seem to think class warfare makes sense, I do not see how that is compatible with this kind of a society and with everything, the kind of economic growth and the kind of entrepreneurial behavior that we want. And I do not have any doubt that rhetorically there is a belief in small business. But I mentioned regulations a while ago. Every small business I talk to feels like it is overregulated, it is drowning in redtape, it is drowning in IRS regulations, and surely we ought to be able to find a way to make life easier for those very small business people that you describe. And I expect that ANDY IRELAND, our Republican ranking member on the Small Business Committee, would love to work with some people on your side of the aisle to bring to the floor a small business bill of rights that would strip away about half of the redtape. But I think it would be very hard to get it through this House.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. It does not wash that it is class warfare when someone suggests that the studies show the rich are getting richer, and the poor are getting poorer. Recent studies show that the tax system is askew, and we need to do something about that. But that's not class warfare.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me describe a Treasury bulletin, spring issue of June 1988, which says:

> The results imply that the 1978 Act produced large and continuing direct revenue gains. Extension of the sample and correction of a flaw in the Treasury report's measurement of inflationary GNP dramatically reduce the estimated losses from the 1981 changes.

In other words, when you go through the Treasury study as of June 1988, the suggestion is that in effect both the 1978 tax cut of capital gains and the 1981 tax cut yields the conclusion that both acts were significantly revenue enhancing. In other words, it is Treasury's contention as of 1988——

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. And what are you reading from?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am reading from a Xeroxed copy of the Treasury Bulletin, spring issue, June 1988.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. They put out a bulletin telling us this?

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes. This is a copy. I will be glad to give you a copy.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Let me tell you that I have a weighty, rather thick study published in 1985 that says exactly the opposite.

Mr. GINGRICH. What that study says is that there was a recalculation of the 1985 study, and that in fact the 1978 act created large and continuing direct revenue gains.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. That is convenient. What happened when 7 years after the capital gains cut in 1978 they said that there had not been a revenue increase. Then 3 years later they said we have changed our mind. It is now 10 years later and we made a mistake 3 years ago about the judgment we were leveling on something that happened 7 years ago. That is a very convenient Treasury Department. How do I get one of those?

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me put it to you this way then: If you had to gamble, and I had a report that says if you cut taxes you get a whole lot more money, or cut taxes and lose money for the Government, my argument, in the middle of a recession would be that it is a lot smarter and more desirable to cut taxes and create more jobs than it is not to cut taxes. All I would say, and that may express the difference in terms of how we tend to be biased in terms of our two parties, my bias is toward cutting taxes and finding a way to stimulate the private sector to create more permanent jobs, and I say it is fair to say your party's bias is to not cut taxes and instead to worry more about extending unemployment rather than create permanent jobs and worry about that half of the equation in a free enterprise system.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. While I create that job that ultimately they are going to look for, I would like for them to have something to eat tonight.

Mr. GINGRICH. As I said earlier, I am very willing to vote for an unemployment extension. I think that when the President vetoes the current bill and it is sustained, that we will come back to the House with a signable package. I would only ask the Democratic leadership at that point to make an order the Economic Growth Act as an amendment, as an addition to the 10 weeks of unemployment extensions that Mr. MICHEL and Mr. DOLE are going to offer, and then we could extend the unemployment temporarily and begin to create permanent jobs for people to go to.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. One final point. It is interesting that the discussion we are having relates back to a philosophical division that goes back decades; the so-called trickle-down theory which we have not discussed here today.

□ 1740

We have not used the terminology "trickle down" to give somebody at the top something, and everybody at the bottom will benefit. I just think we need to give all of the American people, which we believe are the engine of the American economy, something to work with to get the economic engine working well again.

Mr. GINGRICH. I would just say that I think there is a magnet theory that says that Steve Jobs was not being trickled down; he was being pulled into a better future.

We will carry that on another day. I thank the gentleman.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION REAUTHORIZING SECTIONS 405 AND 406 OF GENERAL EDUCATION PROVISIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I am submitting a bill that will reauthorize sections 405 and 406 of the General Education Provisions Act [GEPA], the Office of Educational Research and Improvement [OERI] for an additional 5 years. OERI, in addition to carrying out its original mission to equalize educational opportunities, if properly utilized, could facilitate the development of an American Solution to improve our schools and our workforce, and to create a learning society. Just as an overwhelming force was used to achieve victory in the Middle East, we must mount an "overwhelming campaign" for educational improvement which sets in motion many strategies and models simultaneously. The coordinating entity at the center of this campaign must be OERI.

The bill has been carefully crafted in response to the concerns of parents, teachers, education consultants, school administrators, and civic and business leaders as reflected in 13 hearings held between July 30, 1987 and September 25, 1991, and the 2 Subcommittee on Select Education staff reports: Preliminary Staff Report on Educational Research, Development and Dissemination: Reclaiming A Vision of the Federal Role for the 1990's and Beyond (September 1988) and Education 2005: The Role of Research and Development in An Overwhelming Campaign for Education in America (August 1991).

The urgency of the proposals outlined here could not be greater. We have proposed significant changes designed to place OERI at the center, rather than on the margin, of educational innovation and reform in this country. Although research and development is only a small part of the overall long-term public policy and strategy needed to revamp our national education effort, it is a pivotal and critical component. Many other elements, especially the provision of emergency Federal financial relief to hard-pressed local schools, are of equal importance and must be pursued more vigorously by Congress.

There is widespread agreement that before OERI is capable of playing a significant role, it must ensure an ongoing effort to maintain maximum feasible freedom from partisan interference. It is evident that the critical difference between OERI and other research agencies, such as the National Science Foundation, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Institutes of Health, is that OERI lacks an effective board. The bill establishes a 24-member Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board with the status prestige, and credibility necessary to determine policy and priorities for an office heretofore preoccupied with responding to short-term political pressures.

The bill also calls for OERI to play a more proactive role in disseminating educational knowledge. Testimony before the subcommittee verified that while in many instances we know what works, we lack the ability to effectively disseminate this knowledge to those most in need of the information. To guarantee the continued infusion and utilization of research and development results, the bill proposes the establishment of a responsive and interactive delivery system for reteach, development, and dissemination—similar to the original agriculture extension programs of the land grant colleges. A key component of that delivery system is the District Education Agent Program which will speedily place high quality, useful information, technical assistance, and a host of local and Federal school improvement services at the disposal of the community.

Global competition and national necessity now dictate that the original mission of OERI—to engage in activities which contribute to the effective education of at-risk students—must be expanded to improve education for all students everywhere in America. In order to prevent the dilution of the original mission, the bill calls for the establishment of a National Institute for the Education of At-Risk Students to concretize and solidify the core of policies, actions, and activities related to ensuring the education of our most vulnerable students.The Institute will also become the keeper of the treasure chest of new concepts, models, and publications regarding the education of at-risk students.

Educational improvements cannot be obtained by focusing on the achievements of students alone. Standards, assessments and report cards must also be established for those who govern and manage. Before we forge ahead to institutionalize the national testing of students, it would be more logical, more efficient, and more just to establish a national program for the assessment of the governance and management performance of the States, school districts, and local education agencies responsible for the education of students. It is imperative that OERI move in a more definitive manner to restore balance to the conduct of assessment research. Therefore, we are proposing the establishment of a National Institute on Innovation in Governance and Management.

The bill also addresses public-private partnerships within the context of the National Research and Development Center and National

Educational Laboratories Program and the need to expand OERI's electronic network in order to build a national education treasure chest to advance the synthesis of information of research results, models, and materials to a wide variety of end users. The proposed interactive, computer-based National Education Dissemination Network will also link an expanded OERI library with other Federal research and development entities.

In general, this reauthorization responds to the many changes that have occurred across the educational landscape since the previous reauthorization of OERI in 1985. The increased activism of the private sector in all aspects of educational technology to transform student learning; the enhanced capabilities or telecommunications to improve dissemination are all addressed in this bill.

Today's Washington Post reports that "the Nation 'must travel a tremendous distance' to meet international academic standards and reach the education goals that President Bush and the governors have set for the year 2000." Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill offers the Nation an opportunity to begin that journey. The national education goals cannot be achieved without a greatly expanded Federal research, development, and dissemination system.

A section-by-section analysis of the bill follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS—THE EDUCATION RESEARCH AND DISSEMINATION EXCELLENCE ACT

Section 1. Title.

Section 2. Findings.

Notes that the majority of our public schools are failing and that school reform efforts alone will not allow us to achieve the national education goals. OERI must be central in the coordination, development dissemination and replication of ideas, strategies and interventions that will make a substantial difference to every student and school in America. A new generation of institutions must be established to take on more proactive roles to accelerate the application of research knowledge to high priority areas. A new National Educational Research and Priorities Board must be established to ensure that OERI can function without partisan political interference.

Section 3. Table of Contents.

TITLE I—PURPOSE OF THE OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

Section 101. Purpose and Structure of Office.

Establishes powers of new Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board to determine policies and priorities for OERI. Repeals the National Advisory Council on Educational Research.

Section 103. Funding.

Authorizes $130 million for FY92, $245 million for FY93, $270 million for FY94, $330 million for FY95 and $350 million for FY96 for carrying out sections 405A to 405G. Specifies that no less than 5 percent be reserved for administrative expenses for the National Educational Research and Priorities Board. Revised minimum authorization levels are set for the Regional Educational Laboratories, National Research and Development Centers, Education Resources Information Clearinghouses and field initiated studies.

TITLE II—NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH POLICY AND PRIORITIES BOARD

Section 201. Establishment and Purpose.

The Board will determine priorities and establish procedures and practices for the conduct of all research, development and dissemination carried out by the Department of Education.

The Board will be responsible for setting policies and priorities for the conduct and evaluation of research based upon an assessment of the state of knowledge in education research and development. The Board will also be charged with the greater coordination of all education research, development and dissemination activities conducted across the entire federal government. The Board is authorized to establish subcommittees, convene workshops and conferences and collect data.

The Board will be composed of 24 members appointed by the President with nominations selected from particular national bodies: 10 eminent educational researchers from a pool of nominees provided by the National Academy of Sciences; 4 classroom teachers; 1 Chief State School Officer; 1 local educational agency superintendent; 1 from a National School Board Association; 1 from a Chapter 1 Association; 1 professional librarian; 2 parents; 1 individual from the foundation community; and 2 individuals from business and industry.

TITLE III—DISTRICT EDUCATION AGENT PROGRAM

Subtitle A—District Education Agent Program

Section 301. Establishment and Purpose.

Establishes the District Education Agent Program which provides a capability at the local level to guide the application of tested effective models and techniques to enhance the prospects for all communities to achieve the National Education Goals. Findings set out the need to move expeditiously to establish a responsive and interactive delivery system that can provide focused assistance to ensure that promising innovations are effectively disseminated and used.

Subtitle B—Bureau of Education Extension

Section 311. Establishment and Purpose.

A Bureau of Education Extension is established within OERI. The first duty of the office will be to compete a district education pilot program for fifty of the poorest congressional districts as determined by the 1990 census. The Bureau will provide technical assistance to congressional districts which will be known as research and development districts. These districts can consist of the entire district or no less than 250,000 residents. The remainder of the congressional district can be used as a control for the pilot program.

The Bureau will provide technical assistance to congressional districts in preparation for the competition, as well as facilitating the coordination of appropriate resources. The Bureau will also be charged with the development of a dissemination system to ensure the transfer of exemplary educational models and interventions through the District Education Program.

TITLE IV—AMERICA ON LINE: THE NATIONAL EDUCATION DISSEMINATION NETWORK

Subtitle A—National Education Research Library

Section 401. Establishment and Purpose.

A National Education Library is established to serve as the central location within the federal government for information about education. The Library will provide comprehensive reference services for education information for federal employees as well as members of the public. The Library will also house a "one-stop shopping" information and referral service to provide information concerning Department of Education programs and activities. The bill would transfer all existing information functions to the Library.

Subtitle B—Establishment of an Education Networks and Telecommunications Division

Section 411. Establishment and Purpose.

Establishes an interactive electronic network to link all Department of Education entities, including the ERIC clearinghouses, Regional Educational Laboratories and National Research and Development Centers. Requires the Secretary to provide every OERI-funded entity with an interactive electronic bulletin board.

Demonstration programs are authorized to support Regional Education Laboratories, SEAs and LEAs, universities and private nonprofit entities in the development and expansion of a "user friendly" dissemination network. The Secretary shall provide matching dollars on a 4 to 1 ratio.

TITLE V—THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE EDUCATION OF AT-RISK STUDENTS

Section 501. Findings

Findings set out the need for greater efforts to prevent the further decline in achievement of at-risk students that reside in high poverty areas, in order to achieve the six national education goals.

Section 502. Establishment and Purpose

The Institute will maximize the ability of OERI to conduct non-partisan research so that its original core mission to prevent educational failure among student educationally disadvantaged is achieved. The Institute will maximize involvement of institutions and individual scholars with special experience and expertise in serving the at-risk. The Institute will evaluate, develop, replicate and adapt models, strategies, techniques and methods that will substantially improve the conditions for learning of at-risk students.

The Institute will also develop a model program to serve the 50 poorest congressional districts and will supplement, not supplant other Federal activities.

The Institute shall be administered by a Director appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, together with a 33-member board appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board to establish Institute policy, prioritize research, review all programs, and issue periodic progress reports. The Institute will be organized into three administrative divisions: Innercity Educational Improvement, Rural Educational Improvement, and Minority Language Educational Improvement.

TITLE VI—NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR INNOVATION IN GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT

Section 601. Findings and Purpose

Findings relate to the fact that many American schools are based on outmoded structures and rely on notions and governance that may be outdated. A concentrated effort is needed to support a program that can identify and replicate model innovations in school governance to be used to promote equity and excellence.

Section 602. Establishment and Purpose

Establishes that the Institute will be administered by a Director and a National Institute for Innovation in Governance and Management Board. The Board shall determine policies, priorities and procedures for the Institute every two years.

Authorizes a program of research and development grants for eligible entities for research, planning, development and implementation of promising models of innovation in school governance and management.

Establishes a board of 12 experienced and eminent individual members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board shall establish the policies of the Institute. The President shall select from distinguished researchers nominated by the National Academy of Sciences, and other national bodies.

The Institute shall be responsible for the conduct, evaluation and dissemination of research findings. The Institute is authorized to develop cooperative projects to be conducted in conjunction with two or more research and development centers and regional laboratories.

TITLE VII—NATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTERS, REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES, AND PUBLIC-PRIVATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS

Section 701. Partnerships with Private Organizations

Establishes public-private partnerships between OERI and private organizations to conduct education research development dissemination and technical assistance activities. Each partnership shall require the participation of an SEA or LEA and an educational research team; OERI will contribute no more than fifty percent of the total cost.

Requires any Regional Educational Laboratory, National Research and Development Center, public-private partnership to provide the Secretary with certain information and assurances.

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 801. New American Schools Development Corporation

Specifies that the provision of technical assistance to the New American Schools Development Corporation should not exceed the sum of $5,000 and an amount equal to the maximum rate of basic pay for a GS–15.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order on today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE COURAGE OF TED WILLIAMS

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to call attention to one of the most remarkable career accomplishments in athletics that has ever existed, for it was on September 28, 1941, that Ted Williams, known as The Kid and The Splendid Splinter batted .406. I bring that up on this occasion not only to mark its anniversary but also to contrast it with a number of other records that we once thought could never be surmounted.

What record has lasted over 50 years? Even Babe Ruth's 714 home run record was broken, and Bob Beamon's long jump record was just broken. Even the Berlin Wall has been torn down, and Ty Cobb's most hits in a career have been surpassed.

But on this occasion, I think that we also want to acknowledge the courage of Ted Williams, for on September 28, 1941, Ted Williams could have chosen to sit out a doubleheader. He was hitting .400 going into the last game of that season, and his manager, Joe Cronin, asked if he wanted to sit out the last two games. Consistently, as he had throughout his career, Ted Williams said no, and he went six for eight on that remarkable fall afternoon to end with a .406 batting average.

But we also want to call attention to Ted Williams the individual who, from 1943 to 1945, served in the military as a fighter pilot, and again in 1952 and 1953 he served in the Korean conflict, always a patriot.

Think of these statistics in his major league career: he won a batting title in 1958 at the age of 40, and in 1960, at the age of 42, he hit .316. Indeed, on September 28, 1960, in his last time at bat, Ted Williams hit a home run, and characteristically, he entered the dugout and never came back to tip his cap.

Ted Williams was always his own man.

When we look at that season, we find it all the more remarkable because Joe DiMaggio hit in 56 straight games, and later on in the season, Mickey Owen dropped the famous third strike.

Even in 1942 when Ted Williams won the triple crown, he lost the MVP award, and many people called it in those years the curse of the Bambino. I boast to my children all the time that I had a chance to see Ted Williams play in 1959 and 1960 when my grandfather brought me to Fenway Park for the first time, and I saw his teammates like Pete Runnels and Sammy White, in those years, and Vic Wertz, and Ike Delock, and Frank Malzone. It probably would have been considered a mediocre team at best, but Ted Williams brought that zeal and excitement to the lineup every day.

I might remark that, as I watched him march to the plate, the memory will always be carefully etched in my mind of how he rested that bat on his left shoulder, stared at the pitcher, and dug in with his left foot. He was not ducking out, and he was going to get his time at bat. Everybody in the ball park knew Ted Williams had gone to the plate to hit.

What I would like to do for just the next couple of minutes is to yield time to others who have requested it on this occasion, and then I would like to come back and talk about Ted Williams and the Jimmy Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, why would a Congressman from southern California rise to praise the accomplishments of a baseball player from Boston? There are several reasons for my appearance here today. One reason is that the player in question, Ted Williams, is a native of southern California. He was born and raised in San Diego. A second reason is that I feel certain that our beloved departed colleague Silvio Conte would insist that I rise today, and who could ever refuse Sil. And finally, Ted Williams ranks among the top 5 or 10 baseball players of all time and I would not want this occasion to pass without saying a few words in praise of the "Splendid Splinter."

My remarks will bypass the home runs, the batting average, the years of magnificent performance. My remarks are in praise of a man who twice left the playing fields behind and served in the U.S. Marine Corps as a fighter pilot. If Ted Williams had not lost those years in World War II and Korea he would have set records in our national pastime that might never be reached. His service to his country was truly service at great personal sacrifice although he would be the last to say so.

There exists in the Boston area a wonderful charity known as the Jimmy Fund. This charity raises money to combat children's cancer. No one, and I repeat, no one, has contributed more time, energy, effort and love to the Jimmy Fund campaign than Ted Williams. Again, he would be the last person to tell you that.

I salute Ted Williams today as a genuine sports hero. I also salute today the Marine Corps veteran of two wars and the humanitarian friend of cancer stricken children. For his own reasons, Ted did not like to tip his cap to the fans. I am proud today to tip my cap to Ted Williams.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY].

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking out this very timely special order to recognize a very great man and a great athlete.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the greatest baseball players of all time, Ted Williams.

The baseball season of 1941 for many baseball fans was the season of the great Joe DiMaggio who hit safely in 56 consecutive games. However, the splendid Yankee Clipper shared the limelight that season with a lefthanded hitter nicknamed the Kid, who batted a remarkable .406, a mark which has remained unsurpassed ever since. This October marks the 50th anniversary of that fabulous season of Ted Williams.

During his long career as a player for the Boston Red Sox Williams earned many distinctions. He was named batting champion several times, most valuable player, and triple crown winner. At the plate Williams was one of the

most feared hitters of his time. Whether the Red Sox were hot or not, Sox fans who came to the ball park could always expect a hitting clinic when No. 9 would step up to the plate.

Opposing teams developed many strategies to counter his legendary bat; some teams instructed their pitchers not to throw strikes to him, while other teams shifted their entire outfields to play to his strengths.

However, more often than not these strategies had the same result; Ted Williams standing on first base. Day in and day out during his career Williams personified excellence in baseball. His batting average only once fell below .300 and over his career he batted an outstanding .344.

Despite his remarkable achievements on the playing field Williams never forgot his sense of loyalty and duty to his country. When his fellow countrymen were called to war during World War II and the Korean war, Williams put his flourishing baseball career on hold so that he could serve in the Marines.

During his 4½ years of service as a flier Williams served with distinction, rising to the rank of captain. Upon his return to baseball Williams did not miss a beat, thrilling fans with his ability to knock baseballs around Fenway Park.

Much has been written and said over the years about the amazing bat of Ted Williams. Some attributed his ability to remarkable eyesight and quick wrists, while others say that he had an unusual sixth sense about the game. I believe that these physical attributes combined with a true love for the game of baseball is what made him a great player.

For over a century baseball has been a major part of America's culture.

Records have been set and broken, great players have come and gone, but only a handful have reached the status of legend of the game. Ted Williams is one of that select few.

His graceful swing, his amazing consistency at the plate, have earned him the deserved reputation as the greatest hitter of all time.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe that Ted Williams contribution to baseball can not be measured by the records he set or the games he won.

His contribution to America's pastime is the way that he played the game. For 19 seasons he played baseball with a style and intensity that reflected his passion for the game.

For baseball fans everywhere, of all ages, I join with my colleagues to honor this great man on the anniversary of his greatest season in the Sun.

□ 1750

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, indeed the gentleman from Boston, who is I am sure pleased with the thought that he represents the congressional districts in which the remarkable Fenway Park is located.

Mr. Speaker, let me for a couple moments reflect on Ted Williams' relationship with the Jimmy Fund. We all know that he has donated thousands of hours and money to the Jimmy Fund, and he certainly has made the Jimmy Fund, at least in part, what it is today, New England's favorite charity.

I also want to acknowledge that had Silvio Conte been here now, he would have been doing this special order instead of me because he was a personal friend of Ted Williams.

My office requested from Mike Andrews, who was a former second baseman for the Red Sox some information on Ted Williams and the Jimmy Fund. I would like now to read that for the RECORD.

"Can you think of anything more dreadful than a child ill with cancer? Do you know the one thing anyone wants more than anything else? It's life." So mused Ted Williams in one of the many movie trailers he appeared in to promote the Jimmy Fund.

While the remarkable accomplishments of Ted Williams' career have been well documented in baseball history, the even more remarkable work he has done on behalf of cancer research has not. And that's fine with Williams. You see, Ted Williams' involvement with the Jimmy Fund has nothing to do with getting credit or publicity for all the charitable work he has done through the years. Ted Williams is about making people happy and doing his part to help cure a dreadful disease—cancer.

The Jimmy Fund at Dana-Farber Cancer Institute was founded over four decades ago to help provide care and treatment to people with cancer. Under the leadership of Dr. Sidney Farber, the father of modern chemotherapy, a center dedicated solely to the research and treatment of childhood cancer was established. When Ted Williams first visited Dr. Farber, kids' lives were being extended by two to six months. Today, two out of three children and half of all people with cancer can now be cured.

Williams has donated untold hours visiting the sick, memorabilia used for auctions and raffles, appearance fees and has lent his name for tributes and other functions that helped raise funds for the Jimmy Fund. It is through Ted's and the Boston Red Sox' involvement that the Jimmy Fund has become known as New England's favorite charity. "Never to my knowledge, has anyone professional athlete meant as much to a charity as Ted Williams has meant, and still means to Dana-Farber's Jimmy Fund," said Mike Andrews, the Jimmy Fund Executive Director.

The countless millions of dollars that Ted Williams has helped raise through his philanthropic endeavors would be hard to estimate. For fear he would be shortchanged, that task has never been undertaken. Ted Williams always said that he'd like to be remembered "as the grater hitter who ever played." Somehow, I don't think Ted would object if he were also remembered as one of the greatest humanitarians who ever lived.

Mr. Speaker, let me just close with a couple thoughts about that summer and fall 50 years ago. Some time ago I read an introduction to a text in which Ted Williams raised the rhetorical question as he reflected on hitting, and he said, "You know how hard that is to do?"

Well, anybody who has ever picked up a baseball bat and tried to swing at a pitch from a good left-handed or a good right-handed pitcher, you know precisely how hard it is to do.

Remarkably enough, five decades later Ted Williams is still one of, if not the greatest hitter that ever walked to the plate.

We have watched all those ceremonial records broken. We have watched dramatic changes in the politics of the world, but that record stands as testimony to his commitment to what remains America's game. He had a career that mostly was filled with ups. Seldom were there any downs, but that career was marked by that famous season five decades ago.

I am pleased that this House of Representatives on this occasion has had a chance to pay tribute to not only a great baseball player who also played left field like it was his own backyard, but also we have had a chance to pay tribute to a great American.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, every generation has its heros, but it isn't very often that the feats of those heros transcend several generations. The feats of Ted Williams have transcended several generations and I'm sure will be passed on to several more.

Ted Williams was the finest hitter in modern baseball, collecting six batting titles, including one at age 40, during his 19-year career with the Boston Red Sox.

Williams' most sensational season was 1941 when he was only 23 years old. He batted 0.406 that year, becoming the last man to reach the 0.400 mark and the first since 1930.

How Williams' reached 0.406 is dramatic and reflects on his confidence and perseverance. He was batting 0.400 with a double header scheduled for the final day of the season. Manager Joe Cronin offered him the opportunity to sit out and protect his average. Instead, Williams played, collected six hits in eight at bats, and finished with a 0.406 batting average.

But such heroics were not limited to Williams' youth. Consistency and patience were his trademarks. He received 2,018 walks in his career, second only to Babe Ruth. This contrasted with a mere 709 total strikeouts. Only three times in 19 years did Williams fan more than 50 times in a season. That is a remarkable accomplishment when you consider he played 154 games a season.

It becomes even more remarkable when you consider that his baseball career was interrupted twice by the Marines. Between 1943 and 1945 Williams served as a Marine pilot. In 1952 his Marine Reserve unit was called up for duty in the Korean war and Williams missed most of two additional seasons. He saw significant combat duty during the Korean war.

Williams' service to his country didn't hurt his hitting one bit. He led the 1946 Red Sox to the American League pennant, won his fourth batting crown in 1948 and in 1949 was named the league's MVP. That year he lead the league in five categories including home runs.

After his 2 years in Korea, Williams returned late in the 1953 season to play 37 games and bat 0.407 with 13 homers.

At the age of 39 in 1957 Williams clubbed 38 homers and missed reaching the 0.400 mark by only five hits over the course of the season. He hit 0.388 that year and the next season became the oldest player to capture a batting championship with an average of 0.328 in 1958.

With a home run in his final big league at bat, Williams capped one of the most exciting and successful careers in baseball.

Williams' records and accomplishments remain as impressive today as they did when he achieved them. This despite the coming and going of such superstars as Al Kaline, Brooks Robinson, Hank Aaron, William Mays, Johnny Bench, Mike Schmidt, and Rod Carew.

Being born in 1941, I had the opportunity to follow Williams' career as I was growing up. He now resides in beautiful Hernando, FL, and I am honored to represent him in the House of Representatives.

The courage and confidence Ted Williams has displayed all his life is an inspiration to all Americans.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Ted Williams.

America knows Ted Williams as a great baseball player. At the age of 17, he started an exciting, record-filled career in professional baseball, playing first with the San Diego Padres of the Pacific Coast League. Throughout his career, he compiled an impressive list of statistics. As a patient, consistent hitter, he received, 2,018 walks, contrasted to only 709 total strikeouts. As a rookie with the Boston Red Sox in 1939, Ted Williams batted 0.327 with 31 home runs. He led the league with 145 runs batted in. In 1940, he made his first appearance in the All-Star Game—a game in which he would play 17 more times. The following year, 1941, was Ted Williams' most sensational year. And that is what we are honoring here today.

Fifty years ago this summer, Ted Wiliams, at age 23, batted 0.406—the first player since 1930 to do that, and the last one since then. This accomplishment alone singles out Ted Williams as a great hitter. But I had the privilege of knowing Ted Williams as more than a statistic in a record book.

During World War II, as a Navy pilot, Ted was a member of our team at Bronson Air Field in Florida. Our team had a pitcher with a unique trait. He was a Marine Corps pilot and like a lot of marines, he was independent. He didn't always throw what the catcher signaled. More than once, I saw frustrated catchers throw down their mits and charge the mound to counsel this stubborn pitcher. And this pitcher's batting average wasn't that great either. The Bronson baseball field had no fence, and it seems that this fellow had nothing to aim for. Finally, somebody put up a wire around the outfield, giving this marine pilot a goal. It seems like every hit after that went over that fence.

Mr. Speaker, it's not surprising that our teammate at Bronson Field called his own pitches. Because he wasn't really a pitcher. From 1939 to 1960, he played left field for the Red Sox. And it's not surprising that he hit a home run nerly every time at bat—his lifetime average was 0.344. That young, hardhitting marine was Ted Williams.

When Ted Williams returned to the major leagues after World War II, he was greeted with a new defensive move—the Williams shift. Invented by Cleveland manager Lou Boudreau, the now-famous Williams shift required moving three infielders to the second-base side of the diamond. We weren't quite that sophisticated at Bronson Field, but we did have our own version of the Williams shift. When Ted Williams came up to bat in our games, the outfield just moved back to about 600 feet to have a better chance of catching his hard hits. So I guess we came up with the original Williams shift.

Anyone who forces outfielders to back up 600 feet is a great hitter. But Ted Williams was a great American as well. At the height of his baseball career, he left his sport to serve his country. Twice he traded in his glove and bat for an airplane. For 3 years during World War II, he served in the Marine Corps. And during the Korean war he saw 2 years of combat duty. Ted Williams' service demonstrates what I think is best about America. Unselfishly, he put his country ahead of his career. Without a doubt, those games at Bronson Field during World War II did very little to contribute to Ted Williams' swing, or skill, or statistics. But Ted Williams did his part to contribute to the United States. That willingless to serve, to do his part, adds to his greatness.

The statistics show that Ted Williams was a great hitter. As a part of that Bronson Field contingent, I can attest to that. And as someone who served our Nation during wartime with him, I can say he was a great pilot and a great guy.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this month the attention of the Nation's baseball fans was glued to the results of the smooth, flowing swings of the bat of the greatest hitter in baseball history—Ted Williams.

The batting feat of Ted Williams in 1940 has yet to be matched in the 50 years which have followed. The Splendid Splinter hit .406 for the Boston Red Sox that year, and in the five decades since then no major league ballplayer has been able to swing a bat at the awesome level of .400.

Williams hit for distance with the same measured ease as he hit for average. Often three infielders were employed against Williams between first and second base in an attempt to cut down on his hitting record. But the opposition wasn't permitted to station players in the stands behind the outfield walls, and the fans handled the home run balls which soared above and far beyond opposition outfielders.

One can only imagine what his final record collection might have been had he not interrupted his career to serve as a pilot in the Marine Corps. Twice, in World War II and again during the Korean war, Ted Williams fought for his country. As he was honored at the time of this year's All-Star Baseball Game, he unhesitatingly told one and all how proud he was to have served as a marine.

We tip our hats to a great baseball player and a great American.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, the year was 1941, the last season before World War II. While a good part of the Nation's consciousness focused on the conflict that the United States would soon enter, the rest was following one of the most memorable baseball seasons of all time. This of course was the season Joltin Joe was to hit and hit and hit in 56 consecutive games, smashing the old record and setting a new mark that has not been matched since. While Mr. DiMaggio's consistent hitting was truly remarkable, I will always remember 1941 as the year Ted Williams, the Splendid Splinter, defied the odds and hit an incredible .406.

Although best known for his baseball exploits, Ted Williams was also a decorated captain in the Marine Corps and a veteran of both World War II and the Korean war. In fact, if not for his years of military service, who knows how many baseball records Ted Williams would have set.

Williams used a beautiful left-handed swing, 20/15 vision, steely determination, and a dedication to his craft to become one of the greatest ballplayers of all time. As the 1941 season wound down, it became clear that Williams had a shot at a miraculous .400 season. The day of the Boston Red Sox's season-ending doubleheader found Williams hitting .3995 which would have legitimately been rounded up to .400. While few would have questioned Williams had he decided to sit these games out, Williams insisted on playing and after going six for eight, he raised his average to an unbelievable .406. Fifty years later, no major leaguer has been able to equal this mark.

Mr. Speaker, Ted Williams is truly an American hero. On this, the 50th anniversary of his historic achievement, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting this outstanding individual.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the 50th anniversary of the last major league batter to hit over .400, Ted Williams. This past Saturday, September 28, was the anniversary of the last day of the 1941 baseball season for Ted Williams and his team, the Boston Red Sox. On that day in sports history, Williams completed his historic 400-plus season, .406 to be precise, in a doubleheader against the legendary Connie Mack's Philadelphia Athletics.

A great year for baseball was 1941. It was the year that the Brooklyn Dodgers faced the New York Yankees in the World Series. That series went down in history because of a Mickey Owen's passed ball which changed the outcome of the fourth game in the Yankees favor; 1941 was also the season Joe DiMaggio had his magical 56-game hitting streak and was voted most valuable player. Midway through the season Ted Williams won the All-Star Game for the American League with a two-out, three-run homer in the bottom of the ninth inning. Finally this was the season Ted Williams became the last major leaguer to bat over .400. Most true baseball fans doubt anyone will ever accomplish this feat again.

Three days before the end of the season, Ted Williams' batting average was at .401. Joe Cronin, the coach of the Red Sox, asked Williams if he wanted to sit out the last three games to guarantee his .400 season. Ted wouldn't hear of it.

During the Saturday game the Splendid Splinter went one for four, lowering his average to .39955. While this figure would round up to .400, the media was already making noise about him being under .400.

On Sunday, September 28, 1941, Ted Williams decided he had to play to earn the honor of batting .400. During the first game of the doubleheader, Williams went four for five, boosting his average to .404 and all but ensuring a .400 season. In the second game Williams went two for three. Between the two games, Williams hit four singles, a double, and a home run to finish the year at .406. With his back to the wall, Williams pulled through with flying colors. Ted Williams was the last batter to hit .400 in a baseball season.

Mr. Speaker, the heroism displayed by Ted Williams was but one example of this great man's courage. He would later distinguish himself by serving valiantly in the Armed Forces during both World War II and the Korean conflict. One can only imagine what his baseball statistics would be if all those military years had been instead years spent on a baseball diamond. Ted Williams is, simply put, the greatest hitter ever to play the game of baseball. In addition he is one of baseball's immortals and a true American hero for the ages. God bless Ted Williams and on behalf of all Americans, "Thanks, Ted, for so many great baseball memories."

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join my distinguished colleagues tonight in paying tribute to a very special and talented athlete. Ted Williams' exploits at the plate turned him into a legend throughout New England and the rest of the baseball world. It was his accomplishment of batting .406, 50 years ago, that has served as a goal for every major league ballplayer to achieve. Since the summer of 1941, no one has matched this feat. Most experts agree that in all likelihood Ted Williams will be the last .400 hitter.

Across the board Ted Williams' lifetime statistics are awe-inspiring. They landed him in the Baseball Hall of Fame the first time he became eligible in 1966. He batted .344, had 1839 RBI's, 2,019 walks, and a slugging average of .634, all of which are in the top 10 in their categories of all time. In addition Williams was a member of the American League All Star Team for 16 years, was named most valuable player two seasons, and won six batting titles, the last of which came at the age of 40, a record. He achieved these great accomplishments despite missing 4½ seasons in the prime of his career to serve his country in the form of two tours of duty with the U.S. Marine Corps, in both World War II and Korea.

Ted Williams poise and gracefulness at the plate turned the science of hitting into an art form. No one knew the art of hitting better than the Splendid Splinter. Ted Williams continued to pass on his knowledge of hitting long after his playing days. First as a manager for the Washington Senators and then to young prospects for the Red Sox during spring training sessions.

As a youngster growing up in San Diego, CA, Ted Williams laid the framework for his major league career. He claims that he was always the last to leave the playground. Most of the time there was spent batting. He estimates that he batted over 200,000 times in his lifetime. Ted Williams has taught many that through persistence and hard work any goal can be achieved.

Playing under the shadow of the Green Monster at Fenway Park in Boston, Ted Williams entertained all of New England for 19 seasons. Through these seasons, Ted Williams set new standards of excellence that most can only dream of achieving in baseball and in life. The only person to come close to achieving his remarkable .406 batting average after 1941, was an older Ted Williams who came only 5 hits shy of .400 in 1957.

I commend my fine colleagues for making this tribute for such a wonderful baseball player and person possible. I am proud and honored to have the opportunity of participating in this special order this evening. I hope all will join me in tipping our caps to Ted Williams on the 50th Anniversary of his .406 batting average.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2608

Mr. SMITH of Iowa submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2608) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 102-233)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2608) "making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 15, 18, 35, 43, 58, 60, 65, 84, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 107, 114, 115, 117, 123, 125, 139, 141, 146, 149, 150, 154, 156, 158, 161, 164, 166, 167, 174, 177, and 181.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 11, 19, 27, 37, 38, 39, 44, 45, 52, 56, 66, 70, 87, 88, 104, 108, 110, 113, 118, 124, 127, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 136, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, and 172 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *(d) $22,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$28,820,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$384,249,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$44,994,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$219,125,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$1,926,092,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$17,600,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$82,700,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$69,200,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$13,550,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$183,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$1,453,928,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$63,100,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows:

FISHING VESSEL OBLIGATIONS GUARANTEES

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of guaran-

teed loans authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, $1,000,000: Provided, That during fiscal year 1992 total commitments to guarantee loans shall not exceed $10,000,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, $1,700,000 which may be transferred to and merged with Operations, Research, and Facilities.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$31,280,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert; *$15,140,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$125,290,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$165,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$40,380,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$39,450,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$25,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$17,480,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$17,600,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$22,925,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$1,875,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$1,250,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$20,400,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$10,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$10,464,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 142:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended as follows:

In lieu of the amount "$223,000" insert: *$780,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 151:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 151, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$14,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *$42,434,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *$691,725,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 163:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows:

Of which $1,000,000 shall be available for the Claude and Mildred Pepper Scholarship Program of the Washington Workshops Foundation

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 168:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 168, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *$36,888,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 169:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *$24,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 170:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 170, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended as follows:

In lieu of the sum "$10,000,000" insert: *$5,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 40, 41, 42, 46, 49, 51, 53, 57, 59, 61, 63, 64, 68, 69, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 86, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 105, 106, 109, 111, 112, 116, 121, 122, 128, 129, 135, 137, 140, 152, 153, 155, 160, 162, 165, 171, 173, 175, 176, 178, 179, and 180.

NEAL SMITH,
BILL ALEXANDER,
JOSEPH D. EARLY,
BOB CARR,
ALAN B. MOLLOHAN,
NANCY PELOSI,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
HAL ROGERS,
RALPH REGULA,
JIM KOLBE
(except for amendment 140),
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
DALE BUMPERS,
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,
JIM SASSER,
BROCK ADAMS,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
WARREN B. RUDMAN,
TED STEVENS,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
ROBERT W. KASTEN, JR.,
PHIL GRAMM,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2608) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement by the House and Senate in explanation of the effect of the action by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

The following table identifies the overall conference agreement for the Justice Assistance appropriation for fiscal year 1992. The disposition of each amendment under this heading and a detailed description of the agreement follows the table:

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS—JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

[In thousands of dollars]

Program/Activity	Fiscal year—				
	1991 Enacted	1992 Request	1992 House	1992 Senate	1992 Conference
National Institute of Justice	$23,929	$23,929	$23,570	$23,929	$23,739
Bureau of Justice Statistics	22,095	23,155	22,656	22,095	22,095
Emergency Assistance	0	0	0	0	0
(Prior year carryover)	(2,078)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)
Missing Children	7,971	7,971	7,851	7,971	8,471
Regional Information Sharing System	14,000	0	13,790	15,000	14,500
Management and Administration	19,921	21,704	21,009	21,009	21,199
Subtotal	87,916	76,759	88,876	90,004	90,004
Juvenile Justice Programs:					
Title II—JJDP Act:					
Part A—Management and Administration	3,248	3,076	3,442	3,442	3,442
—Federal effort	342	250	183	183	183
Part B—Formula grants	50,260	0	50,750	50,750	50,750
Part C—Discretionary grants	17,950	7,250	18,125	18,125	18,125
Part D—Youth Gangs	3,500	0	3,500	3,500	3,500
Subtotal—JJDP programs	75,300	10,576	76,000	76,000	76,000
Prior year unobligated balances	0	0	0	0	−4,000
New Budget Authority—JJDP	75,300	10,576	76,000	76,000	72,000
Victims of Child Abuse Act	0	0	2,000	0	2,000
State and Local Law Enforcement Grants:					
Part E—Edward Byrne Memorial Grants:					
Formula grants	423,000	405,250	398,000	423,000	423,000
Discretionary grants	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Management and Administration	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Correctional Options Grants	0	3,000	25,000	0	(13,000)
RISS	0	9,750	0	0	0
Total, Edward Byrne Memorial Grants	475,000	470,000	475,000	475,000	475,000
NCIC 2000	17,000	22,000	17,000	22,000	22,000
National Judicial College	0	0	0	(1,000)	1,000
National College of District Attorneys	0	0	0	0	500
Part N—TV Testimony—Child Abuse	0	0	1,000	1,000	1,000
Total, State and Local Law Enforcement	492,000	492,000	493,000	498,000	499,500
Mariel Cubans	4,963	0	4,885	4,963	4,963
Total, new budget authority	660,179	579,335	664,761	668,967	668,467

Amendment No. 1: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amount stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$90,004,000, of which $500,000 of the funds provided under the Missing Children's Program shall be made available as a grant to a national voluntary organization representing Alzheimer patients and families to plan, design, and operate a Missing Alzheimer Patient Alert program*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The House bill provides $88,876,000 for Justice Assistance programs, while the Senate amendment provides $90,004,000. The conference agreement appropriates $90,004,000, which provides $500,000 above both the House and Senate levels for the Missing Children Program.

The agreement also adds language included under Juvenile Justice by the Senate for a $500,000 grant under the Missing Children Program for a Missing Alzheimer Patient Alert program. The conferees expect that, in developing a Missing Alzheimer Patient Alert program, the grantee's first priority will be materials development, outreach, and training of local law enforcement, public safety, and emergency health personnel in identifying and handling lost Alzheimer patients.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amount stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$499,500,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The House bill appropriates $493,000,000 for State and local law enforcement assistance grants, while the Senate amendment appropriates $498,000,000. The conference agreement appropriates $499,500,000 for these grants.

Amendment No. 3: Designates $475,000,000 for the Edward Byrne Memorial Grant Program as proposed by the Senate instead of $450,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following: *$13,000,000 of the funds made available in fiscal year 1992 under chapter A of subpart 2 of part East of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, shall be available to carry out the provisions of chapter B of subpart 2 of part E of title I of said Act for Correctional Options Grants; (c)*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate amendment strikes language in the House bill which would appropriate $25,000,000 for demonstration grants to State and local agencies for alternatives to traditional modes of incarceration and offender release programs. The conference agriculture appropriates $13,000,000 for these grants from the discretionary grant program.

Amendment No. 5: Designates $22,000,000 for the National Crime Information Center 2000 project as proposed by the Senate instead of $17,000,000 as proposed by the House, and restores the section designation "(d)".

Amendment No. 6: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *: Provided, That $25,000 of the funds made available to the State of Arkansas in fiscal year 1992 under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, shall be provided to the Arkansas State Police for high priority drug investigations: Provided further, The funds made available in fiscal year 1992 under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, may be obligated for programs to assist States in the liti-*

gation processing of death penalty Federal habeas corpus petitions

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate amendment strikes House language earmarking $25,000 of the State of Arkansas' State and Local Law Enforcement Formula Grant funds for high priority drug investigations, and inserts new language earmarking $5,762,000 of discretionary grant funds to assist States in the litigation processing of death penalty Federal habeas corpus petitions. The conference agreement restores the House language designating $25,000 for high priority drug investigations in Arkansas, and amends the Senate language to authorize the use of formula grant funds provided to the States under the Edward Byrne Memorial Grant program for processing death penalty Federal habeas corpus petitions.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *: Provided further, That funds made available in fiscal year 1992 under parts D and E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, shall be available for the following grants in the amounts specified: (1) $1,000,000 to the National Judicial College to provide judicial education and training to State trial judges in the area of illegal drug and violent criminal offenses; and (2) $500,000 to the National College of District Attorneys to establish a permanent facility to improve the education and training of prosecutors involved in the war on drugs*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate amendment added language not in the House bill, which designates $1,000,000 of discretionary funds in the Edward Byrne Memorial Law Enforcement Assistance Grants for a grant to the National Judicial College. The conference agreement provides $1,000,000 for the National Judicial College and $500,000 for a grant to the National College of District Attorneys, but these funds are provided through a separate appropriation and not through the Edward Byrne Memorial program.

National Judicial College—The conference agreement provides a grant of $1,000,000 to the National Judicial College to allow this college to continue to provide critical education and training to State and local trial judges. Without the infusion of these funds the number of judges attending the National Judicial College will decrease. This decrease comes at a time when, due to the war on drugs, this training is needed the most. The conferees note that this is a onetime grant that will provide the College with the ability to continue their educational programs indefinitely.

National College of District Attorneys—The conference agreement also provides a grant of $500,000 to the National College of District Attorneys. This college plays a key role in providing prosecutorial training critical to the war on drugs. This onetime grant will allow the college to move into a permanent facility with the latest training technology.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *: Provided further, That $150,000 of the funds made available to the State of Kansas in fiscal year 1992 under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, shall only be available for a grant to the City of Wichita, Kansas for Project Freedom's Drug Affected Babies Prevention Initiative.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate amendment adds language, not included in the House bill, which earmarks $150,000 of discretionary grant funds for a project in Wichita, Kansas. The conference agreement amends the Senate language to authorize the use of formula grant funds available to the State of Kansas in FY 1992 for this project.

Amendment No. 9: Deletes a designation proposed by the Senate for a Missing Alzheimer Patient Alert program. The conferees agree that this is not an authorized use of Juvenile Justice Program funds, and have included $500,000 for this initiative under the Missing Children program (Amendment No. 1).

Amendment No. 10: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following: *In addition, and notwithstanding section 214(b) of title II of Public Law 101-647 (104 Stat. 4794), $1,500,000, to remain available until expended, for a grant to the American Prosecutor Research Institute's National Center for Prosecution of Child Abuse for technical assistance and training instrumental to the criminal prosecution of child abuse cases, as authorized in section 213 of Public Law 101-647 (104 Stat. 4793).*

In addition, and notwithstanding section 224(b) of title II of Public Law 101-647 (104 Stat. 4798), $500,000, to remain available until expended, for a grant to the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges to develop model technical assistance and training programs to improve the handling of child abuse and neglect cases, as authorized in section 223(a) of Public Law 101-647 (104 Stat. 4797).

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate amendment strikes language included in the House bill, which would appropriate $2,000,000 for implementation of certain provisions of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990. The conference agreement provides $1,500,000 for a grant for specialized technical assistance and training progams to improve prosecution of child abuse cases, and $500,000 for a grant to develop model progams to improve the judicial system's handling of child abuse cases. The conference agreement waives authorization language which requires that 90 percent of amounts appropriated for these two sections of the Child Abuse Act be provided to the States. Since this authorization requirement was envisioned for an appropriation of $50,000,000 and not the $2,000,000 provided herein, the conferees agreed to waive the requirement. These funds will be utilized for national child abuse programs affecting all States.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $4,963,000 for the Mariel Cuban Grant Program as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,885,000 as proposed by the House.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

The conference agreement provides $23,739,000 for the National Institute of Justice. The conferees expect NIJ to continue the monitoring and evaluation needed to ensure that funds are being properly spent by grant recipients. The conferees also expect NIJ to expand reporting of the results of demonstration projects among local law enforcement agencies in order to share valuable information.

JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAMS

The conference agreement provides a total of $76,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) programs, as follows: $3,625,000 for Management and Administration (Part A), $50,750,000 for Formula Grants (Part B), $18,125,000 for Discretionary Grants (Part C), and $3,500,000 for Youth Gangs (Part D).

The conference agreement provides a total of $18,125,000 for discretionary grants, of which:

$500,000 is for a grant to provide financial and technical assistance to an organization representing the State Advisory Groups (SAGs).

$3,200,000 is for a grant for the coordinated Law-Related Education (LRE) program to be used in the same organizational pattern and by the same LRE organizations that have previously received funding.

$1,000,000 is for a grant to the National Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) program for training and development needs and start-up grants to expand CASA programs.

$2,300,000 is for a grant to the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges to provide continuing legal education in family and juvenile law.

The conferees also encourage the Office of Juvenile Justice Programs to examine and give full consideration to a grant proposal by the Consortium on Children, Families and the Law to continue its research on issues affecting children.

In addition, the conferees expect the Office of Juvenile Justice Programs to continue funding the five year effort of the program on the causes and correlates of delinquency being conducted at the Universities of Pittsburgh and Colorado, and the State University of New York at Albany through fiscal year 1992. This will permit the centers the time necessary to obtain support through other sources in fiscal year 1993.

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE GRANTS

The conference agreement appropriates a total of $499,500,000 for fiscal year 1992 for State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Grants.

The agreement provides $2,000,000 for management and administration, $423,000,000 for the formula grant program, and $22,000,000 for NCIC 2000, and as discussed earlier, $1,000,000 for a onetime grant to the National Judicial College and $500,000 for a onetime grant to the National College of District Attorneys.

The conference agreement also provides a total of $50,000,000 for discretionary grants, to include:

Neighborhood Oriented Policing Projects—the agreement provides not less than $4,000,000 for innovative neighborhood oriented policing projects to fund ongoing demonstration projects to their conclusion, and to expand successful projects to new locations. The conferees expect the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to continue to utilize the expertise developed by national organizations, such as the Eisenhower Foundation, the National Crime Prevention Council, the Na-

tional Training and Information Center, and the National Association of Town Watch in expanding this program into new neighborhoods, both urban and rural.

Boys and Girls Clubs of America—the conference agreement provides $2,500,000 for a grant to the Boys and Girls Clubs to expand the number of clubs in public housing projects throughout the country. As discussed later in the report under the U.S. Attorneys, the Department is planning to expand on a new initiative combining Federal, State and local officials, and community groups, designed first to "weed" out violent criminals from selected neighborhoods, and then to "seed" that neighborhood with economic, education and social opportunities. The conferees agree that the programs and services offered by the Boys and Girls Clubs of America would be ideally suited for the "seed" portion of Operation Weed and Seed.

National Demand Reduction Programs—The conference agreement provides not less than $3,000,000 for the National Crime Prevention Council to continue the National Citizens Crime Prevention Campaign (McGruff), and not less than $1,700,000 to continue and expand the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) program.

Correctional Options Grants—The conference agreement provides $13,000,000 for grants for correctional options that provide alternatives to traditional modes of incarceration. This new grant program, authorized in title XVIII of the Crime Control Act of 1990, will allow for the development and testing of innovative new projects, to include boot camps.

The conferees have also been made aware of two projects which would provide innovative alternatives to incarceration and encourage the Bureau of Justice Assistance to examine the proposals and to give them every possible consideration. The first proposal would provide a grant to the State of Maryland for expanding and enhancing a "Boot Camp" program and a pilot project on home detention at its Jessup facility. This program combines physical conditioning and vocational and life skills training, has resulted in dramatic changes in the attitudes and dispositions of the offenders, and has demonstrated a substantial savings from traditional incarceration. The second proposal is by the County of Palm Beach, Florida as part of their Substance Abuse Awareness Program, which would construct a minimum security drug farm to provide mandatory substance abuse treatment and rehabilitation to low risk, nonviolent, drug-dependent offenders in a discipline/therapeutic corrections setting.

Organized Crime Narcotics (OCN)—The conference agreement provides $3,000,000 for the OCN program to support regional organized crime task forces in order to foster improved Federal, State and local cooperation.

Criminal Information Systems—The conference agreement provides $700,000 for a grant to SEARCH Group, Inc. for continued support to State and local criminal justice agencies to improve their use of computers and information technology.

Financial Investigations (FINVEST) Program—The conference agreement provides $3,000,000 for continuation of ongoing FINVEST projects, and for expansion into new projects.

Model State Grand Jury—The conference agreement provides $500,000 to continue the South Carolina State Grand Jury project while a comprehensive model is developed.

Other High Priority Grant Proposals—The conferees have been made aware of a number of other projects which will enhance State and local law enforcement by providing much needed improvements in training, education and other technical assistance. The conferees encourage the Bureau of Justice Assistance to examine these proposals and to provide grants where warranted. The conferees expect the BJA to submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate on its intentions for these proposals. The proposals follow:

1. Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC)—A grant which would improve drug testing laboratory services in the State of Washington.

2. COMMAND—A demonstration project between communities in California and Nevada utilizing private sector investigators to detect and seize hidden drug assets.

3. IMPACT—A demonstration project in Washington State which provides training and consulting to teachers, counselors, administrators, and community groups in youth substance abuse prevention.

4. Public Safety Communications Systems—grants to assist States in establishing unified public safety channels to provide instantaneous communication among all public safety agencies in a region.

5. Violent Crime—a grant of $125,000 to support a Southeastern States Summit on Violent Crime to address the significant increase in violent crime in those States. The conferees strongly support the leadership of the Bureau of Justice Assistance in establishing regional efforts against violent crime, and believe this approach will assist these states in their efforts, and will serve as a model for other regions of the country.

6. Hate Crimes—a grant of $150,000 to develop a model training curriculum on dealing with victims of hate crime for criminal justice and victim assistance professionals.

General Administration

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 12: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$110,100,000.*

DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING

For necessary expenses of drug law enforcement training, $3,500,000, to remain available until expended, for planning, construction, and purchase of equipment incident thereto for an expanded training center at the FBI Training Academy at Quantico, Virginia, to be expended at the direction of the Attorney General

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $100,100,000 for General Administration instead of $109,925,000 as proposed by the House and $114,142,000 as proposed by the Senate. The agreement allows for requested adjustments to base less $279,000 associated with GSA space rental rate decreases and the $1,500,000 requested for GSA buildings delegation. The agreement allows for no program growth, including the $5,125,000 requested for implementation of the Chief Financial Officers Act.

The conference agreement also includes new language, not in either the House or Senate bills, which appropriates $3,500,000 for the initial costs associated with construction of an expanded training facility at the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia. This additional space is urgently needed to accommodate the needs of the FBI and DEA, since current facilities at the FBI Academy are insufficient to handle the full range of training requirements. The shortfall in space at the FBI Academy results from the significant increase in the number of FBI and DEA agents added to fight the war on drugs and from projected increases in agent attrition due to anticipated retirements.

The conferees are aware that, as a result of severe space constraints, the DEA has been forced to reduce its use of training facilities at Quantico to Basic Training only. All other training, including intelligence analyst, diversion investigator, chemist, State and local, international, and DEA in-service, must be conducted offsite. Without this additional space, not only will DEA's training situation worsen, but the FBI Academy will be forced to reduce the availability of space for the training of State and local law enforcement officers. Currently 1,000 police officers attend the National Academy annually with a waiting list of over 12,000.

The conferees expect the Department to ensure a fair and equitable allocation of space between the FBI and the DEA. It is also anticipated that space will be sufficient to accommodate the training of all DEA core series employees.

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND TRANSFER

As a result of language in the fiscal year 1991 Dire Emergency Supplemental, the Attorney General was authorized to transfer unobligated balances from the Assets Forfeiture Fund to procure vehicles, equipment, and other capital investment items. The conferees understand that the Attorney General plans to procure the following items from these transfers in fiscal year 1992:

Federal Prisons—Salaries and Expenses:	
Prison Activations	$47,866,000
Marshals Service—Salaries and Expenses:	
Holding cells for new judgeships	439,000
Aircraft security system	1,000,000
Prisoner vans	417,000
SOG equipment	574,000
Cellular telephones	200,000
Computer workstations	2,425,000
Micrographic equipment	185,000
Subtotal	5,240,000
Drug Enforcement Administration—S&E:	
Portable computers	722,000
Fingerprint equipment	172,000
Subtotal	894,000
U.S. Attorneys—Salaries and Expenses:	
Equipment	10,000,000
Total transfer	$64,000,000

LONG-TERM AUTHORITY FOR FACILITIES

The conferees are concerned about the apparent disregard of some Justice Department agencies over normal budgeting procedures. Several months ago the Committees were made aware of two long-term facility leases that were entered into by the U.S. Marshals Service for which funds were never requested in either the President's budget or through a reprogramming. In both cases, the leases obligate the U.S. Government to make payments over a number of years—commitments never agreed to by the Congress. Subsequent to complaints lodged by the Committees, the Department submitted a reprogramming for these two leases. The Committees reluc-

tantly agreed to the reprogramming, not so much on the merit of the projects, but because potential litigation costs for terminating the contracts could result in costs higher than the leases.

The conferees believe it is incumbent upon the Department to ensure that the taxpayers are not forced into similar situations in the future. The conferees expect the Department to implement regulations which require the various agencies to obtain approval from the Attorney General prior to entering into any facility lease agreement of over one year in duration, including option years, and with a total value in excess of $1,000,000 over the life of the lease. Anticipated costs of such leases shall be separately identified as part of a President's budget request or a reprogramming prior to entering into an agreement.

OFFICE SPACE

The Department of Justice has experienced unprecedented growth over the past several years as the Congress has added personnel to combat illegal drugs. The conferees understand that the Department is experiencing considerable difficulty in acquiring sufficient office space for these new employees not only here in the Washington, DC area, but nationwide. It appears that the current space acquisition process is not designed to respond quickly to accommodate agency requirements of this magnitude. The conferees understand that the Department is housed in 65 separate locations in the Washington metropolitan area alone. The conferees, recognizing the problems created by the fragmentation of Justice components, request the Department to provide the Committees on Appropriations, by February 1, 1992, a comprehensive report defining its housing problems nationwide, and the specific actions recommended to resolve these critical issues.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Amendment No. 13: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The House bill included language to allow the Department of Justice to retain up to 4 percent of the total in the Working Capital Fund for acquisition of capital equipment. The conference agreement incorporates language, proposed in the Senate amendment, to allow for the transfer of unobligated balances into the working capital fund to be used on a Department-wide basis for law enforcement or litigation-related ADP systems, subject to the Committees' reprogramming procedures.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $28,820,000 instead of $27,893,000 as proposed by the House and $30,719,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base, less $63,000 associated with GSA space rental rate decreases. The conference agreement allows for program enhancements of $500,000 for additional positions in the Audit Division. The conferees were unable to provide for requested increases for implementation of the Chief Financial Officers Act.

The conferees have been made aware that a large portion of the Inspector General's workload revolves around the Immigration and Naturalization Service, particularly the examinations program. It was the intent of Congress that the full cost of adjudications and naturalization services be fully funded by fees. The conferees request that the Attorney General provide a report, by February 1, 1992, on whether it is appropriate for fee accounts to provide some reimbursement to the IG to compensate for audit and inspection services.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $9,855,000 as proposed by the House instead of $9,786,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base, less $279,000 associated with GSA space rental rate decreases. The conference agreement allows for a net program decrease of $928,000, including an increase of $117,000 to continue the Hyattsville Monitoring Project. The conferees agree that Bureau of Prisons personnel should be utilized on a reimbursable basis during phaseout of the Commission; however, for certain sensitive positions, the Commission is authorized to utilize either reimbursable or direct funded positions.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $384,249,000 instead of $379,804,000 as proposed by the House and $388,821,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base, less $275,000 associated with GSA space rental rate decreases. The conference agreement allows for program enhancements of $4,330,000, as follows: $1,985,000 to develop and implement regulations pursuant to the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act of 1990, and $2,345,000 to continue implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)—The Justice Department has critical responsibilities for effectuation of the ADA. The successful and orderly implementation of the ADA depends on the Department's ability to provide adequate technical assistance and to mount a credible enforcement effort. The funds provided herein will allow the Department to carry out these responsibilities.

Independent Counsel—The conferees recognize a need to provide autonomy to the Independent Counsels; however, the conferees agree that the Congress should have the ability to exercise control over their spending. The conferees urge the relevant legislative committees of the House and Senate to provide for appropriate financial controls and oversight over the Independent Counsels.

Amendment No. 17: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which designates $1,000 for the official reception and representation expenses of the U.S. National Central Bureau, INTERPOL. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Amendment No. 18: Deletes language added by the Senate and not contained in the House bill, which is intended to protect licensed health care professionals from contracting the HIV and Hepatitis B viruses. The conferees agree that the goals of this amendment are laudable; however, the provision is not germane to this bill and the conferees believe this issue should be addressed by the appropriate Committee of the Congress as part of a more comprehensive legislative package.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

Amendment No. 19: Provides a total of $58,494,000 in new budget (obligational) authority as proposed by the Senate instead of $53,045,000 as proposed by the House. The conference agreement provides $58,494,000 for the Antitrust Division, which allows for their requested adjustments to base, less $509,000 associated with GSA space rental rate reductions. The conference agreement allows for a program enhancement of $200,000 for litigation arising from investigations into infant formula pricing.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *$13,500,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides that $13,500,000 of the amounts appropriated to the Antitrust Division be derived by premerger nofication filing fees, instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House and $13,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $44,994,000 instead of $43,045,000 as proposed by the House and $45,494,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter striken, amended as follows:

In lieu of the sum "$10,000,000" proposed in said amendment, insert the following: *$13,500,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement restores and amends House language, stricken by the Senate, to make fees collected in fiscal year 1992, that are in excess of $13,500,000, available in fiscal year 1993.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Amendment No. 23: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the phrase "within the State of South Carolina" proposed in said amendment, insert the following: *on the campus of the University of South Carolina* and, in lieu of the sum "$728,259,000" named in said amendment, insert the following: *$720,737,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The House bill appropriates $720,737,000 for the U.S. Attorneys, and provides languages making $5,000,000 available for debt collection activities, $1,200,000 available for Project EAGLE, and $8,000 available for official reception and representation expenses.

The Senate amendment appropriates $728,259,000, includes the House designations, and inserts new language designating $10,000,000 for relocating the Department's Legal Education Program to a site in South Carolina, and new language designating $9,000,000 for a program to allow the U.S. Attorneys to enter into cooperative agreements with State and local agencies.

The conference agreement includes the Senate language, amended to specify that the Legal Education Program is to be relocated at the University of South Carolina. The conferees agree that the Department should present its plan for relocation of the

Legal Education Program to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate by no later than December 31, 1991.

The conference agreement also appropriates $720,737,000 for the U.S. Attorneys, which provides for requested adjustments to base, less $9,622,000 associated with GSA space rental rate reductions, and $5,700,000 in program growth for criminal litigation.

Allocating Assistant U.S. Attorneys.—The conferees agree that the Department should consider the increases in high priority caseload, such as defense procurement fraud, drug cases, S&L prosecutions, and criminal aliens, in allocating Assistant U.S. Attorneys (AUSAs) to the various districts.

Telemarketing Fraud—The conferees agree that telemarketing fraud investigations should be accorded a higher priority for the Department, and that the Department should provide a report to the Committees by February 1, 1992 on the steps being taken to combat telemarketing fraud.

Operation Weed and Seed—The conference agreement includes language, requested by the Department, which represents a new integrated approach for attacking the drug problem. Operation Weed and Seed joins together Federal, State and local law enforcement and social services agencies with community organizations to reduce illegal drugs and crime and restore neighborhoods. The two major components of this initiative are (1) removing violent criminals from communities (Weed), and (2) rebuilding institutions and activities in those communities (Seed). The authority provided herein will allow the U.S. Attorneys to coordinate the Federal approach, with associated funding to be directed primarily to enforcement and prosecution activities. These funds will be used to pay police and prosecutorial overtime and, in some instances, case related expenses such as the purchase of evidence and information. The U.S. Attorneys will work closely with the Bureau of Justice Assistance to initiate 8 to 12 Weed and Seed demonstration projects in fiscal year 1992.

While the conferees are supportive of this initiative, concerns have been raised about the lack of specificity over the objectives and sources of funding for the "Seed" side of this program. In order to assure a balanced approach in this program, the conferees expect that the funds provided herein for Operation Weed and Seed will be used only for projects that are comprehensive in nature and include specific resource commitments from the other Federal, State or local entities for prevention, intervention, and neighborhood reclamation and revitalization. In addition, the conferees expect the Department to provide quarterly reports to the relevant Committees of Congress on the progress of this program and an accounting of funds obligated by the agencies involved in the various projects.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amount proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *$57,221,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $57,221,000 for the U.S. Trustees instead of $67,520,000 as proposed by the House and $69,571,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement also assumes the availability of an additional $23,961,000 in new budget (obligational) authority to be derived by fee collections as discussed below. The total amount available to the U.S. Trustees in fiscal year 1992 will be $81,182,000, the full budget request, less $1,000,000 associated with GSA space rental rate reductions. The program enhancement provided herein will allow for a 21 percent increase of 184 new positions for administration of bankruptcy cases.

The conferees have been made aware of ongoing problems within the U.S. Trustees System. Bankruptcy filings have increased by 95% from 1985 to 1990, while Trustee staffing has remained relatively constant. This combination of increasing workload and level staffing has resulted in a growing backlog of unclosed cases, and an inability on the part of the Trustees to adequately investigate cases of bankruptcy fraud.

Currently, funding for the U.S. Trustees is financed totally from bankruptcy filing fees and not from the general Treasury; however, authorizing legislation requires that such funding be specified in an annual appropriations bill. The intent of the original legislation was to make the Trustees a self-funding enterprise by charging a fee for their services. Budget constraints, when coupled with the need to appropriate ever higher amounts for the war on drugs, have precluded the Congress from providing the full amount needed by the U.S. Trustees.

In order to correct this situation, language has been included in section 111 (amendment number 42) which amends title 28 of the United States Code to provide for a slight increase in chapter 1 bankruptcy fees, and to deposit those fees as offsetting collections directly to the Trustee System for use in improving their services. The Congress will continue to appropriate funds for the basic services provided by the Trustees, and will rely on the amounts to be derived from these fee increases for expanded services.

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $219,125,000 instead of $218,125,000 as proposed by the House and $224,125,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides the full budget request for the Care of Prisoners account less amounts associated with prior year carryover. The agreement also provides $15,000,000 for the Cooperative Agreement Program (CAP).

Amendment No. 26: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *: Provided, That, unless a notification as required under section 606 of this Act is submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, none of the funds in this Act for the Cooperative Agreement Program shall be available for a cooperative agreement with a State or local government for the housing of Federal prisoners and detainees when the cost per bed space for such cooperative agreement exceeds $50,000, and in addition, any cooperative agreement with a cost per bed space that exceeds $25,000 must remain in effect for no less than 15 years.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate, and not in the House bill, which would earmark $10,000,000 of CAP funding for a cooperative agreement with the State of Hawaii for the housing of Federal prisoners and detainees, and substitutes language placing limitations on the amount of money that can be spent on CAP projects and on the length of the agreements.

The purpose of the CAP program is to provide a cost-effective means of obtaining detention space for unsentenced Federal prisoners in locations where there is no Federal Detention Facility. While the conferees understand that the cost of construction is significantly higher in Hawaii, the conferees remain concerned that the initial cost estimates for the Hawaii CAP project exceed the national average. In addition, the conferees are concerned that the bed space is guaranteed for 10 years instead of the customary 15 years. Accordingly, this bill calls for a 15-year guarantee.

The conferees continue to support the need for additional Federal detention space in Hawaii. The conferees understand that due to the acute shortage of Federal detention space in Hawaii, the Department has designated the Hawaii project as their number one CAP priority for fiscal year 1992. The conferees support this designation and expect the Department to expedite negotiations with the State of Hawaii on this cooperative agreement.

To assist the Marshals Service in its negotiations, the conferees have included a limitation of $50,000 on the cost per bed space of individual CAP projects. This level is well above the standard cost of $35,000 per bed space, and should provide the Marshals with the flexibility to negotiate projects at a reasonable level. The conferees agree that the $50,000 limitation should be viewed as an upper limit and not a goal. The conferees fully expect the Marshals Service to maintain their average costs at as low a level as possible, otherwise funding for the CAP program could be jeopardized. The conferees request that the Marshals Service provide the Committees on Appropriations with periodic reports on the status of the Hawaii project.

Alaska Detention Facilities—The conferees agree that the Marshals Service should review the requirements of the State of Alaska for participation in the Cooperative Agreement Program and report to the Committee on Appropriations by March 1, 1992, on its findings. Currently many Federal prisoners must be transported out of the State and returned to Alaska for Federal proceedings, at considerable cost to the taxpayer. It may be more appropriate and cost-effective to house such prisoners in Alaska pursuant to a cooperative agreement.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Amendment No. 27: Designates $18,198,000 for the Cuban Haitian Entrant Program as proposed by the Senate instead of $19,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conference agreement will allow for full funding of the prevention and conciliation of community disputes activity.

The conferees expect the Community Relations Service to continue its role in combatting and responding to hate crimes. In addition, the conferees expect CRS to respond to hate crimes as defined by the Hate Crimes Statistics Act.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

ORGANIZED CRIME DRUG ENFORCEMENT

Amendment No. 28: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *to include intergovernmental agreements with*

State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking, $363,374,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $363,374,000 for OCDE as proposed by the House instead of $380,344,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement also adds language not in the House or Senate bill, which provides the OCDE Task Force program with the authority to adminster a State and local overtime program. These overtime payments are currently adminstered by the DEA under their own authorities.

The conference agreement provides the full request for adjustments to base and program enhancements of $15,000,000. The agreement provides for reimbursements to participating agencies as follows:

OCDE REIMBURSEMENTS BY AGENCY

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal years—				
	1991 enacted	1992 request	House	Senate	Conference
Drug law enforcement:					
Drug Enforcement Administration	93,305	107,04	98,804	107,04	100,304
Federal Bureau of Investigation	89,941	107,220	95,150	107,220	97,150
Immigration and naturalization Service	10,251	11,463	10,550	10,550	10,550
U.S. Marshals	1,082	1,122	1,122	1,122	1,122
Customs Service	25,750	30,781	28,286	28,286	28,286
Bureau of Alchohol/Tobacco/Firearms	9,981	11,443	10,344	10,344	10,344
Internal Revenue Service	33,995	46,153	40,866	37,366	37,366
Coast Guard	862	890	890	890	890
Prosecutions:					
U.S. attorneys	66,655	82,428	74,092	74,092	74,092
Criminal Division	702	723	723	723	723
Tax Division	1,194	1,236	1,236	1,236	1,236
Administrative support:					
Administrative staff	1,223	1,311	1,311	1,311	1,311
Total	334,941	401,974	363,374	380,344	363,374

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $1,926,092,000 for the FBI instead of $1,866,832,000 as proposed by the House and $1,972,807,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base less $10,617,000 associated with GSA space rental rate limitations, and less $6,531,000 associated with the absorption of 20 percent of the cost of law enforcement pay reform. The conference agreement provides $76,700,000 for the following high priority program enhancements:

Other Field Programs	$3,500,000
Drug Program	3,500,000
White Collar Crime (S&L)	3,500,000
Technical Field Support	4,000,000
Fingerprint Identification backlog	12,500,000
Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS)	48,000,000
Relocation and Revitalization (IAFIS) Program Office	1,500,000

Hate Crimes—The conferees commend the FBI for its work on implementation of the Hate Crimes Statistics Act, especially the use of the Uniform Crime Reporting System to track hate crimes and the comprehensive and sensitive law enforcement training program developed to implement the Act. The conferees expect the FBI to continue to fund in fiscal year 1992 the training of law enforcement personnel to collect data on hate crimes.

IDENTIFICATION DIVISION RELOCATION AND REVITALIZATION (IAFIS)

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *; and of which $48,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall only be available to defray expenses for the automation of fingerprint identification services and related costs; and of which $1,500,000 shall be available to establish an independent program office dedicated solely to the relocation of the Identification Division and the automation of fingerprint identification services.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate amendment proposes an appropriation of $48,000,000 to allow the FBI to initiate development and acquisition of the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System. The House bill contained no similar provision. The conference agreement provides $48,000,000 for the initial costs associated with development and acquisition of this vitally needed project to automate the FBI's Fingerprint Identification Division. The conference agreement also includes a program enhancement of $1,500,000 for establishment of an independent program office to provide appropriate management and oversight by the FBI of their effort to relocate and revitalize the Identification Division, particularly IAFIS.

The conference agreement establishes the independent program office because experience has shown that agencies, such as the FBI, with little or no experience in major systems acquisition, derive tremendous benefit from a program office. The conferees believe that, in choosing a strategy for the development and implementation of plans for this extremely complex project, and for execution of those plans, the Director should have access to the best possible technical advice and counsel.

The conferees expect that the program office will be completely separate from the Identification Division or any other permanent, operational FBI division or office, and will report directly to the Director or his designee. The conference agreement provides a program enhancement of $1,500,000 and 10 positions, which when combined with existing resources being utilized for relocation and revitalization management, will allow for an office with a staff of at least 25. In addition, sufficient funds are provided to allow the program office to enter into contractual agreements with private industry to provide needed technical advice.

The conferees expect this program office to be set up along lines that have proven successful for other Federal agencies, as follows: (1) the office should be multi-disciplined with an integrated, comprehensive capability to deal with all program issues related to the relocation and automation effort; (2) the office should be organized in functional directorates or entities including, but not limited to: administration, engineering, configuration management, manufacturing, test facilities, training, legal, contracts, logistics support, and budget and finance; (3) there should be program planning and analysis capability to review the status, problems, risks, and issues associated with this program, as well as provide options and alternatives in response to problem areas; and (4) all functional personnel should be assigned to the program office on a full-time basis, and be collocated and directly responsible to the overall Program Director.

Lastly, in determining IAFIS requirements, the conferees expect the FBI to fully consider the needs of the ultimate user of the system, State and local police officers, and to obtain and consider as many innovative design proposals as possible from industry and other Government agencies.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which allows the use of appropriated funds for the DEA to conduct drug training programs.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum "$740,667,000" proposed in said amendment, insert the following: *$716,653,000.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The House bill provides $706,286,000 for the salaries and expenses of the DEA and designates $1,800,000 for research. The Senate amendment provides $740,667,000 and designate $1,800,000 for research, and $1,500,000 for a Washington, D.C. lab. The conference agreement appropriates $716,653,000 and provides the Senate designations.

The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base less $5,706,000 associated with GSA space rental rate reductions, and less $2,227,000 associated with the absorption of 20 percent of the cost of law en-

forcement pay reform. The conference agreement provides for the following high priority program enhancements:

Domestic enforcement	$10,000,000
State and local task forces	8,500,000

The conferees are concerned about DEA's proposed regulation regarding affiliated practitioners' ability to prescribe controlled substances, and especially about how this will impact on health care delivery in rural areas. The conferees recognize the need to ensure that every health care practitioner prescribing drugs is properly registered; however, in establishing the new regulations, the conferees expect the DEA to ensure that the new regulation will not limit the ability of nurse practitioners, physician assistants, and other health care professionals to prescribe controlled substances consistent with individual State statutes. The conferees expect the DEA to submit a report on this issue to the Committees on Appropriations prior to implementation of a final regulation.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 33: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amount proposed in said amendment, insert the following: *$938,241,000.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $938,241,000 for the salaries and expenses of the INS instead of $947,041,000 as proposed by the House and $950,817,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base less $3,217,000 associated with GSA space rental rate reductions, less $3,355,000 associated with the absorption of 20 percent of the cost of law enforcement pay reform, and less $7,500,000 in base reductions to the Border Patrol associated with the transfer of funds from the Special Forfeiture Fund. The conference agreement provides for the following high priority program enhancements:

Land border inspectors	$5,973,000
Detention and deportation	4,336,000
Border patrol agents	3,000,000

Land Border Inspectors.—The conference agreement provides the full requested increase of $5,973,000 and 135 positions for additional land border inspectors. These inspectors are needed because of the increased traffic along both the Northern and Southern borders. The conferees are aware of lengthy delays in locations, such as the Blue Water Bridge between Michigan and Canada, which impede U.S.-Canadian trade. The conferees also understand that traffic along the Southern border has reached all-time highs, as evidenced by the 30 percent increase in crossings at El Paso's ports over the past four years. The conferees expect the INS to distribute these additional resources to border sectors based on their workload requirements. The conferees also encourage the INS to retain temporary inspector positions funded in fiscal year 1991 in order to better handle peak workload needs.

Amendment No. 34: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert the following: *; and of which $312,473,000 shall be available to the Border Patrol program, unless a notification, as required under section 606 of this Act, is submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the Amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes language proposed in the Senate amendment, adding language designating $312,473,000 for the Border Patrol, which can only be adjusted through a reprogramming. No such provision was included in the House bill.

Amendment No. 35: Deletes language proposed in the Senate amendment which would delay implementation of new immigration regulations affecting the admission of artists, athletes and entertainers by 6 months. This language is no longer required, since an identical provision has passed both the House and Senate as separate legislation, and has been sent to the President for his signature.

Airport Inspections—The conferees remain concerned about ongoing delays for arriving passengers at U.S. airports, especially during peak travel times. Such delays impose unacceptable burdens on the traveler, often causing missed connecting flights and detracting from the desirability of traveling to the United States as a tourist destination. The conferees are still committed to the ICAO international processing standard that no passenger wait longer than 45 minutes for inspection by all Federal agencies. The conferees understand that Western European countries, with their strict security requirements, are achieving the 45 minute standard. The conferees agree that it is incumbent upon the INS to work in concert with other Federal agencies, the airlines and airports to achieve the standard.

One means of achieving the standard on a short term basis is through the extension of the Accelerated Citizen Examination (ACE) program. The ACE program allows U.S. citizens to bypass the full INS inspection process in favor of a passport examination and selective inquiry into the automated lookout system. The conferees agree that the ACE program should be an integral part of the total package of options available to INS airport directors to handle peak arrival times. The conferees agree that, when ACE procedures are adopted, they should be applied uniformly at all airports.

Immigration Preinspection—The conferees understand that there is general agreement among the various governmental agencies, both in the United States and the United Kingdom, responsible for the security and facilitation of air travel, that the test of the concept of immigration preinspection from the United Kingdom was an unqualified success. Benefits to be derived under this concept include: expenditious processing of international travelers, avoidance of lengthy delays at U.S. airports upon arrival, improved security, elimination of detention and deportation costs associated with travellers halted before they enter the U.S.

The conferees are aware that many details need to be worked out between the INS and the State Department, and between the United States and the United Kingdom, before this program can be implemented on a permanent basis. Space considerations at airports in the United Kingdom must be negotiated with the appropriate airport authorities. The diplomatic status of INS inspectors must be negotiated with the government of the United Kingdom. Also costs associated with the additional INS inspectors in the United Kingdom must be negotiated with the State Department. The conferees believe that the INS should reimburse the State Department for all of the incremental cost increases resulting from the introduction of additional INS personnel associated with this program.

The conferees expect the Department of State, along with the INS, FAA and other affected agencies to initiate the negotiation process for this preinspection program with the United Kingdom by January 30, 1992. The conferees agree that the implementation goal for this program should be September 30, 1992. As the permanent preinspection program is developed, the conferees expect the INS to utilize the London preinspection test as a model for determining which airline routes are affected. The conferees request that quarterly reports be provided the Committees on Appropriations on the status of negotiations, beginning January 30, 1992.

Inspections User Fee—The Immigration Inspections User Fee Account was established in 1986 primarily to provide the means for the INS inspections program to add additional inspectors and enhance automation with the goal of improving services and avoiding delays at U.S. airports. One of the authorized uses of this fee account is the detention and deportation of excludable aliens seized at airports. The conferees are concerned that funds, which could be utilized to add more airport inspectors and help reduce airport delays, are instead being used for detention and deportations. Over the past five years, user fee detention and deportation costs have gone from $5,500,000 (9% of the user fee budget) to over $24,000,000 (24% of the budget). The conferees agree that the costs associated with original goals of reducing passenger delays should take precedence over the cost of detaining and deporting excludables. The INS should ensure that sufficient funds are made available to achieve inspector staffing plans prior to committing funds for detention and deportation.

Immigration Fines—The conferees note that the INS has not yet published regulations pertaining to air carrier fine provisions that were included in the Immigration Act of 1990. In view of the benefits to be gained by interdicting potention illegal entrants, the conferees expect the INS to act on industry petitions and issue a proposed rule as soon as possible.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 36: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amount proposed in said amendment, insert the following: *$1,598,920,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $1,598,920,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Federal Prison System instead of $1,637,299,000 as proposed by the House and $1,612,635,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base less $388,000 associated with GSA space rental rate reductions, and less $8,327,000 associated with the absorption of 20 percent of the cost of law enforcement pay reform.

The conference agreement provides a net increase of $103,359,000 for the following high priority programs:

Prison activations	$43,756,000
Prisoner population adjustments	42,655,000
Drug abuse treatment program	11,948,000
Contract confinement	5,000,000

The conference agreement also assumes that an additional $47,866,000 will be made available for fiscal year 1992 activations from a previously approved transfer from the Assets Forfeiture Fund.

Parent/Child Programs—The conferees continue to support prison programs providing child-oriented visiting facilities, parent education programs, and social services to inmate families. The conference agreement assumes the continuing maintenance and implementation of parent/child programs in all female institutions and in a minimum of one male institution per region.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $452,090,000 as proposed by the Senate for the buildings and facilities of the Federal Prison System instead of $415,090,000 as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base, and a total of $288,666,000 for new construction projects as follows:

Philadelphia MDC	$81,950,000
Houston MDC	54,900,000
Base program	16,319,000
El Centro INS Detention Center	3,497,000
Other high priority projects	132,000,000

The conferees understand that the Administration's overall request for prison construction assumed a transfer of $46,000,000 from the Special Forfeiture Fund, which, when added to $132,000,000 provided in this appropriation, would fund a $178,000,000 prison complex. The conferees understand that there will not be a transfer of $46,000,000 from the Special Forfeiture Fund. The conferees note that the Congress has refrained from partial funding of prisons in the past, and in keeping with that precedent, expects the Bureau of Prisons not to fund the complex, and instead to fund its next highest priority.

The conferees are aware that the Federal Bureau of Prisons has determined that there is a requirement to expand the hospital bed capacity of the Federal prison system. In connection with this program, the conferees encourage the Bureau to examine the feasibility of acquiring use of the St. Michael's Hospital in Texarkana, Arkansas.

The conferees expect the Bureau of Prisons to carry out the provisions contained in both the House and Senate reports accompanying H.R. 2608, concerning the following prison construction issues:

Prisons in the Lower Mississippi Delta Region

Prisons in the Northeast/Mid-Atlantic Regions

Prison Overcrowding

Constructing Prisons on Military Installations

Hawaii Federal Detention Facility

Beckley, WV Federal Prison Facility

King County, WA

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

Amendment No. 38: Designates $3,297,000 as proposed by the Senate for administrative expenses of the Federal Prison System for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 instead of $3,248,000 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Amendment No. 39: Designates $45,000 as proposed by the Senate for official reception and representation expenses instead of $31,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 40: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which adds language, not contained in the House bill, to waive the four year grant limitation on the receipt of Federal funds for multijurisdictional drug task forces.

Amendment No. 41: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which adds language, not contained in the House bill, to make permanent, language contained in the fiscal year 1991 Appropriations Act to set the Federal match for the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Grant formula program at 75 percent.

Amendment No. 42: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 110. Notwithstanding 28 U.S.C. 1821, no funds appropriated to the Department of Justice in fiscal year 1992 or any prior fiscal year, or any other funds available from the Treasury of the United States, shall be obligated or expended to pay a fact witness fee to a person who is incarcerated testifying as a fact witness in a court of the United States, as defined in 28 U.S.C. 1821(a)(2).

SEC. 111. Effective 60 days after enactment of this Act—(a) Section 1930(a) of title 28, United States Code, as amended, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (3) by striking "$500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$600"; and

(2) in the second sentence of subsection (6), by striking "$150" and inserting in lieu thereof "$250", by striking "$300" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500", by striking "$750" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,250", by striking "$2,250" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,750", and by striking "$3,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,000".

(b) Section 589a(b) of title 28, United States Code, as amended, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (2) by striking "three-fifths" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 percentum"; and

(2) in subsection (5) by striking "all" and inserting in lieu thereof "60 percentum".

(c) Section 589a of title 28, United States Code, as amended, is further amended by adding a new subsection as follows—

"(f) For the purpose of recovering the cost of services of the United States Trustee System, there shall be deposited as offsetting collections to the appropriation "United States Trustee System Fund", to remain available until expended, the following—

(1) 16.7 percentum of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(3) of this title;

(2) 40 percentum of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(6) of this title".

SEC. 112. Section 524 of title 28, United States Code as amended, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by deleting "purposes of the Department of Justice" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "law enforcement purposes";

(2) by deleting subsection (c)(1)(C), and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) at the discretion of the Attorney General, the payment of awards for information or assistance leading to a civil or criminal forfeiture involving any federal agency participating in the Fund;";

(3) in subsection (c)(1)(F), by deleting the word "drug" preceding the words "law enforcement functions";

(4) in subsection (c)(1)(F), by deleting "the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, or the United States Marshals Service", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "any federal agency participating in the Fund";

(5) by deleting subsection (c)(4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) There shall be deposited in the Fund—

"(a) all amounts from the forfeiture of property under any law enforced or administered by the Department of Justice, except all proceeds of forfeitures available for use by the Secretary of Treasury or the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to section 11(d) of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1540(d)) or section 6(d) of the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3375(d)), or the Postmaster General of the United States pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 2003(b)(7);

"(b) all amounts representing the federal equitable share from the forfeiture of property under any State, local or foreign law, for any federal agency participating in the Fund.";

(6) by inserting in subsection (c)(5), immediately following "Amounts in the Fund", the following: ", and in any holding accounts associated with the Fund";

(7) by addicting at the end of subsection (c)(9)(C) the following sentence:

"Further, transfers under subsection (B) may be made only to the extend that the sum of the transfers for the current fiscal year and the unobligated balance at the beginning of the current fiscal year for the Special Forfeiture Fund do not exceed $150,000,000."; and

(8) In subsection (c)(9)(E)—

(A) by deleting ", 1992", and inserting in lieu thereof "of each fiscal year thereafter";

(B) by deleting "to procure vehicles, equipment, and other capital investment items for the law enforcement, prosecution and correctional activities of the Department of Justice.", and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"to be transferred to any federal agency to procure vehicles, equipment, and other capital investment items for law enforcement, prosecution and correctional activities, and related training requirements.".

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate amendment adds language, not included in the House bill, which continues in fiscal year 1992 the prohibition on the use of Justice Department funds for payment of witness fees to incarcerated persons testifying in Federal cases.

The conference agreement includes the Senate language, amended to include a prohibition on payments of witness fees to incarcerated persons, not only from amounts appropriated to the Justice Department, but also from any other funds available from the U.S. Treasury, such as the Judgment Fund. It is clearly the intent of Congress that incarcerated individuals not receive any witness fees, and this amendment clarifies that intent.

The conference agreement also includes new language, not in either the House or Senate bills, which attempts to address a serious backlog of bankruptcy cases being handled by the U.S. Trustees. This issue and a detailed discussion of the conference agreement is addressed earlier in the statement of managers under amendment number 25.

The conference agreement also includes new language, not included in either the

House or Senate bill, which amends sections of title 28 of the United States Code dealing with the Assets Forfeiture Fund. The changes are as follows: (1) expands the authority of the Attorney General to utilize Assets Forfeiture Fund balances for law enforcement agencies outside of the Department of Justice; (2) provides additional authority to deposit amounts into the Fund, to include the Federal share of seizures administered through State courts; (3) allows for the investment of balances contained in holding accounts; (4) limits to $150,000,000 the balance available in the Special Forfeiture Fund; and (5) extends the authorities provided the Attorney General to transfer obligated balances to agencies other than the Justice Department for fiscal year 1993 and beyond.

The conferees note that the section limiting amounts in the Special Forfeiture Fund will have no impact on that fund. Current law provides for the transfer of $150,000,000 each year into the Special Forfeiture Fund. This provisions does not change that transfer authority. If all funds available in the Special Forfeiture Fund are obligated each year, then $150,000,000 can still be transferred from the Assets Forfeiture Fund.

RELATED AGENCIES

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $7,159,000 as proposed by the House instead of $7,617,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided will allow the Commission to continue operating at the current year baseline level but does not allow for the re-opening of the remaining four (of the original ten) regional offices.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $210,271,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $209,875,000 as proposed by the House. The amount provides the full budget request including full funding of the Administration's request for the employment provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

While the bill does not include proposed language creating an EEOC Technical Assistance Revolving Fund, the conferees are aware of interest in the establishment of such a fund by the EEOC authorizing committees. The conferees support this proposal, which will allow funds to be transferred from the Salaries and Expenses account to capitalize the revolving fund, but remind the Commission that such a transfer would be subject to the reprogramming procedures included in section 606 of this Act.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $126,309,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $67,929,000 as proposed by the House. The amount provided is a direct appropriation and does not include bill language proposed by the Administration which would have increased FCC licensing and enforcement fees.

The conference agreement includes $30,000 to permit the FCC to continue to subscribe to the Rutgers University Wireless Information Network Laboratory in fiscal year 1992. The conferees also expect the Commission to carry out, within Disabilities Act (ADA).

Amendement No. 46: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers of the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate, and carried for several years in appropriations act, which : (1) prohibits the FEE and spending funds to repeal, retroactively restrict or continue a pending reexamination of current rules to promote ownership of broadcasting licenses by minorities and women; (20 prohibits the FCC from reducing the number of VHF channel assignments for noncommercial educational television stations; and (3) prohibits the use of funds to repeal, to retroactively apply changes in, or to begin or continue a reexamination of the rules and policies of the FCC regarding newspaper/broadcasting cross-ownership. The House bill contained no similar provisions.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $17,600,000 instead of $17,317,000 as proposed by the House and $17,974,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes the GSA rent reduction proposed by the House and does not included funding for an additional position requested for the Commission's Office of Inspector General.

The conferees are aware of a decision by the Commission not to file the vacant director's position in the FCC's New Orleans District Office because of budgetary constraints and to transfer the responsibilities of the New Orleans District Director to Houston. While the New Orleans office remains open, the conferees are concerned that any downgrading of that office could seriously impact the 17 states served by the New Orleans District. Therefore, the conferees expect the Commission to fill the New Orleans director vacancy as soon as possible within the funds provided in this Act.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 48: Provides a total of $82,700,000 for the Federal Trade Commission instead of $78,892,000 as proposed by the House and $83,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$13,500,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $82,700,000 of which $13,500,000 shall be derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976. This amount is based on the level of fees collected thus far in fiscal year 1991. The House had proposed $10,000,000 and the Senate has proposed $13,000,000 for this purpose.

The amount provided in the conference agreement includes the GSA rent reduction proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates $69,200,000 instead of $68,892,000 as proposed by the House and $70,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Reported in disagreement.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 52: Adds language inserted by the Senate which clarifies the $100,000 limitation on expenses associated with consultations with foreign governmental and regulatory officials to include only those meetings hosted by the Securities and Exchange Commission. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Amendment No. 53: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which requires the SEC to raise the rate of fees under section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 from one-fiftieth to one-thirty-second of one percent. The amendment also provides that these fees are to be deposited as an offsetting collection to this appropriation to recover costs of services of the securities registration process and are to remain available until expended. This increase in the rate of fees will generate an additional $68,307,000 for the SEC and when added to the $157,485,000 directly appropriated to the Commission will provide for the full budget request of $225,792,000. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates $13,550,000 for the State Justice Institute instead of $13,347,000 as proposed by the House and $13,588,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates $183,000,000 instead of $173,942,000 as proposed by the House and $188,950,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount in the conference agreement is allocated as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Conference agreement
Base request	$175,841
Building and fire research	350
Furniture flammability	250
Nonenergy inventions	150
Facilities	2,000
Semiconductors	1,500
Superconductors	1,500
Earthquake hazards	409
Light wave research	500
Intelligent machines	500
Total	183,000

Amendment No. 56: Provides a limitation of up to $11,386,000 for construction of research facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,340,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House.

The conferees believe that the Center for Integrated Design, Non-Destructive Evaluation and Manufacturing Sciences is making important contributions toward increasing U.S. competitiveness in manufacturing, and intend that the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall continue its support for the Center through December 31, 1992.

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

Amendment No. 57: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which adds a provision that waives any other provision of law concerning the use of funds contained in Amendment No. 58. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

Amendment No. 58: Deletes a provision proposed by the Senate which would have prohibited any person incarcerated in a Federal or State penal institution from receiving any funds appropriated to carry out subpart 1 of part A of Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The provision would

have also added language waiving any other provision of law concerning the State Extension Services Program—a subject which is addressed in the conference agreement on Amendment No. 57. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

FLEET MODERNIZATION, SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

Amendment No. 59: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

FLEET MODERNIZATION, SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, leasing, or conversion of vessels, including related equipment, for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, $33,200,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, repair, and modification of facilities and minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and for facility planning and design and land acquisition not otherwise provided for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, $34,917,000, to remain available until expended.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides, $33,200,000 for a new account entitled "Fleet Modernization, Shipbuilding and Conversion". Under the conference agreement, these funds will be available for construction, acquisition, leasing, or conversion of vessels including related equipment. The amount provided by the conference agreement includes $1,000,000 for development of a multibeam sonar.

The Senate had proposed an appropriation of $100,000,000 for the Fleet Modernization account for all of the purposes contained in the conference agreement except for the leasing of vessels. The conferees inserted the authority to lease vessels to allow NOAA to consider potentially cost effective proposals to lease vessels for bathymetric surveys of the United States Exclusive Economic Zone and fisheries research and surveys. The conferees encourage NOAA to consider such opportunities. The Senate had also proposed a limitation that would have prohibited the obligation or expenditure of these funds in foreign shipyards. The conferees have deleted this provision, but strongly recommend that the entire NOAA fleet modernization program be carried out by U.S. firms in U.S. shipyards.

The conferees intend that this new account should be part of a long-term program which could take up to 10 to 15 years to replace NOAA's aging fleet. The conferees expect NOAA to undertake a balanced, cost effective program that meets its program requirements without providing for wasteful excess capacity. The conferees are agreed that before obligating any of the funds contained in this account for any new construction, NOAA should review the option of acquiring excess Navy, Coast Guard, or other vessels, and in any event should submit a reprogramming request to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees under the reprogramming procedures of this Act before obligating any funds for any new construction. In addition, the conferees request that the Department of Commerce Inspector General continue his review of NOAA's Fleet Modernization Program, monitor NOAA's use of the funds provided in this account and submit a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on this program by April 1, 1992 and every 6 months thereafter.

The conference agreement also provides a new appropriation for the construction, repair, facility, planning and design, and land acquisition requirements of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. This new account was not included in either the House or Senate bill. The following projects are funded in the Construction account pursuant to the conference agreement:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Conference agreement
NEXRAD facilities and land acquisition	$23,573
Beaufort, NC Lab	196
NOAA Facilities Initiative	2,000
(Charleston Fisheries Lab repairs)	(700)
Lafayette Fisheries Lab	1,250
Alaska Fisheries Center	1,000
Environmental Compliance Project	2,398
Relocation of San Francisco NWS	2,000
New Construction, Above Standards Costs, Boulder	2,500
Total	$34,917

The House bill contained no provision on any of these matters.

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Amendment No. 60: Designates 439 commissioned officers on the active list for the NOAA corps of commissioned officers as proposed by the House instead of 416 officers as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

grants, contracts, or other payments to nonprofit organizations for the purposes of conducting activities pursuant to cooperative agreements:

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides language which will permit the appropriation to be used for grants, contracts, or other payments to nonprofit organizations for conducting activities pursuant to cooperative agreements. The Senate had proposed this language as well as a provision which would have authorized such grants, contracts, or other payments to nonprofit organizations pursuant to memoranda of understanding. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

Amendment No. 62: Appropriates $1,453,928,000 instead of $1,381,550,000 as proposed by the House and $1,550,769,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The details of the conference agreement are provided in the following table, with appropriate comparisons:

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

	1991 currently available	1992 base	Fiscal year 1992— Total request	House	Senate	Recommended conference
National Ocean Service						
Mapping, Charting and Geodesy:						
Mapping and Charting	$29,727	$30,371	$30,371	$29,915	$30,371	$30,371
ANCS II	1,644	1,636	1,636	1,611	1,636	1,636
Great Lakes Mapping Project	500	498	0	491	500	500
Subtotal	31,871	32,505	32,007	32,017	32,507	32,507
Geodesy	15,999	16,255	16,255	16,011	16,255	16,255
SC Cooperative Geodesy Survey	577	574	0	0	577	577
Land Information System	1,836	1,827	0	1,800	1,800	1,800
Subtotal	18,412	18,656	16,255	17,811	18,632	18,632
Total, Map., Chart. and Geodesy	50,283	51,161	48,262	49,828	51,139	51,139
Observation and Assessment:						
Observation and Prediction	10,826	11,143	11,143	10,976	11,643	11,643
Circulatory Survey Program	773	769	372	757	372	769
California Marine Obs. Buoys	151	150	0	148	0	150
Tampa Bay Mapping Project	1,500		0	0	0	0
Ocean Services	4,800	4,776	4,776	4,704	4,776	4,776
Gulf of Maine Data Collection	250		0	0	250	250
COAP	550	497	497	490	0	490
Subtotal	18,850	17,335	16,788	17,075	17,041	18,078
Estuarine and Coastal Assessment	2,184	2,300	2,300	2,266	2,300	2,300
Ocean Assessment Program	12,693	12,630	12,630	12,441	12,630	12,630
Damage Assessment	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,463	2,500	2,500
New York Bight Center	0	0	0	0	3,000	0
Prince William Sound Oil Spill	2,000	2,000	4,500	1,970	4,500	4,000
Oil Pollution Act of 1990	0	0	0	0	0	1,500
Victorial Bluff Tract, S.C. Acquis	0	0	0	0	0	1,000

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION—Continued

	1991 currently available	1992 base	Fiscal year 1992— Total request	House	Senate	Recommended conference
New England/Gulf of Maine Research	0	0	0	0	3,000	0
SC Wetlands Demo. Project	1,400	1,393	0	0	2,800	1,900
LI Sound	1,000	995	0	0	0	0
Damage Assess. Transfer	500	500	12,000	11,993	12,000	6,500
Subtotal	22,277	22,318	33,930	31,133	42,730	32,330
Coastal Ocean Science	10,846	10,290	17,290	10,136	12,000	11,500
Subtotal	10,846	10,290	17,290	10,136	12,000	11,500
Total, Observation and Assessment	51,973	49,943	68,008	58,344	71,771	61,908
Ocean and Coastal Management:						
Coastal Management:						
CZM Grants	35,939	34,452	25,055	34,931	34,931	34,931
CZM Program Administration	3,394	3,336	2,839	3,915	4,000	4,000
Acqu. of Estuarine Sanctuaries	3,473	3,456	3,456	3,455	4,000	3,705
Charleston, SC. Spec Area Mgt	400	0	0	0	1,000	1,000
Non-Point Source Pollution	0	0	0	2,000	2,000	2,000
Subtotal	43,206	41,244	31,350	44,301	45,931	45,636
Ocean Management	1,723	1,666	1,666	1,642	1,666	1,666
Marine Sanctuary Program	3,822	3,803	3,306	4,746	5,500	5,000
Farallon Islands Damage Assess	500	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii Humpback Mrne. Sanct	250	.....	0	0	150	150
Subtotal	6,295	5,469	4,972	6,387	7,316	6,816
Coastal America	.....	.....	5,000	0	0	0
Total, Ocean and Coastal Mgmnt	49,501	46,713	41,322	50,688	53,247	52,452
Total, National Ocean Service	151,757	147,817	157,592	158,860	176,157	165,499
National Marine Fisheries Service						
Information Collection and Analysis:						
Resource Information	57,757	50,354	50,354	49,599	50,354	50,354
Conservation Eng./By Catch	750	746	746	735	746	746
Bering Sea Pollock Research	1,000	995	995	980	1,000	1,000
Alaskan Groundfish Surveys	700	697	697	687	700	700
Aquaculture	2,702	2,689	467	2,649	2,689	2,689
Stuttgart	2,750	550	0	542	600	600
Multispecies Aquaculture Center	0	0	0	0	0	110
West Coast Groundfish	843	839	839	826	1,050	839
Fish Cooperative Inst. Enhancement	0	0	0	0	400	400
Pacific Salmon Treaty Program	5,000	4,975	4,663	5,900	5,900	5,900
Protected Species Research	2,899	2,885	2,240	3,842	2,885	3,842
Marine Mammal Research	2,000	1,990	2,990	2,960	2,410	2,410
Hawaiian Monk Seals	0	0	0	0	550	550
Stellar Sea Lion Recovery Plan	0	0	0	0	1,500	1,500
SEAMAP	938	933	933	1,419	933	1,419
Habitat Research/Evaluation	500	498	0	491	500	500
Chesapeake Bay Studies	2,000	1,990	0	1,960	2,500	2,000
MARFIN	2,986	2,971	2,971	2,926	4,971	4,000
Right Whale Research	235	234	0	230	230	230
Gear Entanglement Studies	703	700	700	690	800	700
Alaska Salmon Research	2,300	2,289	0	2,255	0	0
Hawaii Stock Management Plan	400	398	0	392	750	750
Lobster Research	0	0	0	0	300	300
Yukon River Chinook Study	235	234	0	230	735	735
Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Research	0	0	0	0	350	350
Antarctic Research	1,300	1,294	0	1,275	2,000	1,275
New England Stock Depletion	647	644	644	1,134	1,400	1,200
Atlantic Salmon Research	500	498	0	491	1,000	750
Oyster Disease Research	1,352	1,345	0	1,325	1,345	1,500
Laboratory Consolidation	.....	.....	(5,000)	0	(1,300)	(1,300)
North Carolina Marlboro Island	1,000	.....	0	0	0	0
Gulf of Maine Groundfish Survey	500	498	0	491	800	600
Dolphin Research	400	398	0	0	0	0
Dolphin Safe Technologies	0	0	0	0	1,000	750
Fishery Res. Data Error Reduct	0	0	2,000	0	2,000	1,000
Protected Species Pop. Assess	0	0	1,000	0	0	0
Hawaiian Sea Turtles	0	0	0	0	250	250
Center for Shark Research	0	0	0	0	0	150
Subtotal	92,397	81,644	67,239	84,029	91,348	88,799
Fishery Industry Information:						
Fish Statistics/Monitoring	11,388	11,173	12,173	11,005	13,873	13,873
PACFIN/Catch Effort Data	2,000	1,990	1,990	2,460	2,000	2,200
Rec. Fishery Harvest Data	.....	.....	1,800	1,000	2,800	2,200
Subtotal	13,388	13,163	15,963	14,465	18,673	18,273
Information Analysis and Diss	19,288	19,936	19,936	19,637	19,936	19,936
Computer Hardware and Software	1,700	1,692	4,992	1,667	3,992	2,800
Subtotal	20,988	21,628	24,928	21,304	23,928	22,736
Total, Info. Coll. and Analyses	126,773	116,435	108,130	119,798	133,949	129,808
Conservation and Management Ops.:						
Fisheries Management Program	12,159	12,446	12,446	12,259	12,446	12,446
Columbia River	10,300	10,249	0	10,095	14,249	13,000
Management of George's Bank	471	469	0	0	1,000	500
Beluga Whale Committee	0	0	0	0	200	200
Pacific Tuna Management	0	0	0	0	2,000	1,700
Smolt/Squawfish	100	100	0	99	120	120
Columbia River Endg. Spec. Stdy	300	299	0	0	300	300
Regional Councils	8,500	8,458	7,166	8,331	9,450	9,200

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION—Continued

	1991 currently available	1992 base	Fiscal year 1992— Total request	Fiscal year 1992— House	Senate	Recommended conference
Subtotal	31,830	32,021	19,612	30,784	39,765	37,466
Protected Species Management	4,758	3,817	3,817	3,760	3,817	3,817
End. Species Act Recovery Plan	235	234	234	230	234	234
Marine Mammal Prot. Act Impl	7,500	7,463	7,463	7,351	7,463	7,463
Driftnet Act Implementation	4,300	4,279	3,286	4,215	4,879	4,500
Recyclable fishing nets study					150	150
Hrbr Seals, Sea Lions (Sec. 109)	36	36	0	0	36	0
East Coast Observers					1,500	750
Fishery Observer Training	200	199	0	0	200	100
ESA Listing and Status Reviews			1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Tissue Bank and Stranding Ntwrk			500	0	500	250
Subtotal	17,029	16,028	16,300	16,556	19,779	18,264
Habitat Conservation	5,857	5,708	5,708	6,622	5,708	6,000
Enforcement and Surveillance	9,385	10,034	10,034	9,883	12,034	11,000
Total, Cons. and Mgmnt Operations	64,101	63,791	51,654	63,845	77,286	72,730
State and Industry Assist. Programs:						
Grants To States:						
Interjuris. Fisheries Grants	3,523	3,483	0	3,431	3,483	3,483
Anadromous Grants	2,354	2,342	0	2,307	2,342	2,342
Anadromous Fishery Project	0	0	0	0	0	200
Striped Bass Grants	471	469	0	462	471	471
Interstate Fish Commissions	330	328	0	323	328	328
Seafood Business Education Center	0	0	0	0	0	300
Subtotal	6,678	6,622	0	6,523	6,624	7,124
Fisheries Development Program:						
Fisheries Trade Promotion Act	1,388	1,793	1,793	1,766	1,793	1,793
Product Quality and Safety	9,058	8,873	7,483	8,740	8,873	8,873
Fish Oils	942	937	0	0	937	937
Export Strategies/Mahi Mahi	470	468	0	461	800	800
Model Seafood Inspection Pgm	330	328	0	0	0	0
Shellfish Water Stds. Research	1,500	1,493	0	1,471	0	1,471
Seafood Consumer Center	1,000	995	0	0	0	0
Seafood Inspection			6,500	0	6,500	3,000
Subtotal	14,688	14,887	15,776	12,438	18,903	16,874
Total, State and Industry Assist	21,366	21,509	15,776	18,961	25,527	23,998
Total, NMFS	212,240	201,735	175,560	202,604	236,762	226,536
Oceanic and Atmospheric Research:						
Climate and Air Quality Research:						
Interannual and Seasonal Clim. R	8,264	8,248	8,248	8,124	8,248	8,248
Long-Term Climate and AQ Research	23,515	24,123	24,123	23,761	24,123	24,123
Nat'l Acid Precipitation Ass	1,487	1,480	1,480	1,458	1,480	1,480
Subtotal, Long Term Clim and AQ R	25,002	25,603	25,603	25,219	25,603	25,603
Climate and Global Change	47,253	46,979	77,779	46,274	46,274	47,000
National Climate Program:						
National Climate Program Office	1,090	1,085	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	1,090	1,085	0	0	0	0
Total, Climate and Air Quality Res	81,609	81,915	111,630	79,617	80,125	80,851
Atmospheric Programs:						
Weather Research	28,039	28,438	28,438	28,011	28,438	28,438
PROFS	3,766	3,747	1,877	1,821	3,246	2,500
Wx. Modification Matching Grnts	2,763	2,749	0	2,708	2,749	2,749
Wind Profiler	5,696	5,668	1,480	1,393	5,668	5,000
Subtotal	40,264	40,602	31,795	33,933	40,101	38,687
Solar-Terr. Svcs. and Research	4,724	4,866	5,366	4,793	5,366	5,000
Southeastern Storm Research						400
Total Atmospheric Programs	44,988	45,468	37,161	38,726	45,467	44,087
Ocean and Great Lakes Programs:						
Marine Prediction Research	8,416	8,893	8,893	8,760	8,893	8,893
GLERL	4,722	4,748	4,251	4,677	4,748	4,748
GERL-Zebra Mussel	1,000	995	0	980	980	980
Lake Champlain Study	0	0	0	0	250	200
Pacific Island Tech. Assist	0	0	0	0	250	200
U.N.H. Marine Research	0	0	0	0	2,000	2,000
Vents	2,600	2,587	0	2,548	2,600	2,600
SE US/Carribean FOCI Program	1,192	1,186	0	1,168	0	1,168
Prince William Sound Institute	0	0	0	0	2,000	500
Florida Laboratory Study	200		0	0	0	0
Oceanology	100		0	0	0	0
Subtotal	18,280	18,409	13,144	18,133	21,721	21,289
Sea Grant:						
Sea Grant College Program	40,824	40,496	25,055	39,889	43,000	41,000
Sea Grant-Zebra Mussel	2,248	1,990	0	2,960	2,000	2,960
Sea Grant—Brown Algae	0	0	0	0	0	50
National Coastal R&D Institute	1,000	995	0	980	1,000	1,000
Subtotal	44,072	43,481	25,055	43,829	46,000	45,010
Undersea Research Program:						
NOAA Undersea Research Program	17,309	16,202	0	15,959	15,959	15,202
Regional Marine Research Centers	0	0	0	0	0	6,500
New York Bight	0	0	0	0	0	(2000)
NE/Gulf of Maine Center	0	0	0	0	0	(2000)
National Centers	0	0	0	0	0	(2500)
Tropical Research/Key Largo	400	400	0	394	0	394

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION—Continued

	1991 currently available	1992 base	Fiscal year 1992— Total request	House	Senate	Recommended conference
Subtotal	17,709	16,602	0	16,353	15,959	22,096
Total, Ocean & Great Lakes Pgms	80,061	78,492	38,199	78,315	83,680	88,395
Total, Oceanic and Atmospheric R	206,658	205,875	186,990	196,658	209,272	213,333
National Weather Service						
Local Warnings and Forecasts	258,163	259,430	259,430	255,539	259,430	259,430
NWS Base Restoration/Pay Raise					4,750	3,000
MARDI	10,000	9,951	11,732	9,802	5,500	9,000
WSFO's-Reduc 8 Stations	787	783	0	771	783	783
Southern Region HQ	852	848	0	835	848	848
Data Buoy Engineering and Test	540	537	0	0	540	540
Data Buoy Maint. for Hawaii	565	562	0	0	565	565
Pacific and Alaska Regional HQ	383	381	0	375	381	381
Agricultural and Fruit Forst Pgm	2,424	2,412	0	2,376	2,412	2,412
Fire Weather Service	470	468	0	461	468	468
Susquehanna R. Basin Flood Svcs	700	697	0	687	697	697
Flood Warning System/Colorado R	300	299	0	295	600	300
Contract Observers	200	199	0	196	200	200
Base Reduction/Equip. Maint	(54)	(54)	(2,054)	0	0	0
Samoa	300	0	0	0	250	250
Regional Climate Centers	2,050	2,041	0	2,010	3,140	3,140
SLOSH Calibration	0	0	0	0	400	400
California Data Buoys	0	0	0	0	0	220
Columbia River Weather Buoy						555
Subtotal	277,680	278,554	269,108	273,347	280,964	282,689
Central Forecast Guidance	28,412	28,189	28,189	27,766	28,189	28,189
Atmospheric and Hydrological Res	2,312	2,296	2,296	2,262	2,296	2,296
Total, Operations & Research	308,404	309,039	299,593	303,375	311,449	313,174
Systems Acquisition:						
Public Warnings and Forecast Syst						
NEXRAD	129,273	113,822	117,646	78,757	117,646	83,427
ASOS	12,506	12,444	13,829	12,257	13,829	13,829
AWIPS/NOAAPORT	20,608	19,909	54,412	19,610	54,412	25,778
NMC Supercomputer Upgrade	7,267	7,231	23,138	11,723	23,138	9,000
System delays/execution					(53,418)	0
Total, Systems Acquisition	169,654	153,406	209,025	122,347	155,607	132,034
Total, National Weather Service	478,058	462,445	508,618	425,722	467,056	445,208
NESDIS						
Satellite Observing Systems:						
Polar Spacecraft & Launching	50,593	50,334	152,144	146,289	152,144	130,289
GOES Spacecraft & Launching	109,229	108,607	148,112	106,978	148,112	118,000
Environmental Observing Svcs	48,418	48,818	53,518	48,086	48,086	48,086
Landsat Operations	9,500	9,453	17,153	9,311	4,500	7,560
Subtotal	217,740	217,212	370,927	310,664	352,842	303,935
Landsat Commercialization	34,755	34,562	0	0	0	2,000
Total, Satellite Observing Syst	252,495	251,774	370,927	310,664	352,842	305,935
Env. Data Management Systems	22,187	22,758	22,758	22,417	22,758	22,758
Data and Information Services		7,000	12,600	11,395	7,000	10,000
Total, Env. Data Management Syst	22,187	29,758	35,358	33,812	29,758	32,758
Total, NESDIS	274,682	281,532	406,285	344,476	382,600	338,693
Program Support						
Administration and Services:						
Executive Director and Admin.	25,376	25,844	25,844	25,456	25,456	25,456
Model Bureau Accounting Syst			1,750	0	0	0
Estuarine Program Office			(500)	0	(500)	(500)
Subtotal	25,376	25,844	27,094	25,456	24,956	24,956
Central Administrative Support	37,435	38,991	38,991	38,406	38,406	38,406
Retired Pay Commissioned Off	5,277	5,638	5,638	5,553	5,638	5,638
Total, Administration and Services	68,088	70,473	71,723	69,415	69,000	69,000
Facilities:						
Maintenance	3,946	1,988	1,988	1,958	1,988	1,988
Woods Hole Fish Lab	670	0	0	0	0	0
Woods Hole Marine Biomedical Inst	0	0	0	0	2,000	2,000
Germantown Fire	1,600				0	0
Subtotal	6,216	1,988	1,988	1,958	3,988	3,988
Consolidation	3,000	2,926	2,926	2,882	2,926	2,926
Subtotal	3,000	2,926	2,926	2,882	2,926	2,926
Total, Facilities	9,216	4,914	4,914	4,840	6,914	6,914
Marine Services:	59,475	62,654	62,654	61,714	59,954	61,514
DAVIDSON	2,400	2,390	0	0	0	0
ALBATROSS IV	1,600	1,592	0	768	1,200	1,000
Marine Electronics Agenda	750	746	0	735	0	735
New England Science Center						200
Southeast Marine Center	282	281	0	277	0	277
NOAA Corps			(1,500)	0	(1,500)	0
Critical Maintenance			4,000	0	0	0
Supplemental—Fuel	1,274				0	0
Total, Marine Services	65,781	67,663	65,154	63,494	59,654	63,726
Supplemental—Fuel	126					
Aircraft Services	8,614	8,916	8,469	8,782	8,900	8,900
Total, program support	151,699	151,966	150,260	145,531	144,468	148,540
Restor GRH Reduction			0		0	0
SLUC Adjustment			0	(4,517)	0	(4,517)

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION—Continued

	1991 currently available	1992 base	Fiscal year 1992— Total request	House	Senate	Recommended conference
FY 1991 ORF Sequester	(19)	0	0	0	0	0
Data Management Reprogramming Adjust		11	(6)		11	11
Total direct obligations	1,475,075	1,451,381	1,585,299	1,470,334	1,616,326	1,533,303
Reimbursable Obligations	429,357	429,357	365,116	365,116	365,116	365,116
Total Obligations	1,904,432	1,880,738	1,950,415	1,835,450	1,981,442	1,898,419
Financing:						
Unobligated Balance, Start of Year	(39,738)		0	0	0	0
Recoveries of Prior Year Oblig	(6,000)		(6,000)	(9,775)	(9,605)	(9,775)
Offsetting Collections From:						
Federal Funds	(363,004)		(288,024)	(288,024)	(288,024)	(288,024)
Non-Federal Funds	(31,832)		(41,703)	(41,703)	(41,703)	(41,703)
Trust Funds	(34,521)		(35,389)	(35,389)	(35,389)	(35,389)
Subtotal, Financing	(475,095)	0	(371,116)	(374,891)	(374,721)	(374,891)
Budget Authority	1,429,337	1,880,738	1,579,299	1,460,559	1,606,721	1,523,528
Transfers:						
From "Promote & Develop . . . American Fisheries"	(60,900)		(70,800)	(69,738)	(56,600)	(63,100)
From "Damage Assessment and Rest. Revolving Fund"	(5,500)		(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	(6,500)
From "Coastal Energy Impact Fund"	(7,000)		0	0	0	0
Subtotal, Transfers	(73,400)	0	(82,800)	(81,738)	(68,600)	(69,600)
Appropriation	1,355,937	1,880,738	1,496,499	1,378,821	1,538,121	1,453,928
Other Accounts: Budget Authority:						
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	34,917
Coastal Zone Management Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fisheries Promotional Fund	2,000	0	0	250	250	(250)
Promote and Develop Fisheries	7,855	0	0	0	0	0
Fishing Vessel and Gear Damage Fund	1,202	1,300	1,300	1,281	1,281	1,281
Fishermen's Contingency Fund	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Foreign Fishing Observer Fund	1,997	2,026	2,026	1,996	1,000	1,000
Damage Assess. and Restor. Rev. Fund	(500)	0	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)
Coastal Energy Impact Fund	(7,000)	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Ship Financing Admin. Exp	3,295	0	0	3,400	0	2,700
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aviation Weather Serv. Trust Fund	34,521	35,389	35,389	34,858	35,389	35,389
Fleet Mod., Shipbuilding and Conv	0	0	0	0	100,000	33,200
Emerg. Weather Satellite Con. Fund	0	0	0	0	110,000	110,000
Total, NOAA Budget Authority	1,473,707	1,920,453	1,607,014	1,491,344	1,843,641	1,731,015

NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE

The conference agreement provides $11,500,000 for the Coastal Ocean Science program. Of this amount, $700,000 is allocated for estuary research by the University of South Carolina's School of Public Health and the Baruch Institute.

The conference agreement provides $11,643,000 for observation and prediction. The conferees agree that $500,000 of this amount is to be used to replace current meters, tide gauges and geodetic reference markers in South Carolina lost as a result of Hurricane Hugo.

The conference agreement includes $250,000 to continue to pursue priority Gulf of Maine program activities, including monitoring and data management, as identified in the Gulf of Maine action plan and the Gulf of Maine Marine Environmental Quality Monitoring Plan.

The conference agreement provides $51,636,000 for coastal zone management programs. Of this amount, $40,931,000 is available for CZM grants ($6,000,000 is provided through the appropriation "Coastal Zone Management Fund"), of which up to $600,000 is for section 305 program development grants for the States of Texas, Ohio, and Minnesota. The conferees have provided an increase of $249,000 over base requirements in the Estuarine Sanctuaries program and recommend that these funds be used to expand the Padilla Bay Reserve in Washington.

It is the conferees' intent that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration provide financial support and technical assistance to help plan, develop, and acquire educational maritime exhibits as part of the Seattle cultural, science, and technology maritime interpretive center. The Maritime Educational Center is supported by the City and Port of Seattle, other State and local agencies, and nonprofit organizations. The conferees expect the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to report to the Congress on its activities in this regard six months after enactment of H.R. 2608.

The conferees have included $1,000,000 for a grant to the South Carolina Coastal Council for the acquisition of the Victoria Bluff Tract in Beaufort County, South Carolina. This 154 acre parcel of property will be used for a nature park and potentially a state marine fish hatchery. This direct grant is in addition to the FY 1992 allocation of Coastal Zone Management grant funds to South Carolina and it is not intended to be subject to the program's procedures.

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

The conference agreement provides $150,000 to establish a Center for Shark Research at Mote Marine Laboratory in Sarasota, Florida. The pending adoption of a Federal Management Plan for the U.S. Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, and Caribbean shark fishery indicates that sharks are a valuable resource that must be managed wisely. In its first year of operation, the center would: 1) enhance public awareness; 2) conduct research; and 3) host an international conference on conservation and management of shark populations.

The conference agreement includes $110,000 to initiate a Multi-species Aquaculture Center in New Jersey. These funds are to be used to make a grant for site selection, preliminary design and engineering. The purpose of this project is to facilitate the development of aquaculture in New Jersey and the northeast. The conferees are agreed that NOAA should consider a proposal from Rutgers University on this matter.

The conferees intend that the $1,500,000 provided for the Stellar Sea Lion recovery plan be used to conduct studies recommended by the recovery plan, and that at least 50 percent of those funds be made available to the State of Alaska to undertake Stellar Sea Lion research consistent with the recovery plan.

The conference agreement includes $1,700,000 for Pacific Tuna and Billfish management activities. This funding will be used to implement the 5-year plan development by the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council in conjunction with the Pacific Basin Development Council. The conferees agree that these funds go only to the Joint Institute for Maine and Atmospheric Research which was created under the terms of a Memorandum of Understanding between NOAA and the University of Hawaii, and that these funds are to supplement, not supplant, fiscal year 1992 funds already intended to support the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council.

The conferees agree to provide $4,200,000 for recreational fisheries base programs and initiatives. Of these amounts, $3,000,000 is to be used to implement data error reduction for the Atlantic and Gulf survey which covers high value recreational species such as king and spanish mackerel, snappers and groupers.

With respect to the National Indicator Study (NIS), the conferees expect NOAA to re-establish a cooperative agreement with the Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium (LUMCON). LUMCON will act as the lead academic administrative organization and fiscal agent to carry out the scientific management of the program. The conferees also expect NOAA to make any necessary changes to the Memorandum of Understanding between the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Interstate Shellfish Sanitation Conference (ISSC) to effectively implement the cooperative agreement with LUMCON. However, the conferees expect the ISSC to maintain its important role in establishing priorities, directing, and overseeing the NIS. Finally, the conferees expect NOAA to complete the proposal process and disperse research funding no later than 90 days after submission of the grant application. No more than 5 percent of the

total appropriations for the NIS may be used for NOAA administrative purposes.

The conference agreement includes $4,000,000 for the marine fisheries initiative (MARFIN). Of this amount, $500,000 is included to initiate the South Atlantic phase of MARFIN. The expansion is intended as a coordinated research program involving NOAA, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, Sea Grant and independent universities. The sum of $1,300,000 of the amount provided for MARFIN is provided to implement a program for assessing the impact of incidental harvest by the shrimp trawl industry on the fisheries in the Southeast and Gulf of Mexico. This program is explained more fully in Senate report 102-106.

The conferees concur with the Senate report language directing that Mitchell Act hatcheries be operated in a manner so as to implement a program to release fish in the upper Columbia River basin above the Bonneville Dam to assist in the rebuilding of upriver naturally-spawning salmon runs. However, the managers also note that similar language was included in the Senate report in past years and no significant program changes were implemented. In light of the potential listing of certain upriver stocks under the Endangered Species Act, the managers are concerned that a disproportionate percentage of hatchery fish are released in the lower Columbia River (approximately 103,000,000 smolts below The Dalles Dam versus 3,000,000 smolts above The Dalles Dam), and that little effort is being made to release fish in the upper river to supplement natural production.

Accordingly, the conferees strongly urge NOAA to consult with Columbia River treaty fishing tribes and State and Federal fishery agencies and report to the Committees within 120 days of enactment of the FY 1992 appropriations Act on a ten-year plan consistent with Chapter C entitled "Supplementation" of the *Integrated System Plan* unanimously submitted to the Northwest Power Planning Council on June 1, 1991, by the member tribes and agencies of the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority. The implementation of such a plan should result in a significant percentage of fish reared in Mitchell Act hatcheries being released in the upper Columbia River basin consistent with the original intent of the Mitchell Act.

In addition to the supplementation program described above, the managers urge that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration consult immediately within the framework of the U.S. v. Oregon Columbia River Management Plan on implementing a pilot program to transfer smolts from lower Columbia River hatcheries for release above The Dalles dam, taking into account the program's feasibility. Any program adopted should not interfere with genetic integrity of existing wild salmon populations.

The conferees are concerned that NOAA's marine mammal research activities should include a focus on marine mammal-fisheries interactions, particularly with fisheries in danger of restrictions due to such interactions.

The conferees agree to provide $300,000 for a grant to a qualified institution to develop and promote innovative post-secondary education and research in the field of seafood business management and operations. The conferees acknowledge the fine program at Kingsborough Community College Center for Marine Development and Research, New York, which has developed such an educational program to train young people from New York's inner city.

OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH

The conferees agree to provide $15,202,000 for the NOAA Undersea Research Program. The conferees also agree that $3,200,000 is included for the Hawaiian Undersea Research Laboratory (HURL) as described in the Senate report (102-106).

The conferees agree to provide $6,500,000 for regional marine centers as authorized by Title IV of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act. Of this amount, $2,000,000 each is provided for the New York Bight Center and the New England/Gulf of Maine Center. The amount of $2,500,000 is available for other regional centers.

With respect to the New York Bight Center, the conferees expect the NOAA Administrator to conduct a solicitation and review to establish a new undersea research center for the New York Bight (the waters of the Atlantic Ocean, north of Cape May, New Jersey, and west of Montauk, New York). The conferees are agreed that this solicitation should exclude existing centers. The conferees expect that the new center will be established at a university in a State bordering the New York Bight with an established record in conducting advanced undersea marine science research. The conferees expect that final selection of the university at which the center will be established shall be completed by the end of the calendar year 1991, and that initial funding for this center will be at least $2,000,000 and made available no later than March 1, 1992.

The conferees intend that these funds be used to support operation, administration, and research at the new center and will include a scientific program to sustain the long-term ecosystem research on the continental shelf, slope and rise. Until the center is established, the conferees expect that the Rutgers Institute of Marine and Coastal Sciences shall continue as the acting undersea center to continue long-term research programs with the U.S. Geological Survey, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Rutgers University, the University of Maryland, and the University of Connecticut on the continental shelf, slope and rise, at the funding level reserved for the new center.

The conferees recommend that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration work cooperatively with the Department of State and the International Joint Commission in planning scientific research that NOAA will subsequently carry out to provide Great Lakes resource managers with knowledge required to overcome critical environmental problems in the Great Lakes. The conferees make this recommendation in the acknowledgement of U.S. research and monitoring obligations outlined in Annexes 11-17 of the U.S.-Canada Water Quality Agreement (1987 Revision).

The conferees have included $500,000 for the Prince William Sound Oil Spill Recovery Institute. The conferees note that section 5001(b) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 specifically restricts the Prince William Sound Oil Spill Recovery Institute to the development of techniques and equipment for responding to arctic and subarctic marine oil spills and to research directly related to the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill and its effects. In addition, the funds shall not be used to initiate or support litigation on behalf of any party, or to influence any decision by any branch of government. The conferees intend that the Secretary of Commerce, through the Secretary's statutory authority as Chairman of the Advisory Board of the Institute, should ensure that the Institute's activities are in compliance with the Oil Pollution Act. The conferees further intend that the Secretary of Commerce keep the appropriate committees of the House and Senate apprised of the Institute's activities on a quarterly basis.

The conferees have included $400,000 for tornado and severe thunderstorm research in the southeastern coastal plain of the United States. The meteorological dynamics of such storms in this region differ significantly from the storms in the Midwest. These research activities should be conducted through a cooperative research program established with a consortium of southeastern universities with qualified atmospheric science research capabilities.

The conferees note the availability of surplus property and U.S. Department of Defense resources allocated to the Navy's oceanographic research work. The conferees expect that NOAA will work in cooperation with the Oceanographer of the Navy to accomplish its oceanic and atmospheric research objectives and will use, to the maximum extent possible, these other available resources of the Department of Defense, the Navy, and the United States Government.

NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE

The conferees have included $155,607,000 for National Weather Service Modernization. Land acquisition and construction costs for the Next Generation Weather Radar program (NEXRAD) are provided for in a new construction account.

The conferees are pleased that the Department of Commerce and the NEXRAD prime contractor have resolved their contract dispute. The conferees have included $107,000,000 to fully fund the FY 1992 requirements consistent with the agreement. Accordingly, NOAA is expected to monitor the NEXRAD program closely and ensure that systems are delivered on schedule and meet performance specifications. It is essential that the NEXRAD doppler radars be deployed expeditiously to help reduce the loss of life due to severe weather.

The conferees agree to provide $9,000,000 for the procurement of a Class VII supercomputer for the National Meteorological Center (NMC) in Suitland, MD, through a lease purchase agreement funded over several years. The conferees agree that the National Meteorological Center needs a new computer to augment the NMC's large scale computational resources and to provide for a complete back-up system in the event of a system failure. This computer should utilize the same operating system software and language compilers that are used on the current system. The conferees strongly urge that any computer be procured from an American vendor.

The conference agreement includes $55,000 to replace a package of meteorological instruments on a buoy at the mouth of the Columbia River. These instruments are no longer operable, and are necessary to provide wind, wave, and weather conditions to ships that cross the Columbia River Bar. The conferees also agree to provide $400,000 for data buoys in California.

The conferees agree with the direction in the Senate report (102-106) that requires the National Weather Service to develop improved safeguards intended to ensure that National Weather Service forecasts or any information about the content of the forecasts are not made available to individuals outside the National Weather Service until the forecasts are released to the general public.

The conferees note the proposal of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to relocate the New York City forecast

office of the National Weather Service to Brookhaven, Long Island. The conferees request and expect NOAA to respond to the concerns raised by the lead National Weather Service forecaster in the New York City forecast office and submit the responses to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees no later than November 1, 1991.

The conferees are aware of NOAA's interest in relocating its Aircraft Operations Center from its current location in private leased space in Miami, Florida. The conferees believe that it might be desirable to relocate this facility to another site in the southeast, and potentially to a military air base or station. Therefore, the NOAA Administrator should submit a study on this issue to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees by March 1, 1992. This study should examine cost and operational impacts of other sites, including but not limited to Charleston, South Carolina, and Jacksonville, Florida.

The conference agreement maintains all National Weather Service stations across the country at least at current operating levels. The conferees further agree that NOAA shall take no action to plan for or to implement any reduction in the Jackson, KY, and Greenville/Greer, SC, Weather Service Offices. The increase provided for the Weather Service is intended to eliminate any financial rationale for reducing these stations. The conferees are concerned that the unique climatological and meteorological conditions at the Jackson and Greenville/Greer stations make any potential proposal to close these stations a risk to the life and safety of residents of these areas.

NESDIS

The conferees have reviewed and approved the Secretary of Commerce's recovery plan for the geostationary "GOES" weather satellite program. The conference agreement aligns funding to enable the Secretary to implement this program. The conference agreement provides a total of $228,000,000 for the GOES program in two separate appropriation accounts. In total, the conference provides $79,888,000 more than the budget request for geostationary weather satellite programs.

Within the "Operations, Research and Facilities" account, the conference agreement includes $118,000,000. This amount assumes that NOAA will procure ground systems to ensure interoperability with the European METEOSAT system with $10,000,000 of funds appropriated in FY 1991. Further, it provides $7,000,000 for operations and processing of data from the METEOSAT system in FY 1992. A total of $111,000,000 is provided for the rephased GOES-NEXT program and launch contract requirements. The conferees agree with the Secretary's decision to test and repair the GOES-NEXT "I" and "J" satellites thoroughly prior to launch.

The conferees expect that the NOAA Administrator provide the House and Senate Appropriations Committees with quarterly status reports on the GOES program. These reports should include but not be limited to such topics as: 1) the status of the GOES-NEXT program and especially the sensor testing program; 2) the status of GOES 7; and 3) use of METEOSAT and GMS.

In a separate "GOES Satellite Contingency Fund" account the conferees have provided $110,000,000 as proposed by the Senate but have deleted Senate proposed bill language that would have required the President to declare an emergency to trigger the release of appropriations. These funds could be used by NOAA to procure a replacement GOES satellite similar to the GOES 7 satellite now in orbit, should the GOES-NEXT program experience further delays.

The conference agreement provides $130,289,000 for NOAA Polar-orbiting spacecraft and launching. The agreement assumes the House proposed reduction and acknowledges that launch costs for the Atlas facility at Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA, should be shared equitably between NOAA and the Air Force as has been the case prior to FY 1992.

The conferees have included $2,000,000 for LANDSAT commercialization. The conferees have taken note of the funding for long-lead parts and construction of LANDSAT 7 that have been provided in other appropriations bills, such as H.R. 2521, the FY 1992 Department of Defense Appropriations bill, as passed the House of Representatives. The conferees recommended that this $2,000,000 be used for the LANDSAT 7 procurement.

MARINE SERVICES

The conference agreement includes $200,000 for a grant to the New England Science Center to support the development of video teleconferencing programs and the use of telepresence to provide ongoing programming, special presentations, and continuing education to improve science literacy and education. These funds will be used to underwrite activities such as participation in undersea explorations through the use of telepresence and other educational programs and presentations for low-income and minority children, the design of ongoing and special educational programs in a variety of scientific disciplines (including oceanography, marine biology, and meteorology), teacher training components, and costs associated with the establishment of video teleconferencing and telepresence capabilities.

Amendment No. 63: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$1,000,000 shall be available for a grant to the South Carolina Coastal Council for the acquisition of the Victoria Bluff Tract in Beaufort County, South Carolina, of which $2,000,000 shall be available for a grant to make permanent improvements to the Woods Hole Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, Massachusetts, of which $600,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement designates $1,000,000 for a grant to the South Carolina Coastal Council for the acquisition of the Victoria Bluff Tract in Beaufort County, South Carolina, $2,000,000 for improvements to the Woods Hole Marine Biological Laboratory, and $600,000 for operational expenses at the Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory, Stuttgart, Arkansas.

The Senate had proposed only to designate $600,000 for operational expenses at the Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory, Stuttgart, Arkansas, and the House had proposed only to designate $542,000 for this purpose.

The conference agreement includes $1,000,000 for a grant to the South Carolina Coastal Council for the acquisition of the Victoria Bluff Tract in Beaufort County, South Carolina. This 154 acre parcel would be used for a nature park and potentially for a State Marine Fish Hatchery. The conferees intend that this grant should be in addition to the FY 1992 allocation of Coastal Zone Management funds to South Carolina. Further, the conferees intend that this grant not be subject to the Coastal Zone Management Program's procedures.

Amendment No. 64: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which adds a provision permitting funds designated in the Act for the Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory, Stuttgart, Arkansas, to be used for cooperative agreements as well as operational expenses. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

Amendment No. 65: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate which designates $394,000 for a semi-tropical research facility located at Key Largo, Florida.

Amendment No. 66: Transfers $35,389,000 from the Airport and Airways Trust Fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $34,858,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 67: Transfers $63,100,000 from the fund entitled, "Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries" instead of $69,738,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House and $56,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for a transfer of $63,100,000 from the "Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries" fund. The conference agreement will permit a fiscal year 1992 program level for the usual fisheries research grant activities funded in this account of not less than $7,000,000, including unused carryover balances from fiscal year 1991.

Amendment No. 68: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which adds language providing that Sections 306 and 306(a) Coastal Zone Management grants shall not exceed $2,000,000 and shall not be less than $500,000. The Senate amendment also provides an appropriation of up to $500,000 to be available from the fund entitled, "Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries" for NOAA grant management and related activities. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

EMERGENCY WEATHER SATELLITE CONTINGENCY FUND

Amendment No. 69: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

GOES SATELLITE CONTINGENCY FUND

For costs necessary to maintain National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration geostationary meteorological satellite coverage for monitoring and prediction of hurricanes and severe storms, including but not limited to the procurement of gap filler satellites, launch vehicles, and payments to foreign governments, $110,000,000, to be deposited in a "GOES Satellite Contingency Fund,", to remain available until expended: Provided, That these funds shall not become available for obligation until the Secretary of Commerce notifies the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate that a requirement for these funds exists through the reprogramming provisions of this Act.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides an appropriation of $110,000,000 to be deposited in a "GOES Satellite Contingency Fund" to maintain NOAA's Geostationary Meteoro-

logical Satellite coverage for monitoring and prediction of hurricanes and severe storms. These funds can be used for but are not limited to procurement of gapfiller satellites, launch vehicles, and payments to foreign governments. The conference agreement provides that these funds shall not become available for obligation until the Secretary of Commerce notifies the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate that a requirement for these funds exists through the reprogramming provisions of this Act.

The Senate had proposed an appropriation of $110,000,000 for an Emergency Weather Satellite Contingency Fund for the same purposes as those contained in the conference agreement. Under the Senate proposal, however, these funds would have been available only if the President had sent written notification to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees requesting that the funds be released to address an emergency and if the House and Senate had voted to release these funds to address the emergency. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

FISHERIES PROMOTIONAL FUND

The conferees are agreed that $250,000 is to be made available from the resources in the Fisheries Promotional Fund for a grant for a feasibility study for the San Francisco Fisheries and Environmental Research Center.

FOREIGN FISHING OBSERVER FUND

Amendment No. 70: Appropriates $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate from the fees imposed under the foreign fishery observer program, instead of $1,996,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House.

FISHING VESSEL OBLIGATIONS GUARANTEES

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates $1,000,000 for the subsidy cost of the fishing vessel obligations guarantees program, provides a limitation on total commitments to guarantee loans of up to $10,000,000, and appropriates $1,700,000 for administrative costs to carry out the guaranteed loan program instead of $1,400,000 for the subsidy cost, $14,000,000 for a limitation on total commitments, and $2,000,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 72: Appropriates $31,280,000 instead of $30,611,000 as proposed by the House and $31,750,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement reflects the GSA rental cost reduction contained in the House bill, a revised program based of $31,083,000, and a program increase of $197,000 for expansion of the Department's procurement oversight functions.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Amendment No. 73: Appropriates $15,140,000 instead of $14,913,000 as proposed by the House and $15,333,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement reflects the GSA rental cost reduction contained in the House bill and a revised program base of $15,140,000.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 74: Appropriates $125,290,000 instead of $123,009,000 as proposed by the House and $127,960,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides a revised program base of $123,490,000 and reflects the GSA rental cost reduction contained in the House bill. The conference agreement also provides $400,000 to continue three census reports relating to cotton and soybean, cotton, and sunflower oil seeds as described in the Senate Appropriations Committee's report. The conference agreement also includes $1,400,000 for the initiative to improve coverage of the service sector of the national economy.

The conferees are concerned about the treatment by the Bureau of the Census of municipalities which are designated as "townships" in certain States such as New Jersey. Unlike many other States, townships in New Jersey are fully incorporated municipalities, bearing the same rights and responsibilities as cities, towns, villages, and boroughs in other States. The Bureau's reluctance to recognize this fact may distort data which is provided to the public and may inaccurately reflect the actual status of New Jersey townships. The conferees urge the Bureau to consider this matter and to submit a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees by February 1, 1992 concerning its findings and recommendations to address this issue.

PERIODIC CENSUSES AND PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 75: Appropriates $165,000,000 instead of $172,357,000 as proposed by the House and $145,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement will provide funding for publication of all the information, statistics, and other products planned in the President's fiscal year 1992 budget request for this account and the Census Bureau is expected to make all of this information available to users expeditiously. The reduction of $10,000,000 from the budget request is due entirely to savings and prior year recoveries which are projected to total at least $10,000,000 by the end of fiscal year 1991 and carry over into fiscal year 1992.

The conference agreement will provide the funding requested to tabulate and distribute information from the 1990 Decennial Census and the other periodic census. This data includes information on commuting patterns, income, education, housing patterns and other products of vital interest to state and local governments, demographers, planners, and other interested parties. The conference agreement also includes a program increase of $8,398,000 for planning and testing activities for the year 2000 Decennial Census. The conference agreement also includes $1,400,000 for the Department of Commerce to enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences for the purpose of conducting a comprehensive and independent study of the Decennial Census as outlined in House Report 102-106. Finally, the conference agreement will provide for funds planned for the Census Bureau's Integrated Multiyear ADP Plan to meet future program requirements for censuses and surveys.

ECONOMIC AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates $40,380,000 instead of $38,912,000 as proposed by the House and $41,994,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement reflects a revised program base of $38,080,000 for this account, including the GSA rental cost reduction proposed by the House. The conference agreement also includes the following program increases: $1,300,000 to stop the deterioration in GNP statistics; $500,000 to modernize and extend the Standard National Accounts; and $500,000 to improve balance of payments statistics.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 77: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said agreement, insert the following: *$207,160,000.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The House had proposed an appropriation of $194,875,000 for this account and the Senate had proposed an appropriation of $203,814,000. The conference agreement provides $207,160,000 as detailed in the following table:

[In thousands of dollars] *Item*	*Conference agreement*
Base request	$185,609
SLUC reduction	−1,132
TC2	3,315
New materials center	3,000
Foreign staffing	2,188
CIMS	4,830
Mexico FTA	450
Seattle Asian Research Center	100
Domestic US&FCS support	450
National Textile Center	8,000
Native American Trade Council	350
Total	$207,160

The conferees are concerned about the proposal of the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service to initiate an E-Mail System between its domestic offices and overseas locations. The conferees have provided resources and direction to the Department of State to plan and implement an enhanced Diplomatic Telecommunications Service to serve the telecommunications requirements of all U.S. agencies at overseas locations. Therefore, the conferees expect that the U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service as well as all other U.S. Government agencies with overseas operations will not proceed independently to provide upgraded communications capabilities, pending the development of the enhanced Diplomatic Telecommunications Service.

The conferees are agreed that the Department of Commerce requires certain trade data in order to meet its statutory responsibilities for the promotion and regulation of trade. These requirements include: (1) data on the State of origin of United States goods exported to Canada, as required by the United States-Canada Data Exchange Agreement; (2) data on the State of an exporter for the National Trade Data Bank; and (3) data on United States exporters in support of the Department's export promotion programs. The conferees are agreed that at the present time, the Department does not possess all of this necessary data, although the Department has the capability to produce an extensive new data base on exporters and exports to meet these responsibilities. The conferees are further agreed that if the Department does not presently have sufficient resources to develop this new data base, it should request sufficient resources in the fiscal year 1993 budget to fulfill its responsibilities pursuant to international agreements, U.S. law, and administration policy.

Amendment No. 78: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: , *of which $3,000,000 is for support costs of a new materials center in Ames, Iowa, and of which $15,221,000 is for the Office of Textiles and Apparel, including $3,315,000 for a grant to the Tailored Clothing Technology Corporation, and $8,000,000 for a grant to the National Textile Center University Research Consortium.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement designates $15,221,000 for the Office of Textiles and Apparel, including $3,315,000 for a grant to the Tailored Clothing Technology Corporation and $8,000,000 for a grant to the National Textile Center University Research Consortium. The conference agreement also includes a designation of $3,000,000 for support costs of a new materials center in Ames, Iowa.

The Senate had proposed a designation of $19,406,000 for the Office of Textiles and Apparel, including $3,000,000 for a grant to the Tailored Clothing Technology Corporation and $12,500,000 for a grant to the National Textile Center University Research Consortium. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The amount provided in the conference agreement for the National Textile Center University Research Consortium will provide $2,000,000 for each of the four universities participating in this project.

Amendment No. 79: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which adds language that permits funds in the Operations and Administration appropriation of the International Trade Administration to be available for export promotion programs notwithstanding the ceiling on the obligation on funds contained in section 201 of Public Law 99-64. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 80: Appropriates $39,450,000 instead of $38,777,000 as proposed by the House and $41,594,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides for a revised program base for the Bureau of Export Administration and reflects the program savings proposed in the budget because of reduced workload and the GSA rental charge reduction proposed by the House.

The conferees are agreed that the Bureau of Export Administration shall make no reduction in support for regional offices.

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 81: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *$40,500,000.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The House had proposed $40,880,000 for the Minority Business Development Agency, and the Senate had proposed $41,578,000. The conference agreement provides $40,500,000. The conferees intend that $74,000 of the reduction contained in the conference agreement below the House and Senate amounts should be applied to GSA space rental charges, and the remainder should be applied to base programs.

Amendment No. 82: Designates $25,000,000 to remain available until expended instead of $24,941,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House and $25,321,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 83: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the agreement of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *$15,500,000.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $15,500,000 for program management instead of $15,939,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House and $16,257,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 84: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would have required the Secretary of Commerce in awarding grants and contracts for the Minority Business Development Center program to give priority to contractors located within the state in which the contract is to be performed. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conferees are concerned that MBDA often contracts with large national accounting firms that may have little understanding of the business and economic development needs of local minority communities. The conferees believe that using local contractors to operate MBDA business development centers could improve the program significantly and urge the Secretary of Commerce and MBDA to give greater preference to local bidders in evaluating and awarding Minority Business Development Center contracts.

The conferees expect that the Minority Business Development Agency will continue to maintain a district office in Boston, Massachusetts at the full funding and staffing level that was provided for in fiscal year 1991.

UNITED STATES TRAVEL AND TOURISM ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 85: Appropriates $17,480,000 instead of $15,249,000 as proposed by the House and $18,546,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides for a revised program base of $15,480,000 for the United States Travel and Tourism Administration and reflects the GSA rental charge reduction as proposed by the House. The conference agreement also includes $2,000,000 for grants to states whose tourism promotion needs have increased due to disasters.

Amendment No. 86: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which adds language to the bill that: (1) waives matching requirements for funds in the FY 1991 Appropriations Act and in the FY 1992 Appropriations Act for grants to States whose tourism promotion needs have increased because of disasters; and (2) designates $2,000,000 to continue such grants or initiate new disaster grants to States or other eligible entities whose tourism promotion needs have increased due to disasters. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 87: Appropriates $88,441,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $91,887,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 88: Designates $86,894,000 to be derived from deposits in the Patent and Trademark Office Fee Surcharge Fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $90,340,000 as proposed by the House.

TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 89: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: *$4,600,000: Provided, That Section 212(a)(1) of Public Law 100-519 (102 Stat. 2594) is amended by adding a new paragraph (E) as follows: (E) For the period of October 1, 1991 through September 30, 1992, only, retain and use all earned and unearned monies heretofore or hereafter received, including receipts, revenues, and advanced payments and deposits, to fund all obligations and expenses, including inventories and capital equipment*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The House has proposed an appropriation of $4,318,000 for this account and the Senate had proposed $4,937,000. The conference agreement provides an appropriation of $4,600,000 for the Salaries and Expenses account of the Technology Administration. The conference agreement reflects the reduction for GSA space rental costs contained in the House bill. The conference agreement includes sufficient funding to maintain the full base program of the Technology Administration, including the number of positions and full-time equivalents (FTE's) that were filled on September 30, 1991.

The conference agreement also includes a provision not included in either the House or Senate bill which clarifies the authority of the National Technical Information Service to use unearned customer deposits to fund operations. This language confirms existing practice and permits NTIS to use customer deposits for operations where it is technically restricted from doing so at the present time. In placing this section in the Act, the conferees intend that these deposit funds are the legal property of the customer, are to be refunded on demand, and are to be recorded as an obligation when used to finance NTIS' operations or at the time the refund is requested. This provision also confirms the current practice of purchasing inventories and capital equipment through the NTIS fund. This provision supplements existing authority provided in 15 U.S.C. Sec. 3704(b)(a)(1)(B) to purchase capital equipment with net revenues.

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 90: Appropriates $17,600,000 instead of $15,861,000 as proposed by the House and $18,122,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes the GSA space rental cost reduction contained in the House bill and a revised program base of $16,100,000. The conference agreement also includes $1,500,000 for NTIA's spectrum management initiative.

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES, PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 91: Appropriates $22,925,000 instead of $22,428,000 as proposed by the House and $32,428,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes $22,275,000 for public telecommunications facilities, planning and construction grants; $400,000 for the PEACESAT program to install new ground terminals and to secure satellite capacity; and $250,000 for the American Indian Higher Education Consortium to develop a plan to enhance the programs of the tribally controlled and Bureau of Indian Affairs colleges through telecommunications technologies.

Amendment No. 92: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which ear-

marks $400,000 for the PEACESAT project and $250,000 for the American Indian Higher Education Consortium study. The House bill contained no similar provision.

ENDOWMENT FOR CHILDREN'S EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Amendment No. 93: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *$2,000,000.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $2,000,000 for the Endowment for Children's Educational Television instead of $4,000,000 for this purpose as proposed by the Senate. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 94: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which appropriates $27,632,000 for the Salaries and Expenses account of the Economic Development Administration and adds bill language which permits the funds to be used to monitor projects pursuant to certain provisions of the Public Works Employment Act of 1976, the Trade Act of 1974, and the Community Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1977, and adds language stipulating certain requirements for Economic Development Representative positions.

The House bill would have appropriated $28,218,000 for the Salaries and Expenses account without providing any of the language provisions contained in the Senate amendment and the conference agreement.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 95: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which appropriates $226,836,000 for Economic Development Assistance Programs. In addition, the conference agreement and the Senate provision include bill language which prohibits EDA from reducing any of the grants for university centers below the fiscal year 1991 level. The conference agreement and the Senate provision also contain language which waives certain EDA regulations and all other provisions of law to enable the grantee in Project Number 01-51-21118 to retain any proceeds from the sale of such property for other development purposes and the grantee in Project Number 05-22-00014 to obligate funds on a no-year basis to complete the project.

The House bill contained no provision on any of these matters.

The amount in the conference agreement shall be allocated as follows among the various EDA programs for fiscal year 1992:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	*Conference agreement*
Public works grants	$154,160
Planning assistance	25,276
Districts	(17,708)
Indians	(2,960)
States	(1,973)
Urban	(2,958)
Technical assistance	9,900
University centers	(7,724)
Economic adjustment	23,000
Trade adjustment assistance	14,000
Research and evaluation	500
Total	$226,836

The conference agreement includes $14,000,000 for the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, including $13,450,000 for Trade Adjustment Assistance Centers and $550,000 for industry grants.

The conference agreement includes $7,724,000 for the University Centers Program under Technical Assistance. This amount represents an increase of $3,000,000 above the amount provided university centers for fiscal year 1991. The conferees intent that this increase should be used to restore and enhance funding of those centers whose funding had been reduced due to EDA's forced graduation policy. The conferees also intend that the increase provided in the conference agreement should also be made available to all university centers after the centers that were targeted for graduation by EDA have had their funds restored. The conferees believe that each university center should be able to receive a total of approximately $130,000 if the required match under the University Center Program is available from the sponsoring university.

The conferees are aware of the following applications for economic development assistance, strongly urge the applicants to submit proposals to EDA through the Economic Development Representative in each of their respective States, and strongly recommend that EDA fully consider these applications in accordance with applicable procedures and guidelines:

(1) City of Cotton Plant, Arkansas, sewage system improvements to accommodate waste water disposal requirements associated with a catfish processing plant;

(2) Newark, New Jersey, feasibility study for conference/convention facilities;

(3) Bradley University, Illinois, application for center for economic development assistance;

(4) Bedford International Festival Foundation, performing arts facility for Bedford County, PA;

(5) City of Scranton, Pennsylvania, acquisition and renovation of a multitenant office building in the core city;

(6) Neosho Basin Development Company, Emporia, Kansas, Title IX Sudden and Severe Economic Dislocation Disaster Assistance grant for a revolving loan fund for capitalization of companies in Osage and Lyon Counties, Kansas.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GUARANTEED LOANS

Amendment No. 96: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum "$565,000" insert: *$800,000.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $800,000 for the subsidy cost of an EDA loan guarantee program and $1,614,000 for administrative expenses of the program. The Senate had proposed $565,000 for the subsidy cost of the loan guarantee program and the same amount as the conference agreement for administrative expenses. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conference agreement will provide for an EDA loan guarantee program of $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 in accordance with OMB baseline subsidy costs for this program. EDA has not made any loan guarantees during fiscal year 1991, made two guarantees in fiscal year 1990 and fiscal year 1989, and did not make any guarantees in fiscal year 1988 and fiscal year 1987. In light of this record, the conferees believe that the loan guarantee program level provided in the conference agreement should be more than sufficient for fiscal year 1992.

It has been brought to the Conferees' attention that in some coal regions of this country, rich coal reserves are being wasted in mines that are sealed due to burning coal fields. Unique, innovative approaches in reopening these burning mines could result in stable employment and economic development in distressed areas. The conferees therefore urge the Economic Development Administration when reviewing guaranteed loans applications to give every consideration to such an application if submitted.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVOLVING FUND

(RESCISSION)

Amendment No. 97: Deletes rescission of $42,500,000 proposed by the Senate. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendment No. 98: Deletes section 206 proposed by the Senate which would have required the Secretary of Commerce to designate an individual to serve as a program manager for each NOAA acquisition program with a total cost exceeding $30,000,000. The provision would also have required each individual so designated to report to the Director of the Systems Program Office and required that Congress be informed bi-annually of the individual so designated. The House bill had no provision on this matter.

The conferees strongly recommend and expect the Secretary of Commerce to designate an individual to serve as program manager for each NOAA acquisition program with a total acquisition cost exceeding $30,000,000 and that each individual so designated should report to the Director of the Systems Program Office of the agency. The conferees are further agreed that the Secretary should inform the Congress bi-annually of the individuals so designated.

The conferees are agreed that in carrying out the Advanced Technology Program, the Department of Commerce and the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall be guided by the provisions in House Report 102-106 in carrying out section 205 of the fiscal year 1992 Appropriations Act.

TITLE III—THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

Amendment No. 99: Appropriates $3,801,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $4,306,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base and program growth of $250,000 to replace PCB transformer.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 100: Appropriates $10,775,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $11,054,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base, less $279,000 associated with GSA space rental rate reductions, and program growth of $373,000 for additional court personnel.

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 101: Appropriates $9,432,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $10,495,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base, less $1,063,000 associated with GSA space rental rate reductions.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 102: Appropriates $1,875,000,000, instead of $1,947,471,000 as proposed by the House and $1,866,762,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base, less $68,638,000 associated with: GSA space rental rate reductions, FY 1991 supplementals, FY 1991 pay raise absorptions, unauthorized geographic pay enhancements, reestimate of furniture and furnishings, overestimated postal rate increases, and a $10,000,000 reduction in the automation account.

The conference agreement provides for the following workload and program enhancements:

Magistrate and bankruptcy judges	$11,000,000
New court/clerk personnel	3,500,000
Probation/pretrial services personnel	3,240,000
Electronic monitoring	1,550,000
S&L workload	4.000,000

The conference agreement provides $94,886,000 for Court automation and automation support costs.

Amendment No. 103: Designates $68,245,000 for space alteration projects as proposed by the House, instead of $40,648,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 104: Appropriates $2,100,000 for processing vaccine injury compensation cases as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,588,000 as proposed by the House.

DEFENDER SERVICES

Amendment No. 105: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *$190,621,000.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $190,621,000 instead of $185,372,000 as proposed by the House and $177,386,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base, less $527,000 associated with GSA space rental rate reductions and $651,000 in FY 1991 pay raise absorptions, and $29,382,000 for workload enhancements.

The conference agreement provides $11,524,000 for Death Penalty Resource Centers, the same amount provided in fiscal year 1991.

COURT SECURITY

Amendment No. 106: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *$81,048,000.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $81,048,000 instead of $82,830,000 as proposed by the House and $83,102,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base, less $294,000 associated with GSA space rental rate reductions and $22,000 in FY 1991 pay raise absorptions. The agreement allows for no program growth.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 107: Appropriates $44,681,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $44,743,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base, less $413,000 associated with GSA space rental rate reductions and $687,000 associated with lapse rates. The agreement allows for no program growth.

Budget Review—The conferees are concerned that the Judiciary does not have an equivalent review process as that performed by OMB for the Executive Branch agencies. The conferees understand that a number of Judiciary appropriation accounts do not even undergo a review by the Judicial Conference. The conferees expect that all Judiciary appropriation accounts will come under the review of the Judicial Conference for fiscal year 1993. At the least, this review should ensure that there are no inconsistencies among the various budget requests.

Amendment No. 108: Designates $7,500 for official reception and representation expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,150 as proposed by the House.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 109: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *$17,795,000.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $17,795,000 instead of $18,795,000 as proposed by the House and $21,626,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base, less $129,000 associated with GSA space rental rate reductions and $76,000 in FY 1991 pay raise absorptions. The agreement allows for program growth of $1,109,000 for operational training and related personnel support costs. The conferees agree with the direction provided in the House report concerning operational training of Court personnel.

Sentencing Guideline Training—The conferees agree that the Federal Judicial Center, the Sentencing Commission, and the Administrative Office need to work more closely to coordinate efforts to accomplish training objectives.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 110: Appropriates $9,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,865,000 as proposed by the House. The conference agreement provides for the full budget request.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY

Amendment No. 111: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 304. Section 121 of title 28, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) in the first sentence of paragraph (4) by striking out "Barnwell, and Hampton" and inserting in lieu thereof "and Barnwell"; and

(2) in the first sentence of paragraph (11) by inserting ", Hampton," before "and Jasper".

SEC. 305. Pursuant to section 140 of Public Law 97-92, Justices and judges of the United States are authorized during fiscal year 1992, to receive a salary adjustment in accordance with 28 USC 461.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate amendment adds language, not in the House bill, which moves Hampton County, South Carolina from the Aiken Division of the South Carolina Judicial District to the Beaufort Division of that district. The conference agreement accepts the Senate language and adds new language, not in either the House or Senate bill, which provides the same pay raise for the Supreme Court Justices and other judges of the United States as that previously approved for general schedule employees.

TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

Amendment No. 112: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following: *$73,200,000, to remain available until expended, of which not less than $8,872,000 shall be available only for the State maritime academy programs, and of which $1,200,000 shall be available for payments to State maritime academies to acquire maritime training simulators: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation may use proceeds derived from the sale or disposal of National Defense Reserve Fleet vessels that are currently collected and retained by the Maritime Administration for facility and ship maintenance, modernization and repair, acquisition of equipment, and fuel costs necessary to maintain training at the United States Merchant Marine Academy and State maritime academies: Provided further,*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $73,200,000 for the operations and training expenses of the Maritime Administration instead of $70,920,000 as proposed by the House and $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided will fund the budget request for the Maritime Administration excluding the $1,000,000 requested for additional funds for the research program.

The conference agreement also includes an additional $1,200,000 for payments to State maritime academies to acquire training simulators. The Senate bill included an earmark of $2,000,000 for the acquisition of training simulators; the House bill contained no similar provision. In the award of these grants, the Committee recommends that the Administrator provide priority to those State schools that already have raised necessary matching funds, such as the Maine Maritime Academy, the New York State Maritime College, and the Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

In addition, the conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate earmarking the minimum amount to be provided to the State academies at $8,872,000 exclusive of support for training simulators.

Finally, the conference agreement includes bill language proposed by the Senate allowing the Maritime Administration to use proceeds from the sale or disposal of obsolete National Defense Reserve Fleet ships for facility and training ship maintenance, modernization, and repair; acquisition of equipment (such as simulators); and fuel costs at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and at State Maritime academies. The House bill contained no similar provision.

READY RESERVE FORCE

Amendment No. 113: Appropriate $233,961,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $225,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 114: Deletes language inserted by the Senate which would have required that the funds provided for the Ready Reserve Force be used only to acquire United States-registered ships with an exception to be made for three ships registered in Denmark, and that any repair or modification of any ships acquired with funds appropriated for the RRF be performed only in U.S. shipyards. The House bill contained no similar provisions.

The conferees encourage the Maritime Administration to make every effort to acquire U.S.-built, U.S.-rebuilt, or U.S. documented vessels as the expansion of the Ready Reserve Fleet continues. The conferees are aware, however, that all of the ship types needed may not be available from U.S. sources in the numbers required, and that the acquisition of some foreign flagged ships could be necessary.

COMMISSION ON AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 115: Appropriates $1,426,000 as proposed by the House instead of $1,448,000 as proposed by the Senate.

COMMISSION ON THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 116: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment insert: *$1,882,000: Provided, That section 7 of Public Law 98-101, as amended by Public Law 99-549, is further amended by striking "December 31, 1991" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1992": Provided further, That funds provided herein are*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes $1,882,000 for the termination expenses of the Bicentennial Commission as proposed by the House instead of $1,911,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement also includes new language which extends the authorization of the Commission by six months. This extension is necessary to allow the Commission to complete preparation, printing and distribution of the official Commission History and Final Report and to address any final requests for Bill of Rights educational materials following the Commission's final Bill of Rights celebratory event on December 15, 1991." The Commission has assured the conferees that the funds provided in this Act, along with carryover funds from previous fiscal years, will be sufficient to meet the Commission's obligations through the revised termination date.

COMMISSION ON LEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 117: Deletes Senate language which would have provided funds for the Commission on Legal Immigration Reform. The House bill contained no similar provision.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 118: Appropriates $1,075,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,059,000 as proposed by the House.

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 119: Appropriates $1,250,000 instead of $1,153,000 as proposed by the House and $1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes an additional $97,000 above the budget request to expand the Marine Mammal Commission's research program.

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 120: Appropriates $20,400,000 instead of $21,077,000 as proposed by the House and $19,400,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides the full amount requested in the President's Budget for the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

Amendment No. 121: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

For payment to the Legal Services Corporation to carry out the purposes of the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974, as amended, $350,000,000; of which $296,755,000 is for basic field programs; $7,848,000 is for Native American programs; $10,839,000 is for migrant programs; $488,000 is for special emergency funds; $1,229,000 is for law school clinics; $1,117,000 is for supplemental field programs; $697,000 is for regional training centers; $8,079,000 is for national support; $9,263,000 is for State support; $966,000 is for the Clearinghouse; $571,000 is for computer assisted legal research regional centers; $9,774,000 is for Corporation management and administration; $977,000 is for board initiatives; $97,000 is for special contingency funds; and $1,300,000, to remain available until expended, is for a grant for equipment, facilities, and other assets for a National Resource and Training Center suitable to accommodate National Trial Advocacy Institutes for Legal Services Corporation personnel: Provided, That the Corporation in awarding such a grant shall give preference to a university at which such Institutes have been held in at least four of the last five years.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $350,000,000 and certain earmarkings of the funds for the various components of the Corporation's budget including $1,300,000 for a National Resource and Training Center for legal services attorneys. The Senate bill provided a total of $350,000,000 with different earmarkings within the various components of the Corporation's budget. The House bill contained no similar provisions.

Legal Services attorneys are dedicated individuals who are often recent law school graduates willing to accept a salary substantially less than the average lawyer receives in a law firm, private business or government. A substantial portion of the law involved in representing clients who qualify for Legal Services help is in a special field, and the training needed, including software for computers and other resources, is not readily available in each State.

The risk of liability for inadequate representation exists today in every legal field, and Legal Services Corporation field programs have paid up to $5,800,000 per year for insurance to cover that risk. More training for newly hired attorneys, refresher courses for line attorneys and access to a resource center should reduce the risk and the corresponding premiums. It would also assure compliance with limitations and guidelines for providing services.

To provide both training for recent hires in Legal Services field programs and periodic refresher courses, it would be very desirable to have a courtroom setting, computer services equipment, video aides, and other facilities and equipment available. A limited number of training institutes have been held and partially paid for with per capita registration fees, but more training opportunities need to be available. Therefore, the conference agreement provides funds for a training facility and other resources suitable for such training institutes and a resource center. It is assumed that per capita registration fees would be paid to support the annual costs of the center. These facilities and equipment would also be used for other legal education related purposes by a university where such facilities and equipment are located. The conference agreement also provides that in making this grant, the Legal Services Corporation shall give preference to a university at which National Trial Advocacy Institutes have been held in at least four of the last five years.

The conferees are agreed that this grant is within the general range of grants for support of Legal Services Programs in the Senate amendment.

The following table shows the amounts for each program provided for in fiscal year 1991, in the budget request, in the Senate amendment and in the conference agreement. The House bill did not include funding for the Legal Services Corporation due to lack of authorization.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1991 enacted	Fiscal year 1992 request	House	Senate	Conference
Basic field programs	$281,314	$302,358	(1)	$297,860	$296,755
Special emergency funds	.....	500	(1)	490	488
Native American program	7,445	8,030	(1)	7,877	7,848
Migrant programs	10,282	11,090	(1)	10,879	10,839
Law school clinics	1,166	1,258	(1)	1,234	1,229
Supplemental field programs	1,060	1,143	(1)	1,121	1,117
Regional training centers	662	714	(1)	700	697
National support	7,663	8,266	(1)	8,109	8,079
State support	8,315	8,968	(1)	9,298	9,263
Clearinghouse	917	989	(1)	970	966
Computer Assisted Legal Research (CALR) regional centers	541	584	(1)	573	571

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1991 enacted	Fiscal year 1992 request	House	Senate	Conference
Corporation management and administration	8,821	10,000	(1)	9,810	9,774
Board initiatives	.....	1000	(1)	981	977
Special contingency funds	.....	100	(1)	98	97
National Resource and Training Center	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,300
Total	328,186	355,000	Defer	350,000	350,000

[1] The House bill did not include funding for the Legal Services Corporation due to lack of authorization.

In recognition of the fact that seven States currently receive no money for State support, the conferees have recommended that the State support line receive an additional $500,000 to fund State support in Delaware, Hawaii, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, South Dakota, and Kansas. The conferees intend that the Corporation shall grant to the basic field program with the largest poverty population within each said State one-seventh of the $500,000.

The conference agreement provides $977,000 for board initiatives. The conferees are agreed that such funds may be used to conduct comparative demonstration projects to study, under appropriate standards and criteria, the use of competition in providing effective and efficient legal services of high quality.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 122: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$235,811,000, of which $60,500,000 is for grants for performance in fiscal year 1992 or fiscal year 1993 for Small Business Development Centers as authorized by section 21 of the Small Business Act, as amended; of which $16,000,000 shall be available to implement section 24 of the Small Business Act, as amended, including $1,000,000 to be made available only to County of Monroe, New York; of which $1,500,000 shall be available to implement section 25 of the Small Business Act, as amended; of which $2,900,000 shall be available for the Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE); of which $4,000,000 shall be made available for a grant to St. Norbert College in De Pere, Wisconsin, for a regional center for rural economic development; of which $1,000,000 shall be made available for a grant to the New York City Public Library for equipment, supplies and materials for the new Science, Industry, and Business Library; of which $500,000 shall be available for a grant to the University of Arkansas at Little Rock for a program to provide basic and high technology technical assistance to small and medium sized manufacturers located in rural areas; of which $150,000 shall be available for a grant to the University of Central Arkansas for the Small Business Institute Program's National Data Center; of which $4,500,000 shall be available for a grant to the University of Kentucky in Lexington, Kentucky, to assist in construction of the Advanced Science and Technology Commercialization Center; of which $1,000,000 shall be made available for a grant to Seton Hill College in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, for a Center for Entrepreneurial Opportunity; of which $1,500,000 shall be available for a grant to the Massachusetts Biotechnology Research Institute to establish and operate a shared incubator facility and a science and business center; of which $1,500,000 shall be available for a grant for a New England Regional Biotechnology Transfer Center to be located at a university in the region that has accredited schools of Medicine, Dental Medicine, Human Nutrition and Veterinary Medicine; of which $1,500,000 shall be available for a grant to Indiana State University for the Center for Interdisciplinary Science Research and Education; of which $1,000,000 shall be available for a grant to the Michigan Biotechnology Institute for an advanced program of technology transfer in the field of industrial biotechnology to support evaluation, validation and scale-up of early-stage technology and technical assistance to small businesses; of which $800,000 shall be available for a grant for the development and implementation of an integrated small business data base for the Appalachian Region to be provided to a non-profit organization based in Towanda, Pennsylvania; of which $340,000 shall be available for a grant to the City of San Francisco, California, for a trade office to provide support, assistance, and research into bilateral trade opportunities between the U.S. and Asia; of which $55,000 is for a grant to the City of San Francisco, California for the publication of a small business export promotion guide; of which $375,000 is for a grant to the City of Espanola, New Mexico and $375,000 is for a grant to County of Rio Arriba, New Mexico for the development of the Espanola Plaza center for cultural enhancement and economic development; and of which $550,000 is for a grant to County of Rio Arriba, New Mexico for the development of the Cumbres and Toltec Scenic Railroad rural economic development project.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will offer a motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides a total of $235,811,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Small Business Administration, including $60,500,000 for grants for Small Business Development Centers. The conference agreement also restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate which earmarks the amount provided for SBDCs and specifies that grants for the Small Business Development Centers are for performance in fiscal year 1992 or fiscal year 1993. The House bill provided a total of $221,079,000 for SBA salaries and expenses with an earmark of $61,500,000 for grants for SBDCs. The Senate bill provided a total of $209,731,000 for salaries and expenses with no earmark for SBDC grants. The conference agreement also includes the GSA rent reduction as proposed by the House.

In addition, the conference agreement earmarks a total of $16,000,000 to carry out the Natural Resource Development provisions of the Small Business Act. Of this amount, $1,000,000 is designated for the County of Monroe, New York. The conferees are in agreement that providing these funds to the County of Monroe in no way constitutes any duplication of benefits. The remaining $15,000,000 is to be distributed according to the existing formula for this program. The House provided 98.5 percent of the base ($15,000,000) for this program with no specific bill earmark. The Senate bill did not include any provision on this matter.

The conference agreement also includes $1,500,000 for the Central European Commission and includes an earmark of this amount in the bill. The House provided 98.5 percent of current services ($1,000,000) for this Commission with no specific bill earmark. The Senate bill did not include any provision on this matter. The conferees are pleased with the work of the Central European Commission in carrying out the provisions of Section 25 of the Small Business Act in assisting with management and technical development in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary. Additional funds are provided in this Act to continue these activities and the conferees express their hope that continuity of membership on the Commission will continue in order to facilitate orderly program development.

The conference agreement provides $2,900,000 for the Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE) program and includes language similar to that proposed by the Senate earmarking this amount in the bill. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The conference agreement also includes language earmarking funds for various small business development projects, including four which were proposed in the Senate bill, which are designed: (1) to promote the development of small businesses, particularly in rural and economically depressed areas of the country; (2) to facilitate the more effective transfer of emerging technologies to small business concerns; (3) to assist small businesses in taking advantage of opportunities in international trade; and/or (4) to address the particular needs of women and minorities seeking to initiate and administer successful small businesses. These grants include the following: $4,000,000 for St. Norbert's College in De Pere, Wisconsin; $1,000,000 for the New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development; $1,000,000 for a grant to the New York City Public Library for equipment, supplies and materials for the Science, Industry and Business Library; $500,000 for the University of Arkansas at Little Rock for a program to provide basic and high technology technical assistance to manufacturers; $150,000 for the University of Central Arkansas SBI National Data Center; $4,500,000 for the University of Kentucky's Advanced Science and Technology Commercialization Center; $1,000,000 for Seton Hill College for a Center for Entrepreneurial Opportunity, described in House Report 102–106; $1,500,000 for the Massachusetts Biotechnology Research Institute; $1,500,000 for a New England Regional Biotechnology Transfer Center; $1,500,000 for Indiana State University for the Center for Interdisciplinary Science Research and Education for a technology transfer program; $1,000,000 for the Michigan Biotechnology Institute for an industrial biotechnology transfer program; $800,000 for a non-profit institute in Towanda, Pennsylvania for an integrated small business date base as described in House Report 102–106; $395,000 for the City of San Francisco, California, for a U.S.-Asia bilateral trade office and the publication of an export guide, as described in House Report 102–106; $750,000 for the City of Espanola, New Mexico, for a rural economic development center; and $550,000 for Rio Arriba County, New Mexico, for a rural business development project. The Senate amendment earmarked the following small business development activities: $4,000,000 for St. Norbert College; $1,000,000 for the New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development; $1,000,000 for the New York City Public Library's new Science, Industry, and Business Library; and $500,000 for the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. The House bill contained no provision on these matters.

The conference agreement includes $300,000 and six additional positions to be assigned to the SBA headquarters SBDC program office for additional oversight of the Small Busi-

ness Development Centers, as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement also includes $100,000 for the New Jersey EXCEL program, as described in Senate Report 102-106.

The conferees are supportive of programs which promote small business in rural areas. The Small Business Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-574) directed the Administration to undertake two specific actions designed to promote rural small business. Section 304 directed the Administration to compile a catalog of programs which offer assistance to small business concerns in rural areas. Section 306 directed the SBA to convene regional rural conferences. The conferees expect the Administration to accomplish these actions within the funds made available in this Act. The conferees are encouraged by the Administrator's recent decision to establish an Office of Rural Affairs and Economic Development within the SBA and expect this new office to take a lead role in carrying out the rural small business initiatives.

The conferees note the success of the procurement center representative (PCR) program, which assists small businesses in securing government contracts for various goods and services. According to the SBA, the government will award approximately $180 billion in contracts to U.S. businesses in fiscal year 1992. Procurement center representatives assigned nationwide aim to ensure that small businesses receive a fair share of those procurement dollars. By promoting more competition for federal contracts, savings to the government from the program this year are an estimated $330 million, a sum far exceeding the cost of the program. The conferees note that the State of Louisiana is not served by a full-time PCR, although it ranks third in prime contracts awarded from reporting federal installations. The conferees believe that small business opportunities would be greatly enhanced and savings to the government realized by the assignment of a full-time, permanent PCR in Louisiana, and expect the Agency to make such an assignment within the amounts provided as soon as possible.

The conferees are aware that the Small Business Administration entered into a contract with Price Waterhouse, Inc. for an evaluation of SBA's 7(a) guaranteed loan program. The conferees have received information that the Office of Management and Budget has attempted to micro-manage this contract to insure that the program does not receive a strong endorsement. The conferees do not want to influence the contractor's evaluation of the 7(a) program; however, they do not believe that any other entity should do so either. The conferees request that SBA forward to the House and Senate Small Business and Appropriations Committees, within ninety days of receipt, a copy of the contractor's final report along with any additional information or comments deemed appropriate by the Administration.

The conference agreement provides the following amounts for the various items funded in the SBA salaries and expenses account with appropriate comparisons to the House and Senate bills:

[In thousands of dollars]

	House	Senate	Conference
Small Business Dev. Centers	61,500	55,750	60,500
Six add'l SBDC Positions	300	0	300
SCORE	2,725	3,100	2,900
SBI	2,945	2,990	2,990
7(j)	8,600	8,600	8,600
Women's Outreach	1,970	2,000	1,500
Veteran's Outreach	452	459	459
International Trade	486	493	493
Advocacy Research/Data Base	1,638	1,663	1,638
PASS	1,161	1,179	1,179
Women's Council	486	493	493
Minority Commission	591	600	600
Special Initiatives	9,084	6,500	19,445
SBDC Tech. Asst. Program	1,182	0	1,000
New Jersey EXCEL	0	100	100
Microloan Tech. Asst.	0	3,000	3,000
Natural Resources Development	14,775	0	16,000
SBDC Central Europe	985	0	1,500
Vulnerability Studies	0	1,000	500
Financial Systems Upgrade	0	500	500
GSA Rent Reduction	−2,300	0	−2,300
All other	114,499	121,304	114,414
Total Salaries and Expenses	221,079	209,731	235,811

(Additional amounts for SBA salaries and expenses are included under the Business Loans Program Account and the Disaster Loan Program Account.)

Amendment No. 123: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate which prohibits the Small Business Administration from adopting, implementing or enforcing any rule or regulation relating to Small Business Development Centers and prohibits the SBA from imposing any restrictions, conditions or limitations on the SBDC program that were not in effect on October 1, 1987.

Amendment No. 124: Adds language proposed by the Senate which clarifies that the limitation on imposing new or increased loan guarantee fees or debenture guarantee fees excludes increases provided for elsewhere in this Act. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Amendment No. 125: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would allow the SBA to impose new or increased user fees or management assistance fees subject to the submission of a reprogramming notification pursuant to section 606 of this Act. The House bill contained no similar provision.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Amendment No. 126: Appropriates $10,000,000 for the SBA Office of Inspector General instead of $9,757,000 as proposed by the House and $11,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Amendment No. 127: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate which would specify the total amount of loan principal to be guaranteed by the subsidy amounts provided in this Act for the Business Loans Programs.

The conference agreement provides $245,786,000 to subsidize guaranteed loans under the Business Loans Program Account. Under assumptions existing at the time this bill was considered by both the House and the Senate, this amount would subsidize total loan principal of $4,819,000,000; however, changing economic assumptions might increase the total principal made possible by this subsidy amount.

The conferees are concerned about continued efficient functioning of the secondary markets for SBA-guaranteed loans and debentures. Strong, viable secondary markets for these securities are crucial in facilitating the flow of capital to small businesses and in ensuring that investors in these securities receive prompt payment from small business borrowers.

To promote the continued orderly functioning of the secondary markets in SBA securities, the conferees recommend the Administrator take appropriate steps to promote market stability, including continuation of existing market management functions, as appropriate. Present contractual relationships should be reviewed in light of previous experience and should be continued if the Administrator determines that these arrangements are in the best interest of small business. SBA should consider continuing these current management arrangements through the procedures authorized under 41 U.S.C. 253(c)(7) to accomplish this purpose.

Amendment No. 128: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: : *Provided further, That, in addition, $2,600,000 are available until expended for the subsidy cost of $15,000,000 in direct loans for the Small Business Administration Micro-Loan program.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $2,600,000 to subsidize $15,000,000 for the Small Business Administration Micro-Loan Program. This is an increase of $800,000 above the amount provided by the Senate. The House bill contained no similar provision. In addition, the conference agreement includes new language in amendment No. 176 providing an authorization for this program. The conference agreement also includes $3,000,000 in amendment No. 122 for technical assistance associated with this program under the SBA Salaries and Expenses appropriation.

DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Amendment No. 129: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which increases the amount provided to subsidize disaster assistance loans to $121,555,000 and makes these funds available until expended. The House bill provided $114,913,000 for disaster loan subsidies and did not make the funds available until expended.

The conference agreement provides full funding of the Administration's request for credit subsidies associated with the disaster loan program.

Amendment No. 130: Provides for a total direct disaster loan level of $365,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $344,750,000 as proposed by the House. This amount is consistent with the average disaster loan program level over the past ten years (excluding the high and low years of FY 1989 and FY 1990).

The conferees understand that, consistent with the Administration's proposal for funding unanticipated disaster needs, any funding requirements in excess of the amounts provided in this Act for SBA disaster loan program credit subsidies and/or administrative expenses associated with this program would be designated as "emergency requirements" under the Budget Enforcement Act.

Amendment Nos. 131 and 132: Provide $78,000,000 for administrative expenses associated with the disaster loan program as proposed by the Senate instead of $76,830,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees are concerned that the amounts requested and provided for the administrative expenses associated with the disaster loan program may not be sufficient to adequately maintain the program. In previous years, funding uncertainties for the administrative expenses of the disaster program were dealt with by allowing the transfer of such sums as were necessary from the Disaster Loan Fund. One of the casualties of

credit reform was the elimination of the ability to make this type of transfer from the disaster program account. The conferees, therefore, urge the Administration to make every effort to identify in a timely manner any potential shortfalls in disaster program administrative expenses so that requests for emergency appropriations can be acted on quickly, and those who suffer damages resulting from natural disasters will not endure additional and unnecessary inconvenience.

SURETY BOND GUARANTEES REVOLVING FUND

Amendment No. 133: Appropriates $14,600,000 for additional capital for the Surety Bond Guarantees Revolving Fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,381,000 as proposed by the House.

POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT CONTRACT GUARANTEE REVOLVING FUND

Amendment No. 134: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate which appropriated $8,400,000 in additional capital for the Pollution Control Equipment Contract Guarantee Revolving Fund. This account now has permanent indefinite borrowing authority from Treasury and does not require annual appropriations.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 135: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *$2,015,335,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be available only for grants, contracts, and other activities to conduct research and promote international cooperation and of which $15,000,000 shall be available until expended only for enhancement of the Diplomatic Telecommunications Service (DTS): Provided, That such DTS funds shall not be available for obligation until the Secretary of State notifies the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate under the reprogramming procedures of this Act that a Diplomatic Telecommunications Service Program Office (DTS-PO) to manage a fully integrated DTS is established, in operation, and has developed a consolidation plan with common architecture, and that a requirement for these funds exists to expand the Diplomatic Telecommunications Service: Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be available for the Department of State Telecommunications Network (DOSTN) project.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $2,015,335,000 for the State Department's Salaries and Expenses account of which $5,000,000 shall be available only for grants, contracts, and other activities to conduct research and promote international cooperation pursuant to a program developed by the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs and submitted to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees under the reprogramming procedures of this Act. The conference agreement also designates $15,000,000 which shall be available until expended only for enhancement of the Diplomatic Telecommunications Service. However, these funds are not available until such time as the Secretary of State notifies the Appropriations Committees that a Diplomatic Telecommunications Service Program Office to manage a fully integrated DTS is formed, is operating, and has developed a consolidation plan with common architecture, and that the funds are needed to expand the DTS. Finally, the conference agreement contains a limitation prohibiting any of the funds in the Salaries and Expenses account from being used for the Department of State Telecommunications Network (DOSTN) project.

The House had proposed an appropriation of $2,021,835,000 for this account and a limitation of $500,000 for the State Department's Office of Congressional Relations which was stricken by the Senate. The conference agreement deletes the limitation as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate since the Secretary of State has provided unqualified assurance to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees that the top managers of the Department will conduct a complete review of the Department's legislative affairs functions, policies, and operations and make appropriate changes if merited. Given this assurance, the conferees have deleted the House limitation and recommend that the House and Senate Appropriations Committees review this matter in the fiscal year 1993 budget process.

The Senate had proposed an appropriation of $2,007,246,000 of which $20,853,000 would have been available only for the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs including $10,000,000 for grants, contracts, and other activities to conduct research and promote international cooperation.

The conference agreement generally reflects the House level for this appropriation account including the House reduction for GSA space rental charges. The conference agreement includes the requested program increase of $24,000,000 and 232 positions to carry out the Department of State's responsibilities under the Immigration Act of 1990, and $4,000,000 to continue the machine readable visa project. In addition, the conference agreement includes $5,000,000 for grants and contracts for the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs to conduct research and promote international cooperation, and $3,500,000 for personnel and expenses needed for new posts in the Baltic Nations and Soviet Republics. In addition, the conference agreement prohibits any funding for continuation of the DOSTN procurement and makes a reduction of $30,000,000 from the House level accordingly. However, the conference agreement provides $15,000,000 to enhance the Diplomatic Telecommunications Service in accordance with certain requirements.

The conferees are concerned that the Diplomatic Telecommunications Service (DTS), as it is currently configured, is a nonfunctioning entity. Despite numerous MOU's, NSDD's as well as nonofficial coordination documents which espouse a policy of cooperative effort and teamwork, in practice the DTS agencies expend considerable resources on communications, have substantial capabilities in place, and have unilateral and uncoordinated plans to upgrade their separate systems. One of the agencies presently has funds designated to continue the installation/upgrade of its government-owned subsystems. Another agency has a worldwide communications network composed of commercially-leased circuitry which is badly in need of upgrade and improvement, and that agency has plans and funds earmarked to conduct this upgrade by unilaterally acquiring a new packet switched telecommunications network which it calls DOSTN.

In light of national budgetary constraints, the existing capabilities, and the need to improve communications on a cost effective basis for all U.S. agencies in the Foreign Affairs community, the conferees most strongly recommend that a Diplomatic Telecommunications Service-Program Office (DTS-PO) be created to consolidate and ensure interoperability of the assets and capabilities of the DTS. The conferees expect the DTS-PO to be jointly staffed and managed and have independent funding and contract authority. The conferees are agreed that the purpose of the DTS-PO will be to: (1) sustain current service, (2) satisfy immediate requirements through maximum use of existing assets, and (3) develop and acquire enhanced capabilities to satisfy the jointly validated future communications/information management requirements of a fully integrated DTS and the entire U.S. Government's Foreign Affairs community.

The conferees request that the DTS Program Office prepare a plan to achieve the interoperability of overseas diplomatic telecommunications services. this plan should be submitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress no later than May 1, 1992. This plan should ensure the termination of both the government-owned and leased systems as separate entities. The plan should include proposals and recommendations concerning the transfer of the Operation and Maintenance budgets of the separate portions of the DTS to a new DTS-PO. The conferees are agreed that the DTS-PO should be supported with funds specifically and solely designated for the DTS, and that the DTS-PO and a new DTS Operations and Network Management Center be established at a neutral site.

The conference agreement for the Salaries and Expenses account is intended to implement this policy statement. The agreement provides funds which will be available until expended for an enhancement of the DTS. However, these funds are embargoed until such time as the DTS-PO is formed, actually begins to function and reports back to the Congress with a consolidation plan and common architecture in accordance with the reprogramming procedures of the Committees.

The conferees are agreed that the Department of State should comply with the policy regarding immigration preinspection as stated in this Joint Statement under Amendment No. 35.

Amendment No. 136: Provides that up to $700,000 shall be available for certain registration fees collected pursuant to section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act as proposed by the Senate instead of $523,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 137: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which permits up to $6,000,000 of the State Department's Salaries and Expenses appropriation to be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the purpose of providing payment of medical expenses. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

PROTECTION OF FOREIGN MISSIONS AND OFFICIALS

Amendment No. 138: Appropriates $10,464,000 instead of $9,464,000 as proposed by the House and $11,464,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes $8,303,000 for reimbursement of New York City for the protection of foreign missions

and officials credited to the United Nations and other international organizations, pursuant to submission of certified billings for any costs incurred.

MOSCOW EMBASSY RECONSTRUCTION AND SECURITY

Amendment No. 139: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would have appropriated $130,000,000 for a teardown-reconstruction option for a new U.S. embassy in Moscow, and would have required the Secretary of State to seek reimbursement from the Soviet Union for the full costs incurred by the United States as a result of intelligence activities of the Soviet Union. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

This subject is further addressed in Amendment No. 140.

ACQUISITION AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

Amendment No. 140: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, inset the following: *$545,000,000 of which $100,000,000 is available for construction of an entirely new and secure chancery for the United States Embassy in Moscow, U.S.S.R.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides a total of $545,000,000 for the State Department's Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad account. Of this amount, $100,000,000 is for construction of an entirely new and secure chancery for the United States Embassy in Moscow. The House had proposed an appropriation of $552,594,000 of which $130,000,000 was to be available for construction of chancery facilities in Moscow. The Senate had proposed an appropriation of $430,000,000 for the account with no designation for construction of chancery facilities in Moscow.

The conference agreement includes $415,000,000 for the regular Foreign Buildings Program of construction and maintenance of facilities and $30,000,000 for facilities in the Baltic Republics and other sites in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe.

The following table shows a distribution of the conference agreement among the various items funded in this account:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Conference agreement
Capital program	$50,372
Leasehold program	123,467
Functional programs:	
Physical security upgrades	8,098
Fire life safety	5,447
Energy conservation	800
Seismic program	545
Power support	5,220
PCC renovation	3,540
Asbestos program	2,740
Maintenance of buildings	59,153
Facility rehabilitation	23,775
Facility maintenance assistance	24,045
Furniture and furnishings	4,200
Applied engineering	520
Project supervision	8,083
Project management	10,000
Construction security	44,000
Subtotal	374,000
Administration	41,000
Regular Programs	415,000
New and Secure Chancery for Moscow, U.S.S.R.	100,000
Baltics, other sites in U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe	30,000
Grand Total	545,000

Of the total amount of $545,000,000 provided in the conference agreement, $100,000,000 is designated toward the cost of constructing and procuring equipment and other services necessary to provide an entirely new and secure chancery for the United States Embassy in Moscow, U.S.S.R. The conferees also have provided $30,000,000 for renovation, rehabilitation, and construction requirements for U.S. missions in Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania and sites in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe. The conferees expect the Department of State to consider possible alternatives for the use of the partially constructed new chancery in Moscow and to report the same to the appropriate committees of Congress before making a decision at a later date under the usual reprogramming procedures.

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

Amendment No. 141: Appropriates $7,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

REPATRIATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Amendment No. 142: Provides a limitation on the program level for direct loans of up to $780,000 instead of $223,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

PAYMENT TO THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN TAIWAN

Amendment No. 143: Appropriates $13,784,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $13,334,000 as proposed by the House.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Amendment No. 144: Appropriates $842,384,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $866,774,000 as proposed by the House. The conference agreement provides full funding of the fiscal year 1992 annual requirements for U.S. assessed contributions to international organizations and 20 percent of arrearages.

Amendment No. 145: Designates $92,719,000 to pay arrearages as proposed by the Senate instead of $117,109,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House.

The bill language as agreed to by the House and Senate provides that the payment of arrearages shall be directed towards special activities that are mutually agreed upon by the United States and the respective international organization. The conferees expect that the Department of State will submit a reprogramming to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees under the reprogramming provisions of this Act, concerning any such agreements before any payment of arrearages is made to any of the international organizations.

Amendment No. 146: Deletes a provision proposed by the Senate which would have required the Secretary of State to certify that the United Nations and each specialized agency are making progress in increasing American professional staff positions or that an organization has met its geographic distribution formula before any funds for arrearage payments would be available. In addition, the provision would have applied only to those organizations with a geographic distribution formula in effect on January 1, 1991. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

As the largest contributor to most international organizations, the United States should be assigned a high percentage of jobs in these organizations. While a number of international organizations have developed geographic distribution formulas as a guide to hiring personnel from specific countries, the employment of American professional staff members meets the geographic distribution formula in only two organizations—the United Nations and the World Health Organization. In many cases little or no progress has been made in the past 10 years in increasing American employment.

The conferees are concerned that too few Americans are employed in international organizations and strongly urge and expect the Inspector General to review the hiring practices of these organizations in order to ascertain the facts and recommend processes and procedures to increase American employment. In addition, the Inspector General should identify any institutional barriers to or biases against the hiring of American personnel, and recommend appropriate action.

The conferees strongly recommend that the House and Senate Appropriations Committees review hiring patterns at international organizations during the coming year to determine whether progress is being made in increasing American employment. To the extent that it is not, the conferees recommend that the Committees reconsider amendments such as that included by the Senate in the FY 1992 appropriations bill.

The conferees note that Public Law 100-204 established the United States Commission on Improving the Effectiveness of the United Nations. The purpose of the commission is to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the United Nations and to provide recommendations to the President and the Congress on ways to improve the effectiveness of the U.N. and the U.S. role in the U.N. system. The 16 members of the commission are appointed by the bipartisan leadership of the Congress and the President. The conferees further note that even though the 12 Congressional appointments have been made and commitments of private contributions to underwrite commissions expenses have been secured, the Presidential appointment have yet to be made. The conferees strongly urge the Department of State to take all necessary action so that the President may make these appointments as soon as possible. The conferees expect the Department to report on the status of these efforts by December 1, 1991.

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 147: Appropriates $107,229,000 for Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities as proposed by the Senate instead of $108,856,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House. The conference agreement fully funds annual requirements for United States assessed contributions for international peacekeeping activities and fiscal year 1992 arrearage payments.

Amendment No. 148: Designates $38,360,000 for arrearage payments as proposed by the Senate instead of $39,987,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House.

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 149: Appropriates $11,400,000 as proposed by the House instead of $10,900,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides $500,000 above the budget request for this account to fund additional operating requirements for the Nogales, Arizona Wastewater Treatment Facilities.

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 150: Appropriates $10,277,000 as proposed by the House instead of $10,525,000 as proposed by the Senate.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION

Amendment No. 151: Appropriates $14,000,000 instead of $12,647,000 as proposed by the House and $14,758,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The following table shows the conference agreement for various items funded in this account, with appropriate comparisons:

Activities	1992 Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference Agreement
Great Lakes Fishery Commission	$6,338	$6,738	$8,338	$7,780
Pacific Salmon Commission	1,414	1,514	2,000	1,800
North Pacific Marine Sciences Organization	50	50	75	75
All Other Commissions and Activities	4,345	4,345	4,345	4,345
Total	12,147	12,647	14,758	14,000

Amendment No. 152: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a margin to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

SEC. 502. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended by the Department of State for contracts with any foreign or United States firm that complies with the Arab League Boycott of the State of Israel or with any foreign or United States firm that discriminates in the award of subcontracts on the basis of religion: Provided, That the Secretary of State may waive this provision on a country-by-country basis upon certification to the Congress by the Secretary that such waiver is in the national interest and is necessary to carry on the diplomatic functions of the United States.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement inserts a general provision prohibiting the State Department from obligating or expending any funds in this Act for contracts with any foreign or United States firm that complies with the Arab League Boycott of Israel or with any such firm that discriminates in the award of subcontracts on the basis of religion, provided that the Secretary of State may waive this provision on a country-by-country basis upon certification to the Congress that such waiver is in the national interest and is necessary to carry on the diplomatic functions of the United States. The Senate had proposed language which is the same as that in the conference agreement except for the waiver provision. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conferees agree that the Department of State should take every action possible to oppose the Arab League Boycott of Israel, and discrimination against U.S. companies owned by Jewish Americans. The conferees, however, are concerned that the amendment proposed by the Senate could have made continued operation of State Department posts in some countries impracticable. Therefore, the conferees have agreed to provide the Secretary of State with waiver authority on a country-by-country basis upon certification to Congress that such waivers are in the national interest and are necessary to conduct diplomatic operations.

Amendment No. 153: Reported in disagreement.

RELATED AGENCIES

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 154: Deletes the heading "(Including Transfer of Funds)" as proposed by the Senate. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Amendment No. 155: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *$44,527,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides $44,527,000 for the fiscal year 1992 operating expenses of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, instead of $43,527,000 as proposed by the House and $44,423,000 (including a $2,000,000 transfer of funds) as propose by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes a base level of funding for the operating programs of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and an additional $1,000,000 for the Agency's external research program.

The conference agreement does not include funds for the additional 24 full-time and two reimbursable staff positions requested for fiscal year 1992. The conferees are aware of continuing unfilled vacancies at the Agency and will consider any request to reprogram Agency resources to utilize these additional positions only after ACDA can successfully demonstrate that every effort has been made to fill the existing slots. The conferees remind the Agency that any such request would be subject to the reprogramming procedures included in section 606 of this Act.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate which would have provided $2,000,000 to be derived by transfer from the Department of State "Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad" account.

COMMISSION FOR THE PRESERVATION OF AMERICA'S HERITAGE ABROAD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 156: Appropriates $200,000 as proposed by the House instead of $50,000 as proposed by the Senate.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 157: Appropriates $42,434,000 instead of $42,934,000 as proposed by the House and $41,934,000 as proposed by the Senate.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 158: Deletes a heading proposed by the Senate referring to the transfer of funds. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Amendment No. 159: Appropriates $691,725,000 instead of $681,051,000 as proposed by the House and $692,275,000 with an additional transfer of $4,000,000 from the State Department's Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad account as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement of $691,725,000 reflects the reduction of $1,868,000 for GSA space rental rate limitations proposed by the House and an increase of $1,318,000 above the budget request to cover a portion of the proposed base reductions.

The conferees are concerned about the additional requirements for the U.S. Information Service resulting from United States recognition of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia as well as the need to adjust the agency's programs in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Eastern European countries. In addition, the conferees are concerned about expansion of USIA and Voice of America programs mandated in other Acts at a time of restricted budgets. Before any funds are obligated or committed for new posts or expansion of posts or for any newly authorized programs, the conferees are agreed that a reprogramming proposal must be submitted to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees in accordance with the reprogramming provisions of this Act.

Amendment No. 160: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which adds language permitting up to $1,250,000 of the USIA's Salaries and Expenses appropriation to be available for the operation of the International Literary Centre or a nonprofit successor organization as appropriate. The House bill contained no provision on this matter. The conferees support the purposes of this organization which distributes books and periodicals on democracy, economics, law, government, management, and related fields in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 161: Deletes a heading proposed by the Senate referring to the transfer of funds. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Amendment No. 162: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *$194,232,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The House had proposed an appropriation of $178,000,000 for the Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs and the Senate had proposed an appropriation of $186,163,000. The conference agreement provides an appropriation of $194,232,000.

The following table shows the conference agreement with appropriate comparisons:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Request	House	Senate	Conference
Fulbright scholarships	$107,065	$104,365	$115,065	$110,000
CAMPUS	3,389	3,389	4,422	4,000
International visitors	44,336	45,366	45,366	45,000
Humphrey fellowships	5,682	5,552	5,682	5,667
Congress-Bundestag exchanges	2,465	2,465	2,465	2,465
Institute for Representative Government	.....	.....	600	600
East Europe training projects	1,500	3,500	1,500	3,500
Citizen exhange programs	8,063	8,063	8,063	8,000
Pepper scholarships	.....	1,000	1,000	1,000
Soviet-American Interparliamentarian meetings	.....	2,000	.....	2,000
World University games	.....	2,000	2,000	2,000
(By Transfer):				
U.S. Soviet Exchange Program	.....	.....	(7,000)	7,000
Educational Exchange Enhancement Act	.....	.....	(4,000)	2,000
Federal Endowment for High School Exchanges	.....	.....	(2,000)	1,000

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	Request	House	Senate	Conference
Total	$172,500	$178,000	$186,163	$194,232
(By Transfer)	(---)	(---)	(13,000)	---

Note: The Senate transfers were proposed in Amendment No. 164.

The conferees encourage the Director of the United States Information Agency to place greater emphasis upon exchange programs which include the disabled. The Director should consider expanding the participation of individuals with disabilities in international educational and cultural exchange activities, including the full array of government-sponsored and government-assisted programs. The Director should, subject to the availability of funds, consider contracting for the development and expansion of such programs with a nonprofit organization with a demonstrated capability to coordinate exchange programs for the disabled.

The conferees are aware of the proposals of certain universities including the University of Kansas, Rutgers University, and De Paul University to provide training for educators, government officials, business leaders, and scholars in the emerging democracies of Eastern Europe. The conferees note that the U.S. Information Agency provided funding for various project proposals on this matter from these and other American universities and colleges in fiscal year 1991. The conferees strongly support this program and urge the U.S. Information Agency to consider proposals for funding during fiscal year 1992.

The conferees agree with the language in the House Appropriations Committee report regarding the importance of USIA's Designated Exchange Visitor Programs for flight, agricultural, and other trainees, in particular the on-the-job components of such programs, and wish to reemphasize the expectation that USIA will submit its proposed, revised regulations regarding such programs "to the appropriate Congressional committees with a detailed explanation of the proposed changes before implementing any such revised regulations".

Amendment No. 163: Provides an earmarking of $1,000,000 for the Claude and Mildred Pepper Scholarship Program. The House had proposed this earmarking as well as an earmarking of $2,000,000 for the 1993 World University Games in Buffalo, New York, and $2,000,000 for the expenses of Soviet-American Interparliamentary Meetings and visits in the United States—all of which were stricken by the Senate. Funding for each of these programs is included in the conference agreement on Amendment No. 162.

Amendment No. 164: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would have transferred $13,000,000 from the State Department's Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad account and would have designated certain amounts for several new exchange programs. The House bill contained no provision on this matter. Funding for these exchange programs is provided in the conference agreement on Amendment No. 162.

EISENHOWER EXCHANGE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM PAYMENT TO THE EISENHOWER EXCHANGE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM TRUST FUND

Amendment No. 165: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *: Provided, That interest and earnings in the Fund shall be made available to the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships, Incorporated, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 5203(a): Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay any salary or other compensation, or to enter into any contract providing for the payment thereof, in excess of the rate authorized for GS-18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; or for purposes which are not in accordance with OMB Circulars A-110 (Uniform Administrative Requirements) and A-122 (Cost Principles for Nonprofit Organizations), including the restrictions on compensation for personal services.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides language as proposed by the Senate that makes interest and earnings in the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program Trust Fund available to the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships, Incorporated pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 5203(a). The conference agreement also adds new language not contained in either the House or Senate bills which prohibits any of the funds appropriated for payment to the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program Trust Fund to pay any salary or other compensation in excess of the rate authorized for GS-18. This provision also prohibits the use of this appropriation for purposes which are not in accordance with OMB Circulars A-110 (Uniform Administrative Requirements) and A-112 (Cost Principles for Nonprofit Organizations), including the restriction on compensation for personal services. The House bill included no provision on these matters.

The conferees have included a restriction on the use of this appropriation which was not contained in either bill, pursuant to the recommendation of the USIA Inspector General who recently completed an audit of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships, Incorporated. In his audit report, the Inspector General found that the EEF had granted its president a 15 year below-market interest (6 percent loan of $250,000) to purchase a new home as part of the president's compensation package. The Inspector General also found that under a proposed compensation plan, which the president stated was never approved, the president's compensation would increase from $89,000 per year to $175,000 per year, including deferred payments, by 1997. The conferees have included the restriction on the use of the appropriation to the Endowment in light of the fact that the Endowment may not be covered by the restrictions normally applicable to grants, as recommended by the USIA Inspector General.

RADIO CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 166: Deletes a heading proposed by the Senate which refers to the transfer of funds. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Amendment No. 167: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would have transferred $10,000,000 from the Department of State's acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad account to supplement the direct appropriation for USIA's Radio Construction account. The House bill contained no similar provision.

BROADCASTING TO CUBA

Amendment No. 168: Appropriates $6,888,000 instead of $33,288,000 as proposed by the House and $38,988,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement provides $11,013,000 for Radio Broadcasting to Cuba, $14,553,000 for Television Broadcasting to Cuba, $8,022,000 for program direction and administration, and $3,300,000 for construction of an additional transmitting facility for Radio Marti.

EAST-WEST CENTER

Amendment No. 169: Appropriates $24,500,000 for the East-West Center instead of $23,920,000 as proposed by the House and $26,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees recommend that the East-West Center allocate $150,000 from these funds to the Kapalua Pacific Center to conduct a follow-up, five-day survey of cultural values in the Age of Technology. The purpose of this survey is to define further program statements and issues developed by Pacific Island leaders who are attempting to build an economy in today's rapidly changing technology. The conferees expect that field visits will be made to selected Pacific sites in carrying out this study and that 40 Pacific Island leaders will participate in the survey.

NORTH/SOUTH CENTER

Amendment No. 170: Appropriates $5,000,000 for the North/South Center instead of $10,000,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

Amendment No. 171: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *$27,500,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $27,500,000 for the National Endowment for Democracy instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 172: Deletes section 607 proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate which would have prohibited any of the funds in this Act from being used to implement the provisions of Public Law 101-576.

Amendment No. 173: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum "$9.79" in subparagraph (1) of said amendment, insert: *$9.76* and

In lieu of the term "9 cents" in subparagraph (1) of said amendment, insert: *8 cents*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement continues all of the legislative provisions relating to the Legal Services Corporation which were in effect during fiscal year 1991 as proposed by the Senate. These provisions include prohibitions on abortion litigation and representation of illegal aliens; restrictions on lobbying, class action suits and training programs; provisions governing the appointment of local program boards of directors; and provisions making it easier to deny refunding to grantees. The conference agreement also includes Senate language which continues provisions which were in effect in fiscal year 1991 concerning the development of a system of competitive bidding of grants; requirements for full-year funding of grants; a requirement that any timekeeping system be developed by regulation; and restrictions on implementation of LSC regulations. No new legislative provisions have been added.

The conference agreement also includes a funding formula for the distribution of funds to field programs which provides that grants shall be maintained at not less than $9.76 per poor person instead of $9.79 as proposed by

the Senate or 8 cents per poor person more than the annual per-poor-person level at which funding was appropriated in Public Law 101-515 instead of 9 cents for this purpose as proposed by the Senate. These changes in the formula reflect the changes in the distribution of funds among the various components of the LSC appropriation in the conference agreement.

The House bill contained no similar provisions.

The conferees are optimistic that reauthorization legislation for the Legal Services Corporation will be enacted during this Congress to address, and supersede, many of the legislative provisions which have been carried year after year in appropriations bills.

Amendment No. 174: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would have prohibited any person who has served as the United States Trade Representative from representing foreign governments within five years after leaving office.

The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

Amendment No. 175: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the section number named in said amendment, insert: *608* and after the word "prohibition" in new Sec. 608(a), insert the following: *in the national interest or*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement adds section 608 to the bill. Subsection (a) prohibits the use of funds in the Act to approve any export license application for the launch of U.S.-built satellites on Chinese-built launch vehicles unless the President waives such prohibition in the national interest or under subsection (b) of this section. Under the conference agreement subsection (b) provides that the restriction on the approval of export licenses for U.S.-built satellites to the People's Republic of China for launch on Chinese-built launch vehicles contained in subsection (a) may be waived by the President on a case-by-case basis upon certification by the United States Trade Representative that the People's Republic of China is in full compliance with the memorandum of agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of the People's Republic of China regarding international trade in commercial launch services.

The Senate had proposed the provisions in the conference agreement except for the authority of the President to waive this provision in the national interest. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

Amendment No. 176: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 609. (a) Section 5(g)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 634(g)(1)) is amended by striking "except separate trust certificates shall be issued for loans approved under section 7(a)(13)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or under section 502 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 660)."

(b) Section 7(a)(18) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(18)) is amended by striking "or a loan under paragraph (13)" from the first sentence.

(c) Section 215(a)(2) of the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-574) is amended by striking "July 1, 1991" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1991."

(d) The Small Business Act is amended by adding the following new section:

"SEC. 28. PILOT TECHNOLOGY ACCESS PROGRAM.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administration, in consultation with the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the National Technical Information Service, shall establish a Pilot Technology Access Program, for making awards under this section to Small Business Development Centers (hereinafter in this section referred to as "Centers").

"(b) CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF CENTERS.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall establish competitive, merit-based criteria for the selection of Centers to receive awards on the basis of—

"(1) the ability of the applicant to carry out the purposes described in subsection (d) in a manner relevant to the needs of industries in the area served by the Center;

"(2) the ability of the applicant to integrate the implementation of this program with existing Federal and State technical and business assistance resources; and

"(3) the ability of the applicant to continue providing technology access after the termination of this pilot program.

"(c) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—To be eligible to receive an award under this section, an applicant shall provide a matching contribution at least equal to that received under such award, not more than fifty percent of which may be waived overhead or in-kind contributions.

"(d) PURPOSE OF AWARDS.—Awards made under this section shall be for the purpose of increasing access by small businesses to on-line data base services that provide technical and business information, and access to technical experts, in a wide range of technologies, through such activities as—

"(1) defraying the cost of access by small businesses to the data base services;

"(2) training small businesses in the use of the data base services; and

"(3) establishing a public point of access to the data base services.

"Activities described in paragraphs (1) through (3) may be carried out through contract with a private entity.

"(e) RENEWAL OF AWARDS.—Awards previously made under section 21(A) of this Act may be renewed under this section.

"(f) INTERIM REPORT.—Two years after the date on which the first award was issued under section 21(A) of this Act, the General Accounting Office shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, an interim report on the implementation of the program under such section and this section, including the judgments of the participating Centers as to its effect on small business productivity and innovation.

"(g) FINAL REPORT.—Three years after such date, the General Accounting Office shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation of the Senate, a final report evaluating the effectiveness of the Program under section 21(A) and this section in improving small business productivity and innovation.

"(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Small Business Administration $5 million for each of fiscal years 1992 through 1995 to carry out this section, and such amounts may remain available until expended.

"(i) Centers are encouraged to seek funding from Federal and non-Federal sources other than those provided for in this section to assist small businesses in the identification of appropriate technologies to fill their needs, the transfer of technologies from Federal laboratories, public and private universities, and other public institutions, the analysis of commercial opportunities represented by such technologies, and such other functions as the development, business planning, market research, and financial packaging required for commercialization. Insofar as such Centers pursue these activities, Federal agencies are encouraged to employ these Centers to interface with small businesses for such purposes as facilitating small business participation in Federal procurement and fostering commercialization of Federally-funded research and development.".

"(e) Notwithstanding any other law, no funds shall be appropriated to carry out section 21(A) of the Small Business Act after September 30, 1991, and such section is repealed October 1, 1992.

"(f) Section 232 of the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 1990 is repealed.

"(g) Section 7(b) of the Small Business Computer Security and Education Act of 1984 (15 U.S.C. 633 Note) is amended by striking "March 31, 1991" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1992".

(h) Section 7 of the Small Busienss Act (15 U.S.C. 636) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"( ) Microloan Demonstration Program.—

"(1)(A) PURPOSE.—The purposes of the Microloan Demonstration Program are—

"(A) to assist women, low-income, and minority entrepreneurs, business owners, and other individuals possessing the capability to operate successful business concerns;

"(B) to assist small business concerns in those areas suffering from a lack of credit due to economic downturns; and

"(C) to establish a microloan demonstration program to be administered by the Small Business Administration—

"(i) to make loans to eligible intermediaries to enable such intermediaries to provide small-scale loans to startup, newly established, or growing small business concerns for working capital or the acquisition of materials, supplies, or equipment.

"(ii) to make grants to eligible intermediaries that, together with non-Federal matching funds, will enable such intermediaries to provide intensive marketing, management, and technical assistance to microloan borrowers;

"(iii) to make grants to eligible nonprofit entities that, together with non-Federal matching funds, will enable such entities to provide intensive marketing, management, and technical assistance to assist low-income entrepreneurs and other low-income individuals obtain private sector financing for their businesses, with or without loan guarantees; and

"(iv) to report to the Committees on Small Business of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the effectiveness of the microloan program and the advisability and feasibility of implementing such a program nationwide.

"(B) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a microloan demonstration program, under which the Administration may—

"(i) make direct loans to eligible intermediaries, as provided under paragraph (3), for the purpose of making short-term, fixed interest rate microloans to startup, newly established, and growing small business concerns under paragraph (6);

"(ii) in conjunction with such loans and subject to the requirements of paragraph (4), make grants to such intermediaries for the purpose of providing intensive marketing, management, and technical assistance to small business concerns that are borrowers under this subsection; and

"(iii) subject to the requirements of paragraph (5), make grants to nonprofit entities for the purpose of providing marketing, management, and technical assistance to low-income individuals seeking to start or enlarge their own businesses, if such assistance includes working with the grant recipient to secure loans in amounts not to exceed $15,000 from private sector lending institutions, without a loan guarantee from the nonprofit entity.

"(2) ELIGIBILITY FOR PARTICIPATION.—An intermediary shall be eligible to receive loans and grants under subparagraphs (B)(i) and (B)(ii) of paragraph (1)(B) if it—

"(A) meets the definition in paragraph (10); and

"(B) has at least 1 year of experience making microloans to startup, newly established, or growing small business concerns and providing, as an integral part of this microloan program, intensive marketing, management, and technical assistance to its borrowers.

"(3) LOANS TO INTERMEDIARIES.—

"(A) INTERMEDIARY APPLICATIONS.—As part of its application for a loan, each intermediary shall submit a description to the Administration of—

"(i) the type of businesses to be assisted;

"(ii) the size and range of loans to be made;

"(iii) the geographic area to be served and its economic and unemployment characteristics;

"(iv) the status of small business concerns in the area to be served and an analysis of their credit and technical assistance needs;

"(v) any marketing, management, and technical assistance to be provided in connection with a loan made under this subsection;

"(vi) the local economic credit markets, including the costs associated with obtaining credit locally;

"(vii) the qualifications of the applicant to carry out the purpose of this subsection; and

"(viii) any plan to involve private sector lenders in assisting selected small business concerns.

"(B) INTERMEDIARY CONTRIBUTION.—As a condition of any loan made to an intermediary under subparagraph (B)(i) of paragraph (1), the Administration shall require the intermediary to contribute not less than 15 percent of the loan amount in cash from non-Federal sources.

"(C) LOAN LIMITS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a)(3), no loan shall be made under this subsection if the total amount outstanding and committed to one intermediary (excluding outstanding grants) from the business loan and investment fund established by this Act would, as a result of such loan, exceed $750,000 in the first year of such intermediary's participation in the program, and $1,250,000 in the remaining years of the intermediary's participation in the demonstration program.

"(D) LOAN LOSS RESERVE FUND.—The Administration shall, by regulation, require each intermediary to establish a loan loss reserve fund, and to maintain such reserve fund until all obligations owed to the Administration under this subsection are repaid. The Administration shall require the loan loss reserve fund to be maintained—

"(i) in the first year of the intermediary's participation in the demonstration program, at a level equal to not more than 15 percent of the outstanding balance of the notes receivable owned to the intermediary; and

"(ii) in each year of participation thereafter, at a level reflecting the intermediary's total losses as a result of participation in the demonstration program, as determined by the Administration on a case-by-case basis, but in no case shall the required level exceed 15 percent of the outstanding balance of the notes receivable owned to the intermediary under the program.

"(E) UNAVAILABILITY OF COMPARABLE CREDIT.—An intermediary may make a loan under this subsection of more than $15,000 to a small business concern only if such small business concern demonstrates that it is unable to obtain credit elsewhere at comparable interest rates and that it has good prospects for success. In no case shall an intermediary make a loan under this subsection of more than $25,000, or have outstanding or committed to any 1 borrower more than $25,000.

"(F) LOAN DURATION.—Loans made by the Administration under this subsection shall be for a term of 10 years and at an interest rate equal to the rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury for obligations of the United States with a period of maturity of 5 years, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

"(G) DELAYED PAYMENTS.—The Administration shall not require repayment of interest or principal of a loan made to an intermediary under this subjection during the first year of the loan.

"(H) FEES; COLLATERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (D), the Administration shall not charge any fees or require collateral other than an assignment of the notes receivable of the microloans with respect to any loan made to an intermediary under this subsection.

"(4) MARKETING, MANAGEMENT, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO INTERMEDIARIES.—Grants made in accordance with subparagraph (b)(ii) of paragraph (1) shall be subject to the following requirements:

"(A) GRANT AMOUNTS.—Subject to the requirements of subparagraph (B), each intermediary that receives a loan under subparagraph (B)(i) of paragraph (1) shall be eligible to receive a grant to provide marketing, management, and technical assistance to small business concerns that are borrowers under this subsection. In the first and second years of an intermediary's program participation, each intermediary meeting the requirement of subparagraph (B) may receive a grant of not more than 20 percent of the total outstanding balance of loans made to it under this subsection. In the third and subsequent years of an intermediary's program participation, each intermediary meeting the requirements of subparagraph (B) may receive a grant of not more than 10 percent of the total outstanding balance of loans made to it under this subsection.

"(B) CONTRIBUTION.—As a condition of any grant made under subparagraph (A), the Administration shall require the intermediary to contribute an amount equal to one-half of the amount of the grant, obtained solely from non-Federal sources. In addition to cash or other direct funding, the contribution may include indirect costs or in-kind contributions paid for under non-Federal programs.

"(5) PRIVATE SECTOR BORROWING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS.—Grants made in accordance with subparagraph (B)(iii) of paragraph (1) shall be subject to the following requirements:

"(A) GRANT AMOUNTS.—Subject to the requirements of subparagraph (B), in each of the 5 years of the demonstration program established under this subsection, the Administration may make not more than 2 grants, each in amounts not to exceed $125,000 for the purposes specified in subparagraph (B)(iii) of paragraph (1).

"(B) CONTRIBUTION.—As a condition of any grant made under subparagraph (A), the Administration shall require the grant recipient to contribute an amount equal to 20 percent of the amount of the grant, obtained solely from non-Federal sources. In addition to cash or other direct funding, the contribution may include indirect costs or in-kind contributions paid for under non-Federal programs.

"(6) LOANS TO SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS FROM ELIGIBLE INTERMEDIARIES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible intermediary shall make short-term, fixed rate loans to startup, newly established, and growing small business concerns from the funds made available to it under subparagraphs (B)(i) of paragraph (1) for working capital and the acquisition of materials, supplies, furniture, fixtures, and equipment.

"(B) PORTFOLIO REQUIREMENT.—To the extent practicable, each intermediary that operates a microloan program under this subsection shall maintain a microloan portfolio with an average loan size of not more than $10,000.

"(C) INTEREST LIMIT.—Notwithstanding any provision of the laws of any State or the constitution of any State pertaining to the rate or amount of interest that may be charged, taken, received or reserved on a loan, the maximum rate of interest to be charged on a microloan funded under this subsection shall be not more than 4 percentage points above the prime lending rate, as identified by the Administration and published in the Federal Register on a quarterly basis.

"(D) REVIEW RESTRICTION.—The Administration shall not review individual microloans made by intermediaries prior to approval.

"(7) PROGRAM FUNDING.—

"(A) FIRST YEAR PROGRAMS.—In the first year of the demonstration program, the Administration is authorized to fund, on a competitive basis, not more than 35 microloan programs, including not less than 1 program to be located in each of the following States: Arkansas, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Wisconsin.

"(B) EXPANDED PROGRAMS.—In the second year of the demonstration program, the Administration is authorized to fund up to 25 additional microloan programs.

"(C) STATE LIMITATIONS.—In no case shall a State—

"(i) be awarded more than 2 microloan programs in any year of the demonstration program;

"(ii) receive more than $1,000,000 to fund such programs in such State's first year of participation; or

"(iii) receive more than $1,500,000 to fund such programs in any succeeding year of such State's participation.

"(8) RURAL ASSISTANCE.—In funding microloan programs, the Administration shall ensure that at least one-half of the programs funded under this subsection will provide microloans to small business concerns located in rural areas.

"(9) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—On November 1, 1995, the Administration shall submit to the Committees on Small Business of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report, including the Administration's evaluation of the effectiveness of the first 3½ years of the microloan demonstration program and the following:

"(A) the numbers and locations of the intermediaries funded to conduct microloan programs;

"(B) the amounts of each loan and each grant to intermediaries;

"(C) a description of the matching contributions of each intermediary;

"(D) the numbers and amounts of microloans made by the intermediaries to small business concern borrowers;

"(E) the repayment history of each intermediary;

"(F) a description of the loan portfolio of each intermediary including the extent to which it provides microloans to small business concerns in rural areas; and

"(G) any recommendations for legislative changes that would improve program operations.

"(10) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'intermediary' means a private, nonprofit entity or a nonprofit community development corporation that seeks to borrow or has borrowed funds from the Small Business Administration to make microloans to small business concerns under this subsection;

"(B) the term 'microloan' means a short-term, fixed rate loan of not more than $25,000, made by an intermediary to a startup, newly established, or growing small business concern;

"(C) the term 'rural area' means any political subdivision or unincorporated area—

"(i) in a nonmetropolitan county (as defined by the Secretary of Agriculture) or its equivalent thereof; or

"(ii) in a metropolitan county or its equivalent that has a resident population of less than 20,000 if the Small Business Administration has determined such political subdivision or area to be rural."

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Small Business Administration shall promulgate interim final regulations to implement the microloan demonstration program.

(c) PROGRAM TERMINATION.—The demonstration program established by subsection (a) shall terminate 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) PROGRAM FUNDING AND REPAYMENT OF LOANS.—Section 4(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "and 7(c)(2)" and inserting "7(c)(2), and 7(m)";

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking "and 8(a)" and inserting "7(m), and 8(a)".

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out the demonstration program established under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (as added by subsection (a)), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Small Business Administration—

(1) for fiscal year 1992—

(A) $15,000,000 to be used for the provision of loans; and

(B) $3,000,000 to be used for the provision of grants; and

(2) for fiscal year 1993—

(A) $25,000,000 to be used for the provision of loans; and

(B) $5,000,000 to be used for the provision of grants.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes several language changes to the Small Business Act as follows:

Subsection (a) includes language provided in the Senate bill which amends the Small Business Act to provide authority for loans made under the Administration's 502 Development Company Program to be pooled with SBA's 7(a) guaranteed loans for sale in the secondary market. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Subsection (b) includes language provided in the Senate bill which amends the Small Business Act to permit the SBA to charge the same guarantee fee (2 percent) for 502 development company loans as it does for 7(a) guaranteed loans. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Subsection (c) includes language provided in the Senate bill which extends for 1 year the effective date of a $35,000,000 cap on leverage of commonly controlled small business investment companies (SBIC's) imposed by the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 1990. This extension will allow the Congress to complete a major review and overhaul of the SBIC program before the new limitation becomes effective. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Subsection (d) provides new language establishing the Pilot Technology Access Program for the purpose of increasing access by small businesses to on-line data base services that provide technical and business information. The Senate bill included language intended to clarify the existing Small Business Development Center Technical Assistance Program. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Subsection (e) includes new language providing that no funds shall be used to carry out the existing SBDC Technical Assistance program after the end of FY 1991, and that such program is repealed at the end of FY 1992. The House and Senate bills contained no similar provision.

Subsection (f) repeals section 232 of the Small Business Reauthorization and Amendment Act of 1990. The Senate bill provided language (under subsection (e)) which would have stricken section 232 from P.L. 101-574. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Subsection (g) amends Section 7(b) of the Small Business Computer Security and Education Act to extend the SBA's ability to cosponsor training events for small business until the end of FY 1992. The Senate bill included language extending the cosponsorship provision indefinitely; the House bill contained no similar provision.

Subsection (h) of the bill provides the authorization a Microloan Demonstration Program to be administered by the Small Business Administration (SBA).

Under the demonstration program, SBA will make direct loans at the Treasury's cost of money to non-profit intermediaries for 35 microloan demonstration projects in FY 1992 and 25 additional microloan demonstration projects in FY 1993, which will provide small loans to enterpreneurs to establish or to strengthen their small businesses. As an integral part of each demonstration project, each intermediary, which meets non-Federal matching requirements, will receive a grant to provide marketing, management and technical assistance to the small business borrowers. The grants will be available in amounts not to exceed 20 percent of the amount of the intermediary's outstanding SBA loan balance in FY 1992 and FY 1993, and 10 percent of that amount in each of its remaining years of program participation. In order to receive such a grant, the intermediary must contribute 50 percent of the amount of the grant to the microloan project from non-Federal sources. The contribution may include, among other things, cash, direct costs, indirect costs and in-kind contributions.

Additionally, at least one and not more than two technical assistance grants in FY 1992 may be made to non-profit community organizations which provide only technical assistance or technical assistance with loan guarantees to microloan borrowers.

In fiscal year 1992, eligible intermediaries will receive no more than $750,000 in loans (excluding grants) from SBA and no one state shall receive more than $1 million in loans (excluding grants). Intermediaries will provide loans of not more than $25,000 to start-up and newly established small businesses, and each intermediary shall strive to maintain an average loan size of $10,000 in its microloan portfolio. Borrowers wishing to borrow more than $15,000 must demonstrate that they are unable to secure credit elsewhere on comparable terms.

The conferees recognize that the following states have strong microloan programs at this time: Arkansas, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina and Wisconsin. Based on the strength of these existing programs, this provision mandates that the SBA include programs from these states among the first 35 demonstation programs.

Amendment No. 177: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would have required the Subcommittee on Government Information and Regulation of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs to report to the Senate on the use of the Post Enumeration Survey of the 1990 Census for purposes other than political apportionment and recommend such changes as necessary. The language would also have required that report to be made after consultation with the Secretary of Commerce by February 1, 1992. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conferees have deleted this provision from the bill since this is an internal Senate matter.

Amendment No. 178: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the first section number named in said amendment, insert the following: *610*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement adds language proposed by the Senate, which requires the Attorney General to issue regulations covering declarations of immigration emergencies. The House bill contained no such provision.

Amendment No. 179: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 611. Notwithstanding any other provision of law.—

(a) For fiscal year 1992 and thereafter, the Department of Justice may procure the services of expert witnesses for use in preparing or prosecuting a civil or criminal action, without regard to competitive procurement procedures, including the Commerce Business Daily publication requirements: Provided, That no witness shall be paid more than one attendance fee for any calendar day.

(b) The Attorney General is authorized to enter into a lease with the University of South Carolina to carry out the provision required under the appropriation "Salaries and Expenses, United States Attorneys" in this Act.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate agreement adds language, not in the House bill, which requires the Attorney General to develop a tracking system for I-94 forms to determine when aliens are admitted into the United States, and when they depart. The conference agreement deletes the Senate language and adds new language, not in either the House or Senate bill.

I-94 TRACKING SYSTEM.—The conferees agree that there is merit in the Senate proposal to track when aliens arrive and leave the United States. However, the development and acquisition of a tracking system will be extremely costly, and such funds are not available at this time. The conferees expect the Commissioner of INS to examine the possibility of developing a tracking system and to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, by February 1, 1992 on its feasibility and estimated cost.

EXPERT WITNESSES.—The conferees have been made aware of difficulties being experienced by the Justice Department in procuring, in a timely manner, the services of expert witnesses for use in preparing or prosecuting a civil or criminal action. The conference agreement provides authority, similar to that contained in the Superfund Act of 1986, allowing the Department to procure expert witness services without competition.

The conference agreement also contains language which clarifies the intent of the conferees in regard to leasing of a facility at the University of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 180: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 612. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds in this Act shall be available for General Services Administration Rent System payments, unless such payments are processed through the Treasury Department's Billed Office Address Code System.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate amendment adds language which requires the Attorney General to provide for the timely parole of certain aliens detained at the Krome Processing Center in Florida. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The conference agreement deletes the Senate language and adds new language concerning billings by the Treasury Department.

KROME PROCESSING CENTER.—The conferees agree to delete the Krome language, because this issue should not be limited to one section of the country, but instead should be addressed as part of a comprehensive review of INS detention procedures throughout the United States. The conferees understand that the House Committee on the Judiciary is awaiting just such a review by the General Accounting Office.

The conferees are interested in the Pilot Parole Program begun by the Immigration Service in May 1990 and are eager to see the Service expand the availability of parole for excludable aliens currently under detainment. The Attorney General shall expand this program or develop a new parole program, working especially to alleviate the problems which have been experienced at Krome Processing Center in Florida under the current Pilot Parole Program so that parole opportunities in the Miami District can be increased.

In developing criteria for parole release, the Service shall pay particular attention to the likelihood that the alien will participate in future immigration proceedings, the posting of a reasonable bond, the danger to the community posed by the alien, offers of employment or other financial support, and the presence of a family member or sponsoring agency in the community.

The Immigration Service shall report to Congress no later than September 30, 1992, on the success of the parole project and of efforts to ameliorate past obstacles to implementing the program effectively.

TREASURY BILLINGS—In order to provide the agencies and commissions in this Act the opportunity to appeal unusually high space rental billings to GSA in a more equitable fashion, the conference agreement provides language requiring the Treasury Department to process those billings through their Billed Office Address Code System, and not through automatic deductions.

Amendment No. 181: Deletes language proposed by the Senate, which added Sense of the Senate language concerning a Metropolitan Corrections Center in Brooklyn. The House bill contained no similar provision.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1992 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1991 amount, the 1992 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1992 follow:

	Billions
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1991	$19,496,278
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1992	22,342,064
House bill, fiscal year 1992	20,974,822
Senate bill, fiscal year 1992	22,123,488
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1992	21,925,436
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1991	+2,429,158
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1992	−416,628
House bill, fiscal year 1992	+950,614
Senate bill, fiscal year 1992	−198,052

NEAL SMITH,
BILL ALEXANDER,
JOSEPH D. EARLY,
BOB CARR,
ALAN B. MOLLOHAN,
NANCY PELOSI,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
HAL ROGERS,
RALPH REGULA,
JIM KOLBE
(except for amendment 140),
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
DALE BUMPERS,
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,
JIM SASSER,
BROCK ADAMS,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
WARREN B. RUDMAN,
TED STEVENS,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
ROBERT W. KASTEN, Jr.,
PHIL GRAMM,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DERRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of business in district;

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of illness in the family;

Mr. RANGEL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of business in district;

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RITTER, for 60 minutes, on October 9.

Mr. GALLEGLY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DELAY, for 60 minutes, on October 3.

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

Mr. PICKLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today, for 60 minutes on October 2, and for 5 minutes each day on October 3 and 4.

Ms. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, on October 2.

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

Mr. FLAKE, for 60 minutes each day, on October 8 and 9.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois, for 60 minutes, on October 2.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. HUNTER.
Mr. LOWERY of California.
Mr. SUNDQUIST.
Mr. GEKAS.
Mr. GINGRICH.
Ms. SNOWE.
Mr. SOLOMON in four instances.
Mr. MACHTLEY in two instances.
Mr. CRANE.
Mr. FAWELL.
Mr. VANDER JAGT.
Mr. CLINGER.
Mr. SHAW.
Mr. ROHRABACHER.

Mr. MCEWEN.
Mrs. ROUKEMA.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. TOWNS.
Mr. ROE in two instances.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. FAZIO in two instances.
Mr. ROSE.
Mr. BUSTAMANTE.
Mr. REED.
Mr. DOWNEY in two instances.
Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.
Mr. LUKEN.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. RAY.
Mr. SMITH of Florida.
Mr. SANDERS.
Mr. DE LUGO.
Ms. HORN.
Mr. MILLER of California.
Mr. HERTEL.
Mr. WEISS.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1035. An act to amend section 107 of title 17, United States Code, relating to fair use with regard to unpublished copyrighted works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1742. An act to authorize grants to be made to State programs designed to provide resources to persons who are nutritionally at risk in the form of fresh nutritious unprepared foods, from farmers' markets, to expand the awareness and use of farmers' markets, and to increase sales at the markets, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Agriculture and Education and Labor.

S. 1766. An act relating to the jurisdiction of the United States Capitol Police; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 296. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for special immigrant status for certain aliens who have served honorably (or are enlisted to serve) in the Armed Forces of the United States for at least 12 years;

S.J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 6, 1991 through October 12, 1991, as "Mental Illness Awareness Week"; and

S.J. Res. 172. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim each of the months of November 1991 and 1992 as "National American Indian Heritage Month."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 2, 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:

2157. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting certification that the current 5-year defense program fully funds the support costs associated with the family of medium tactical vehicles, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2306(h)(3); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2158. A letter from the Executive Director, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the status report to the Congress for the month of August 1991, review of 1988-89 FSLIC assistance agreements; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2159. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Department's 1990 annual report, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1519; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Government Operations, the Judiciary, Science, Space, and Technology, Post Office and Civil Service, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Foreign Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee of Conference. Conference report on S. 1722 (Rept. 102-228). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 932. A bill to settle all claims of the Aroostook Band of Micmacs resulting from the Band's omission from the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act of 1980, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEILENSON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 231, a resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3039 to reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-230). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALL of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 232, a resolution waiving all points of order against the conference report on the bill H.R. 2508 to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to rewrite the authorities of that act in order to establish more effective assistance programs and eliminate obsolete and inconsistent provisions, to amend the Arms Export Control Act and to redesignate that act as the Defense Trade and Export Control Act, to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes, and against the consideration of such conference report (Rept. 102-231). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa: Committee of Conference. Conference Report on H.R. 2608 (Rept. 102-233). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

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

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1688. A bill entitled the "Omnibus Insular Areas Act of 1991"; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation for a period ending not later than October 2, 1991, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(p) of rule X (Rept. 102-232, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. KYL, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RHODES, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. HANCOCK):

H.R. 3438. A bill to prevent immigration document fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. KYL, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RHODES, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. HANCOCK):

H.R. 3439. A bill to improve immigration law enforcement; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Education and Labor, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. KYL, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RHODES, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. HANCOCK):

H.R. 3440. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve enforcement of the employer sanctions provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. KYL, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RHODES, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. DELAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. HANCOCK):

H.R. 3441. A bill to prohibit direct Federal financial benefits and unemployment benefits for illegal aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RHODES, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr.

FIELDS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. HANCOCK):

H.R. 3442. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit transportation of illegal aliens for purposes of employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3443. A bill to encourage employers to extend greater job-related benefits to employees, and to provide job security for certain employees who take leave for a legitimate personal purpose; jointly, to the Committee on Education and Labor and Ways and Means.

By Mr. WISE:

H.R. 3444. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to implement and enforce network reliability and quality standards on telephone common carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3445. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on blank raw material baseballs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DARDEN:

H.R. 3446. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to create a program of national security scholarships, fellowships, and grants; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Armed Services.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 3447. A bill to authorize the provision of financial assistance to Knoxville College for the construction of the Southeast Region African-American Educator Institute; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 3448. A bill to alleviate homelessness, reduce housing cost burdens, and increase housing opportunities for low-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GINGRICH:

H.R. 3449. A bill to establish a date certain for the termination of the Resolution Trust Corporation before the current statutory deadline for such termination and to extend the period during which such Corporation shall be appointed conservator or receiver for savings associations; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. EMERSON):

H.R. 3450. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to remove barriers and disincentives in the program of aid to families with dependent children so as to enable recipients of such aid to move toward self-sufficiency through microenterprises; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and Labor.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H.R. 3451. A bill to amend the Education Amendments of 1972 to ensure that students attending institutions of higher education that receive Federal funds are able to exercise the right to freedom of speech, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3452. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers the targeted jobs credit for hiring individuals who have received, or were eligible to receive, unemployment compensation covering at least 90 days; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 3453. A bill to convey certain surplus real property located in the Black Hills National Forest to the Black Hills Workshop and Training Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. WEBER, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. NUSSLE):

H.R. 3454. A bill to prohibit imports into the United States of meat products from the European Community until certain unfair trade barriers are removed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3455. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act to create a Student Assistance Revolving Loan Program for American Indians and Alaska Natives; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 3456. A bill to amend title XV of the Higher Education Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

H.R. 3457. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Delaware River in Pennsylvania and New Jersey as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS of New York:

H.R. 3458. A bill to improve education in the United States by promoting excellence in research, development, and the dissemination of information; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3459. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to promote improved public access to Government information; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 3460. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend certain programs relating to the education of nurses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. YATES, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 3461. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program of grants regarding preventable cases of infertility arising as a result of sexually transmitted diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Mrs. LLOYD, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. YATES, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ROE, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. REED, Mr. MFUME, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. FORD of Michigan):

H.R. 3462. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the authority for the regulation of mammography services and radiological equipment, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3463. A bill to amend the Federal Rules of Evidence with respect to evidence in sexual assault and child molestation cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mrs. MINK, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FROST, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. ROE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 3464. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable credit for qualified cancer screening tests; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of California:

H.R. 3465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the one-time exclusion of gain from sale of a principal residence based on the amount of increase in equity in the new residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.J. Res. 338. Joint resolution to designate 1991 as the "Year of the Bay"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 339. Joint resolution to designate the month of October 1991, as "National Seafood Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RITTER (for himself and Mr. HERTEL):

H. Con. Res. 212. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the President should recognize Ukraine's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUKEN:

H. Res. 233. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the defense budget should be reexamined and reduced based on the changing national security needs of the United States in the post-cold war era, thereby reducing the Federal budget deficit; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PACKARD (for himself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. COX of California, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. RITTER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. BOUCHER):

H. Res. 234. Resolution urging the President to call upon the President of the Soviet Union to begin immediate negotiations with leaders of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia for the prompt withdrawal of Soviet troops from the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

[Omitted from the Record of September 30, 1991]

H. Con. Res. 209: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEACH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ORTON, and Mr. LANTOS.

[Submitted October 1, 1991]

H.R. 44: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WILSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. JOHNSON

of Connecticut, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. MANTON, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 53: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. REED, Mr. VENTO, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 77: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 112: Mr. JAMES.

H.R. 193: Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 303: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 327: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 381: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER and Mr. LENT.

H.R. 382: Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 384: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mrs. TAUZIN.

H.R. 431: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 612: Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 747: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CARR, and Mr. HAYES of Louisiana.

H.R. 830: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 842: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 856: Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 961: Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 1007: Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 1021: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1067: Mr. DANNEMEYER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. OBEY, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. EWING, Mr. JAMES, Mr. FUSTER, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

H.R. 1147: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 1218: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. OLIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SWETT, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1245: Mr. MCDADE, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. DICKINSON, Ms. HORN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. PRICE, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1386: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1411: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. RHODES.

H.R. 1414: Mr. MORAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1472: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. MORRISON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 1481: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1495: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. SWETT, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 1515: Mr. GORDON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1566: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. RAY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. YATES, and Mr. HATCHER.

H.R. 1652: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1655: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 1703: Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 1755: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 1885: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1992: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 2008: Mr. PRICE.

H.R. 2009: Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 2027: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 2081: Mr. REED and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 2199: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 2210: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2228: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. GRANDY.

H.R. 2248: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. WISE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. ERDREICH, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 2354: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 2363: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2374: Mr. FOGLIETTA and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 2385: Mr. ANDREWS of Texas and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2456: Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 2486: Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 2561: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 2595: Mr. WALSH and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 2598: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SHAW, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 2632: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado and Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 2643: Mr. MCEWEN.

H.R. 2695: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mrs. BYRON.

H.R. 2755: Mr. FROST, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2806: Mr. TORRES, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. HORTON, Mr. STARK, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 2812: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 2821: Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 2824: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 2840: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 2860: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 2872: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2880: Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2890: Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 2902: Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 2903: Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 2904: Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. DAN DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 3006: Mr. HORTON and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 3070: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. STUMP, Mr. REED, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. GORDON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. ROYBAL.

H.R. 3098: Mr. JONTZ and Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 3102: Mr. EVANS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. FUSTER.

H.R. 3104: Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 3128: Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. EWING, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 3164: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 3216: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WILSON, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. GEREN of Texas, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 3226: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. EWING.

H.R. 3231: Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 3239: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 3243: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. MCCANDLESS.

H.R. 3281: Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 3285: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 3286: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 3334: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 3349: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 3351: Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 3353: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 3354: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 3361: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 3372: Mr. JONTZ, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. IRELAND, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 3373: Mr. HORTON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PARKER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. OLIN, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 3422: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. SWETT.

H.J. Res. 28: Mr. ROTH.

H.J. Res. 67: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.J. Res. 123: Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. PETERSON of Florida.

H.J. Res. 177: Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. MAVROULES, and Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 189: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. BENNETT.

H.J. Res. 212: Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. IRELAND, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. PAXON, Mr. HERTEL, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. ESPY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. YATES, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. MINETA.

H.J. Res. 242: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.J. Res. 261: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. WEISS.

H.J. Res. 300: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GOOD-

LING, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.J. Res. 312: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PRICE, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. RITTER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. WELDON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 317: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PENNY, Mr. INHOFE, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.J. Res. 324: Ms. HORN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MINETA, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. HYDE.

H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. RITTER.

H. Con. Res. 144: Mr. SCHEUER and Mr. MANTON.

H. Con. Res. 149: Mr. ZELIFF.

H. Con. Res. 179: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H. Con. Res. 180: Mr. YATES and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H. Con. Res. 187: Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H. Con. Res. 197: Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 161: Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H. Res. 194: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. SHAYS.

H. Res. 201: Mr. IRELAND, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. SWETT, Mr. RAY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. TANNER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. GOODLING, Ms. LONG, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. OBEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. WELDON, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. KYL, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SCHAEFER, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H. Res. 222: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. CAMP, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. EWING, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

[Omitted from the Record of September 30, 1991]

H. Res. 194: Mr. ROTH.

[Submitted October 1, 1991.]

H.R. 1330: Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 3334: Mr. DELLUMS.

H. Res. 194: Mr. WALSH.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

124. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city council of the city of Seattle, WA, relative to South Africa; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.