

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 8, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

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

With great appreciation and earnest praise we remember, O loving God, those women and men whose lives have been a witness to righteousness and whose testimony continues through the ages. On this particular day we recall the sacrifice and heroism of Raoul Wallenberg who, during the dark days of tyranny, rose to champion the cause of those people whose lives were in jeopardy. We remember how his persistence and courage saved tens of thousands of people and how his actions spoke for the virtues of truth and righteousness, of sacrifice and honor. As our Nation has honored him in significant ways, may we give him the highest honor by living our lives in ways that reflect his decency and his goodness. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DEFAZIO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1583. An act to amend the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 and the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979 to authorize appropriations and to improve pipeline safety, and for other purposes.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER AND APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF CIVIL WAR SITES ADVISORY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable D. FRENCH SLAUGHTER, JR., Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 16, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with great personal regret that I must inform you of my decision to resign from the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission effective immediately. While I had hoped to fulfill the responsibilities set forth by my appointment to the Commission, I believe it would be in the best interest of the Congressionally stated goals of the Commission that I excuse myself from the panel.

This has been a difficult decision for me to reach, but I believe it would be inappropriate for me to remain on the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission in light of my approaching resignation from the U.S. House of Representatives for health reasons. The Congressional mandated goals of the Commission are formidable, and deserve the full attention and abilities of every appointed Member.

The appointment you bestowed upon me is truly appreciated, and I will long remember your support in this matter. I hope that my resignation from the Commission will not cause discord, as it is my understanding that vacancies on the Commission will not affect the authority of the remaining Members until a new appointment is made.

My personal interest in Civil War history, and the preservation of appropriate sites through means which respect the property rights of landowners remains firm. I certainly intend to follow the progress of discussions by the Commission, and I will no doubt lend my comments from time to time.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

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

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1205(a)(4) of Public Law 101-628, the Chair appoints on the part of the House the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] to the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

JOB LOSS

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, when George Bush became President of the United States, 3,038,000 Americans were unemployed.

Last month, 4,801,000 Americans had lost their jobs.

In other words, one American has lost their job every minute George Bush has been President.

Every minute the President delays in signing unemployment compensation legislation, not only do those without work continue to suffer, but another American joins their ranks.

THE POLITICS OF AN EMERGENCY

(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 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 1, 1991, states that the conference report on S. 1722, dealing with unemployment compensation, was agreed to, "clearing the measure for the President."

Seven days have passed, but the majority has not sent the bill to the President.

The delay means that, given the Senate's schedule, the earliest the bill can come back from the President is next week.

At this point the majority is enrolling S. 1722 at a record six pages a day, the legislative equivalent of a sit-down strike.

This is the same majority whose Members come to the floor raging about the emergency nature of the bill.

Hurry, hurry, hurry. This is of the essence. Every minute counts?

We did not even have an opportunity to offer a substitute in the normal legitimate sort of way. If the majority had cooperated with us, the unemployed would be getting their extended benefit checks now.

Why, after all the rhetoric about compassion, all the cries of "emergency," is the majority exploiting the plight of the unemployed by sitting on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to ask—but could it be politics?

THE ENDLESS SAVINGS AND LOAN SCANDAL

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, a pall of odor and privilege hangs heavy over Washington, DC, today. More checks? Lunch bills unpaid? Free parking at the airport? No. I'm talking about a real scandal.

A secretly negotiated deal, Federal employees threatened and their criti-

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

cal memos shredded, hundreds of millions in interest free loans, below market discounts on prime real estate—all at taxpayer expense.

It's another sweet deal in the sorry, seemingly endless savings and loan scandal.

It's the patriot deal. Four wealthy developers represented by a Bush administration insider have negotiated a deal to "buy a \$500 million package of buildings at 60 percent of appraised value—with \$400 million in taxpayer financing with no interest for 7 years."

To quote my Republican colleague from Iowa, "a Government sponsored leveraged buyout that would make Michael Milken drool."

In 1989 the Bush administration asked for \$50 billion to bail out the savings and loans, \$30 billion last March, and now they are going to come in for another \$90 billion this month.

Maybe this scandal is too big, the perpetrators too powerful to expose—whatever the reason—while the bulldogs of the press are scouring Capitol Hill looking for the mythical free haircuts and free taxi rides; the bandits downtown have robbed the U.S. Treasury again.

HULK HEAVEN FOR THE GHOST FLEET

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell the American taxpayer that much of the ghost fleet, a flotilla that each year does nothing but soak up rust—and millions of taxpayer dollars, will soon be headed for hulk heaven.

A bill I am introducing today will set up a long-term policy to scrap much of this mothballed armada of rusting steel.

From now on, it's up or out. Make them seaworthy, or they're history.

Last year, not one ship from the ghost fleet ever made it to the Persian Gulf. A comprehensive GAO study shows why. These ships are too old, they're too small, they're too slow, and it would take forever to reactivate them.

I am pleased that Congressmen RON WYDEN, WALTER JONES, BOB DAVIS, and NORM LENT have joined me as cosponsors of the National Defense Reserve Fleet Ship Disposal Act.

These ships deserve a final rest. Their first act, in World War II, was a great victory for the Western democracies. Their final act will be a great victory for the American taxpayer.

ANNOUNCING THE DEATH OF OUR FRIEND, GEORGE LEWIS RUSSELL, JR.

(Mr. MFUME asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, it is with tremendous sadness and a heavy heart that I call attention this morning to the untimely passing of our friend, George Lewis Russell. As many of our colleagues will remember, George suffered a heart attack while driving home to Baltimore from his job here in the House.

George had been in a coma and attached to a respirator for almost 2 weeks. On Friday, October 5, 1991, George was removed from the respirator and died peacefully that evening.

All of us who knew George Russell realized that he was a man of great character and a wonderful person to be around. George sat in this very well for 17 years and witnessed the great debates of the day and helped to compile the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the use of Members, staff, and the general public.

George is survived by his wife, Rev. Helen D. Russell, his two children, George Jr. and Diane Russell Tolbert who is a staffer for our colleague Representative TIM VALENTINE, two grandchildren, three brothers, and two sisters.

Mr. Speaker, this House has lost a great friend. And our prayers go out to George's loving family as we cherish the memory of his years of dedication and service to this House. George Lewis Russell, we shall all dearly miss you.

NATURAL GAS

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, suppose someone told us that after years of depending on foreign oil to meet our energy needs, the United States could rely upon an energy source that is abundantly available here. Would that get our attention?

And suppose that source was also clean burning so that its generation and usage would be environmentally sound. Better yet, suppose it cost less than foreign oil so that consumers end up paying less. Would you not think we would be vigorously pursuing that as an option and a real solution to our Nation's energy problems?

You might think so, but you would be wrong.

We do have a domestically abundant, clean-burning, low-cost energy source that we could put in our cars, our factories, our utilities, and our homes. It is called natural gas. But right now much natural gas is being burned up as a byproduct of oil production and wasted because there is no transport mechanism in place to distribute it to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, some people are already using natural gas; it was about 24 percent of our Nation's total energy consumption in 1989, in fact.

Why then are we proposing to drill for more oil in environmentally sensitive areas rather than utilize available natural gas? People want to know the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker.

THE RECESSION IS NOT OVER

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, economists are saying the recession is over. If that is true, Mr. Speaker, tell me why are dairy farmers shooting their cattle? Why are truckers burning their trucks? Why did Westinghouse lose \$1.5 billion last quarter? Why did the State of Maryland lay off 1,800 workers last week?

If it is true, Mr. Speaker, why are more Americans reading the bankruptcy laws than Reader's Digest?

I do not buy this propaganda. I say the recession is not only not over, but if we take away food stamps, welfare and Social Security, this Nation would be in a state of depression. The unemployment lines are beginning to look just like the soup lines of the 1930's.

Think about it.

CENSUS BUREAU POVERTY FIGURES

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, on September 26, the U.S. Census Bureau released its official report on poverty and family income for 1990. Robert Rector, from the Heritage Foundation, raises grave concerns about these figures because once again, this report presents a very misleading picture.

According to Bureau figures, over 30 million Americans still live in poverty. And last week a group of European and Canadian social scientists published a report claiming that the United States is the poverty capital of the Western World. Considering that the average poor American lives in a larger house or apartment than does the average West European of any income group, this claim is preposterous. Not only that, unpublicized Census Bureau surveys show that 38 percent of those who the Bureau defines as poor own their own homes, 62 percent of poor households own a car, and 31 percent of all poor households have microwave ovens. If we are the poverty capital of the Western World, then the Western World is not doing too badly.

The point here, Mr. Speaker, is not to be indifferent to those who are in genuine need. The purpose of my

speaking today is to point out that the way the Census Bureau reaches its conclusions is fundamentally flawed, and to try to stave off the wave of unjustified liberal outrage that these inaccurate numbers are bound to ignite. Its report ignores facts such as the ones I just mentioned which demonstrate that most poor Americans today are better housed, better fed, and own more personal property than average U.S. citizens did throughout most of this century.

The problem lies in the way the Census Bureau determines a household's income. It ignores all assets owned by households and nearly all Government welfare benefits they receive, disregarding billions of dollars in noncash assistance. Thus it seems that poverty is running rampant, causing people to cry out for more welfare. Studies reveal, however, that the largest effect of welfare spending is not to raise income but merely to replace self-sufficiency with dependence. Creating more welfare programs is not the answer. Let's not take this Census Bureau report at face value, or risk being tricked into backing programs that are based on lies.

ATLANTA BRAVES GOING TO CHOP RIGHT TO THE TOP

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

Mr. JONES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, last week my colleague and friend, Congressman MEL LEVINE, bet me a crate of California oranges that the Los Angeles Dodgers were going to defeat the Atlanta Braves for the Western Division title.

Mr. Speaker, I won that bet. Now comes Pittsburgh, and my good friend and colleague, Mr. BILL COYNE, has wagered me a basket of the finest Pittsburgh foods that the Pirates are going to defeat the Braves for the National League championship.

Mr. Speaker, I accept that wager. I think that the Atlanta Braves are going to chop-chop-chop, right to the top. I am not sure what I am going to bet Mr. COYNE, however. But I think I might bet him a crate of California oranges.

AIDS RESEARCH MONEY OVERSHADOWING OTHER IMPORTANT DISEASES

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, during this fiscal year the Federal Government will spend almost \$2 billion on AIDS-related programs. This will be \$140 million more than will be spent on cancer research and prevention. Cancer

is a disease which touches many millions more than does AIDS. This year 518,000 people will die from cancer, 13 or 14 times the number who will die from AIDS.

Even more people are affected by heart disease. Some 760,000 people will die from heart problems this year. Yet we will spend more than 2½ times on AIDS what we will spend on heart disease research and prevention during this fiscal year which just started.

AIDS is a very serious problem. But we should not take scarce Federal funds from programs dealing with cancer, heart disease, diabetes, Alzheimer's and other similar programs because AIDS is a popular cause with the media, the Hollywood crowd and the liberal establishment.

□ 1220

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO IMPOSE SANCTIONS AGAINST THE COMMUNIST LEADERSHIP IN BELGRADE

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the outrageous and brutal attack against the Croatian Presidential complex in Zagreb yesterday which was ordered by the Communist leadership in Belgrade calls for a serious and substantive response by those who wish to prevent a Balkan explosion that could undermine the stability of Europe.

Today, with my distinguished Republican and Democratic colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], I am introducing legislation that will impose sweeping economic sanctions against the Communist regime in Belgrade. We hope this legislation will bring some reason to the expansionist clique currently in control there. They must know that we do not condone violence and military action against democratically elected governments.

Mr. Speaker, our legislation is identical to the bipartisan bill just introduced in the other body with the support of the Republican leader, Senator DOLE, and the Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator PELL.

I urge my colleagues to join me in acting to preserve the peace of Europe.

SMALL BUSINESSES PROVIDE QUALITY CHILD CARE

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the need for family friendly workplace policies has emerged as a major issue

facing our country. I would like to personally recognize and salute the many small businesses across the United States that care enough to offer child care services to their employees. These employers are pioneers, and their example can and should inspire other employers to follow their lead.

The Wall Street Journal, in its September 5 edition, spotlighted individual small businesses which offer child care benefits. To prove that their employees are truly their most valuable assets, several businesses with fewer than 20 employees offer on-site child care centers. I applaud this kind of unselfish caring.

Neuville Industries, in Hildebran, NC, is a great example of a company dedicated to providing its employees with quality child care. In 1979, it created an on-site center, which is open to both children and grandchildren of employees. The child care facility has a capacity of 108, and strives to maintain enrollment at approximately 80 percent of that figure. Currently 70 children participate at Hildebran. Neuville Industries subsidizes 50 percent of the child care program for its employees. This is truly a company who cares.

These employers' efforts, when combined with increased investment by State and Federal governments to improve child care programs, can go a long way toward ensuring that parents have appropriate choices of care for their children.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW ACT

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

Mr. OLIN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a bill that will help 1,200 cities and towns across the Nation avoid violating clean water laws and facing stiff fines.

I am talking about the cities in 220 congressional districts that, because they are old, have storm water systems that run into their sanitary sewers. In heavy rains the sewers overflow into public streams and rivers.

The cost of repiping these towns is generally very high and has to be done over a period of years, many years in most cases.

My bill would require cities to come up with a plan to eliminate their cross-connected sewers. It would allow each city to determine how much it could afford to pay each year and it authorizes Federal and State grants to help.

Cities that follow this plan will not be subject to fines or harassment as they work to get this problem behind them.

I urge Members to cosponsor the Combined Sewer Overflow Act, H.R. 3477.

ENACT CONGRESSIONAL REFORMS

(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, the Sergeant at Arms' Disbursement Office flap has been a colossal embarrassment to all of us.

Whether you have written a hot check or not, and I have not, we all have reason to be embarrassed. The real issue here is the credibility of the Congress, and that is something that must be corrected. We must do it ourselves, not leaving it to the feeding frenzy of talk-show hosts and newspaper columnists to use these kinds of issues to increase the cynicism of our representative system.

Mr. Speaker, we need to examine ourselves. We need to change those things that are not reasonable. We need to remove the exceptions that Congress has provided for itself. We need to remove the privileges that go beyond those extended to all citizens of this country, and we must do it ourselves.

We need a workman-like examination of these procedures. If we have procedures that are not defensible, we need to change them. If we want to really make a change in Congress, we ought to do some of the reforms that have been here. We ought to limit terms, do something with the budget reform such as line-item veto, balanced-budget amendment, and limit growth of government. We need some campaign reform such as full disclosure, and 50 percent of the funds coming from the district. Finally, we need a work schedule based on need and not on the holidays that are coming up.

SUPREME COURT NOMINATION CAN WAIT A FEW DAYS FOR THE TRUTH

(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, the compelling case for the nominee to the Supreme Court was not legal expertise, and it was not race. It was character, that out of the crucible of life experience, a man emerges with vision and a viewpoint that cannot be duplicated on the Supreme Court.

Whatever you may think of that thinking, this case had been winning the day since the nominee's nomination. That case now has been challenged by charges that the nominee used indecent words to sexually harass a woman.

Mr. Speaker, these are serious charges, and they deserve a serious hearing. If confirmed, the nominee would serve on the Supreme Court for the rest of his life most likely. Surely consideration of the nominee can wait

a few days so that the truth can be learned.

FULL DISCLOSURE OF HOUSE BANKING OVERDRAFTS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, resolution of the House banking matter is dependent upon full disclosure of Members' overdrafts.

For this reason, I am urging the chairman of the Ethics Committee to provide full disclosure, beginning with the members of that committee.

Some committee members may be among the reported 134 House Members who had overdrafts of \$1,000 or more.

So the possibility exists that such a committee member may be in the position of recommending action on another Member who has had overdrafts of \$1,000 or more.

That is unacceptable to my constituents because representative government begins with accountability.

ENACT H.R. 1414: CORRECT PASSIVE-LOSS RULES OF 1986 TAX ACT

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the House has an opportunity to do something which I think is good for America.

By enacting H.R. 1414, which would correct the passive-loss rules of the 1986 tax law, the Congress can ensure that people in the real estate industry are treated the same as people in every other business.

This is a tax-fairness issue, important to small-business owners and working families alike. This is an issue that has drawn the support of 313 Members of the House, and it deserves to be acted on.

H.R. 1414 is not a return to the tax-shelter days of the early 1980's. It is a reasonable response with safeguards. H.R. 1414 will apply only to certifiable property professionals and not to millionaires or billionaires who are looking for tax shelters.

H.R. 1414 is an opportunity to promote tax fairness; it is an opportunity to promote small businesses which will lead to better housing opportunities and jobs. H.R. 1414 has the support it needs in the House of Representatives, and now what is needed is an opportunity to vote.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ALL AMERICANS SAVINGS AND INVESTMENT INCENTIVE ACT OF 1991

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

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a lot of talk about the need for a fair tax cut and the need to stimulate economic growth. I believe the time has come for action to replace talk. That is why I have introduced a bill that will give important tax relief to lower and middle income Americans, will stimulate growth, and will not bust the budget.

My bill, H.R. 3128, the All Americans Savings and Investment Incentive Act of 1991, will give more than \$10 billion of tax relief to the 137 million Americans earning up to \$50,000.

We pay for this \$10 billion tax cut by enacting the President's capital gains proposal. The revenue it generates will virtually pay for the much needed tax relief for average Americans proposed in my bill. What could be more fair than that?

I urge my colleagues to join the bipartisan list of 79 Members who have already cosponsored H.R. 3128.

MAKE CERTAIN SEXUAL HARASSMENT CHARGES CHECKED THOROUGHLY

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, we vest enormous power in judges in this country. A judge can take away your family, your children, your business, your liberty, and that is why we take great care in choosing people who serve in the judiciary, no less than those who serve in the Supreme Court of the United States, a lifetime appointment.

□ 1230

A young woman, a woman with a good background, took the courage and the time to try to say that there were some allegations about the present nominee that should be investigated, and the usual cry goes up from men all over the country, "Too late, too late, should have told us about it earlier. Why did she wait around? It couldn't have been much. We're going on with the dance."

Mr. Speaker, that is the reason why women in this country are so afraid to come forward with allegations of sexual harassment. That is why Congress has written laws making it possible for them to come forward in cases of sexual harassment. That is why the Congress should make certain that allegations are checked thoroughly.

If this nominee is confirmed, he has the possibility of serving 40 years with

this allegation hanging over him. For the rest of her life, Professor Hill will be faced with the fact that she came forward to this committee and made these allegations.

Surely, for the sake of both of them, for their reputations and for their future, time must be taken to look at these thoroughly and dispose of them properly.

A 20TH CENTURY TORQUEMADA

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, history repeats itself and constantly reminds us of how the more things change, the more they remain the same.

Take for example a man called Torquemada of 16th century Spain, whose job it was to don a black hood and cloak, seize worthy citizens falsely accused by rumor and innuendo, and threaten them with death by torture until they confessed to imaginary sins of witchcraft or heresy.

And then there is a man called Walsh, of 20th century America, who under cloak of law conducts his own inquisition, again taking worthy citizens, trusted and loyal Americans, threatening them with drowning in a sea of legal entanglement, of felony indictments and irreparable expense, until they confess to meaningless misdemeanors.

Yes, Judge Walsh, the modern day inquisitor, with the limitless resources of the U.S. Treasury, is in all respects no different from Torquemada, the inquisitor. Alan Fiers, Elliott Abrams, and Claire George are his most recent victims. Who is next in the star chamber, Mr. Speaker? Certainly not the Democrats who negotiated behind closed doors with the Communist Sandinistas in Nicaragua.

TAKE TIME FOR JUSTICE

(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, this is a nation that has prided itself in always having time for justice. Think about our symbol of justice, a scale, a scale where the woman is blindfolded and cannot see who says what and everyone's words weigh equally. It does not say someone is empowered to say, "Well, a Supreme Court nominee's words weigh heavier than someone else's, or someone else's words weigh heavier." No. It is equal.

Nor is there a plot behind that scale of justice saying, "Oh, time ran out. Take the scales away. That's it."

Nor does it say we can defer to an FBI official or someone else an elected

representative's responsibility to take the time to be fair.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a very critical time in which a woman has come forward and made very serious allegations, and there is an attempt to brush them under the rug in the speed to have an adjournment for the Columbus Day recess. Columbus, I think, would even be appalled that we would be hurrying home to celebrate this great Nation and also tainting this great Nation's reputation for justice.

Mr. Speaker, I hope justice prevails. I hope we can take time to listen to everyone and weigh their words.

LIBERALS, HAVE YOU NO SENSE OF DECENCY?

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, the last minute personal attack on Judge Thomas is another example of the rotten gutter level politics which is now the standard operating procedure for liberals in America.

Liberalism has been rejected by the people, with its reliance on high taxes, large bureaucracy, and social nonsense that is contrary to fundamental American values.

So not having the support of the people for their views, liberals now rely on personal attacks—vicious, mean-spirited, often untruthful abuse of people who disagree with them. Liberals are making Joe McCarthy look like a nice guy.

Someday the public is going to realize that the personal attacks on anyone who disagrees with liberals are part of a pattern—a pattern that is contrary to our national spirit. Has liberalism really sunk to this nasty, destroy your opponent style of politics?

Liberals. Have you no sense of decency?

Confirm Judge Thomas. Reject gutter politics.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Chair would remind Members that it is not within the rules to urge specific action by the Senate, and Members should refrain from doing so.

CONGRESS MUST PROTECT THE VULNERABLE

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, imagine yourself dependent on another human being for your livelihood. Imagine the

power that person holds over you. Imagine that person making suggestive comments to you and beyond that telling you in detail about pornographic materials he had seen. Would you be intimidated?

Yes, especially if you are in your twenties and you are a woman in a man's field. Intimidation like that is against the law. Indeed, our law protects women in the workplace from that type of harassment.

And which court is that final protector of women from this kind of harassment? Which court has that most awesome responsibility to protect society from those who would harm its most vulnerable citizens? The Supreme Court of the United States of America.

Where are those in Congress who talk about pornography every other day? Why are they not leading the charge for a delay?

This is not pleasant. It is not happy and it is not pretty. Neither is sexual harassment, whether you are touched or verbally demeaned.

To respect women in this society means you give these charges your attention, and when you are confident about the truth, however long it takes beyond a reasonable doubt, it will be time to vote.

WOMEN BUSINESS OWNERS WILL LEAD SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, today's women are turning in ever-increasing numbers toward business ownership. From 1982 to 1987, the number of women-owned businesses increased by 58 percent. Many of these women turn to self-employment out of necessity all do so with the strong desire to achieve self-sufficiency.

It is no secret here on Capitol Hill or around the country that these new women-owned businesses and the jobs they will create are essential to our economic well-being. Clearly, it is in the country's best interest to encourage and promote women business ownership.

And yet, all too often, we in Congress seem to be intent on putting up barriers to opportunity, rather than tearing them down. Heavy-handed laws and regulations are blocking the path to economic independence for many would-be, female entrepreneurs.

Today we can remove at least some of those barriers by voting for the Women's Business Opportunity Act.

And so, as we cast our votes today I would urge my colleagues to remember: it is easy to say that you are in business. But it is how you vote that really counts.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, the Chair stated that the rules of the House prevent individual Members from urging action by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. COX of California. It has been the observation of this Member, Mr. Speaker, that a parade of speakers have come to speak for 1 minute under unanimous consent and have urged that the Senate delay consideration of Judge Thomas.

It is the opinion of the Chair, Mr. Speaker, that these Members are violating the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the opinion of the Chair that several Members have expressed in general terms their desire to see a delay, but in only one instance so far has someone specifically requested the Senate to take a specific action on confirmation.

The Chair has been trying to be scrupulously fair about this and the Chair has no intention of singling out any individual, but one individual did say, "Let's confirm Judge Thomas," and that the Chair believes is a specific exhortation to the Senate.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would just like to ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

Is not asking for a delay of action in the other body infringing on the rights of the other body, and is that not a violation of the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not yet hear anybody specifically ask for a delay by the Senate. If the Chair missed that, the Chair apologizes, but the Chair heard some Members express the view that more time should be taken, and so on.

□ 1240

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to have the words of the gentlewoman from Colorado read because I believe she did ask for a delay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Chair believes it is too late to make that request.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, if a Member were to ask for such a delay, it is the opinion of the Chair that that would be out of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, it is, if it is a reference to the Senate confirmation process.

Mr. COX of California. I appreciate the Chair's response.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And the Chair will so rule.

[Mrs. MINK addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SHE DOES NOT SOUND LIKE SOMEBODY WHO WAS SEXUALLY HARASSED

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, nobody likes sexual harassment. But let us get the record straight. I would like to read to my liberal colleagues on the other side of the aisle what was in the Wall Street Journal today, and I hope you will pay particular attention to this:

The FBI report on Ms. Hill's charges, filed with the Judiciary Committee before its vote, found no evidence to support harassment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of personal privilege is not in order at this time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unless the gentleman yields, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] may proceed in order.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I hope I have my full 60 seconds.

The FBI report on Ms. Hill's charges, filed with the Judiciary Committee before its vote, found no evidence to support harassment. Indeed, it was after the supposed harassment that Ms. Hill transferred to the EEOC to work with Chairman Thomas. She did not say anything during his three previous nomination hearings. When she became a law professor, she asked Judge Thomas for help collecting information about equal opportunity employment cases. She also invited him to make a trip to Norman, OK, to speak to her law students, which he did this past spring.

Mr. Speaker, this woman's credibility is really in question. She has followed the man from job to job, she even called him to congratulate him on his marriage. Then she asked him to come out to speak to her law students. That does not sound like somebody that was sexually harassed, to me.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House is it appropriate to label other colleagues as liberals or conservatives or whatever?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not necessarily a violation of the rules of the House.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you. But I would say it is poor manners.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Just to make a brief comment. Mr. Speaker, if it is inaccurate to label her as a liberal, I stand convicted.

PENDING CONFIRMATION OF JUDGE THOMAS

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the Senate is about to embark on a misguided journey.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentlewoman will refrain from direct reference to the other body.

Ms. DELAURO. How can there be a vote to place Judge Thomas in a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court under this cloud? To be sure, a person is innocent until proven guilty, but without a full and public hearing about the veracity of these very serious charges of sexual harassment, a decision this evening to elevate Judge Thomas to the Supreme Court casts doubt on the entire process.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the gentlewoman's words be taken down.

Ms. DELAURO. The actions of the Committee on the Judiciary say loud and clear—

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the words of the gentlewoman be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend.

The Chair has repeatedly asked Members to refrain from specific reference to the other body and would admonish the gentlewoman to do so.

Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] insist on his request?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do. I think the precedent ought to be set and put in the precedents of the House on what the extent of the prohibition against discussing the proceedings in the other body are.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Chair's rulings previously today are consistent with and constitute the precedents of the House. The Chair will insist upon compliance with those precedents.

Under those circumstances, does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] still insist?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words that are objected to.

□ 1250

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentlewoman will state it.

Ms. WATERS. Will the Speaker—

Mr. WALKER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker. You cannot entertain a parliamentary inquiry at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is that the words will be read. The Chair will await that.

Mr. WALKER. Right.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

* * * to be sure a person is innocent until proven guilty, but without a full and public hearing about these very serious charges a decision this evening to elevate Judge Thomas to the Supreme Court casts doubt on the entire process.

The SPEAKER. It is the Chair's opinion that the words inevitably relate to an action to be taken by the Senate with respect to a nomination by the President subject to the confirmation of the Senate and, accordingly, are not in order, and the words, accordingly without objection, will be stricken from the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Without objection the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] may proceed in order.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The question is: Shall the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] be permitted to proceed in order?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. SENSENBRENNER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER moves to table the motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] to lay on the table the motion to proceed in order.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. 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 142, nays 257, answered "present" 1, not voting 33, as follows:

(Roll No. 295)

YEAS—142

Allard
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Billie
Boehert
Boehner
Broomfield
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Chandler
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Davis
DeLay
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dorman (CA)
Duncan
Emerson
Fawell
Fields
Fish
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilcrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodling
Goss

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Barnard
Bellenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Coleman (TX)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers

NAYS—257

Cooper
Costello
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman

Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Rhodes
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
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

Leach
Lehman (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (GA)
Parker
Lipinski
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
Roth
McCurdy
McDermott
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinar
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton

Owens (UT)
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Reed
Richardson
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Sikorski
Siskisky
Skaggs
Skelton

Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Sweet
Swift
Synar
Tallion
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Towns
Traffant
Traxler
Unsold
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmere
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Edwards (OK)

NOT VOTING—33

Bilirakis
Bruce
Collins (IL)
Dreier
Durbin
Dymally
Engel
Ewing
Ford (MI)
Hastert
Holloway

Hopkins
Hunter
Lancaster
Laughlin
Lehman (FL)
Levin (CA)
Lloyd
Martin
Moody
Morella
Mrazek

Oakar
Owens (NY)
Pelosi
Poshard
Ridge
Riggs
Roe-Lehtinen
Savage
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Torricelli

□ 1319

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. Miller of Washington changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to table was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1320

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. This is my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker: Is the motion now before the House a motion which is debatable?

The SPEAKER. The motion now before the House is subject to debate, the gentleman is correct, within the narrow limits of the motion.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, who would control the time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair intends to recognize the majority leader, Mr. GEP-

HARDT, to control the time, since the Chair put the question *sue sponte* on the motion when objection was heard.

Mr. WALKER. And the subject matter would be strictly—

The SPEAKER. The question is whether the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] should be permitted to proceed in order.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

If the gentlewoman was permitted to proceed in order, would she be allowed to continue the remarks that she was engaged in at the time that she was called to order by the Chair?

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Connecticut will be permitted to proceed in order as long as her remarks are in order. Members are allowed to proceed as long as their remarks are in order.

The Chair has stated a number of times and will repeat one additional time that references to the confirmation process in the other body are not in order.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, obviously, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Members that the resolution we have before us makes it clear that the gentlewoman's words are to be taken down. The resolution calls for her being allowed to proceed with her statement.

As the Speaker has said, we have clear House precedents that we are operating under. We intend to abide by that precedent and try to finish the work of the House through 1-minute speeches and through the rest of the day.

I would ask Members to allow us to move to a vote on this resolution as quickly as possible so that we can move through our business.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. For purposes of debate only, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our concern I think is that we are developing a pattern where the taking down of words carries with it no penalty. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct in stating that taking down of words is supposed to carry with it the penalty that the Member of Congress who utters the unparliamentary words is to be taken off their feet for the rest of that legislative day. What we see happening is that there is the pattern developing here where the majority is using their voting power as a majority to assure that any Member of the majority who utters unparliamentary words can proceed as though no harm has been done,

and we move forward. And I have got to tell you from the standpoint of the minority we are concerned about that because we have seen in the past that such privileges then are not always granted to the minority. If our words are taken down, the chances are the majority will then vote to discipline the Member on the majority and use their power of that direction.

If we are not going to have any penalty for uttering unparliamentary words, the fact is that we will create a situation where we will constantly have this battle on the floor, and where Members will come to the floor and do things which are not within the rules. And I think at least I have a concern, and I think a number of other Members should have a concern that we are creating a situation in this House that will be I think both unparliamentary and ultimately unmanageable, and I thank the gentleman for yielding, but I would hope that we would vote in the case of this motion to make certain that the discipline of the House which was adopted under the rules, and I did not vote for those rules, the Members of the majority voted for those rules, and those rules explicitly state that if you take action on the floor which is not warranted with regard to your words, you are supposed to have the discipline of being taken off your feet for a day.

I do not understand why that discipline then would not be effective, and again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield back, for the purpose of debate, obviously, I would say to the gentleman that the practice that we have been trying to follow, and I think Members have followed pretty carefully, is that the admonishment of the Chair has been sufficient to solve the problem. And we have not felt, and I do not think most Members feel that added penalties and added actions need to be taken in order to solve the problem.

And as the gentleman knows, in many cases Members are not fully aware that some words they may be using may not be proper under our precedents, and once they are told that by the Speaker they have been most willing to not go forward.

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. For purposes of debate only, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because in this particular case the Chair had said on about three occasions prior to the gentlewoman uttering the words that such words would not be permitted on the floor and so, therefore, there was a clear indication from the Chair that the words were not acceptable. And yet, the proceedings went ahead.

That is when the disciplinary action came into place, and so in this particular case there was no doubt about that.

Also, typically under this kind of situation the person who is in violation asks unanimous consent that their words be withdrawn. In this case the gentlewoman had no such action on the floor. She did not ask that her words be withdrawn and so, therefore, it is not clear to the Members on this side that she even understands at this point that she uttered unparliamentary words, other than the fact that the Chair ruled in that manner.

So I think the situation is somewhat different than where a Member inadvertently let it slip into that particular matter.

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield back again, for the purpose of debate, I do not share his interpretation of what happened. I believe that in this case, as in many other cases in the past, the bringing up of the objection and the ruling of the Chair served to solve the problem.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. For the purpose of debate only, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I was present on the floor, and not only did the acting Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. McNULTY] admonish the gentlewoman from Connecticut not to speak out of order, but he admonished a number of the preceding speakers not to speak out of order. And the impression that I had before I asked that the gentlewoman from Connecticut's words be taken down is that those admonishments were falling upon deaf ears, and that the speeches would continue out of order and out of the rules. And that is the concern that I share with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The rules do set forth certain parameters of debate, and I would hope that this would be sufficient admonishment, with a penalty, that we would fall within those parameters. And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. For purposes of debate only, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that the rules were passed by the majority, and if the rules are very explicit on the person who has violated the rules of the House being sat down for the day, then the rules should be followed. Otherwise, why did the majority pass them in the first place?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield back for the purpose of debate, I would simply say that I think the rules are working. The gentlewoman's words were taken down. The resolution that is in front of us now states that her words are taken down,

and that I think will achieve the results that the rules were intended to achieve.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GEPHARDT. For the purposes of debate only, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, does the rule to which we are referring right now give that kind of latitude? I did not know that it was that flexible. I thought it said that if the person's words were taken down that they were to sit down that day, period.

Mr. GEPHARDT. The motion that is in front of us is to take words down and to proceed, obviously with the admonition that the precedents which are now clear will be followed.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] be allowed to proceed in order?

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 145, answered "present" 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]
YEAS—260

Abercrombie	Cooper	Geren
Ackerman	Costello	Gibbons
Alexander	Cox (IL)	Gilman
Anderson	Coyne	Glickman
Andrews (ME)	Cramer	Gonzalez
Andrews (NJ)	Darden	Goodling
Andrews (TX)	de la Garza	Gordon
Annunzio	DeFazio	Green
Applegate	DeLauro	Guarini
Aspin	Dellums	Hall (OH)
Atkins	Derrick	Hall (TX)
AuCoin	Dicks	Hamilton
Bacchus	Dingell	Harris
Barnard	Dixon	Hatcher
Bellenson	Donnelly	Hayes (IL)
Bennett	Dooley	Hayes (LA)
Berman	Dorgan (ND)	Hefner
Bevill	Downey	Hertel
Bilbray	Dwyer	Hoagland
Bonior	Dymally	Hochbrueckner
Borski	Early	Horn
Boucher	Eckart	Hoyer
Boxer	Edwards (CA)	Hubbard
Brewster	Edwards (TX)	Huckaby
Brooks	Engel	Hughes
Browder	English	Hutto
Brown	Erdreich	Jacobs
Bryant	Espy	Jefferson
Bustamante	Evans	Jenkins
Byron	Fascell	Johnson (CT)
Campbell (CO)	Fazio	Johnson (SD)
Cardin	Feighan	Johnston
Carper	Flake	Jones (GA)
Carr	Foglietta	Jones (NC)
Chapman	Ford (MI)	Jontz
Clay	Ford (TN)	Kanjorski
Clement	Frank (MA)	Kaptur
Coleman (TX)	Frost	Kennedy
Collins (MI)	Gaydos	Kennelly
Condit	Gejdenson	Kildee
Conyers	Gephardt	Kliczka

Kolter	Oakar	Shays
Kopetski	Oberstar	Sikorski
Kostmayer	Obey	Sisisky
LaFalce	Olin	Skaggs
Lantos	Oliver	Skelton
LaRocco	Ortiz	Slattery
Laughlin	Orton	Slaughter (NY)
Leach	Owens (UT)	Smith (IA)
Lehman (CA)	Pallone	Snowe
Levin (MI)	Panetta	Solarz
Lewis (GA)	Parker	Spratt
Lipinski	Pastor	Staggers
Long	Patterson	Stallings
Lowe (NY)	Payne (NJ)	Stenholm
Luken	Payne (VA)	Stokes
Manton	Pease	Studds
Markey	Penny	Swett
Martinez	Perkins	Swift
Matsui	Peterson (FL)	Synar
Mavroules	Peterson (MN)	Tallon
Mazzoli	Pickett	Tanner
McCloskey	Pickle	Tauzin
McCurdy	Price	Taylor (MS)
McDermott	Rahall	Thomas (GA)
McHugh	Rangel	Thornton
McMillen (MD)	Ray	Torres
McNulty	Reed	Towns
Meyers	Richardson	Traffant
Mfume	Roe	Traxler
Miller (CA)	Roemer	Unsold
Mineta	Rose	Vento
Mink	Rostenkowski	Visclosky
Moakley	Roukema	Volkmer
Mollinari	Rowland	Washington
Mollohan	Roybal	Waters
Montgomery	Russo	Waxman
Moran	Sabo	Weiss
Morella	Sanders	Wheat
Murphy	Sangmeister	Whitten
Murtha	Sarpalius	Wilson
Nagle	Sawyer	Wise
Natcher	Scheuer	Wolpe
Neal (MA)	Schroeder	Wyden
Neal (NC)	Schumer	Yates
Nowak	Serrano	Yatron
Nussle	Sharp	

NAYS—145

Allard	Goss	Packard
Archer	Gradison	Paxon
Armye	Grandy	Petri
Baker	Gunderson	Porter
Ballenger	Hammerschmidt	Pursell
Barrett	Hancock	Quillen
Barton	Hansen	Ramstad
Bateman	Hefley	Ravenel
Bentley	Henry	Ravenel
Bereuter	Herger	Regula
Billie	Hobson	Rhodes
Boehert	Horton	Ridge
Boehner	Houghton	Rinaldo
Broomfield	Hyde	Ritter
Bunning	Inhofe	Roberts
Burton	Ireland	Rogers
Callahan	James	Rohrabacher
Camp	Johnson (TX)	Roth
Campbell (CA)	Kasich	Santorum
Chandler	Klug	Saxton
Clinger	Kolbe	Schaefer
Coble	Kyl	Schiff
Coleman (MO)	Lagomarsino	Schulze
Combust	Lent	Sensenbrenner
Coughlin	Lewis (CA)	Shaw
Cox (CA)	Lewis (FL)	Shuster
Crane	Lightfoot	Skeen
Cunningham	Livingston	Smith (NJ)
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)	Smith (OR)
Davis	Machtley	Smith (TX)
DeLay	Marlenee	Solomon
Dickinson	Martin	Spence
Doolittle	McCandless	Stearns
Dorman (CA)	McCollum	Stump
Dreier	McCrery	Sundquist
Duncan	McDade	Taylor (NC)
Emerson	McEwen	Thomas (CA)
Fawell	McGrath	Thomas (WY)
Fields	McMillan (NC)	Upton
Fish	Michel	Vander Jagt
Franks (CT)	Miller (OH)	Vucanovich
Gallely	Miller (WA)	Walker
Gallo	Moorhead	Walsh
Gekas	Morrison	Weber
Gilchrist	Myers	Weidon
Gillmor	Nichols	Williams
Gingrich	Oxley	

Wolf	Young (AK)	Zeliff
Wylie	Young (FL)	Zimmer

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Edwards (OK)	Riggs
--------------	-------

NOT VOTING—26

Anthony	Hunter	Poshard
Billirakis	Lancaster	Ros-Lehtinen
Bruce	Lehman (FL)	Savage
Collins (IL)	Levine (CA)	Slaughter (VA)
Durbin	Lloyd	Smith (FL)
Ewing	Moody	Stark
Hastert	Mrazek	Torricelli
Holloway	Owens (NY)	Valentine
Hopkins	Pelosi	

□ 1350

So the motion was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MCNULTY). The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for the balance of her 1 minute, which shall constitute 28 seconds.

CONTINUATION OF 1 MINUTE BY MS. DELAURO

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, allegations of sexual harassment are serious charges which deserve serious consideration. The Justices of the Supreme Court must demonstrate respect for law and for individual rights. To impugn the integrity of Professor Hill, to elevate that of Judge Thomas, is not appropriate nor is it a credible tactic. The American people deserve more than a dismissal of Professor Hill's charges. They deserve to know the truth.

Mr. Speaker, let us take the time to uncover the truth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] has expired.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to record votes because my presence was necessary in Illinois to help maintain the strong tradition of southern Illinois representation in Congress. Had I been present for the procedural votes before the House of Representatives, I would have cast the following votes:

On rollcall No. 295, the motion to table the motion to proceed with 1-minute speeches, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall No. 296, the motion to proceed in order, I would have voted "yea."

GIANNA JENSEN, A SURVIVOR OF ABORTION

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on Friday I hosted a Capitol Hill press conference, and our special guest, Gianna Jensen, a spunky 14-

year-old girl who survived a salt-poisoning abortion, is now going public with her story.

The medical records which I have seen show that as an unborn baby of about 24 weeks' gestation, Gianna was injected with high-concentrated saline solution with the intent to kill her. Of course, under Roe versus Wade, such violence against children is perfectly legal. Unborn children have no rights. Although the poisonous salt solution worked on Gianna's fragile body for 5 hours, she nevertheless survived. She was injured and today bears some of the scars and a mild case of cerebral palsy. But she is alive, she is well and full of life.

Mr. Speaker, how do the proabortionists react to a survivor like Gianna?

Mr. Speaker, they respond by devising more efficient means of killing.

In the Washington Times, on Saturday, their story about Gianna, Susan Shermer of the National Abortion Federation, said, "The way most abortions are performed today, most physicians make sure there is fetal demise."

"Ensuring fetal demise," what an antiseptic, euphemistic way of saying, "Make sure that the baby is dead."

Mr. Speaker, it is a national scandal that each day over 4,000 babies are killed by chemical abortion or by dismemberment. Every child killed, every child killed by abortion and those who will die today are exactly like Gianna Jensen. This Congress should rise to their defense.

bill, S. 1722, even though the bill was only 48 pages in length;

Whereas the final enrollment of the bill, S. 1722, has not been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives or by the President of the Senate, or by any presiding officer empowered by either House by written designation to sign enrolled bills;

Whereas the failure to complete action on an enrolled bill delays its presentation to the President of the United States;

Whereas an unreasonable delay in the transmission of an enrolled bill to the President affects the integrity of the proceedings of the House of Representatives: now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint a committee of two Members of the House, one from each major party, to determine whether there has been unreasonable delay in transmitting the enrolled bill of S. 1722 to the President and such committee shall promptly inform the Senate of the concern of the House of Representatives over the delay in the bill's presentation to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). This resolution constitutes a question of privileges of the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the resolution.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. 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. 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 253, nays 156, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]
YEAS—253

Abercrombie	Carr	Espy
Ackerman	Chapman	Evans
Alexander	Clay	Fascell
Anderson	Clement	Fazio
Andrews (ME)	Coleman (TX)	Feighan
Andrews (NJ)	Collins (MI)	Flake
Andrews (TX)	Condit	Foglietta
Annunzio	Conyers	Ford (MI)
Anthony	Cooper	Ford (TN)
Applegate	Costello	Frank (MA)
Aspin	Cox (IL)	Frost
Atkins	Coyne	Gaydos
AuCoin	Cramer	Gejdenson
Bacchus	Darden	Gephardt
Barnard	de la Garza	Geren
Bellenson	DeFazio	Gibbons
Bennett	DeLauro	Glickman
Berman	Dellums	Gonzalez
Bevill	Derrick	Gordon
Bilbray	Dicks	Guarini
Bonior	Dingell	Hall (OH)
Borski	Dixon	Hall (TX)
Boucher	Donnelly	Hamilton
Boxer	Dooley	Harris
Brewster	Dorgan (ND)	Hatcher
Brooks	Downey	Hayes (IL)
Browder	Dwyer	Hayes (LA)
Brown	Dymally	Hefner
Bryant	Early	Hertel
Bustamante	Edwards (CA)	Hoagland
Byron	Edwards (TX)	Hochbrueckner
Campbell (CO)	Engel	Horn
Cardin	English	Hoyer
Carper	Erdreich	Hubbard

Huckaby	Moran	Schumer
Hughes	Murphy	Serrano
Hutto	Murtha	Sharp
Jacobs	Nagle	Sikorski
Jefferson	Natcher	Sisisky
Jenkins	Neal (MA)	Skaggs
Johnson (SD)	Neal (NC)	Skelton
Johnston	Nowak	Slattery
Jones (GA)	Oakar	Slaughter (NY)
Jones (NC)	Oberstar	Smith (IA)
Jontz	Obey	Solarz
Kanjorski	Olin	Spratt
Kaptur	Oliver	Staggers
Kennedy	Ortiz	Stallings
Kennelly	Orton	Stark
Kildee	Owens (UT)	Stenholm
Kleczka	Pallone	Stokes
Kolter	Panetta	Studds
Kopetski	Parker	Swett
Kostmayer	Pastor	Swift
LaFalce	Patterson	Synar
Lancaster	Payne (NJ)	Tallon
Lantos	Payne (VA)	Tanner
LaRocco	Pease	Tauzin
Laughlin	Pelosi	Taylor (MS)
Lehman (CA)	Penny	Thomas (GA)
Levin (MI)	Perkins	Thornton
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (FL)	Torres
Lipinski	Peterson (MN)	Torricelli
Long	Pickett	Towns
Lowey (NY)	Pickle	Trafficant
Luken	Pricc	Traxler
Manton	Rahall	Unsoeld
Markey	Rangel	Valentine
Martinez	Ray	Vento
Matsui	Reed	Visclosky
Mavroules	Richardson	Volkmer
Mazzoli	Roe	Washington
McCloskey	Roemer	Waters
McCurdy	Rose	Waxman
McDermott	Rostenkowski	Weiss
McHugh	Rowland	Wheat
McMillen (MD)	Roybal	Whitten
McNulty	Russo	Williams
Mfume	Sabo	Wise
Miller (CA)	Sanders	Wolpe
Mineta	Sangmeister	Wyden
Mink	Sarpallus	Yates
Moakley	Sawyer	Yatron
Mollohan	Scheuer	
Montgomery	Schroeder	

NAYS—156

Allard	Galleghy	Martin
Archer	Gallo	McCandless
Armey	Gekas	McCollum
Baker	Gilchrist	McCrary
Balenger	Gillmor	McDade
Barrett	Gilman	McEwen
Barton	Gingrich	McGrath
Bateman	Goodling	McMillan (NC)
Bentley	Goss	Meyers
Bereuter	Gradison	Michel
Bliley	Grandy	Miller (WA)
Boehlert	Green	Molinari
Boehner	Gunderson	Moorhead
Broomfield	Hammerschmidt	Morella
Bunning	Hancock	Morrison
Burton	Hansen	Myers
Callahan	Hefley	Nichols
Camp	Henry	Oxley
Campbell (CA)	Herger	Packard
Chandler	Hobson	Paxon
Clinger	Horton	Petri
Coble	Houghton	Porter
Coleman (MO)	Hyde	Pursell
Combest	Inhofe	Quillen
Coughlin	Ireland	Ramstad
Cox (CA)	James	Ravenel
Crane	Johnson (CT)	Regula
Cunningham	Johnson (TX)	Rhodes
Dannemeyer	Kasich	Ridge
Davis	Klug	Riggs
DeLay	Kolbe	Rinaldo
Dickinson	Kyl	Ritter
Doolittle	Lagomarsino	Roberts
Dornan (CA)	Leach	Rogers
Dreier	Lent	Rohrabacher
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Roth
Edwards (OK)	Lewis (FL)	Roukema
Emerson	Lightfoot	Santorum
Fawell	Livingston	Saxton
Fields	Lowery (CA)	Schaefer
Fish	Machtley	Schiff
Franks (CT)	Marlenee	Schulze

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor to the bill, H.R. 1330, the Comprehensive Wetlands Conservation and Management Act. My name was added as a cosponsor without my knowledge.

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

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—FAILURE TO COMPLETE ACTION ON ENROLLED BILL

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege and offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 239) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 239

Whereas the House of Representatives and the Senate both acted on and adopted on October 1, 1991 the Conference Report to accompany the bill, S. 1722, a bill to provide emergency unemployment compensation;

Whereas as of this morning, October 8, 1991, the Senate Enrolling Clerk hasn't completed action on the final enrollment of the

Sensenbrenner	Spence	Walker
Shaw	Stearns	Walsh
Shays	Stump	Weber
Shuster	Sundquist	Weldon
Skeen	Taylor (NC)	Wolf
Smith (NJ)	Thomas (CA)	Wyllie
Smith (OR)	Thomas (WY)	Young (AK)
Smith (TX)	Upton	Young (FL)
Snowe	Vander Jagt	Zeliff
Solomon	Vucanovich	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—24

Billirakis	Hopkins	Nussle
Bruce	Hunter	Owens (NY)
Collins (IL)	Lehman (FL)	Poshard
Durbin	Levine (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Eckart	Lloyd	Savage
Ewing	Miller (OH)	Slaughter (VA)
Hastert	Moody	Smith (FL)
Holloway	Mrazek	Wilson

□ 1419

So, the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote numbers 295, 296, and 297, I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted on number 295, "nay"; on 296 "yea"; and on 297, "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to record votes because my presence was necessary in Illinois to help maintain the strong tradition of southern Illinois representation in Congress. Had I been present for the procedural votes before the House of Representatives, I would have cast the following votes:

On rollcall No. 297, the Gephardt motion to table the resolution, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present during recorded votes due to pressing concerns regarding the elimination of the congressional district which has historically represented southern Illinois and is now in danger of being eliminated.

Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: On rollcall No. 295, "nay," on rollcall No. 296 "aye", and on rollcall No. 297, "aye."

POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE—ALLEGED IMPUGNING OF CHARACTER OR MOTIVES OF MINORITY WHIP

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I have a question of personal privilege at the desk which I am going to ask the Parliamentarian to rule on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman will state his question.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to frankly rise to a question of personal privilege. I have talked with the Parliamentarian, and I simply want to make the following point. I will, of course, respect whatever ruling the Parliamentarian feels he must make.

At a time when the Democratic leadership has held the unemployment bill

at the desk in the Senate, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, as I understand it, which is controlled by the Democratic leadership through an officer of the Democratic leadership, has been running a commercial which holds both the President and myself up to ridicule.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, under the standards of the House, to have a Member of the other side's leadership authorizing an action which clearly holds a Member up to ridicule would be a question of personal privilege, and, therefore, responsive.

Since it involves the unemployment question, which has just come up and which has just been tabled, it seems to me very timely and appropriate to raise this question about the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee's behavior, and whether or not we could in fact discuss on the floor of the House the Democratic leadership running this commercial while refusing to send the bill down to the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to have the Parliamentarians' ruling on whether or not we have in fact standing, and I would, of course, respect the ruling of the Parliamentarian.

I would note that in the Rules of the House of Representatives, in the manual for the 102d Congress, on page 348, it says, "A Member may raise a question of personal privilege based upon press accounts of another Member's remarks, in debate or off the floor, which impugned his character or motives."

Mr. Speaker, in this case it is clear that the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] had to have been the authorizing agent, and these are in effect his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman states that his character and motives were impugned by the commercial, then the gentleman states a point of personal privilege.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] for 1 hour.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me explain to Members why I have sought this hour and why I do so at this point.

The majority leader just tabled a motion which we did not get to discuss or debate because of the fact the Democratic leadership was very embarrassed to discuss or debate the motion. The motion refers to unemployment.

The fact is, and I think most Members probably do not know this, the unemployment bill which was passed in this House last Wednesday with great statements about how urgent, how vital, how necessary it was on the part of the Democrats, is, in fact, being held in the other body and has not been sent to the White House.

Now, we said last week, as we said in previous weeks, the Republicans are prepared to send to the White House a 10-week extension of unemployment, which the President will sign. Had we

sent that bill last week, it would, in fact, have been signed into law and checks would be going out this week in every State. It would have extended unemployment 6 weeks in every State, and by 10 weeks in the hardest hit States.

Instead, what do we have? We have a situation in which the Democratic leadership of the Congress has refused to send the unemployment bill to the White House, but is, through its arm, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, running commercials attacking the President and attacking this Member.

Now, I just want to suggest to every Member in this body who cares seriously about the unemployed, there is something outrageous, absolutely outrageous, about the idea that on the one hand your leadership would claim to care about the poor and the unemployed; on the other hand, your leadership would fail to send down a bill, and then, while failing to send the bill down to the President, your leadership would approve running commercials attacking the President for not acting on a bill which your leadership has failed to send him.

Mr. Speaker, let me suggest further that as I understand it, the other body will be leaving this evening. So we will have the spectacle of the Democratic leadership of Congress sending an unemployment bill to the President while the other body leaves town, so if the President does veto it, the unemployed will have another week without having any kind of opportunity to be dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, I want to finally say I believe that this entire episode is a very sad commentary on why the American people are cynical and why there is so much call for term limitation in this country.

The American people are not stupid. They do after a while pick up on the details of how this city is being run and how Capitol Hill is being run. When they watch us play these kinds of games, when they watch us say we care about the unemployed, but not enough to get the bill to the White House, we care about the unemployed, but only enough to write a commercial on television, I think one more wave of people, as George Will did last week, will say, "Well, I guess we do need term limitations."

Mr. Speaker, I just want to suggest to the Democratic leadership, which is probably the most antiterm limitation group in this city, every time this body acts in a way which increases public cynicism, we increase the national pressure for a term limitation amendment. Every time we fail to act in a manner in which people can be proud of their Congress, we increase the public sense that it is time for term limitation.

Let me say also to any Democrat who has a chance to see the Demo-

cratic Congressional Campaign Committee commercial, the President I believe will veto the unemployment bill you sent down, because it breaks the budget agreement, it is not paid for, and it increases the deficit. He will then ask the Congress to pass the 10-week extension of unemployment which he will sign.

We will challenge the Democratic leadership, if you really care about the unemployed, having failed in the constitutional process to send your bill down in a way which could make it law, it seems to me you will have an obligation at that point, if you care about the unemployed, to quit running commercials, and instead to schedule within 48 hours the passage of a signable unemployment bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me make this point: Nobody in the House or the other body is affected by this. Nobody here is not going to have a check next week. Nobody here is not going to be able to meet their mortgage payments. But this kind of use of the schedule, to fail to send the bill through to the White House, to fail to have the President be able to act on it, to fail to be able to keep faith with the unemployed of America, the people being hurt by the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee and the Democratic leadership scheduling are in fact precisely the unemployed, on whose behalf so many Democrats rose just a week ago to speak out.

Mr. Speaker, I find it appalling that almost virtually every Democrat voted to table a motion to instruct that the bill be sent to the White House in order to get it signed.

Now, if you truly care about the unemployed, how are you going to go home and explain that you care about the unemployed enough for a speech, you care about the unemployed enough for a press release, you care about the unemployed enough for a commercial, but you did not care about the unemployed enough to request the other body to send the bill to the White House so the President could act on it.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] correctly that the bill that has passed both houses of the Congress on unemployment has not yet been sent to the White House for action by the White House?

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is exactly correct. The House and Senate acted on and adopted on October 1 the conference report which would have accompanied the bill on October 1.

As of the morning, October 8, the Senate Enrolling Clerk has not completed action on the final enrollment of the bill. The bill, by the way, is 48

pages long. This is not a technical problem. This bill could have gone down on October 1 if they wanted to.

Let me make an additional point. I have asked the White House and I am informed that the White House has been calling the Senate Enrolling Clerk twice a day to find out when the bill which passed the House a week ago will get to the White House. But twice a day the President's staff has been calling and saying, "Where is the bill? Where is the bill to help the unemployed? How can we keep the process moving?"

I think it is a tragedy that the Democratic leadership scheduling decisions add at a minimum 2 additional weeks to our being able to help the unemployed.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, let me ask a question about the timing here.

Now, if the bill should go down at some point today, it is a bill, as I recall, that has a Senate number on it, which means that when the bill comes back up, having been vetoed, it would have to go first to the Senate for action.

So the Senate, as I am led to believe, is going out on recess for a 1-week to 10-day period, so that even when the bill comes back up here, there will be no one capable of acting on the veto. So we will have another period of time now where this will roll out and the unemployed will not have an appropriate bill that might pay them some checks.

□ 1430

Is that the gentleman's understanding of what is happening here is that literally they are holding the bill until the day they leave town so that there cannot be any action on the veto for at least 10 days to a week?

Mr. GINGRICH. My understanding is that based on the schedule of the Democratic congressional leadership, those who are unemployed who are eagerly awaiting an unemployment check from an extension, people, for example in a State like Michigan, which has just had its unemployment go up to over 9 percent, those folks will see that for 2 more weeks nothing can be done to pass a signable bill.

I think for 2 more weeks because of the failure to act, the Congress will have blocked people from getting the unemployment checks.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman, when we went through this debate over a 4-week period, we know that the Democrats refused to allow an open rule, to allow this issue to be fully debated on the floor.

As a matter of fact, we were told that it was the intention of the Democrats

that they would drag this out week after week after week, thereby stopping the unemployment checks from reaching these people.

I just want to put the House on notice with regard to the Dole unemployment measure, which is a temporary measure which would extend benefits for up to 10 weeks, that I will file a motion to discharge on the first appropriate day which will discharge the Committee on Rules and bring that bill to the floor so that we can have an open and fair debate on this issue. I would so notify the membership.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the House voted down a resolution or at least tabled a resolution and did not even allow the debate of it to look into this question.

As I understand it, looking at this resolution, what the resolution said was that there has been an unreasonable delay in transmitting the bill to the White House. The Members who voted to table that motion evidently do not believe that it is an unreasonable delay to hold the bill for weeks at a time and not allow it to move forward.

What it did was set up a process to appoint a committee to find out whether or not we could not get the bill moving.

Does the gentleman have any explanation at all why someone would vote to table such a resolution and not even allow such a resolution to be debated on the House floor?

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, no Member of the Democratic leadership has yet explained why they kept the bill for 6 days, almost 7 days now in the Senate. Nobody from the Democratic leadership has explained why they would not want to pass a resolution to get the bill down to the White House.

I find it sort of fascinating that the Democratic leadership feels great urgency to speak about the bill, to run a commercial about the bill, but they have no sense of urgency about getting the bill to go to the White House to go through the process, knowing, as they do, that we are going to have to come back, go through a veto process, get the veto sustained, and then bring up a bill the President will sign.

Each of these steps widens the gap between the unemployed getting a check. I would have thought that the Democratic leadership would have been eager last Wednesday to rush the bill to the White House.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman wants to be fair. I am happy to see that after sometime the President now is for extended un-

employment benefits, although it took the gentleman's party some time to get here. I am very happy to see him supporting even some small amount.

Could the gentleman explain to me, out of the 50 States, what percentage of those States would be eligible for unemployment for the 10 weeks instead of the 20 weeks? Is it all 50 States that would be eligible under the President's proposal or is it only 4 or 5 States or is it 15 States? Could the gentleman tell me?

One of the questions out there in the public is that the President's proposal, while it seems to be half the length of the Democratic proposal, it is nice that he has a proposal and that the gentleman's party has a proposal at this point. But the understanding was, of the way it is crafted, is that a lot of people might not be able to take advantage of it.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend from Connecticut, he needs to understand the distinction here for a second. The President has a proposal which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and Mr. DOLE would introduce, which would get for a lot of States in New England, which have a lot of problems, extended benefits.

Mr. GEJDENSON. If the gentleman will continue to yield, which States in New England? How many States is that?

Mr. GINGRICH. We are getting the exact amount, the information.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Every State in the Nation would be applicable, so every unemployed worker would be applicable for 10 additional weeks under the President's proposal?

Mr. GINGRICH. It is our understanding, we are trying to get somebody from the Committee on Ways and Means to come over.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, we have the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means here.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the President's proposal is.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Is there anybody who knows, the President's proposal?

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me say, I will come back in a few minutes and give the gentleman that detail, but let me make this point to him.

There is a difference. This is not just our party's proposal. The gentleman's party is going to attempt to pass a law it believes in. They have every right to do that. They are going to fail to do that in the other body, when they get back from their break.

At that point, he is faced with a choice. If he truly wants to get extended help for unemployed in every State, there would be at least 6 weeks.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Six weeks of coverage for those whose benefits have run out. That makes sense to give them 6 weeks of coverage, but not 20? They should lose their homes?

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, if I may reclaim my time, I just want to suggest the difference. The President, under the Constitution, can stop a bill unless we have two-thirds plus one.

We have two choices. We can decide that we do not want to help the poor at all. We do not want to cooperate with George Bush, and we would rather not cooperate with the President of the United States and, therefore, have the unemployed not get checks.

Or after we get done with the dance of legislation, we can decide we want to pass a bill the President will sign. We are not going to get it overridden.

All I am saying today is whatever the gentleman's position is on this, it does seem to me very strange that we would slow down the process of getting what was described as an emergency bill from October 1. We are standing here on October 8, and it still has not gotten through.

The reason I rose to a point of personal privilege, to have the Democratic congressional leadership hold the bill, not allow the President to act on it and then run commercials attacking the President over what is described on the floor as an emergency, and attack me, by the way, which is why I am standing in this debate, over a bill which has, in fact, been deliberately withheld from the President strikes me as something where there is such a large gap that it does not make sense.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I just checked with the Committee on Ways and Means and found that all States will get something from a minimum of 6 to 7 weeks with some States getting a maximum of 10.

Mr. GINGRICH. Do we know what the formula is?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, every State would get 6 weeks.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. A minimum of 6 to 7.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Let me just explain to the gentleman then in 1 second, and then I will give him back his time. He has been very generous.

The reason we persisted in this is, had we quit at the beginning, the President would have no unemployment compensation proposal. Now we have got him to 6, maybe we can get him to where he ought to be so that every American gets decent coverage in this.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleague, first of all, having persisted it is very strange to stop persisting when they have the vote last October 1 and then keep the bill on Capitol Hill. They cannot move the bill any further unless the President gets it, and for the other body, for the Democratic leadership to only send it

down to the White House, as they leave town, further extends the length of time.

If they truly care about the emergency, I do not understand exactly how they can argue.

The States which would count under the 5 percent trigger, as of October 1, would be Alaska, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and Rhode Island.

So New England—Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island—would get 10 weeks.

I would suggest to the gentleman, getting them 10 weeks is better than getting them a Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee commercial. It is better than getting them a press release. Ten weeks is real money and real checks.

□ 1440

Mr. GEJDENSON. And they are there because there was a Democratic bill to force your side to come up with a proposal, and now maybe if we give the President a little more time, he will come to his senses and sign a 20-week bill.

Mr. GINGRICH. No, no. Let me just ask you, are you prepared to stonewall all winter; or do you want to get the checks to the people who are unemployed?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I would have hoped that a year ago the President would have signed a 20-week extension for the people in pain around this country. And I am just tickled pink that he has finally gotten it up to 5 or 6 weeks in some instances, but people need more.

Mr. GINGRICH. But you are not prepared today and did not vote today to instruct the Senate to send that bill downtown. In fact, you voted not to tell the Senate to send the bill down.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Well, frankly, we are hoping to get the votes to override or to get the President to sign it.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, because the question has been asked, in other words, by my good friend from Connecticut, which States would qualify right now, today, let me read you those States, and those of you who are sitting out here today and in your offices, the checks would flow tomorrow to these States for 10 weeks: Arkansas, Alaska, California, Connecticut. Where is the gentleman from Connecticut? Connecticut would start tomorrow. Idaho, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, my State, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

That should answer your question. You allow this bill on the floor and the

President will sign it tomorrow. The checks flow tomorrow to all of these States.

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

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I come over here today as someone, a Republican who voted for the bill, consistently, throughout the entire process, and who is absolutely disgusted with what the majority party is doing in failing to allow a compromise to be brought forth. I supported the bill. I voted for it. I spoke in favor of it and I tried to convince my colleagues of that position.

We won the vote on the floor. We do not have the votes to override a veto. The people in my district want to see unemployment extended, and the Democratic Party will not allow that to happen. That is an absolute travesty.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from California on my point of personal privilege.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we have really ranged far from the point of personal privilege. But I am really optimistic listening here to this quartet of the Republican leaders here on the floor today arguing vociferously that we need some type of unemployment insurance extension bill. I mean we have come a long way.

Mr. GINGRICH. If I can reclaim my time for a second—

Mr. FAZIO. I am happy to let you reclaim your time.

Mr. GINGRICH. I will yield again, but let me just say that we went to the Rules Committee and said very early in this process we could support a bill. We went to the Rules Committee 2 weeks ago and said we could not only support a bill, we thought we could get a majority of Republicans, a large majority to vote for it, and we thought we could guarantee the President would sign it.

We have had several weeks, I would suggest, of the gentleman's party refusing to make in order a bill which could be signed by the President.

Mr. FAZIO. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FAZIO. I am happy to have the gentleman yield to me again. The point that I was simply trying to make is that we went for months here in the middle of a recession that seemed to have no end without any real interest being expressed on the part of the minority here about these very individuals who we now say we are willing to help to some extent, in some states, as long as we do not use the trust fund that was created for this purpose. I mean, we really have made progress. We do have some more distance to

travel before we can come to a consensus. But I am convinced that we are getting somewhere. I think we are now beginning to see that the most conservative members of the Republican conference are here today on the floor clamoring for some sort of extended benefits. We are getting somewhere, and I think we know why we are getting somewhere, and that is because the heat is beginning to be generated from at home where it really hurts.

Mr. GINGRICH. If I can reclaim my time, let me say to the gentleman from California, it is fascinating that as we are getting somewhere it is the Democratic leadership which for a week has held the bill on Capitol Hill and refused to send it to the White House, knowing that given the schedule of the next 2 weeks that the unemployed of America will not get any unemployment checks for at least 3 weeks, given the Democratic leadership's decision.

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield, you know, I do not know what the hurry is. Is the rush so that the President can veto the bill again? Is that what the rush is all about?

Mr. GINGRICH. No, the rush is to convince your side in order to get a signable bill that you are in fact going to have to agree to keep the budget agreement, you are going to have to agree to pay for it, and then he will sign it.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, the rush is to help unemployed men and women in America receive an extension of their benefits. We have gone on the record in favor of that. A number of us supported the bill when it came to the floor on this side, a number of us want to put aside the political rhetoric and gamesmanship that is being played by the majority party, and a number of us want to see these benefits extended, and we challenge you to allow that to happen.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, may I point out that everyone is operating within the rules, but our Committee on Appropriations was scheduled today to bring up the conference report on the Agriculture bill at 12:30. We have the appropriation bill here which has all of the food programs, WIC and school lunch, and all of this, and we are trying to get it over to the Senate so that they can accept it today. Listen, if we cannot get it to the Senate in time for them to accept it, all of these programs will be operating on much less money

than they require. They will have to operate at the 1991 level rather than the level provided in the conference agreement. I am just urging my friends to cooperate with us and conclude so we can get our bill over to the Senate before they recess.

May I say again, you are operating within the rules, there is no question about it, but we are waiting with patience, and if we do not get this to the Senate side, you will be responsible for reducing these programs so vital to the American people.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me simply say to the distinguished chairman that he is one of the most influential members of the Democratic leadership, and of course if you could get some kind of a commitment out of the Democratic leadership to send the unemployment bill down, we would be delighted to stop right this minute. But the fact is we want to drive home the message that the Democratic leadership has simultaneously refused to send the bill to the President, and run commercials attacking the President and myself in a process which strikes me as being to some extent lacking in authenticity.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to put this into some historical perspective. When Jimmy Carter was President we had 14 percent unemployment, and the Democrat majority did not ask for an extension of unemployment benefits. Today it is 6.7 percent unemployment, but because there is a Republican President who is very popular in the White House, and you do not have any issues to defeat him with next year, you are trying to use this.

Mr. FAZIO. If I could say to the historian in the well, if he would yield—

Mr. WALKER. Regular order.

Mr. FAZIO. We had unemployment benefits in place which were repealed by the Reagan administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Regular order is debate on the question of personal privilege. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] has the time.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me say, and I am quoting from my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], on Wednesday, September 25, who said:

I will therefore today * * * make an initial attempt to defeat the previous question to make in order the so-called * * * Dole alternative which was introduced last night by the distinguished Republican leader and myself as H.R. 3400. This is a bill the President can and will sign. It provides a two-tier system of Federally funded benefits that provides 6 weeks of benefits to all States and an additional 4 weeks in States whose insured unemployment rate, adjusted to include exhaustees, is at 5 percent or greater.

Moreover, the bill provides mechanisms to finance these additional 10 weeks of benefits

by auctioning frequencies of the electromagnetic spectrum for new communications use.

Let me just say this, I think the point I find so outrageous is that we were prepared to pass a signable bill but you did not want to pass it, and that is fine. We then, frankly, expected on our side that a bill would go down last week, the White House would, in fact, veto it, it would come back up, it would be sustained, and in prompt order, and at that point we would have a chance to vote and pass a signable bill so that people in places like Massachusetts and Connecticut could get 10 weeks of extended unemployment. Instead, what we have discovered is that for the last 7 days the Democratic leadership is blocked the bill from going down. Now the other body will adjourn this evening for I think a week to 10 days, and in effect what this particular strategy on the part of the Democratic leadership does is it extends the period without unemployment compensation for those folks for 3 more weeks, and at a minimum, and in the process you have the gall to run a commercial attacking the President and the Republican whip for not doing something which we want to do.

Now I would just suggest to you that there is something outrageous even by the standards of American politics to have this kind of a dual strategy of deliberately and callously not moving the bill, making sure no one gets the check, and then running a commercial attacking us from them not getting the check when you stopped the bill.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to look at the wording of the commercial too, because the commercial is loaded with just outright distortions if not lies.

It says, "George Bush and the Republicans in Congress think that extending unemployment benefits, helping unemployed workers is 'garbage.' "

Whose quote? We made the point on the floor the other week that the President said no such thing, despite the representations on the floor to the contrary. And I know of no Republican in the Congress who has made that kind of a quote. And so, therefore, the commercial that they are running is in itself garbage. It has absolutely no identification with the truth whatsoever.

□ 1450

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield further, it really does need to be clarified.

It says in the September 25, 1991, AP story out of New Jersey where the President was speaking to a \$1,000-a-plate dinner for people from the Far Hills area, "The jobless benefits program that the Democrats are offering

was for 20 weeks. The Republicans were endorsing a plan for 10 weeks. Bush defended his domestic policy calling Democratic legislation on unemployment benefits garbage." So we are essentially using the language that was reported by the Associated Press in the aftermath of that event.

Mr. GINGRICH. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman may not have been on the floor that day, but we attempted, and I certainly would want to give you the benefit of the doubt for not having the factual information at hand, although the gentleman might inquire of the DCCC staff why they did not check this out.

Let me yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield to me, it was brought to the floor, somebody from the DCCC certainly knew about it, that the transcript of the President's speech is available, regardless of what the AP story said, and the AP story was absolutely wrong in suggesting the President in any way referred to unemployment benefits in terms of garbage.

The fact is the only thing President referred to as garbage were Democratic domestic programs that he would not sign.

Mr. FAZIO. Was this one of them? Was the unemployment insurance bill one of those domestic programs?

Mr. WALKER. No. There was no mention of the unemployment anywhere to the use of the term, and so, therefore, what the gentleman, it seems, is doing is taking the remarks out of context.

Mr. GINGRICH. Reclaiming my time, would the gentleman clarify, read the paragraph, read the exact paragraph in which the President asked the Congress to pass an unemployment bill?

Mr. WALKER. What he said was that, I am tired of hearing Democrats say we have no domestic agenda. The problem is that their domestic agenda is to crush our domestic agenda. They are doing nothing but griping in refusing to consider new ideas and send me a bunch of garbage I will not sign. I will continue to veto the bad stuff until we get good bills.

Mr. GINGRICH. New read the part on unemployment.

Mr. WALKER. He said he would sign good bills, which is exactly the point the gentleman has been making. Now, you get down four more paragraphs, get down four more paragraphs, and this is what the President says about unemployment:

And right now in Congress, there is some debate upon how to help the unemployed whose benefits have run out. The Democrats want us to pass a bill and simply not pay for it, push it on over to future generations, and our approach, the Dole substitute it is called, helps the unemployed. They get the extended benefits, but it pays for the programs, and this approach, their approach, adds to an already humongous deficit, and ours does not. Ours pays as you go and takes care of those who are in need, and that is the fundamental difference between Republicans and Democrats.

Now, there is no mention whatsoever of any word that says anything about garbage there. In fact, he says specifically he will sign that kind of a good bill.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me reclaim my time for a minute to explain, and then I will yield to the gentleman from California.

But I want to explain this a little slower, because it seems to elude some people on your side. The fact is the President said in that speech, and the President has said on a number of occasions recently, the President said as recently as Friday he would like to pass and sign 10 weeks of extended unemployment, and that 10 weeks would allow us to send checks to a wide range of States including at least four of the New England States for 10 weeks. It would send 6 weeks to every State. We are prepared, and we would be prepared, to meet this evening and pass the President's bill. I think we have got virtually unanimous or close to unanimous support on our side. We could have the bill signed this week, and we could have it going down to the White House. We could have checks going out by Friday, but our point is that is not what is going to happen. What is going to happen is precisely as the President suggested in that particular passage, the Democratic leadership is going to wait until the last minute. They are going to hold the bill up for a full week. Then they are going to send their bill down knowing it will be vetoed and leave town.

When they leave town, they guarantee another week without the unemployed getting any help and in that kind of a setting, I think it is tragic to have this kind of dance of desperation going on when, in fact, what we need is to work together to legislate signable legislation that would allow the President to actually help the unemployed.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this debate since July.

Let me just go back, in August before Congress recessed for the August work period, the Democrat majority in both the House and the Senate decided there was a national emergency that would require extended unemployment benefits despite the fact that there is no money in the unemployment trust fund because it has been spent by Congress for other purposes, despite the fact that the level of unemployment, the duration of unemployment did not, by any historical standard of comparison, constitute an emergency.

In fact, the conditions were less severe than they were at the time we lifted extended benefits, the last time they were put into place by a Republican President. They were not then, they are still not today, severe enough to

have triggered the mechanism that finally triggered under the Carter administration.

So there is no historical basis by which you can say this is an emergency. Yet, they passed the bill before they went for their recess, declaring it an emergency, and asking the President to sign the bill, declare an emergency, and break the budget deal, funding the bill to deficit spending.

Now then, the President did not take that bait. They have come back now and they have passed a bill where they declare it is an emergency and ask the President to sign it.

It has been passed by both Houses as the gentleman has indicated. It has not been sent by the Senate to the President for his signature or veto, and in the meantime, they are running political ads and sending out, and incidentally I must say I share the umbrage of the gentleman from Georgia, because the Democrat Congressional Campaign Committee sent a press release into my district saying that I had abandoned the unemployed.

The fact is what I had suggested is, and do suggest now, is that if it is an emergency, first we should pass a bill the President would sign. If you believe it to be an emergency. They have chosen not even to allow such a bill to be debated on the floor of the House.

Second, find a way to pay for it so as to not bust the budget deal, the fact of the matter is this is now, has been since July, and will continue to be on the part of the Democrat, the Democrat majority in both the House and Senate nothing, nothing other than a shameful political exercise, and we ought to at least in this body be embarrassed on their behalf, and I am.

Mr. GINGRICH. Reclaiming my time just for a second, I have two very distinguished Members from California to whom I wish to yield.

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman would yield for just one point, the gentleman has mentioned my name in his earlier comments.

I could possibly ask for an hour on a point of personal privilege, but I would rather not, because I agree with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that we really do need to move on.

But if the gentleman is not going to yield to anyone on this side, any adequate amount of time—

Mr. GINGRICH. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. FAZIO. Promises; promises. I am still awaiting. So is the gentlewoman in the well.

Mr. GINGRICH. I am going to yield much quicker than you got the unemployment bill down to the White House.

Let me just say for a second that even if we are going to argue over lineage, it does seem to me to be very hard for any Democrat who truly cares

about the unemployed to get up and defend keeping the bill at the desk in the other body for 7 days rather than sending it to the White House.

Let me yield to the gentleman from California, and then I am going to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. First of all, I think it is important to point out that ironically the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Texas who have just been talking are advocating a bill that the administration says it will sign that is actually less beneficial to the people of their States than the bill, S. 1722, that we would like to see the President sign. But I am particularly focused for a moment on the irony.

Mr. GINGRICH. Reclaiming my time, that is factually wrong. In Georgia it is 6 weeks instead of 5.

Mr. FAZIO. No; 7—S. 1722 has 7 weeks for Georgia, 7 for Texas. Yours is 6. So it is not factually wrong.

The point I would like to make is that one of the ways in which you pay for your bill is to eliminate benefits to ex-military personnel who voluntarily leave the military.

Here we are after the Persian Gulf war with a lot of red, white, and blue flags and patriotism, appropriately, congratulating these people on the service they have rendered this country. What do they get on return? They get eliminated from extended unemployment insurance benefits because we cannot afford them under the Dole proposal.

Now, it seems to me in a period when we are building down our military by beginning to close bases and reduce military personnel all across this country that they are the last people who should be eliminated.

This is the reason why we believe that the Dole proposal is so totally inadequate that we are going to focus the heat that I think you hear on the floor today, we are going to focus that heat on the enactment of S. 1722 over this impending veto of the President.

That, I think, is the best way to help people who have gone for too long without the attention of the minority in this House.

Mr. GINGRICH. It is my time, so let me just say to the gentleman that if S. 1722 matters that much to you, why have you kept it in the other body for a week? Why did you not send it down if it is that important? Why has it not gone to the President? How can it help the poor being held in the Senate and then not being sent down until after the other body has decided to recess?

□ 1500

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am still waiting for the gentleman to explain to me why the gentleman is in such a hurry to get this bill to its uncertain fate.

Mr. GINGRICH. I will be glad to explain it. It is because we believe we are not going to get to a signable bill.

I would point out to the gentleman that since S. 1722 is going to be vetoed and sustained, Georgia will get zero amount of money out of it, that we are not going to get to a signable bill until we finish the dance, until the Democrats get done trying to prove that they can override. The sooner we can get that dance done, the sooner we will get something done.

Mr. FAZIO. We do not have to dance any longer. The President has a bill on his desk—

Mr. GINGRICH. Which he will veto.

Mr. FAZIO [continuing]. Which he has signed, and all he needs to do now is to allow it through emergency procedures to go into effect.

If the gentleman is anxious to get unemployment benefits out, he can do it.

Mr. GINGRICH. No, the August bill only gave him 1 day. He only had 1 day.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have watched the plight of veterans, particularly since the Persian Gulf war.

I think it is imperative that Members on the other side of the aisle stop playing politics with this issue and urge the President of the United States to sign the legislation. Not only will it cover people who are hurting from unemployment, but this bill also creates opportunities for veterans to get benefits that they have otherwise not been eligible for.

As we know, for whatever reason, veterans were not eligible for extended unemployment benefits. A lot of people are surprised about that.

This legislation would correct that.

In addition, veterans would be eligible for unemployment benefits in a shorter period of time with this legislation.

The President needs to sign the legislation. It does not make good sense to have a debate about whether or not this is an emergency or whether or not in past years we had comparable unemployment and whether or not we declared an emergency.

The fact of the matter is there are 10 million people out of work, 10 million people who deserve to have unemployment benefits extended to them. They are hurting.

Mr. GINGRICH. We agree.

Ms. WATERS. We have been working on this issue since August. The Republicans had an opportunity to join us. You could have attempted to amend the bill on the floor.

Mr. GINGRICH. No, we could not.

Ms. WATERS. You could have if you had wanted to.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me reclaim my time.

Ms. WATERS. You could have if you had wanted to support this legislation.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me reclaim my time.

Ms. WATERS. You could have, if you wanted to support this legislation. You have been caught not supporting the unemployed. Now you want to revoke it.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentlewoman first of all, and then I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] to explain this.

We were not allowed to amend. We were not allowed to bring the Dole bill to the floor. We were not allowed to add the Economic Growth Act. The Speaker specifically ruled us out of order, so we were not allowed to do the things the gentlewoman just said.

I would hope the gentlewoman would spend as much passion on her leadership, asking them why they kept the bill in the other body for 7 days. If in fact we are trying to get help to the unemployed, why have they kept the bill locked up in the other body for the last 7 days when it could have gone down last Wednesday?

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me yield first to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the gentlewoman, for whom I have respect, ought to know better than to say that because she knows, I think the gentlewoman was even up in the Rules Committee; if she was not, everybody else was, but we fought to get an open rule on this floor so that no person, including the gentlewoman and me, would be gagged on this floor; but half this House was gagged, not just the Republicans, but Democrats alike.

Let me just say, let us put this thing in perspective here. The first thing offered in the Rules Committee was a Democrat package which would have given 20 weeks of extension, and we were gagged from any kind of Republican substitute.

The Republicans countered, the gentleman from Georgia, with a package of economic growth which would have created 1 million new jobs in this country of ours. The Democrats refused.

We then because we know this is a system where we have to compromise, the Republicans countered with a 10-week package, but coupling it with the economic growth package which created IRA's, which created first-time home tax credits for young people, which took the cap off Social Security, and we were gagged up in the Rules Committee.

Then we came back, because we know that we have to compromise, and we offered the Dole-Michel bill, which is just the 10 weeks, and we offered to fund it so that we would not break our promise to the American people of busting the budget, and you turned that down. It is all because we were gagged up in the Rules Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman at any time attempt to include the States that the gentleman says will not be covered by way of an amendment? Did the gentleman at any time attempt to do that in the process?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, if we were given an open rule we would have had a lot of amendments like that.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for yielding to me. I will try to be a little more sedate.

I just want to tell the gentlewoman from California, she makes a good point. We should take care of our veterans and we have to take care of our veterans, but do you know the reason we cannot? Because your leadership, either tomorrow or the day after, is going to bring up a bill to send another \$25 billion overseas and not take care of our own people.

The American people do not want their bill, but you are going to thumb your nose at the taxpayers again on the foreign aid bill, which is a bill that people do not want.

Incidentally, in this foreign aid bill there is \$8.8 billion that you shoved into this pipeline that they cannot spend on the other end fast enough. Some of this money has been there for 8 and 10 years.

You know, we had an amendment on the floor and the amendment passed to take \$2 billion out of there that the GAO asked us to take out.

But what happened? Your own conferees betrayed you in the conference committee, because while the amendment passed 216 to 203, when the conferees met, your own conferees betrayed you because they talked against your amendment, the amendment that people in this House, a majority voted for, and you come and posture that the President of the United States does not take care of domestic needs. You are the people who are shoveling money overseas and do not care about the people here at home.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, will the gentleman use his influence so we can look after the people here in our country. We have been waiting for over 2 hours to call up the conference report on the Agriculture bill.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman let me finish my statement? I am not finished.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield briefly again to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, at the very time that the head of the AID Program

is under a cloud, the inspector general, since April, your people in this House have not even begun an investigation. You have closed your eyes to what is going on, to the corruption. That is why the American people are saying, "Out with those guys in Congress."

Did the gentlewoman from California get her latest survey? What does it say? "Study sends clear danger warning to incumbents."

Let me read just one sentence why.

They say, "The American people are troubled by Government waste, indifference to the homeless, failure to redirect spending from overseas needs to home needs."

And you are going to bring up another bill to send another \$25 billion overseas, by thumbing your nose at the taxpayers and you are wondering why the American people are upset with the Democrats in Congress.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me reclaim my time and yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me again. I am sure he wishes he had yielded to me earlier.

This is a bit off the subject of a point of personal privilege to have the gentleman from Wisconsin attacking the administration's foreign aid authorization here on the floor and trying to blame it on the Democrats.

But I would like to put into perspective exactly what it is we are talking about when we differ between the Dole bill, which is the Republican alternative that they are offering, and S. 1722 that we hope the President will have the good sense to sign.

Take the State of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] knows it well. Some 93,000 people have exhausted their benefits there. The Republican bill would not begin to help them in any retroactive sense, only in the future. None of those people who still remain unemployed would be benefited, but 66,594, two-thirds of them, would be helped under the bill that we hope the President will sign.

I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] would like to see it signed. He is from a State that is totally left out of the Dole bill. He is from a State that is included in this bill. That is why we must enact it into law.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me just ask the gentleman. Granted everything the gentleman has said, why would the gentleman hold it up for a week?

Mr. FAZIO. Well, we are hoping this bill can become law, whether it is signed into law by a President who finally gets the heat from the gentleman from Georgia, or whether it is overriden because people are getting the

heat from it at home, it has a much better chance of being enacted.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California is one of the most sophisticated and experienced Members of the leadership. The gentleman knows that the President has said he is going to veto it and the gentleman knows that Senator DOLE has the votes to sustain it. The gentleman knows this.

We are not talking here now on the stump. Why would your leadership not send the bill down for a full week?

I mean, we have been talking about this as an emergency. Then why is the Democratic leadership holding the bill on the Hill, rather than sending it to the White House.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we would rather see this issue dealt with in a way that is fundamentally a solution to the people affected. The tragedy would be if we sent them in a totally inadequate way a package that does not even take into consideration those 66,000 people in Pennsylvania that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] represent.

□ 1510

So we simply want to send the right bill, not just any bill, to get this off the agenda so that you folks can go back to the other things you care about.

Mr. GINGRICH. But since the gentleman claims he cares about the right bill, why have you not sent it? It has been sitting there for weeks.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I want to hear from a member of the leadership.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced this bill will arrive on the President's desk in better shape to be enacted if it takes another day or two. This is a President who needs to feel the same heat that all of you are feeling which brings you to the floor today.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me make one other point because I think several of our Democratic colleagues are a little bit inaccurately informed about the Dole bill.

The Dole bill provides for unemployment for those members of the Armed Services who are involuntarily separated. All it says is, if you voluntarily leave because you think you have got a better job on the outside, you do not automatically get unemployment. That is in fact the circumstance for civilians in a voluntary situation where they leave to get a better job.

Ms. WATERS. If the gentleman will yield, that is not the point. If the gentleman will yield so that we can clarify what the gentleman just tried to explain.

Mr. GINGRICH. Wait a second, if I might, Madam.

S. 1477, on October 1, 1991, the bill was introduced by Senator DOLE. Section 107, "payment of unemployment compensation to former members of the Armed Forces," sets up the circumstances to pay—we are in regular order—to pay the veterans from Desert Storm under appropriate circumstances. So it is in there. In fact, that is not a legitimate complaint.

But I want to come back because I still do not understand this. We were told for weeks that we had an emergency. We were told for weeks that this truly mattered. Now for a week, having finished with the speeches, we have had a bill held up on Capitol Hill by the Democratic leadership while the Democratic Campaign Committee runs commercials.

Now, how can it possibly be helpful to the unemployed to have a situation in which, for a week, you hold the bill up, then you know that the President is going to veto it, you only send it down the night that the other body leaves town. The President, if he does veto it, it is now going to take 2 additional weeks to get an override before we can prove to you that you cannot pass the bill you want. How can it possibly be helpful in that setting and how can it possibly increase respect for the Congress to spend time, I think inaccurately and misleadingly, attacking the President about a bill which he cannot get to?

Now, would it not have been a lot better for the unemployed Americans, whether they were in Michigan or Massachusetts or Connecticut or Pennsylvania or California or Georgia, would it not have been better, if we have to go through this dance, to go ahead and bring the bill up, get it down there, let the President veto it, which he would have done by Thursday or Friday, have the bill back up here by yesterday or today, get to the override, prove you cannot do it and, if you cannot do it, then agree to a bill the President will sign and by the middle of this week we could have sent a bill to the President that he would have signed and we would have had 10 weeks of extended unemployment checks going to people who badly need the money.

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

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

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker I think I can give you a reason, 800,000 people who are not included under the Dole bill that you guys have come to adopt even though you did not have one most of this time, this bill is inadequate. The Dole bill does not meet the need. You have 800,000 people covered in this bill that the President could still sign if he will, and that we could override him on. That is the reason, that is why we are concerned.

There are deserving individuals. They have paid into the trust fund. They have contributed to this insurance against long-term unemployment. Yet, under your legislation, they are left out in the cold.

Mr. GINGRICH. I say to my colleague from California first of all, how can you argue that holding the bill up for a week helps those 800,000 people who do not have a chance even if by some miracle late tonight, you know, Michael Dukakis and Walter Mondale might whisper in George Bush's ear and he magically became the President you wish you would have elected, even if that happens, you will not send him the bill so he cannot sign it. So how can that help under those circumstances to keep the bill locked up for a week, I would say to the gentleman?

Mr. FAZIO. Even if the President were to sign this inadequate bill that Senator DOLE has offered, those people would not be covered.

Mr. GINGRICH. That would be substantial coverage.

Mr. FAZIO. No, those are people who are excluded. They are only covered under our bill and are locked out because of fiscal requirements because you could not find enough nickels and dimes in the various corners of your desks to pay for this bill.

Mr. GINGRICH. In every State there would be 6 weeks of extended unemployment and in key States it would be 10 weeks.

Let me just ask the gentleman because I am curious as to what your legislative strategy would be then: Let us say you fail, that under our Constitution, having had the President veto the bill, you cannot override it. At that point is your strategy going to be to then bring—refuse to bring up the Dole bill, refuse to bring up anything the President of the United States will sign? Is your answer to unemployment to say to the President of the United States, "Either take ours or we will do nothing"?

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would tell my friend from the other side of the aisle that we will come back again and again and again until you people get it through your heads that there are lots of people suffering out there. And to answer the gentleman's earlier question that he asked my friend from California: Yes, the heat is on. The example of the heat is why you are here today under such emotional charge that you cannot stand the heat. You know your constituents and the President is feeling the heat. He knows the country wants this bill. And if it takes us a day longer or 2 days longer, we are going to do it

because we got 10 million people out of work. We are not going to stand for any short-term 6-weeks' phony bill paid for out of airwaves that are for sale in the country. This is a serious issue.

People have put money into a trust fund. It is their trust fund—\$8 billion. And they want that money spent for what it was put there for, and that is to take care of them, to pay the bill.

Mr. GINGRICH. Now, wait a second. I did not vote for the budget deal. Why did your side sign the money away. I would say to my friend from Michigan? It is your side which signed the money away, it is your side which mortgaged the money in the budget. I voted against the budget deal. So that I do not have any problem standing here and saying that.

Mr. BONIOR. The budget says, to my friend, that if there is an emergency, you can use that emergency clause to take care of the need. The President did it for the Kurds, he did it for the Bangladeshi, he did it for the Turks; he will not do it for Americans. It is in the budget resolution. He can do it now. He can do it today.

Mr. GINGRICH. But under the budget agreement your side supported, it required, and it was very carefully stated, it required the President to make that determination. Now, I am sure the more clever Members of your side understood what that meant.

Mr. BONIOR. I wish the President would make that determination.

Mr. GINGRICH. So now you are breaking the deal.

Now let me go just one step further, I say to my friend. I think we could work out an offer.

Mr. BONIOR. What are you offering?

Mr. GINGRICH. The offer is real simple. Assuming, as I suggested, that you cannot override, and I think that is—if you can override, listen, that is perfectly legitimate, and that is the way you should do it, given your belief.

Mr. BONIOR. We may be able to do it.

Mr. GINGRICH. You may be able to, but I think the vote count in the Senate is against—

Mr. BONIOR. I am glad the gentleman concedes that we might be able to override.

Mr. GINGRICH. My guess is the vote is—frankly, had you sent the bill down last Wednesday, we would know right now. But you did not. So let me make this suggestion.

Mr. BONIOR. We need a little more heat and a few more Senators.

Mr. GINGRICH. I do not think that either, but let me come back—

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield, I think we can see the heat. You can almost see it rise up from that side of the aisle the gentlemen is speaking on.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me say that I know the affection I am held in on your side.

Mr. FAZIO. It is the affection you are held in in Atlanta we are most interested in.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me suggest to you, let me suggest to you that running commercials that attack me does not threaten any Republican Senator. There is no heat felt by my colleagues in the Senate when you run commercials against me. I am perfectly happy if you do it, but it does not affect their vote; but let me come back.

Mr. BONIOR. That is because we have Democratic Senators from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me make you an offer and suggest to you a way of thinking about this: We can agree, I believe, that at a minimum the people who are in the Dole bill deserve some help. We may argue about the margins, but certain we can agree now the people in the Dole bill deserve some help. Why do we not craft—if S. 1722 fails, why do we not craft two bills and we would be perfectly happy to share the bipartisanship, although it would probably shatter both sides. We might even have a Bonior-Gingrich bill, which might be more than the system could bear.

But the first bill would be the one the President says he will sign. The second bill could be everything else which you want. Now, we could get the initial extended unemployment of 10 weeks to all of that entire first wave of people in 50 States. We would take care of a lot of human beings immediately. We could do it within 48 hours. Checks would be going out.

You would then have as much time as you want to take to try to fight the rest of the battle. Why deny that core group of unemployed the opportunity to get a check, just for the purpose of making a point for the President of the United States? It seems to me if we could agree to pass the initial bill, the initial checks would go out into every State for 6 to 10 weeks.

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman would yield, you know, I really do not understand your frustration about this—

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me yield to the gentleman first, and then I will come back to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FAZIO. There is simply something you are overlooking. This is not a political game. This is not just putting the heat on the President. We are talking about 800,000 people that we do know about, that we are concerned about. That is why we are still here, and that is why we want to see a good bill enacted, 800,000 people—

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, regular order, regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from Georgia reclaims his time.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me just say to the distinguished chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee: The level of art you have mastered in being able to stand there while running commercials and suggest that this is not a political issue on your side is truly wonderful and worthy of study. But if you truly want to help the core group we are talking about, we could pass a bill this week that would be signed and that core group would be helped, and then we could spend as much time as necessary on the rest.

□ 1520

What they are doing, Mr. Speaker, is holding every single person who would get a check under the Dole bill hostage. They are blocking every single person under the Dole bill from getting a check so that they can engage the President at the level of political commercials.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] yielding to me because I just distinctly heard the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, say to the distinguished whip of the Republican Party, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], that it is his popularity in Atlanta that we are interested in.

Mr. FAZIO. I did not say "popularity."

Mr. ARMEY. Those were the exact words from the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the people of Atlanta applying the heat.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] yield to me?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. The point remains that their side determined that we had an emergency in July, just in time to pass a bill and pass the buck to the President at the beginning of August before Congress recessed. It is their side that continues to argue that we have got an emergency, that people are starving today, that have held the bill at the Senate for over a week and will not go on with it while the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], as the chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, writes press releases and does campaign commercials, and the gentleman very clearly on this floor said that the point of all this is the popularity of the gentleman from Georgia's constituency in Atlanta.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] said on this floor, and I wanted it to be

clear in the RECORD before we get to revise and extend, because I will not revise and extend.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me just say one thing because we are about to run out of time, and I appreciate the patience of the House.

First of all, we are very surprised on our side to discover that the other side has held up the unemployment bill for a week. We do not understand that. We do not think it makes sense. We are very saddened that the Democratic leadership chose to hold that up until the other body would adjourn this evening for a week. That further hurts the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, we are prepared, the day the veto is sustained, to bring to the floor a signable bill, and then we are prepared, if you wish, to engage on the other issue. But I do not understand why it would be to anyone's advantage to hold hostage the millions of people who would get money under the Dole bill, to not allow them to get their checks, to block them from getting extended unemployment just to be able to make partisan points, and I really hope that the Democratic leadership would consider my offer to make in order a bill that could be signed immediately, and then let us go ahead and continue the fight over the rest of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] has expired.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Chair will recognize the remaining Members who wish to give 1-minute speeches.

MEMORIAL TO JOHNNY LEWIS: A NEW ORLEANS FIREFIGHTER AND HERO

(Mr. JEFFERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute.)

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise today, National Firefighters Day, to honor the memory of a gallant and dedicated man, Johnny Lewis, a New Orleans firefighter who died in the line of duty on September 7, 1991. Johnny Lewis died while searching through a six-alarm blaze for a brother firefighter believed trapped inside.

Johnny Lewis is the first black firefighter to die in the line of duty in the 100-year history of the New Orleans Fire Department, but that does not qualify him as hero. His life as a dedicated father of four, firefighter, and community worker are the real measures of his heroism.

On the day he died, Johnny Lewis was working overtime to earn extra money to support his family.

Johnny Lewis saw his job with the new Orleans Fire Department as his first real break in life, an opportunity to reach out beyond his own family to help his community. He volunteered for the New Orleans Firefighters' Better Things Program, visiting with school children and talking with them about the dangers of drug and alcohol abuse.

Johnny Lewis sought no recognition or headlines in life; but his tragic death drew deserved attention to his life and contributions to his community.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would ask for a moment of silence in recognition of a dedicated father, gallant firefighter, and a true American hero, Johnny Lewis.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2698, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2698) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see Proceedings of the House of October 3, 1991, at page H7503.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and that I be permitted to include tables, charts, and other extraneous materials on the conference report on H.R. 2698.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, we bring before you today the conference agree-

ment on appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies for fiscal year 1992. This is a bill that is within the 602(b) discretionary allocation, within the congressional budget agreement, and it meets all the requirements of law. There were 241 Senate amendments involving over 600 items that had to be resolved in order to bring you this report.

May I say that this report conforms to all the requirements, and that we are in thorough agreement with our Senate colleagues and those on the House side.

Mr. Speaker, I have often pointed out that agriculture is basic, basic to our economy and basic to our well-being as a nation. I would point out, however, that only a relatively small part of the bill we bring to you today is for agriculture. Over half the bill is for food and consumer programs, \$32.7 billion for food programs, \$1.5 billion for Food for Peace, \$760 million for FDA, and \$474 million for food inspection. In total we recommend \$52,522,621,000 in total budget authority. This is \$57 million less than the budget estimate.

As Members know, we on our committee received testimony from various colleagues, and in connection with this bill we had 32 Members present statements to the committee. Members wrote us over 1,000 letters of recommendation for items in the bill. We had a total of 382 witnesses, and our hearing record totals 6,101 pages. In connection with items in conference, Members wrote us almost 200 additional letters.

Mr. Speaker, we tried to address the concerns of Members of the House and their sections of the country to the extent possible under the ceilings.

Almost 80 percent of the bill is mandatory spending not under the control of the Committee on Appropriations. Only 20 percent of the bill is discretionary domestic spending.

Food stamps have been adjusted upward above the House passed bill by \$1.2 billion. This is made contingent upon getting a budget request from the President, which I trust will be forthcoming.

The agreement funds WIC at \$2.6 billion, \$250 million more than fiscal year 1991.

The bill provides funds for water and sewer, rural housing, REA, for the conservation programs, the ACP, watershed and flood prevention and protection, special grants, urban gardening, and wholesale market development.

The conference agreement provides for a Wetlands Reserve Program of up to 50,000 acres in fiscal year 1992. Any payments under the program will be made by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service as with other cost share programs, and the Soil Conservation Service will determine what

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1992 (H.R. 2698)**

	FY 1991 Enacted	FY 1992 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS						
Production, Processing and Marketing						
Office of the Secretary	1,943,000	2,282,000	2,282,000	2,150,000	2,282,000	+339,000
Office of the Deputy Secretary	477,000	543,000	543,000	514,000	543,000	+66,000
Office of Budget and Program Analysis.....	4,971,000	5,549,000	6,149,000	5,303,000	6,149,000	+1,178,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	544,000	658,000	596,000	576,000	596,000	+82,000
Rental payments (USDA)	49,305,000	51,598,000	50,808,000	51,598,000	51,203,000	+1,888,000
Building operations and maintenance	25,093,000	25,700,000	25,700,000	25,349,000	25,700,000	+807,000
Advisory committees (USDA)	1,407,000	2,038,000	1,918,000	2,038,000	2,038,000	+831,000
Hazardous waste management	24,757,000	29,943,000	27,943,000	24,757,000	29,350,000	+1,563,000
Departmental administration	23,052,000	26,583,000	25,084,000	24,814,000	25,084,000	+2,012,000
Working Capital Fund	3,750,000	-3,750,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	1,095,000	1,310,000	1,307,000	1,285,000	1,307,000	+212,000
Office of Public Affairs	8,442,000	9,093,000	8,925,000	8,925,000	8,925,000	+483,000
Intergovernmental affairs.....	440,000	506,000	468,000	468,000	468,000	+28,000
Total, Office of Public Affairs	8,882,000	9,599,000	9,393,000	9,393,000	9,393,000	+511,000
Office of the Inspector General	55,580,000	65,247,000	62,786,000	60,786,000	62,786,000	+7,208,000
Office of the General Counsel.....	23,130,000	25,865,000	24,554,000	24,554,000	24,554,000	+1,424,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics	529,000	580,000	580,000	563,000	580,000	+51,000
Economic Research Service	54,400,000	62,479,000	59,125,000	56,245,000	58,720,000	+4,320,000
National Agricultural Statistics Service.....	76,451,000	86,866,000	83,401,000	75,447,000	82,601,000	+6,150,000
World Agricultural Outlook Board	2,196,000	2,520,000	2,367,000	2,341,000	2,367,000	+171,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education	512,000	580,000	580,000	544,000	580,000	+48,000
Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization.....	5,000,000	4,500,000	+4,500,000
Agricultural Research Service	621,585,000	680,627,000	658,424,000	629,143,000	658,379,000	+36,794,000
Special fund	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Buildings and facilities	41,016,000	46,100,000	49,473,000	61,818,000	50,584,000	+9,548,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	665,101,000	709,227,000	710,397,000	693,461,000	711,443,000	+46,342,000
Cooperative State Research Service	388,489,000	384,151,000	412,886,000	419,788,000	430,711,000	+42,222,000
(By transfer)	(93,000)	(-93,000)
Buildings and facilities	62,867,000	25,000,000	82,529,000	60,769,000	75,270,000	+12,403,000
Extension Service	398,478,000	410,817,000	417,057,000	412,129,000	419,325,000	+20,847,000
National Agricultural Library.....	16,796,000	17,483,000	17,253,000	17,149,000	17,715,000	+917,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Services.....	497,000	550,000	550,000	535,000	550,000	+53,000
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:						
Salaries and expenses	381,120,000	324,378,000	340,861,000	337,631,000	345,017,000	-36,103,000
Special fund, user fees.....	13,000,000	85,922,000	85,922,000	78,356,000	85,922,000	+72,922,000
Buildings and facilities	21,396,000	23,400,000	21,396,000	20,800,000	21,396,000
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.....	415,516,000	433,700,000	448,299,000	436,887,000	452,335,000	+36,819,000
Food Safety and Inspection Service	448,882,000	473,512,000	473,512,000	473,512,000	473,512,000	+24,630,000
Federal Grain Inspection Service	9,706,000	13,011,000	11,397,000	10,557,000	11,397,000	+1,891,000
Inspection and Weighing Services (limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(37,164,000)	(40,176,000)	(39,383,000)	(40,178,000)	(40,176,000)	(+3,012,000)
Agricultural Cooperative Service	4,864,000	5,140,000	5,840,000	5,140,000	5,840,000	+776,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:						
Marketing Services	47,914,000	68,333,000	58,636,000	42,066,000	56,636,000	+8,722,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(40,182,000)	(50,735,000)	(50,735,000)	(50,735,000)	(50,735,000)	(+10,573,000)
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	8,255,000	10,360,000	10,360,000	10,360,000	10,360,000	+2,105,000
Payments to States and possessions	1,250,000	980,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
Miscellaneous trust funds	2,625,000	1,850,000	600,000	1,850,000	+1,850,000
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service.....	57,419,000	82,298,000	69,896,000	54,276,000	70,066,000	+12,877,000
Office of Transportation.....	2,429,000	-2,429,000
Packers and Stockyards Administration.....	10,887,000	11,359,000	12,009,000	11,859,000	12,009,000	+1,322,000
Total, Production, Processing and Marketing.....	2,839,807,000	2,968,118,000	3,028,501,000	2,989,299,000	3,067,298,000	+227,489,000
Farm Income Stabilization						
Office of the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs	506,000	740,000	551,000	531,000	551,000	+45,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:						
(By transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation).....	(630,406,000)	(769,736,000)	(719,289,000)	(-630,406,000)
Salaries and expenses	46,900,000	719,289,000	719,289,000	+672,389,000

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1992 (H.R. 2698), Continued**

	FY 1991 Enacted	FY 1992 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Export loans		(589,000)	(589,000)	(589,000)	(589,000)	(+ 589,000)
P.L. 480.....		(573,000)	(705,000)	(558,000)	(573,000)	(+ 573,000)
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	(677,306,000)	(770,888,000)	(720,583,000)	(720,436,000)	(720,451,000)	(+ 43,145,000)
Dairy Indemnity program	5,000		5,000	5,000	5,000	
Total, Farm Income Stabilization	(677,817,000)	(771,838,000)	(721,138,000)	(720,872,000)	(721,007,000)	(+ 43,190,000)
CORPORATIONS						
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:						
Administrative and operating expenses.....	340,000,000	322,870,000	322,870,000	322,870,000	322,870,000	-17,130,000
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	337,365,000	308,782,000	221,500,000	280,500,000	280,500,000	-76,865,000
Total, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	677,365,000	631,652,000	544,370,000	583,370,000	583,370,000	-93,995,000
Commodity Credit Corporation:						
Reimbursement for net realized losses.....	5,000,000,000	9,000,000,000	8,450,000,000	8,450,000,000	7,250,000,000	+ 2,250,000,000
Disaster payments.....	1,400,000					-1,400,000
Hazardous waste (limitation on administrative expenses).....		(3,000,000)	(5,000,000)		(3,000,000)	(+ 3,000,000)
Options pilot program (limitation on administrative expenses).....		(1,000,000)				
General Sales Manager (transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(7,803,000)	(5,098,000)	(5,098,000)	(5,098,000)	(5,098,000)	(-2,705,000)
Export loans		(2,731,000)	(2,731,000)	(2,731,000)	(2,731,000)	(+ 2,731,000)
P.L. 480.....		(1,274,000)	(1,274,000)	(1,242,000)	(1,242,000)	(+ 1,242,000)
Subtotal, General Sales Manager	(7,803,000)	(9,103,000)	(9,103,000)	(9,071,000)	(9,071,000)	(+ 1,268,000)
Total, Corporations:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	5,678,785,000	9,631,852,000	8,994,370,000	9,033,370,000	7,833,370,000	+ 2,154,805,000
(By transfer)	(7,803,000)	(5,098,000)	(5,098,000)	(5,098,000)	(5,098,000)	(-2,705,000)
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	8,565,983,000	12,598,510,000	12,740,716,000	12,003,205,000	11,620,511,000	+ 3,054,528,000
(By transfer)	(638,302,000)	(774,834,000)	(5,098,000)	(724,387,000)	(5,098,000)	(-633,204,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(77,326,000)	(94,911,000)	(95,118,000)	(90,911,000)	(93,911,000)	(+ 16,585,000)
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS						
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	520,000	563,000	563,000	543,000	563,000	+ 43,000
Soil Conservation Service:						
Conservation operations	509,056,000	588,604,000	564,129,000	564,129,000	564,129,000	+ 55,073,000
River basin surveys and investigations	12,783,000	10,982,000	13,251,000	13,251,000	13,251,000	+ 468,000
Watershed planning.....	9,176,000	7,291,000	9,545,000	9,545,000	9,545,000	+ 369,000
Watershed and flood prevention operations	185,705,000	152,981,000	205,238,000	205,286,000	205,286,000	+ 19,581,000
Resource conservation and development	29,900,000	23,631,000	32,516,000	31,238,000	32,516,000	+ 2,616,000
Great Plains conservation program.....	24,637,000	25,271,000	25,271,000	25,271,000	25,271,000	+ 634,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service.....	771,257,000	806,740,000	849,950,000	848,998,000	849,978,000	+ 78,721,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:						
Agricultural conservation program.....	190,152,000	178,024,000	194,435,000	193,852,000	194,435,000	+ 4,283,000
Water quality incentives program.....		5,000,000	3,500,000			
Forestry incentives program.....	12,446,000	12,446,000	12,446,000	12,446,000	12,446,000	
Water bank program.....	13,620,000	10,935,000	18,820,000	18,820,000	18,820,000	+ 5,000,000
Emergency conservation program.....	10,000,000		10,000,000		8,000,000	-4,000,000
Colorado River Basin salinity control program	14,783,000	14,783,000	14,783,000	14,783,000	14,783,000	
Conservation reserve program	1,314,926,000	1,642,780,000	1,642,760,000	1,611,277,000	1,611,277,000	+ 296,351,000
Wetlands reserve program		124,350,000		91,000,000	46,357,000	+ 46,357,000
Total, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	1,555,927,000	1,988,298,000	1,896,544,000	1,941,778,000	1,903,918,000	+ 347,991,000
Total, title II, Conservation Programs, new budget (obligational) authority	2,327,704,000	2,797,601,000	2,747,057,000	2,791,019,000	2,754,456,000	+ 426,755,000
TITLE III - FARMERS HOME AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS						
Office of the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development.....	530,000	721,000	572,000	552,000	572,000	+ 42,000
Farmers Home Administration:						
Rural Housing Insurance Fund:						
Loan authorizations:						
Low-income housing (sec. 502)	(1,226,451,000)	(559,000,000)	(1,226,451,000)	(1,256,451,000)	(1,245,000,000)	(+ 18,549,000)
Unsubsidized direct.....	(50,000,000)		(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(70,000,000)	(347,000,000)	(350,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(329,500,000)	(+ 259,500,000)
Subsidized guaranteed	(30,000,000)	(347,000,000)				(-30,000,000)
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(11,330,000)	(11,100,000)	(11,330,000)	(11,330,000)	(11,330,000)	

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1992 (H.R. 2698), Continued**

	FY 1991 Enacted	FY 1992 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Farm labor (sec. 514)	(16,300,000)	(16,250,000)	(16,300,000)	(16,300,000)	(16,300,000)	
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(573,900,000)	(341,000,000)	(573,900,000)	(573,900,000)	(573,900,000)	
Site loans	(600,000)		(600,000)	(600,000)	(600,000)	
Credit sales of acquired property		(284,000,000)	(284,000,000)		(250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(1,978,581,000)	(1,905,350,000)	(2,512,581,000)	(2,008,581,000)	(2,478,630,000)	(+498,049,000)
Loan subsidies:						
Single family (sec. 502):						
Direct		126,578,000	312,538,000	286,461,000	283,888,000	+263,888,000
Guaranteed		96,880,000	12,360,000	1,130,000	3,723,000	+3,723,000
Housing repair (sec. 504)		4,887,000	5,280,000	4,869,000	4,869,000	+4,869,000
Farm labor (sec. 514)		8,975,000	8,538,000	9,002,000	9,002,000	+9,002,000
Rental housing (sec. 515)		147,857,000	268,585,000	248,499,000	248,499,000	+248,499,000
Site loans				9,000	9,000	+9,000
Credit sales of acquired property		41,724,000	40,612,000		36,725,000	+36,725,000
Total, Loan subsidies		426,511,000	648,909,000	550,100,000	586,825,000	+586,825,000
RHIF Salaries and expenses		425,173,000	425,173,000	428,748,000	427,111,000	+427,111,000
Collection and servicing contracts (limitation on obligations)	(10,000,000)					(-10,000,000)
Rent supplement	308,100,000	289,800,000	308,100,000	319,900,000	319,900,000	+11,800,000
Reimbursement for interest and other losses	2,667,186,000					-2,667,186,000
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund:						
New budget (obligational) authority	2,975,286,000	1,121,484,000	1,382,182,000	1,298,746,000	1,333,636,000	-1,641,450,000
(Loan authorization)	(1,978,581,000)	(1,905,350,000)	(2,512,581,000)	(2,008,581,000)	(2,478,630,000)	(+498,049,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(10,000,000)					(-10,000,000)
Self-Help Housing Land Development Fund:						
Loan authorization	(500,000)		(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	
Loan subsidy				43,000	43,000	+43,000
Administrative expenses				21,000	21,000	+21,000
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund:						
Loan authorizations:						
Farm ownership loans:						
Direct	(46,500,000)	(37,000,000)	(46,500,000)	(87,000,000)	(66,750,000)	(+20,250,000)
Guaranteed	(509,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(509,000,000)	(774,000,000)	(488,750,000)	(-20,250,000)
Subtotal	(555,500,000)	(237,000,000)	(555,500,000)	(861,000,000)	(555,500,000)	
Operating loans:						
Direct	(900,000,000)	(410,000,000)	(900,000,000)	(740,000,000)	(850,000,000)	(-50,000,000)
Guaranteed	(2,600,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,600,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,800,000,000)	(-800,000,000)
Guaranteed subsidized		(584,000,000)		(182,140,000)	(182,140,000)	(+182,140,000)
Subtotal	(3,500,000,000)	(2,974,000,000)	(3,500,000,000)	(1,922,140,000)	(2,832,140,000)	(-667,860,000)
Soil and water loans:						
Direct	(5,500,000)		(5,500,000)	(5,500,000)	(5,500,000)	
Guaranteed	(1,500,000)		(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	
Subtotal	(7,000,000)		(7,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(7,000,000)	
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(1,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	
Emergency disaster loans	(600,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	
Watershed and flood prevention	(4,000,000)		(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	
Resource conservation loans	(600,000)		(600,000)	(600,000)	(600,000)	
Credit sales of acquired property		(250,000,000)	(250,000,000)		(200,000,000)	(+200,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(4,668,100,000)	(3,488,000,000)	(4,918,100,000)	(3,395,740,000)	(4,200,240,000)	(-467,860,000)
Loan subsidies:						
Farm ownership:						
Direct		9,144,000	18,089,000	19,865,000	15,241,000	+15,241,000
Guaranteed		25,834,000	15,270,000	38,870,000	24,545,000	+24,545,000
Farm operating:						
Direct		66,952,000	189,000,000	113,587,000	130,472,000	+130,472,000
Guaranteed		72,509,000	31,200,000	12,475,000	22,455,000	+22,455,000
Guaranteed subsidized				15,350,000	15,350,000	+15,350,000
Soil and water loans:						
Direct			2,585,000	456,000	456,000	+456,000
Guaranteed			30,000	43,000	43,000	+43,000
Indian tribe land acquisition		505,000	1,000,000	253,000	253,000	+253,000
Emergency disaster		5,065,000	32,100,000	121,560,000	55,000,000	+55,000,000
Watershed and flood prevention loans			2,182,000	1,000	1,000	+1,000
Resource conservation				1,000	1,000	+1,000
Credit sales of acquired property		74,851,000	117,500,000		59,880,000	+59,880,000
Total, Loan subsidies		254,860,000	406,936,000	322,461,000	323,697,000	+323,697,000
ACIF salaries and expenses		230,179,000	230,179,000	229,557,000	230,179,000	+230,179,000
State mediation program	3,750,000	2,000,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1992 (H.R. 2698), Continued**

	FY 1991 Enacted	FY 1992 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Reimbursement for interest and other losses.....	8,014,358,000					-8,014,358,000
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	6,018,106,000	487,038,000	642,865,000	555,768,000	557,626,000	-5,480,480,000
(Loan authorization).....	(4,668,100,000)	(3,488,000,000)	(4,918,100,000)	(3,395,740,000)	(4,200,240,000)	(-467,880,000)
Rural Development Insurance Fund:						
Loan authorizations:						
Water and sewer facility loans:						
Direct.....	(500,000,000)	(425,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(+100,000,000)
Guaranteed.....	(35,000,000)		(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	
Subtotal.....	(535,000,000)	(425,000,000)	(635,000,000)	(535,000,000)	(635,000,000)	(+100,000,000)
Community facility loans:						
Direct.....	(100,000,000)	(45,700,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	
Guaranteed.....	(25,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	
Subtotal.....	(125,000,000)	(95,700,000)	(125,000,000)	(125,000,000)	(125,000,000)	
Industrial development loans:						
Guaranteed.....	(100,000,000)	(95,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	
Total, loan authorizations.....	(760,000,000)	(615,700,000)	(860,000,000)	(760,000,000)	(860,000,000)	(+100,000,000)
Loan subsidies:						
Water and sewer:						
Direct.....		63,678,000	98,000,000	74,900,000	89,880,000	+89,880,000
Guaranteed.....			840,000	630,000	630,000	+630,000
Community facility:						
Direct.....		5,490,000	14,000,000	12,011,000	12,011,000	+12,011,000
Guaranteed.....		1,016,000	325,000	508,000	508,000	+508,000
Industrial development.....		5,873,000	7,920,000	5,870,000	5,870,000	+5,870,000
Total, Loan subsidies.....		75,757,000	119,085,000	93,919,000	108,899,000	+108,899,000
RDIF salaries and expenses.....		54,906,000	54,906,000	52,286,000	52,286,000	+52,286,000
Reimbursement for interest and other losses.....	1,868,160,000					-1,868,160,000
Total, Rural Development Insurance Fund:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	1,868,160,000	130,683,000	173,991,000	146,205,000	161,185,000	-1,504,975,000
(Loan authorization).....	(760,000,000)	(615,700,000)	(860,000,000)	(760,000,000)	(860,000,000)	(+100,000,000)
Rural Development Loan Fund:						
(Loan authorization).....	(32,500,000)	(35,000,000)	(32,500,000)	(32,500,000)	(32,500,000)	
Appropriation.....	30,500,000					-30,500,000
Loan subsidy.....		17,510,000	22,050,000	16,260,000	16,260,000	+16,260,000
RDLF Salaries and expenses.....		689,000	689,000	656,000	689,000	+689,000
Rural water and waste disposal grants.....	300,000,000	225,000,000	350,000,000	350,000,000	350,000,000	+50,000,000
Very low-income housing repair grants.....	12,500,000	5,000,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	
Rural housing for domestic farm labor.....	11,000,000	5,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	
Mutual and self-help housing.....	8,750,000		8,750,000	8,750,000	8,750,000	
Supervisory and technical assistance grants.....			2,500,000		2,500,000	+2,500,000
Rural community fire protection grants.....	3,500,000		3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	
Compensation for construction defects.....	500,000		500,000	500,000	500,000	
Rural rental assistance payments (voucher program).....		189,928,000				
Rural housing preservation grants.....	23,000,000	10,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	
Rural development grants.....	20,750,000	20,000,000	20,750,000	20,750,000	20,750,000	
Solid waste management grants.....	1,500,000		1,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	+1,500,000
Emergency community water assistance grants.....	10,000,000			10,000,000	10,000,000	
Subtotal, grants and payments.....	391,500,000	454,928,000	434,000,000	443,000,000	445,500,000	+54,000,000
Office of the Administrator.....	600,000		600,000	600,000	600,000	
Salaries and expenses.....	439,854,000	28,548,000	37,637,000	38,959,000	38,298,000	-401,556,000
Transfer from loan accounts.....	4,000,000					-4,000,000
Transfer from revolving fund.....	271,673,000					-271,673,000
Loan administrative expenses:						
RHIF.....		(425,173,000)	(425,173,000)	(428,748,000)	(427,111,000)	(+427,111,000)
ACIF.....		(230,179,000)	(230,179,000)	(229,557,000)	(230,179,000)	(+230,179,000)
RDIF.....		(54,906,000)	(54,906,000)	(52,286,000)	(52,286,000)	(+52,286,000)
RDLF.....		(689,000)	(689,000)	(656,000)	(689,000)	(+689,000)
Self-Help HLDF.....				(21,000)	(21,000)	(+21,000)
Total, salaries and expenses.....	(715,527,000)	(737,495,000)	(748,584,000)	(750,225,000)	(748,584,000)	(+33,057,000)
Total, Farmers Home Administration:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	11,797,679,000	2,238,861,000	2,894,014,000	2,500,258,000	2,554,056,000	-8,243,621,000
(Loan authorization).....	(7,439,881,000)	(6,044,050,000)	(8,323,681,000)	(6,197,321,000)	(7,569,870,000)	(+130,188,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(10,000,000)					(-10,000,000)

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1992 (H.R. 2698), Continued**

	FY 1991 Enacted	FY 1992 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Rural Development Administration:						
Salaries and expenses.....		13,722,000				
Rural Electrification Administration:						
Rural electrification and telephone loans program account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Direct loans:						
Electric.....	(622,050,000)	(504,958,000)	(622,050,000)	(622,050,000)	(622,050,000)	
Telephone.....	(239,250,000)	(194,042,000)	(239,250,000)	(239,250,000)	(239,250,000)	
Subtotal.....	(861,300,000)	(698,999,000)	(861,300,000)	(861,300,000)	(861,300,000)	
FFB loans:						
Electric.....	(813,450,000)		(813,450,000)	(813,450,000)	(813,450,000)	
Telephone.....	(119,625,000)		(119,625,000)	(119,625,000)	(119,625,000)	
Subtotal.....	(933,075,000)		(933,075,000)	(933,075,000)	(933,075,000)	
Guaranteed loans:						
Electric.....		(169,042,000)	(169,042,000)			
Telephone.....		(64,958,000)	(64,958,000)			
Subtotal.....		(234,000,000)	(234,000,000)			
Modified direct loans.....		(493,700,000)	(493,700,000)	(493,700,000)	(493,700,000)	(+493,700,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(1,794,375,000)	(1,426,700,000)	(2,522,075,000)	(2,288,075,000)	(2,288,075,000)	(+493,700,000)
Loan subsidies:						
Direct loans:						
Electric.....		95,237,000	166,087,000	117,319,000	117,319,000	+117,319,000
Telephone.....		32,629,000	63,880,000	40,290,000	40,290,000	+40,290,000
Guaranteed loans:						
Electric.....		62,000	62,000			
Telephone.....		43,000	43,000			
FFB Loans.....			8,531,000	14,152,000	14,152,000	+14,152,000
Total, Loan subsidies.....		127,971,000	236,603,000	171,761,000	171,761,000	+171,761,000
RETRF salaries and expenses.....		29,419,000	29,183,000	28,311,000	29,163,000	+29,163,000
Reimbursement to the rural electrification and telephone loans program account.....	266,603,000					-266,603,000
Total, Rural electrification and telephone loans program account:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	266,603,000	157,390,000	265,766,000	200,072,000	200,924,000	-65,679,000
(Loan authorization).....	(1,794,375,000)	(1,426,700,000)	(2,522,075,000)	(2,288,075,000)	(2,288,075,000)	(+493,700,000)
Rural telephone bank program account.....	28,710,000					-28,710,000
Direct loans (limitation on obligations).....	(177,045,000)	(125,000,000)	(177,045,000)	(177,045,000)	(177,045,000)	
Direct loan subsidy.....		2,563,000	11,331,000	3,629,000	3,629,000	+3,629,000
RTB salaries and expenses.....	8,632,000	8,632,000	8,632,000	8,392,000	8,632,000	+8,632,000
Rural communication development fund.....	1,264,000	1,264,000	1,264,000			-1,264,000
Distance Learning and Medical Lnk Programs.....			5,000,000		5,000,000	+5,000,000
Rural economic development subaccount:						
Direct loan appropriation.....	5,000,000					-5,000,000
Direct loans (limitation on obligations).....		(4,800,000)	(5,000,000)	(8,406,000)	(8,406,000)	(+8,406,000)
Direct subsidy.....		1,454,000	1,700,000	2,546,000	2,546,000	+2,546,000
Office of the Administrator.....	229,000		256,000	243,000	243,000	+14,000
Salaries and expenses.....	32,826,000					-32,826,000
Electric and telephone loans.....		(29,419,000)	(29,183,000)	(28,311,000)	(29,163,000)	(+29,163,000)
Rural telephone bank program account.....		(8,632,000)	(8,632,000)	(8,392,000)	(8,632,000)	(+8,632,000)
Subtotal.....	(32,826,000)	(38,051,000)	(37,795,000)	(36,703,000)	(37,795,000)	(+4,969,000)
Total, Rural Electrification Administration:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	334,632,000	171,303,000	293,949,000	214,882,000	220,974,000	-113,656,000
(Loan authorization).....	(1,794,375,000)	(1,426,700,000)	(2,522,075,000)	(2,288,075,000)	(2,288,075,000)	(+493,700,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(177,045,000)	(129,800,000)	(182,045,000)	(185,451,000)	(185,451,000)	(+8,406,000)
Total, title III, Rural Development Programs:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	12,132,841,000	2,424,607,000	2,988,535,000	2,715,892,000	2,775,804,000	-9,357,237,000
(Loan authorization).....	(9,234,056,000)	(7,470,750,000)	(10,845,756,000)	(8,485,398,000)	(9,857,945,000)	(+623,889,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(187,045,000)	(129,800,000)	(182,045,000)	(185,451,000)	(185,451,000)	(-1,594,000)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS						
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services.....	485,000	574,000	542,000	522,000	542,000	+57,000

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1992 (H.R. 2698), Continued**

	FY 1991 Enacted	FY 1992 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Food and Nutrition Service:						
Child nutrition programs	880,898,000	1,389,711,000	1,392,294,000	1,393,851,000	1,393,223,000	+512,525,000
Transfer from section 32	4,896,501,000	4,675,092,000	4,675,092,000	4,675,092,000	4,675,092,000	-21,409,000
Total, Child nutrition programs	5,577,199,000	6,064,803,000	6,067,386,000	6,068,743,000	6,068,315,000	+491,118,000
Special milk program	19,268,000	23,011,000	23,011,000	23,011,000	23,011,000	+3,743,000
Special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	2,350,000,000	2,573,400,000	2,600,000,000	2,573,400,000	2,600,000,000	+250,000,000
Commodity supplemental food program	81,928,000	85,369,000	91,284,000	88,318,000	90,000,000	+8,072,000
Food stamp program:						
Expenses	17,453,168,000	19,649,975,000	19,649,975,000	19,649,975,000	20,849,975,000	+3,396,807,000
Subject to budget request	2,123,513,000	2,500,000,000	1,500,000,000	3,000,000,000	1,500,000,000	-823,513,000
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico	983,395,000	1,013,000,000	1,002,175,000	1,002,175,000	1,002,175,000	+38,780,000
Cattle tick eradication	10,825,000	10,825,000	10,825,000	10,825,000
Total, Food stamp program	20,550,901,000	23,162,975,000	22,162,975,000	23,662,975,000	23,362,975,000	+2,812,074,000
Food donations programs for selected groups:						
Needy family program	78,241,000	81,527,000	81,945,000	82,108,000	81,945,000	+3,704,000
Elderly feeding program	149,897,000	151,492,000	151,492,000	143,035,000	151,492,000	+1,595,000
Subtotal	228,138,000	233,019,000	233,437,000	225,143,000	233,437,000	+5,299,000
Soup kitchens	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
Total, Food donations programs	260,138,000	265,019,000	265,437,000	257,143,000	265,437,000	+5,299,000
The emergency food assistance program	50,000,000	27,000,000	50,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	-5,000,000
Commodity purchases - TEFAP	120,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000
Total, The emergency food assistance program	170,000,000	147,000,000	170,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000	-5,000,000
Food program administration	96,778,000	113,856,000	101,617,000	105,453,000	103,535,000	+6,757,000
Total, Food and Nutrition Service	29,108,212,000	32,435,433,000	31,481,710,000	32,944,043,000	32,678,273,000	+3,572,081,000
Human Nutrition Information Service						
	9,923,000	12,654,000	11,255,000	9,788,000	10,788,000	+885,000
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs, new budget (obligational) authority	29,118,620,000	32,448,661,000	31,483,507,000	32,954,353,000	32,689,603,000	+3,572,983,000
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS						
Foreign Agricultural Service						
Ameri Flora '92 Exposition	105,048,000	109,523,000	110,023,000	106,626,000	110,023,000	+4,975,000
	500,000	500,000	500,000
Public Law 480:						
Title I - Credit sales:						
Program level	(880,000,000)	(463,800,000)	(570,800,000)	(563,804,000)	(563,804,000)	(-316,198,000)
Direct loans	(806,400,000)	(417,420,000)	(513,800,000)	(511,619,000)	(511,619,000)	(-294,781,000)
Ocean freight differential	(73,600,000)	(-73,600,000)
Appropriation	314,853,000	-314,853,000
Ocean freight differential	46,380,000	57,000,000	52,185,000	52,185,000	+52,185,000
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:						
Program level	(696,000,000)	(627,000,000)	(698,000,000)	(710,087,000)	(710,087,000)	(+14,087,000)
Appropriation	696,000,000	627,000,000	698,000,000	710,087,000	710,087,000	+14,087,000
Title III - Commodity grants:						
Program level	(309,200,000)	(254,959,000)	(333,809,000)	(333,594,000)	(+333,594,000)
Appropriation	309,200,000	254,959,000	333,809,000	333,594,000	+333,594,000
Loan subsidies	316,826,000	389,979,000	388,319,000	388,319,000	+388,319,000
Debt restructuring	668,000	668,000
Salaries and expenses:						
General Sales Manager	1,274,000	1,274,000	1,242,000	1,242,000	+1,242,000
ASCS	573,000	705,000	558,000	573,000	+573,000
Subtotal	1,847,000	1,979,000	1,800,000	1,815,000	+1,815,000
Total, Public Law 480:						
Program level	(1,576,000,000)	(1,400,000,000)	(1,521,759,000)	(1,807,500,000)	(1,807,485,000)	(+31,485,000)
Appropriation	1,010,853,000	1,301,921,000	1,400,585,000	1,488,000,000	1,488,000,000	+475,147,000
OCC Export Loans:						
Loan guarantees:						
Short-term export credit	(5,000,000,000)	(5,000,000,000)	(5,000,000,000)	(5,000,000,000)	(5,000,000,000)
Intermediate export credit	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)
Emerging democracies export credit	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(+200,000,000)
Loan subsidy	155,524,000	155,524,000	155,524,000	155,524,000	+155,524,000

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1992 (H.R. 2698), Continued**

	FY 1991 Enacted	FY 1992 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):						
General Sales Manager.....		2,731,000	2,731,000	1,876,000	2,731,000	+2,731,000
ASCS		589,000	589,000	589,000	589,000	+589,000
Subtotal		158,844,000	158,844,000	157,989,000	158,844,000	+158,844,000
Office of International Cooperation and Development.....	6,879,000	6,872,000	7,392,000	7,247,000	7,247,000	+388,000
Scientific activities overseas (foreign currency program)	1,082,000		1,082,000			-1,082,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)					(1,082,000)	(+1,082,000)
Total, title V, International Programs, new budget (obligational) authority.....	1,124,342,000	1,578,980,000	1,878,408,000	1,757,862,000	1,782,614,000	+638,272,000
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION						
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Food and Drug Administration						
Salaries and expenses	658,519,000	537,104,000	725,982,000	704,734,000	725,982,000	+89,443,000
Buildings and facilities	8,350,000	10,000,000	10,350,000	8,350,000	8,350,000	
Rental payments	25,612,000	25,612,000	25,612,000	25,612,000	25,612,000	
Total, Food and Drug Administration.....	690,481,000	572,716,000	781,924,000	738,696,000	759,924,000	+89,443,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
Financial Management Service:						
Payments to the farm credit system financial assistance corporation	90,000,000	112,806,000	112,806,000	112,806,000	112,806,000	+22,806,000
Farm Credit System Assistance Board (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(2,017,000)	(2,175,000)	(2,175,000)	(2,175,000)	(2,175,000)	(+158,000)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Commodity Futures Trading Commission.....	43,960,000	48,285,000	47,300,000	46,597,000	47,300,000	+3,340,000
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(40,888,000)	(43,276,000)	(40,290,000)	(40,290,000)	(40,290,000)	(-808,000)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies: New budget (obligational) authority.....	824,441,000	733,607,000	921,830,000	897,899,000	919,830,000	+95,389,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(42,915,000)	(45,451,000)	(42,485,000)	(42,485,000)	(42,485,000)	(-450,000)
RECAPITULATION						
Grand Total:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	54,091,931,000	52,579,946,000	52,570,051,000	53,120,030,000	52,522,621,000	-1,589,310,000
(By transfer)	(638,302,000)	(774,834,000)	(5,098,000)	(724,387,000)	(5,098,000)	(-633,204,000)
(Loan authorization)	(14,734,056,000)	(13,170,750,000)	(16,545,756,000)	(14,185,396,000)	(15,557,945,000)	(+823,889,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(120,241,000)	(140,362,000)	(137,583,000)	(133,376,000)	(137,438,000)	(+17,197,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(187,045,000)	(129,800,000)	(182,045,000)	(185,451,000)	(185,451,000)	(-1,594,000)
Title I - Agricultural programs	8,585,983,000	12,598,510,000	12,740,716,000	12,003,205,000	11,820,511,000	+3,054,528,000
Title II - Conservation programs	2,327,704,000	2,797,601,000	2,747,057,000	2,791,019,000	2,754,459,000	+426,755,000
Title III - Farmers Home and Rural development programs.....	12,132,841,000	2,424,607,000	2,988,535,000	2,715,882,000	2,775,604,000	-9,357,237,000
Title IV - Domestic food programs.....	29,116,820,000	32,448,981,000	31,493,507,000	32,954,353,000	32,889,603,000	+3,572,983,000
Title V - Foreign assistance and related programs	1,124,342,000	1,578,980,000	1,878,406,000	1,757,862,000	1,782,614,000	+638,272,000
Title VI - Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration	824,441,000	733,607,000	921,830,000	897,899,000	919,830,000	+95,389,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority.....	54,091,931,000	52,579,946,000	52,570,051,000	53,120,030,000	52,522,621,000	-1,589,310,000

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

Mr. Speaker, at the outset of today's deliberations, I want to compliment the chairman of our committee and subcommittee—the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]—and the other members of the subcommittee, and the staff for their hard work and untiring efforts to produce this bill.

This bill comes in at \$52.5 billion in budget authority. However, because of the large mandated entitlement programs in the bill, such as the Food

Stamp Program, only \$12.3 billion of our total budget authority is in discretionary spending.

Given all of the House appropriations subcommittees' tight budget allocations this year, this bill, in many ways, represents our best efforts.

Members of this distinguished body do not need to hold or heed any reservations in supporting this bill.

This bill provides important Federal support for our farmers, consumers and agricultural researchers.

Briefly, I would like to stress some major highlights in this bill.

On the farmer's side, this bill provides funding for several rural economic development programs and continues to assist farmers in the development and enhancement of export markets.

On the research side, this bill includes \$97.5 million for the President's National Research Initiative Competitive Grant Program, an increase of \$26 million over last year's funding level. Major research programs in the areas of water quality, air quality, the environment and nonpoint source pollution are also funded in the bill.

On the consumer side, this bill provides \$2.6 billion for the Woman, Infants and Children [WIC] Program, an increase of \$250 million above last year's level. The conferees accepted the funding level recommended by our distinguished body.

In closing, I appreciate working with the chairman, my fellow colleagues and the administration in achieving a final version of this bill which all sides can proudly support.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and urge my colleagues to support it. I appreciate and value the leadership of our chairman, Mr. WHITTEN, whose contributions to American agriculture span 50 years in Congress. I also appreciate the cooperation of our ranking Republican on the subcommittee, Mr. SKEEN. It is a privilege to serve on this subcommittee where there is genuine bipartisan support for the important programs funded by this bill.

Each year the rural development, agriculture and related agencies bill appropriates what is necessary to fund the operations of the Department of Agriculture. These programs are important to both farmers and consumers. Sustaining the producers, a shrinking portion of our population, is a vital goal of this legislation. However, more than half the funds we appropriate are devoted to feeding, nutrition, public health and safety, and other programs that are of direct benefit to consumers. Many of these programs serve some of the most vulnerable people in our society: the children, the elderly, and the poor. This conference report funds the Food and Drug Administration, rural housing programs, water and sewer systems in rural communities, and vital research to assure that our Nation will be able to meet our needs for fiber and safe, wholesome food in the future.

Mr. Speaker, there are a wide array of essential programs in this bill, but I would like to take special note of the WIC program, the special supplemental food program for women, infants and children. As my colleagues know, this nutrition program is targeted at pregnant women with limited incomes and their children under age 6 who are at nutritional risk. Numerous independent studies have confirmed through the years that the supplemental food packages which are provided at modest cost are extraordinarily effective in reducing infant mortality rates, preventing mental retardation, and enhancing the health of vulnerable children. These studies have also demonstrated that for every \$1 invested in WIC there is a savings to taxpayers of \$3 in medical

costs that would have otherwise been incurred in programs like Medicaid.

For this reason, the WIC Program has enjoyed unusually strong bipartisan support. Even during the last decade, when many domestic programs were being cut or eliminated, our committee not only protected WIC, but extended its reach to serve more women and children. In 1980, we served 2.2 million people. In this conference report, we are providing \$2.6 billion for fiscal year 1992, which will serve approximately 5.1 million people. This is an increase of \$250 million over fiscal year 1991. It will not only maintain current services, but provide an additional \$150 million for expansion.

If the Congress were not subject to significant budget constraints, I am confident that we would be recommending even larger appropriations for WIC. It is one of the most cost-effective programs we fund, and even with the increases of the last 10 years, more than \$1.2 billion over the President's requests, we are still reaching only 55 percent of the eligible population. I hope we can do better in the future.

I am also pleased that the conferees noted the work of the Department of Agriculture in reviewing the WIC food package without recommending revisions in the package or in the standards used to approve foods for the package. This evaluation is appropriately within the Department's purview and should not be prejudged by committees of Congress. We look forward to receiving the Department's status report by the end of 1991 on the cereal portion of the package.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report promotes the interests of American producers and consumers alike, while at the same time keeping faith with the reality of the budget limitations under which we must operate. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE].

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] for yielding time to me, and, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise in support of this conference report.

This is a fine work product. It represents an excellent job done by my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the full committee and of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. The same is true of my good friend, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], who is the ranking member of this subcommittee and who works so hard and who is such a valuable asset to the Appropriations Committee.

Despite the tremendous differences between the House and the Senate, the

chairman, the ranking member, and the members of the subcommittee have brought back a bill that is very balanced and very fair, and I am pleased to recommend it.

Total spending for the bill is under the 602(b) budget allocations, and I have no indication that the President would not sign it.

I am especially pleased that the conferees have agreed to approve \$329.5 million for the section 502 Rural Housing Loan Guarantee program. That will make it possible for roughly 7,000 low- and moderate-income families living in rural parts of America to achieve the American dream of home ownership. I am very grateful to my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and their colleagues for including this as part of the act.

I want to express my appreciation as well, as we fund this program nationally for the first time, to my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], and to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE], and also two members from my own State who played an active role on the Housing Subcommittee in getting this passed, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI], and as well the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] who was also the original author of the section 502 demonstration program.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that we have not found a way to deal with the problems of disaster assistance to agriculture either in the conference report or in some other way at this juncture. A reasonable and necessary amount of funding for crop loss payments due to severe drought and other natural disasters should be considered. However, such added costs ought to be included in a reasonable way that does not violate the budget agreement, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will soon be able to work together in a cooperative manner to find a way to respond to this problem which is acceptable to the administration and which will get signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fine conference report. It is an excellent work product. It benefits all American farmers and consumers in so many important ways, and I do not hesitate to recommend its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment and elaborate on a few additional items of importance which are addressed by the conference report.

The administration had previously objected to the failure of the House to provide any funds to implement the Wetlands Reserve Program administered by USDA's Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service. The Senate provided \$91 million for this

program in fiscal year 1992 and the conference report in good spirit of compromise approves \$46.357 million for reservation of a designated 50,000 acres of wetlands. In my view this should be very helpful in overcoming one of the main problems identified by the administration.

I am pleased that the conferees were able to find sufficient resources to pay for an overall increase for the USDA Soil Conservation Service of \$849.950 million, \$41 million more than the budget request, however I am disappointed that the amount made available for the actual soil conservation operations account falls short by \$23 million of the amount needed and requested in the President's budget. These conservation programs make important contributions for the improvement of the environment and enhance agricultural productivity.

One of our most efficient domestic food assistance programs is the food program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] Program. And it is gratifying for me to see that the highest House passed funding level of \$2.6 billion has been included.

I am also in support of the \$3 million which is recommended to fund the very successful farmers market coupon demonstration project.

In closing let me mention two other important matters of concern articulated by the administration, which have been accommodated in the conference agreements. The administration expressed a desire to be provided some flexibility and discretion in determining the costs for modifying loans or loan guarantees under the Commodity Credit Corporation Export Loan Program account. The House bill capped this item at \$155.524 million, while the Senate provided "such sums as necessary," preferred by the administration. We have been able to work this out in conference satisfactory to the administration by accepting the Senate language.

Another administration concern which has hopefully been resolved, relating to several Senate limitations and restrictions imposed on the use of funds for The Food and Drug Administration [FDA] salaries and expenses. The Senate version of the bill included delayed obligations and a requirement for the President to designate a portion of the funds for FDA salaries and expenses as emergency spending under the Budget Act. The conferees have agreed to remove these restrictions and to provide \$725.962 million for FDA salaries and expenses for fiscal year 1992.

I am firmly convinced that this conference report making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies is a good bill and deserves our support. I recommend a "yea" vote.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the chairman of the committee for his work in producing the bill before us today.

Before we vote on this bill, I would like to engage the chairman of the committee in a brief colloquy with respect to one program which is funded in this bill, the Distance Learning and Medical Link Program, aimed at enhancing advanced telecommunications capabilities of local schools in rural areas, rural medical facilities, and rural communities.

The legislative history indicates that organizations such as local schools, universities, rural medical facilities, telecommunications providers, regional education laboratories, and public television stations would all be expected to participate and compete for funds under this program.

Page 44 of the conference report notes the work of the Satellite Education Resources Consortium and urges the Rural Electrification Administration to work closely with the extension service and to participate with this consortium and the Agricultural Satellite Corporation to make affordable advanced communications available to rural schools and communities.

□ 1540

While the work of these organizations is, I am sure, laudable, am I correct in my understanding that the \$5 million for the Distance Learning and Medical Link Program included in this bill is not in any way earmarked by the conference report language, and that REA is to administer the program in accordance with the authorizing legislation and the House Committee on Appropriations report language, so that other groups, in addition to SERC and Agsat may apply for support under this program?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, we thought it well to mention this program here because it is important, but it is not restrictive. It is open to everybody.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding. I also thank the gentleman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] for letting me step in a little bit here.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be the person to throw cold water on this friendly discussion that is taking place right now, but there does happen to be some pork in this bill. There is \$500,000 that is proposed for a new 1-mile road at the University of North Dakota. I read about this yesterday in Jack Anderson's column, which I include for the RECORD.

SENATOR BURDICK'S PORK-BARREL WAYS

(By Jack Anderson and Dale Van Atta)

FARGO, ND.—In tight budget times, one of the Senate's kings of pork is at it again. Sen-

Quentin N. Burdick (D-N.D.) is building a "golden mile" road here with federal money. He says it's essential for access to some U.S. Agriculture Department labs, but the lab employees say they don't need it.

The people who do need it are the thousands of North Dakota State University football fans who will someday travel Burdick's road to reach their new 17,000-seat stadium. You may never use the road, but you'll pay for it, and Burdick will take credit for it with the voters back home.

He won his last election here in 1988 by emphasizing his clout in Congress. So many federal dollars have flowed into North Dakota as a result of Burdick's finagling that last year North Dakota ranked third in the amount of federal funds received per person.

This is the same Burdick who tried to turn Lawrence Welk's boyhood home into a national shrine with \$500,000 in Agriculture Department funds. You have to hand it to Burdick, chairman of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee on agriculture. It takes some creativity to restore a band leader's house or build an access road to a football stadium and call it "agriculture."

The site of the latest Burdick sleight of hand is a stretch of gravel road through a sunflower field on the west side of the North Dakota State University campus. Along Burdick's mile are pieces of bacon that the senator has already brought home—Agriculture Department research labs on the campus. Burdick says they need a paved road to connect them. But those who are naturally suspicious of Burdick's motives—us included—can't help but notice that the road will relieve congestion on the campus and will be the most convenient way to reach the new Fagodome stadium.

Some university officials are annoyed about the half-baked quality of Burdick's pork. They had originally asked for \$2 million for the mile-long road. Burdick slipped the project into an agricultural appropriations bill, but for only \$500,000. He must have known there was only \$500,000. He must have known there was only so much piggishness that his fellow senators would tolerate on a single project.

However, it's a mystery to us how any of Burdick's fellow senators would have caught him anyway. He labeled the expense "facilities completion."

We talked to several of the Agriculture Department researchers and all of them said they hadn't complained about the gravel road that currently links their labs—which, by the way, do some award-winning research.

Expansion of the university means that the road will be useful in the future, but the idea of taxpayers around the country handing over hundreds of thousands of dollars to connect a few Ag labs is ludicrous.

And it proves that Burdick, 83, is willing to do anything to ingratiate himself with the folks back home, if it will get him reelected. He has already informed North Dakotans that he will run again in 1994 and serve in the Senate until 2000 when he will be 92 years old.

Mr. Speaker, this project is labeled as a "facility completion." Its official purpose is to connect the agricultural research labs at North Dakota State University. However, the real purpose of it is to construct a road to the football stadium.

It is a pure pork barrel project. They need \$2 million for it, and they are going to get \$500,000 from this bill. It is pure and unadulterated pork.

If they want a road from one place to the football stadium, they have every right to build that road. But I do not think the people of California, the people of Indiana, or the people of New York want to be spending \$500,000 of their taxpayer money for that purpose. This is pork, and I once again say to Members, if we are ever going to get control of this deficit, we are going to have to stop these pork barrel projects.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2698, the Agricultural appropriations bill for fiscal 1992. This conference report represents a very responsible resolution of differences between the bill that we passed here in the House, and the one passed by the other body. It is not everything we hoped for, but these are the choices that must be made within the budget limitations.

I want to extend my thanks and compliments to our very distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], who so ably proves time and time again that he is the true friend and supporter of American agriculture. I also extend my thanks and compliments to our ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] for his vital leadership and cooperation in our conference effort. I urge all Members to support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, we have provided funds for a great deal of research activities in this conference report. Some like to criticize research, particularly when they do not understand the research that is being done or because it sounds funny to those not familiar with the details of our bill. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, is funny about research. American agriculture provides to our consumers the most bountiful food supply for the lowest percentage of income of any nation in the world. This is true because we have an ongoing and aggressive research program that is constantly providing us with new varieties of food and fiber, or with new production practices that time after time improve our food basket.

There are a number of research projects in Michigan which we continue at last year's levels, and there are some for which we are fortunate enough to have increases. Every one of these projects has been the subject of review during our hearings. They have all been developed with the consultation of the affected commodity groups and with those conducting the research work. They withstand informed scrutiny.

I am particularly pleased that we were able to provide \$900,000 for the Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service to participate in the Consortium for International Earth

Science Information Network [CIESIN]. This project will assess data integration on the impact of global climate change on the agricultural environment and agricultural impacts on climate. This effort will be in cooperation with a larger effort put forward by NASA that will be a full review of the massive amounts of data being provided to us through the various resources of our space program.

I am also extremely pleased that we were able to provide nearly \$10.4 million to continue construction of the National Center for Food Toxicology Research, located at Michigan State University. This facility is vitally needed at this time when so many people are concerned about securing the wholesomeness of our food supply. We need on-going research that is credible so that consumers can be spared those episodes of uncertainty when science doesn't have an immediate answer.

We have restored \$189,000 for continuing research at the Saginaw Valley Bean and Beet Research Farm in my district. This facility provides on-going work on the development of varieties and production practices for dry beans and sugar beets, two commodities of great economic importance to my district. Work has often resulted in new varieties and production practices, including narrow row planting techniques, which help to maintain the productivity of our farmers.

I am very happy to report that the conferees have approved \$1,431,000 to continue subirrigation research work in Michigan; \$531,000 is provided through special research grants of the Cooperative State Research Service, and \$900,000 is provided through conservation operations of the Soil Conservation Service. Subirrigation research work helps to control farm land runoff, reclaim chemicals, reduce leaching into the soil, and to generally more effectively manage one of our most vital resources—water. This work is a model for the Nation.

There are a number of other special research grants provided within this bill that have been developed in consultation with farmers and researchers, and I commend them all to my colleagues.

While this bill provides important funding for farm programs, it also provides funding for food assistance programs. Providing food assistance to the less fortunate in our society is a responsibility we cannot avoid. But when we provide this assistance, we need to do so in a consistent manner.

Mr. Speaker, you may recall that when we first reported this bill to you last summer, the House Appropriations Committee reported that we wanted the Department to include an evaluation of why cereals containing fruit are excluded from the WIC food package, even though the Department recommends that people eat the fruit that

is being excluded. The conference report amplifies this concern with the demand for a report by December 31, 1991.

The inconsistency of telling people what to eat and then not letting them have it is mind boggling. The Department has it within its power to end this silliness by not counting the naturally occurring sugars found in raisins when determining whether or not a given cereal meets any sugar limit imposed on cereals. I am hopeful that this will be done.

Nothing is more important than consistent nutrition information. If we tell people they should eat something, then we shouldn't prevent them from getting it.

We also need to look at diets as a whole. More and more doctors are saying that people should have a diet based on total food intake. Putting limits on only one or two items in a food package, rather than reviewing the entire food package, risks giving people the wrong dietary advice. We found agreement on this point last year when we asked the Food and Drug Administration about it during a review of their labeling proposals.

I am also very pleased that we have provided \$90 million for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. This very important food assistance program helps mothers, infants, children, and the elderly. I appreciate the review given this program by Assistant Secretary Bertini, Deputy Assistant Secretary Abrams, and FNS Administrator Betty Jo Nelsen. We support assistance for both target groups, and reject the statements made by some that we need to choose between which needy group gets served. We may not be able to help everyone who needs help, but we must continue to work towards that goal without pitting any group against another.

Our conference report calls upon the Department to use these appropriated funds plus the anticipated carryover from fiscal 1991 toward at least maintaining existing caseloads and expanding program assistance to both eligible groups at existing and new sites. I sincerely hope that this action will be achieved when the Department allocates caseloads early in December, or we will once again have to raise the issue at next year's hearings.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent conference report. I urge its immediate adoption.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Agriculture Subcommittee I rise in support of this conference report and I commend Chairman WHITTEN and Congressman JOE SKEEN for their hard work at arriving at this agreement with the other body.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair and balanced bill, I believe. The bill provides

roughly \$53 billion for agriculture and nutrition programs. About \$31 billion of the funding under the measure would go toward nutrition programs, including \$22 billion for food stamps and \$2.6 billion for the Women, Infants and Children Nutrition Program. I commend the subcommittee for making the WIC program one of its priorities. As you know, this program provides critical nutrition and health benefits to low-income pregnant women and young children.

I am also pleased with the funding level for the Cooperative State Research Service which provides funding for important research projects such as water conservation and biochemistry.

In addition, I support funding for Farmers Home and rural development assistance. Coming from a State with very large rural areas I realize the importance of providing them with this much needed assistance in order to provide opportunities to these rural communities.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, funding is included in this bill for extension agents on Indian reservations. These funds are included to ensure that the needs of native Americans are adequately addressed. This is a very worthwhile program and I am pleased that the committee has decided to continue it.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of hard work, on both sides, has gone into this bill and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I fully support this bill. I just want to say a word about disaster assistance: it is too bad we could not reach some kind of an agreement on disaster assistance. But also it is unfortunate that a few years ago farmers were removed from eligibility for disaster assistance under the Small Business Disaster Loan Program. If they were still under that, they could have had disaster assistance last year and the year before from the funds in the revolving fund which accumulated from repayments of past disaster loans. Under that program those that can show they need an average of 7 or 8 years, but as much as 15 years, to spread out their loss from the disaster are eligible for a low-interest loan. It helps not only the victim of the disaster but also the whole community where he or she lives by restoring his purchasing power. Ninety-seven percent are paying off those loans. There was money in the revolving fund but the administration strongly supported making farmers, who are small businessmen and businesswomen, ineligible to be under that program. They required them to depend upon disaster programs which are dependent upon annual appropriations and usually after the disaster has occurred. The administration opposed

such an appropriation both last year and this year.

Mr. Speaker, as a consequence, they are not under the SBA administered program, money is not available under the Farm Home Administration Program either. So that is a difficulty that farmers should not have to endure.

In my opinion, farmers are small business people in every sense of the word.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support this bill, and hope that we can remedy the problem with regard to disaster assistance in the near future.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to take this time to thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and Subcommittee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the ranking minority member on that subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], and the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], for their assistance in expediting this legislation.

This appropriations conference report represents a significant and much needed investment in our Nation's agricultural system. Specifically, this Member would like to thank the committee and subcommittee for recognizing the need for funding agriculture related programs at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. These programs include: First, the George W. Beadle Center for Genetics and Biomaterials Research; second, the Ag-Sat Program for a consortium of 35 land grant institutions; third, the rural development programs included in the USDA Extension Service appropriations; and fourth, Nebraska specific special research grants.

First, this Member would like to thank the Agriculture Appropriations conferees for approving funding for the George W. Beadle Center for Genetics and Biomaterials Research in the amount of \$4.5 million. Previously, Federal funds totaling approximately \$17.9 million have been appropriated for this facility. This amount of Federal funding, when combined with State matching funds appropriated, the University of Nebraska Foundation funds, and the University of Nebraska internal reallocation, brings the total project funding to \$30.9 million. The funding level of \$4.5 million is critical to the project as this will enable the University to adequately provide for each of the three units—biotechnology, chemical engineering, and biochemistry—which give the project its uniqueness and effectiveness.

Second, this Member commends the conferees for funding the Ag-Sat Program in the amount of \$1.2 million. The Ag-Sat Program is the result of provi-

sions in the 1990 farm bill which provided for such new agricultural telecommunications programs. The Ag-Sat consortium of 35 land grant institutions has made tremendous progress during its first 2 years of development, but this operations funding is critical for it to achieve its potential. Without this assistance, the long-term potential of this new satellite system and service would not be realized.

In addition, the agriculture appropriations conference report includes funding for a number of other important projects that this Member supports. These include the following \$400,000 for the livestock gene mapping project for the Meat Animal Research Center in Clay Center, NE; \$525,000 for the Rural Policies Research Institute Consortium at UNL; \$385,000 for the UNL Center for Rural Community Revitalization and Development; and \$100,000 for industrial products research at UNL. These programs each address a significant research need which will enable Nebraska's agriculture and agribusiness to remain competitive and profitable.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] has already mentioned the section 502 Loan Guarantee Housing Program which is administered by the Farmers Home Administration. This Member, I think it is fair to say, has initiated work on such authorization legislation about 5 or 6 years ago. Outside of the members of the authorizing committee where this Member serves, no one has done more than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] to advance this program. I want to express special appreciation to him, and join him in hoping that the appropriation levels provided for fiscal year 1992 will extend to all States what is not a demonstration program that is used in a number of States across the country during the current fiscal year.

As members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations may know, the Federal Government has, unfortunately, in the past discriminated against Americans who live in small towns and in rural areas by not providing loan guarantee programs, either subsidized or unsubsidized, to people in such areas even if their incomes are less than 115 percent of median area income. At least now we have a program funded by this committee which will reach those people in small communities and rural areas who have incomes of less than 100 percent of median area income. We are not yet at parity with the treatment given to urban areas where loan guarantees are available through HUD for those whose income are under 115 percent of median area income, but this funding helps us take this Farmers Home Administration loan guarantee demonstration program and extend it to the whole country.

Again, this Member commends and thanks the agriculture appropriations conferees for their actions, and urges his colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], a member of this subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of the committee conference report, and wish to say how very important this is to farmers in the country and in my district. I think that the provisions in here for the extension of the Cooperative Extension Service's services, as well as the Soil Conservation Service, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, and the Farmers Home programs that have been referenced here this afternoon, are of critical importance to farmers in north-west Ohio and throughout our country.

□ 1550

I would echo the comment of the gentleman from Iowa who expressed some dismay that the disaster assistance that is so essential to farmers in the country today is not included in this legislation. I have to say in my own district, having met with farmers over the last several weeks, in the last 10 years I have never seen the farmers of our community as concerned as they are about getting legislation cleared by this Congress that would be of benefit to them.

This is an important step in the right direction. I think 10 years of not getting decent prices for crops that they produce, bad weather, and far too many loans have created a situation where many of our farmers are up against the wall and going bankrupt.

This legislation is an important step for us to continue our investment in the people that feed us and feed so much of the world. I would urge that the farmers who are listening to us here deliberate this afternoon would write the President of the United States and urge him to agree with us that this disaster assistance is equally important and deserves as much of an emergency status as some of the foreign aid bills that have come through here in the last several weeks. I urge full support of this excellent bill.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies appropriations conference report for fiscal year 1992. I would also like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WHITTEN, and the ranking Members, Mr. SKEEN and Mr. MYERS, for their hard work and diligence in preparing such a balanced package within a highly constrained budget.

This legislation represents what has been a long and deliberative process which meets many of today's agricultural needs, but yet reflects much needed fiscal responsibility. This legislation represents many difficult budget decisions that continue to prove that agriculture is willing to pull its fair share of the budget reduction load.

Additionally, I am also pleased to note a particular item within this appropriations measure that continues to benefit agricultural producers across the Nation. For several years now, significant and promising research on the soybean cyst nematode problem has been conducted in my district at the Delta Area Agricultural Research Center in Portageville, MO. This facility is ideally suited to conducting this research, given its extensive work in the past on the problem and the fact that many farmers in the country continue to face a serious cyst nematode problem.

By including this research as a part of the appropriations package, I believe we will be saving a number of farmers from financial ruin in the long run. As many as 25 million acres of farmland in the United States are contaminated with the cyst nematode, including all major soybean-producing counties in Missouri and several adjoining States. It has been estimated that in 1990 the soybean nematode cost our Nation's farmers over \$600 million in reduced yields. But because of the work being conducted on this problem, the Federal Government will easily save many times the \$359,000 we will spend on soybean cyst nematode research next year.

Additionally, this measure restores funding for the Rural Electrification Administration to meet the increasing needs of our Nation's rural electric systems. In the past 10 years, insured REA loan funds have declined substantially despite continued inflation. Now, through restored funding levels, rural electric insured loans can better meet growing rural development demands.

Likewise, there are many other fine projects and research efforts contained in this bill along with needed funding for the supplemental food program for women, infants, and children and continued funding for other vital domestic food and nutrition programs. I urge my colleagues to show their support for these valuable endeavors by giving favorable approval to this appropriations measure.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2698, a bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, and related agencies for fiscal year 1992. This legislation will provide more than \$52 billion for these programs that are so impor-

tant to assure that Americans continue to have access to an abundant, high quality, safe supply of food at reasonable prices.

The environmental programs funded in the bill will protect the Nation's soil and water resources. I am particularly pleased that the conference agreement provides \$46.4 million to fund the Wetlands Reserve Program, although I believe that the benefits of the program should be extended to eligible participants regardless of where they live, as is required by law. Attempts to limit the program to pilot projects in a limited number of States are contrary to law and would limit the soil and water conservation benefits that the program might otherwise provide.

I am also pleased that the conference agreement provides \$6.75 million for the Water Quality Incentives Program established in the 1990 farm bill.

Finally, I am pleased that the other body did not include language in the bill, nor was language included in the conference agreement, that would interfere with the establishment within the Department of Agriculture of the Rural Development Administration [RDA], as required by sections 2301 through 2303 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990. Language in section 738 of H.R. 2698, as originally reported by the Committee on Appropriations, that would have prohibited the use of funds for the establishment of the RDA was stricken by the full House of Representatives. The intent of Congress in this regard remains clear—the Department of Agriculture should move ahead to establish the RDA, as they are required to do by law.

I also commend the committee for their work on WIC. This is a good program. This is a program that I would like to see my tax dollars go to.

Also I commend the chairman and distinguished Members for their efforts to do something with the disaster relief. Unfortunately, it did not come to pass but it was not through any lack of effort from the distinguished chairman and members of this committee.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I rise just to make several short comments. First, to rise in support of the conference report and to thank the leadership on this committee for the work they have done to present what I think is a balanced bill to deal with the needs of agriculture, both in the Midwest and the West and throughout the country, and yet stay within the budget marks. I appreciate that very much.

Three items. One is that I am interested enough in the budget and in the

deficit that I have said to myself I am not going to vote for. This one falls within that category, and I appreciate it. I appreciate the good work that has been done.

Second, in the area of the Cooperative State Research Service, I am very impressed with what has been done there. We in Wyoming have a particular project. It has to do with an environmental simulator. I think it holds great promise in the area of point source run-off, in the area of hazardous waste in dealing with those problems that affect us all and, in particular, agriculture. It is a simulator where we can see how these hazards move through the soil in a very abbreviated fashion. I appreciate the funding there for planning and development.

Last, in the area of marketing for lambs and wool, a very important part of agriculture in the West, one in which the price of labor has fallen from in the neighborhood of 75, 80 cents a pound down to 45, 50, devastating to the marketing of lamb. Wool has had the same experience. So I appreciate the fact that the packers and stockyards administration is given some funds here.

We met in Denver sometime ago with producers of lamb and wool, and they wanted two fairly simple things. One is a better method of market information and market discovery. The other was grading for grading yield sales.

I think both of these things can be accomplished under this budget.

I thank the gentleman for his work and the leadership on the bill.

□ 1600

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], chairman of the House Administration Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your efforts to reject an amendment which would have stopped funding for section 1557, reporting requirements relating to tobacco. This is a very important provision to my farmers in North Carolina. I feel that it is important that I express my concerns about the need for trade secret confidentiality with respect to section 1557 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990.

In providing this funding, I express my specific concern about the need for the Department to take clear and effective regulatory measures to ensure the protection of trade secrets with respect to information reported under section 1557 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990.

Section 1557, requires manufacturers to submit to the Secretary of Agriculture individual shipment-by-shipment reports on tobacco exports within 60 days of export. The reports must disclose the crop year, grade, type, coun-

try of origin, and poundage of export shipments as well as other information deemed appropriate by the Secretary. A special rule in section 1557 provides that, for cigarettes and cigarette-ready tobacco, manufacturers may disclose this information on a quarterly aggregated basis. This rule for cigarette-ready tobacco includes brand blended tobacco strips.

I emphasize that the regulations promulgated by the Department to implement the export reporting scheme must effectively meet the confidentiality requirements of the 1990 act. Specifically, the special rule, in particular, and the overall reporting requirements in general, are to be carried out in a manner that is "designed to protect specific or particular brand formulation." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD H11859 (1990) statement of Representative ROSE. These formulations are the result of years of research and testing and the expenditure of millions of dollars: They are fiercely guarded trade secrets because they are the most important factor in establishing the uniqueness of the product.

To meet the confidentiality requirements, I suggest that quarterly reports from the various manufacturers be aggregated together by the Secretary before they are submitted to the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry as required by section 1557. These Committees shall have the ability to review individual quarterly reports. In such instances, individual reports could be protected by procedural and security measures intended to avoid inadvertent disclosure. Such mechanisms might include, first, designating a document control officer within the Department to implement confidentiality procedures; second, masking the source of the reports; third, securing the reports while they are not in actual use; fourth, requiring proof of authorization before allowing access to the reports; fifth, requiring persons to sign in before obtaining reports; and sixth, prohibiting the photocopying or other reproduction of individual reports.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN], the ranking Republican member of the authorizing committee.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues this afternoon to urge adoption of the conference report on H.R. 2698, the 1992 Agriculture appropriations bill.

This legislation is significant for many reasons but not the least for a provision it does not contain: any prohibition of implementation of the Rural Development Administration at the Department of Agriculture. The RDA was established in last year's

farm bill, the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act, and the administration is ready to begin full implementation of those provisions.

As my colleagues may remember, the House Appropriations Committee-reported bill originally contained a provision prohibiting the Secretary of Agriculture from implementing the RDA. The House by amendment, struck that section of the bill thus clearly mandating that rural economic development policy shall be carried out by the RDA. The bill was adopted overwhelmingly by the House.

Although the other body included some report language in its version of agriculture appropriations, it in no way clarifies statutory language but attempts to subvert it by attempting to reverse the legislative process. They clearly failed in that attempt. The statute, Public Law 101-624—the 1990 farm bill—is clear: The Secretary shall establish a Rural Development Administration that will carry out certain programs currently operated by the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH].

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 2698, the Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1992.

As you know, the House passed the Agriculture appropriations bill on June 26, 1991, by vote of 368 to 48. Prior to its passage, Chairman DE LA GARZA, Representative TOM COLEMAN, Representative BOB SMITH, and myself sponsored an amendment that was adopted by the House which struck Appropriations Committee language that would have prohibited the Secretary of Agriculture from establishing the Rural Development Administration. This agency was created by title XXIII of the 1990 farm bill and is to be established within the Department beginning this month.

The Senate has included in its report filed with the Agriculture appropriations bill, language which would attempt to prohibit the Secretary from establishing this important agency. I join with Chairman DE LA GARZA and my other colleagues in noting with pleasure that no statutory language has been included in this appropriation bill that would prohibit the Department of Agriculture from establishing the Rural Development Administration. In fact, it is clear that Congress has spoken loud and clear on this issue during floor action on June 26 and now, more than ever, expects the Secretary to comply with title XXIII of the 1990 farm bill.

Further, it is important to note that committee report language does not have the force of law, especially when it attempts to contradict statutory language. This also applies to crop insurance as well as Rural Development.

I look forward to the Department's establishment of the RDA and witness-

ing the many benefits this agency will help provide to rural America.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

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

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Committee on Appropriations and its chairman for the work that they have done. There are three particular areas, the increase in the Agricultural Stabilization Service, the funding for the extension and, of course, the full funding that was restored for the rural electrification. All of these are very important to rural America. All of them are very important to the State that I represent, the State of Missouri.

Small town rural America often is forgotten, and but for the work that this Appropriations Committee has done, I say to the chairman, we would be all the more forgotten, and we thank you, and we think it is a good bill. I rise in support of it.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good conference report at a time when farmers need lots of help. From the freezes in California to the early rain periods in the northern Midwest when they could not get their crops planted, to the droughts later on in the Midwest, to the floods in the South, all of this has caused farmers to have difficulty in producing a crop this year. Couple that with low prices, and the farmers need all of the help that they can get.

But this bill and conference report is \$57 million below when it passed the House. It is almost \$600 million below the Senate-passed version of the appropriations bill for agriculture, and it is \$57 million below the President's request.

But the important thing is this: \$32 billion of this bill goes to domestic nutrition programs, feeding hungry people, taking care of people in our own country. Of that \$6 billion is child nutrition.

This is a very good conference report and deserves our support.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany the bill H.R. 2698. I am pleased that this legislation contains \$2.6 billion for the special supplemental food program for women, infants and children [WIC]. Clearly, the WIC Program is our most successful and efficient Government feeding program and I am pleased that the conferees have provided the \$2.6 billion for this program as was originally proposed by this body.

I would like, at this point, to commend the conferees for including report language which requires the Department to address what I believe to be a blatant inconsistency in its policy with regard to the WIC Program. This issue involves cereals containing fruit in the WIC food package. The conference report requires the USDA to report back to the Congress on this issue by December 31, 1991.

Mr. Speaker, the USDA currently enforces a regulation which excludes from the WIC food package certain nutritious cereals which meet all of the USDA's nutritional requirements simply because these cereals contain fruit. This policy is inconsistent with the Department's nutritional and dietary recommendations. The USDA, as well as several other agencies of the Federal Government and many nutritional experts throughout the country, recommend that we choose diets with plenty of fruits. The Department distributes literature to WIC participants which urges them to eat fruit. In addition, the Department distributes literature to WIC participants which urges them to use fruit in cereal. Furthermore, the bill which we are passing today contains additional funds to be used to distribute vouchers to WIC participants which enable them to purchase fruit.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only inconsistent but it is totally irresponsible and incomprehensible for the Department to urge WIC participants to eat fruit and to use it on their cereal which at the same time it prevents them from obtaining cereal which meets all its nutritional requirements simply because these cereals contain fruit.

I would hope that the USDA will, upon its own initiative, revise its policies and take whatever steps are necessary to correct the current inconsistency which keeps nutritious cereals out of the WIC food package simply because these cereals contain fruit. Mr. Speaker, this issue was recently the subject of an editorial in the Kalamazoo Gazette which concluded, "as far as we're concerned the USDA deserves a great big raspberry for its failure to deal with its illogical regulation and we hope that Congress gives the bureaucrats the nudge they need." At this point, I would like to include in the record the editorial from the September 5, 1991, issue of the Kalamazoo Gazette.

WE'VE HEARD IT ON THE GRAPEVINE; RAISINS ARE IN

Speaking of grapes, let's turn the subject to raisins—those dandy sun-dried grapes with a long history. Subjects of the Old Testament's King David are said to have brought "asses laden with cheese and raisins" to pay their taxes.

Well, this story isn't about King David or cheese but it does have something to do with raisins, taxes and bureaucrats.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, as part of its job setting nutrition standards and educating the public about nutrition, says "eat more fruit, fruit is good for you" and suggests raisins as an acceptable fruit.

The USDA also says "eat more complex carbohydrates such as whole grain cereals, they're really good for you," and under its guidelines, bran flakes are acceptable.

The USDA even suggests "at breakfast, use fruit in cereal."

A lot of tax money has gone into promoting those notions.

People could logically assume that the USDA, therefore, would think a cereal combining bran flakes with raisins would be a nifty way to kill two birds with one stone.

No way. The Kellogg Co., whose world headquarters is located in Battle Creek, is raising a fuss in Washington because the USDA says Kellogg's Raisin Bran and other similar products don't meet nutritional standards to be included in the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program, a federal food assist-

ance program serving more than five million poor pregnant or nursing women, children and infants.

Without the raisins, bran flakes qualify for WIC, meeting the standards for cereal of no more than 6 grams of sugar per serving. There is a small amount of sugar that occurs naturally in grains. But raisins, like other fruits, have natural sugars and including them with the cereal pushes the sugar content too high.

Kellogg's beef with the regulations is economic. The WIC program costs about \$2.4 billion a year, \$150 million of which goes for cereal. And, according to Kellogg officials, about two-thirds of the cereal money goes to Kellogg competitor, General Mills, the maker of Cheerios. We have no argument with Cheerios. But there is a question of consistency and fairness here.

Part of the inconsistency stems from the fact that fruits contain natural sugars. Six fluid ounces of unsweetened orange juice, for example, contain more sugar than a serving of almost any ready-to-eat cereal. No one with any knowledge of nutrition would suggest that fruits be banned from the list of foods allowed under the WIC program.

If the raisins and the bran flakes are purchased separately and mixed at home, the nutritionists would jump for joy. But mix them in a box? That's a different story.

The proposed solution is to exempt fruit from being included in the sugar count for cereals. That would neither "destroy the integrity of the program," as some critics have charged, nor leave the door open for taxpayer subsidy of high sugar cookies, candy or other such goodies for poor mothers and children.

The argument seems so clear cut that it is surprising to learn that Kellogg has been fighting a losing battle on it since at least 1977, and is pulling out all the lobbying guns it has in hopes that Congress will order the bureaucrats to make an exemption for fruit in the WIC regulations on cereals.

As U.S. Rep. Paul Henry, R-Grand Rapids, asked, "What kind of prunes do we have setting these guidelines?"

As far as we're concerned, the USDA deserves a great big raspberry for its failure to deal with its illogical regulation as we hope Congress gives the bureaucrats the nudge they need.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee on Hunger, I am a strong supporter of the Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] Nutrition Program, which is a Federal food assistance program that serves more than 5 million poor pregnant or nursing women, Children, and infants. The nutritious food these women receive helps ensure that their babies get a healthy start in life. Given our country's tragic infant mortality rate, I think that we all should be working to emphasize how healthy lifestyles and diets of pregnant women can reduce infant mortality in the United States.

However, the Department of Agriculture is hampering these efforts by sending our conflicting messages about what comprises a nutritious diet. On one hand, the Department tells the American public that fruit is an essential ingredient in a nutritious diet, and they urge WIC participants not only to eat fruit, but to use fruit in cereal. On the other hand, though, the Department enforces a regulation which in effect bars cereal with fruit from the WIC Program because the natural sugar contained in the fruit exceeds the Department's regulation limits.

I think this policy is inconsistent and ridiculous. Cereals such as Raisin Bran should not be barred from the WIC Program. Every WIC participant should be able to get their two scoops of raisins from Raisin Bran or other nutritious cereals with fruit.

My constituents in the Fourth Congressional District in southwest Michigan know the nutrition value of cereals that contain fruit, and so do most other Americans. I think it's time that the Department of Agriculture stop talking out of both sides of its mouth.

I note that the Members who served on the conference committee on this bill acknowledged this issue and included language in their conference report that requires the Department of Agriculture to report to Congress by the end of this year on the issue of cereals containing fruit. I commend these Members and especially Congressman DALE KILDEE and Congressman PAUL HENRY, who have also worked hard to draw attention to this inconsistency.

I am looking forward to the completion of the Department's study, and I hope that the Secretary will agree that this inconsistency ought to be eliminated.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2698, the Agriculture, rural development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. This is the eighth conference report on 1 of the 13 annual appropriations bills to be reported to the House.

This conference report provides \$12.299 billion in total discretionary budget authority and \$11.223 billion in total discretionary outlays, which are equal to the 602(b) subdivision for budget authority and \$2 million below the 602(b) subdivision for outlays, respectively, for this subcommittee.

I want to commend Chairman WHITTEN and the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. SKEEN, for the work they have done in adhering to the limits set forth in the budget agreement and the 1992 budget resolution.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I will continue to inform the House of the impact of all spending legislation. I have provided a "Dear Colleague" letter describing how each appropriation measure considered so far compared to the 602(b) subdivisions for that subcommittee. I will provide similar information about the remaining conference agreements on the fiscal year 1992 appropriations bills.

I look forward to working with the Appropriations Committee in the future.

[Fact Sheet]

CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 2698, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1992 (H. REPT. 102-239)

The House Appropriations Committee filed the conference report to accompany H.R. 2698, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for 1992 on Thursday, October 3, 1991. This conference report could be considered at any time.

COMPARISON TO THE 602(b) SUBDIVISION

The conference report provides \$12,299 million in total discretionary budget authority, equal to the Appropriations subdivisions for this subcommittee. The estimated discre-

tionary outlays in the conference report are \$2 million less than the subdivision total. These totals include amounts in both the domestic and international categories.

COMPARISON TO DOMESTIC DISCRETIONARY SPENDING ALLOCATION

The conference report provides \$10,813 million of domestic discretionary budget authority, equal to the Appropriations subdivision for this subcommittee. The conference report provides \$9,928 million of domestic discretionary outlays, which are \$2 million below the discretionary outlay subdivision for this subcommittee. A comparison of the conference report to the domestic spending allocations for this subcommittee follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Agriculture, Rural Development appropriations bill		Appropriations Committee 602(b) subdivision		Bill over(+)/ under (-) Committee 602(b) subdivision
	BA	O	BA	O	
Discretionary	10,813	9,928	10,813	9,930	-2
Mandatory ¹	37,888	29,486	37,888	29,486	0
Total	48,701	39,414	48,701	39,416	-2

BA = New budget authority, O = Estimated outlays.
¹ Conforms to budget resolution estimates of existing law.

COMPARISON TO INTERNATIONAL DISCRETIONARY SPENDING ALLOCATION

The conference report provides \$1,486 million of international discretionary budget authority for P.L. 480 Food for Peace programs, equal to the Appropriations subdivision for this subcommittee. The conference report provides outlays \$1 million less than the subdivision for international discretionary outlays.

[In millions of dollars]

	Agriculture, Rural Development appropriations bill		Appropriations Committee 602(b) subdivision		Bill over(+)/ under (-) Committee 602(b) subdivision
	BA	O	BA	O	
Discretionary	1,486	1,295	1,486	1,296	-1

BA = New budget authority, O = Estimated outlays.

The Appropriations Committee reported the Committee's subdivision of budget authority and outlays pursuant to Section 602(b) of the 1974 Budget Act as amended in House Report 102-180. These subdivisions are consistent with the allocation of spending responsibility to House committees contained in House Report 102-69, the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 121, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1992, as adopted by the Congress on May 22, 1991.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

The following are the major program highlights for the conference report to accompany the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1992:

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	New outlays
Agriculture programs:		
Commodity Credit Corporation (mandatory)	7,250	523
Agricultural Research Service	714	523
Extension Service	419	356
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	452	374
Cooperative State Research Service	506	211
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (mandatory in part)	583	312
Food Safety and Inspection Service	474	431

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	New outlays
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service Conservation and rural development programs:	719	719
Rural Electrification Administration:		
New loan subsidies	174	20
Administrative expenses	29	27
Farm operation and ownership loans:		
New loan subsidies	324	267
Administrative expenses	230	219
Rural housing:		
New loan subsidies	587	277
Administrative expenses	427	427
Rental assistance program	320	11
Rural development loans:		
New loan subsidies	109	6
Administrative expenses	52	47
Soil Conservation Service conservation operations	564	520
Watershed and flood prevention operations	205	114
Conservation reserve (mandatory)	1,611	1,611
Nutrition programs:		
Food Stamp Program (mandatory)	22,350	19,168
Child Nutrition Programs (mandatory)	6,068	4,960
Supplemental Feeding Programs (WIC)	2,600	2,444
Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico (mandatory)	1,013	1,007
Food donations for selected groups	265	216
Emergency Food Assistance Program	165	147
Other programs:		
P.L. 480, Food for Peace	1,486	1,129
Food and Drug Administration	760	625
Payment to the Farm Credit System (mandatory)	113	110
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	47	41

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, press reports indicate that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee intends to present a dire emergency supplemental within the next 2 weeks. Quite frankly, I am amazed. We are barely a week into the new fiscal year, still considering regular appropriations for fiscal year 1992 operations, and the Appropriations Committee is already considering a dire emergency supplemental.

The committee has a discretionary spending cap of nearly \$200 billion. The discretionary dire emergency items are approximately \$2.6 billion—barely more than 1 percent of the available funds. If the need for these funds is such a dire emergency, why can't the committee find the funds within the cap? Are we to believe that the cap is so tight that not even 1 percent of funds can be redirected from normal operations to meet a dire emergency?

Most of the domestic emergency involves agricultural disasters—floods, freezes, and droughts. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee says he needs \$1.75 billion to address these emergencies. Today we are considering the fiscal year 1992 agriculture appropriations bill which contains over \$50 billion in new budget authority. If these emergency items are so dire, why can't the committee find room in a \$50 billion measure for \$1.75 billion? Obviously, they must think that all of this \$50 billion is more important than the \$1.75 billion emergency needs. Let us look at some of these higher priority items: \$74 million for special research grants on such items as asparagus, cranberries, a mechanical tomato harvester, Christmas tree root rot, mink, manure disposal, and Russian wheat aphids. More than \$4.6 million for bee research at the same time that we are spending over \$25 million to buy surplus honey. More than \$100 million for construction at State agricultural facilities including a road to the new stadium at North Dakota State University.

The committee has also increased loan limits for the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers House Administration to the levels in effect prior to the budget agreement last fall. This action effectively cancels the

budget savings credited to agricultural programs by last year's budget agreement. Many of these loans will go to people and organizations who can well afford to get commercial loans. So, while the committee can't find the money to help those facing dire emergencies, it has more than enough money to help those that can help themselves.

The committee's inability to find money within the caps for things they define as emergencies, while simultaneously funding projects that have dubious value, leads to a single conclusion—that the committee is not interested in abiding by the new budget agreement. Let's stop playing games. If the Appropriations Committee thinks there is a real domestic emergency, then they should use some of the \$200 billion reserved for domestic programs to meet those emergencies.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2698, the bill providing appropriations in fiscal year 1992 for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies. This conference report represents a good and fair compromise with the measure passed by the other body, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WHITTEN, and the ranking minority member, Mr. SKEEN, as well as their able and very fine staffs, for putting together such a balanced package. In particular, I would like to thank them for their continuing sensitivity to the somewhat unique problems of agriculture in California.

Specifically, the bill includes \$1.609 million to continue construction of the national grape importation facility to be located in Davis, CA. The grape importation facility similarly will be located on land donated by the University of California and will be supported through industry user fees as a national facility.

The immediate construction of this facility is crucial to the continued international competitiveness of the U.S. wine industry because of the critical shortage of grape quarantine facilities. The lack of quarantine facilities puts the U.S. industry at a severe disadvantage to foreign producers which have access to the latest variety releases.

The facility will provide grape quarantine services for commercial grape growers and researchers throughout the United States and will develop and implement faster methods for grape disease detection.

Imported grape stocks, on which the United States depends heavily for new wine grape varieties, must be quarantined and inspected for disease prior to being released for general use. The facility will help accelerate the inspection process and the introduction of new varieties of wine grapes.

Quicker inspection services will help the United States wine industry become more diverse and internationally competitive with major wine producing countries in Europe.

The bill also provides \$207,000 for design and planning work on a new alternative pest management research facility, a joint Federal-State of California project which will be constructed on donated property by the University of California and will be jointly operated with the California Department of Food and Agriculture. Increasingly, California and American growers are being called upon to reduce their

use of chemicals in agricultural production. But the loss of major pesticides in the absence of alternative pest control technologies and management systems could have severe economic impacts on U.S. agriculture and result in higher food prices, increased imports, and reduced exports of our agricultural products. Thus, it is imperative that we expand and accelerate research to control exotic pests, like the Medfly, the Mexican fruit fly, and the Africanized honey bee, and develop viable alternative pest control technologies and management systems.

While located on the campuses of the University of California, both of these facilities will serve as key national research resources.

Mr. Speaker, I note that the conferees have included language which requires the U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA] to report to the Congress on the issue of cereals containing fruit in the WIC food package by December 31, 1991. I am most pleased that the conferees have underscored the significance of this issue in their conference report.

This issue is one which I raised with my colleagues on the committee earlier this year. The USDA as well as other Federal agencies and nutritional experts have advised us for years that fruit is an essential element of a nutritional diet. In fact, the USDA not only specifically recommends that people should choose a diet which includes plenty of fruit but it distributes literature to WIC participants urging that they use fruits in cereal.

Nevertheless, the USDA continues to enforce a regulation which prohibits the inclusion of certain nutritious cereals in the WIC food package simply because these cereals contain fruit. For example, under the current regulations bran flakes would be eligible for distribution in the WIC food package. However, when raisins are added to this cereal and it becomes raisin bran, the cereal is no longer eligible because under the Department's interpretation of its own regulations, the fruit causes the cereal to exceed an arbitrary limit on sugar content in the cereal.

This policy is totally inconsistent with the Department's own nutritional and dietary guidelines. Either fruit is good for you or it is not. Either you should use fruit in cereal or you should not. I would hope that the Department will acknowledge this glaring inconsistency in its policy and revise it to allow cereals containing fruit in the WIC Program as long as these cereals met all nutritional standards.

Mr. Speaker, this issue was recently the subject of an editorial in the Sacramento Bee. The editorial notes that "like so many other governmental follies, this inconsistency is a case of good intentions defeated by the bureaucratic tools used to implement them." At this point, I request that the full text of this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report represents a balanced and sound compromise, and I urge its adoption.

[From the Sacramento Bee, Aug. 30, 1991]

USDA VS. RAISIN BRAN

Today's breakfast menu is two scoops of government silliness.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), in its guise as the nation's nutritional conscience, has been telling Americans loudly and often that they ought to eat

more fruit and more foods high in fiber. One good way to do both, department publications suggest, is to begin the day with a high-fiber cereal topped with fruit—something like Raisin Bran, for example.

Except, that is, if you are on WIC, the Women, Infants and Children supplemental feeding program regulated by USDA.

USDA makes sure that the foods that can be bought under WIC meet strict nutritional guidelines—breakfast cereals, for example, must be high in nutrients and low in sugar, like bran flakes. And it encourages program participants, pregnant women and preschool children, to eat iron-rich foods, such as liver, beans, whole-wheat cereals and raisins.

But if you're on WIC, don't even think of buying your bran flakes and raisins in the same box. Under the WIC program, Raisin Bran is strictly off-limits, consigned to exile along with Cap'n Crunch and other breakfast confections.

Like so many other governmental follies, this inconsistency is a case of good intentions defeated by the bureaucratic tools used to implement them. To assure that WIC recipients get nutritious food, USDA rules require that breakfast cereals available under the program have no more than 6 grams of sugar per serving. The cereal in Raisin Bran meets that standard, but when raisins, full of natural fruit sugar, are thrown into the box, Raisin Bran flunks.

That exasperates the Kellogg Co., maker of Raisin Bran. WIC recipients buy more than \$100 million worth of breakfast cereal a year, mostly Cheerios, made by rival General Mills. Kellogg officials have been trying for 14 years to get USDA to agree that added fruit shouldn't count against the sugar limit, so that Raisin Bran, one of the best selling cereals, can compete for a piece of that business. It points out that Raisin Bran is higher than Cheerios in iron, is generally less expensive and meets the government's objective of trying to increase the consumption of fruit.

Those facts this year finally caught the attention of prominent members of Congress, who've urged USDA to review its Raisin Bran ban, and quickly. With any luck, it won't take 14 more years for USDA to reverse its raisin silliness.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2698, a bill providing appropriations for agriculture, rural development, and related agencies for fiscal year 1992.

In particular, I want to once again commend and thank Chairman WHITTEN and the subcommittee's Ranking Minority Member, Representative JOE SKEEN, for their continued strong support of Federal nutrition programs for our Nation's children and elderly.

I was very pleased with the conference report's recommended funding level for the child nutrition account, which provides an overall 8.8-percent increase over the account's previous fiscal year operating level. This overall increase will permit the school breakfast and child and adult care food programs to expand their scope, and will give real impetus to an acceleration in the nutritional training we will be able to provide.

Our conferees should also be congratulated on their success in persuading the other body to fund the WIC Program at the \$2.6 billion mark endorsed by the House. I was particularly pleased to also find that Chairman WHITTEN and Representative SKEEN had seen fit to agree to a substantial portion of the Senate's set-aside for the WIC farmers' market coupon

demonstration project. This funding will permit this demonstration to continue during this fiscal year and will thus give the Education and Labor Committee the opportunity to further examine its possible reauthorization.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2698, the appropriations bill for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies. I want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of our subcommittee, the honorable JAMIE WHITTEN, for his work on this legislation. The chairman has brought a bill to the floor which addresses the needs of rural America in spite of tight budgetary constraints.

I also want to thank the new ranking member of our committee, JOE SKEEN, for his efforts on this legislation. His concern and work on behalf of rural America is certainly reflected in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has a number of worthy programs that I strongly support and deserved to be mentioned here today. However, I want to take this opportunity to talk about the increasing importance of the Food and Drug Administration and the need to ensure that this agency will have adequate funds to accomplish its mission. As we move in to the 1990's, Mr. Speaker, the consumers of our Nation will continue to insist that their food is safe, pure, and wholesome. They will want to be assured that drugs and cosmetics are safe for their use. The consumers of our Nation, Mr. Speaker, are demanding that the FDA take an activist role on their behalf.

The agency, and Congress, need to be in a position to respond to these new demands. I was glad to see that our subcommittee was able to provide over \$725 million for the Food and Drug Administration. This money is sorely needed by the agency in order to carry out new legislative mandates recently placed on them by Congress. However, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that this level of funding will not be adequate for the agency to accomplish its mission in future years. Furthermore, I am disturbed by the continuing budgetary games that the administration continues to play with this agency.

In the conference report, Mr. Speaker, the conferees provided that over \$188 million of the appropriated amount would be available for the Food and Drug Administration when an official budget request for this amount would be transmitted to Congress. The conferees felt that this was necessary since OMB and the Department of Health and Human Services routinely have not requested sufficient funds for this important agency. As the report states: "It is disheartening that these two agencies continue to resort to budget gimmickry by claiming fictitious user fees as part of the Food and Drug Administration's annual budget request." It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that the administration is intent on playing a game of Russian roulette with the funding request for this agency. Obviously, the administration's approach funding this agency is penny wise but pound foolish.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that when our subcommittee considers next year's funding for the FDA that the administration will present us with an accurate funding request. Those groups who rely on this agency to ensure that

we have safe food and drugs are demanding it, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is time that Congress demands it as well.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report making appropriations for agriculture and rural development for fiscal year 1992. In particular, I would like to point out one decision made by the conferees that I believe will yield great benefits for many years to come.

This legislation will provide \$4.5 million for the activities under the Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Act of 1990 [AARC] authorized in the 1990 farm bill.

There is an urgent need for jobs and income in rural America. Based on much discussion and a series of hearings before the House Agriculture Committee, we determined that AARC is the best way to increase the development and commercialization of new nonfood, nonfeed products made from farm commodities. New uses commercialization represents a significant opportunity to increase demand for agricultural commodities, thereby strengthening the agricultural sector and rural economies.

From experience we know that the Government by itself or industry working alone is not bringing these products to the marketplace with the speed necessary in today's competitive world. According to the Foreign Agriculture Service, over 50 percent of U.S. agricultural exports are unprocessed bulk commodities. Another 20 percent of exports have had some intermediate processing such as vegetable oil from soybeans. In contrast, over 75 percent of the farm exports of the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Italy are value-added products. The European Community controls over 50 percent of the world trade in value-added and high-value products, while the United States has merely 8 percent of that trade. Our loss in terms of jobs and income is tremendous. The Economic Research Service estimates that \$15 to \$20 billion could be added to farm income alone by substituting new crops and products for imports.

Realistically, this country has to change the way it does business if it is to compete more effectively in international markets. Japan and other countries often assist their companies in commercializing technology, quite often U.S. technology. In this country, there are substantial barriers to moving these new products to the market which private companies just face alone. Three primary obstacles—coordination, high cost, and long-term risk-hamper and often prevent commercialization.

In addition, our excellent Federal agricultural research system focuses primarily on increasing farm production rather than developing new uses and markets for farm products. In 1988, about 1.5 percent of the total \$900 million budget for the Agricultural Research Service and the Cooperative State Research Service was spent on nonfood products. Funding for new uses research was actually less since this \$16 million includes feed and traditional textiles research. Even when researching new uses, researchers often do their work without talking with private companies and farmers about market needs and economic feasibility.

In today's increasing competitive world market, significant resources must be focused on developing new uses and assisting the private

sector to overcome the barriers to commercialization. Offering a company a patent or cooperative agreement is not enough—the public and private sectors must work in partnership if we are to grasp the opportunities presented by new uses.

We enacted AARC to change the way the Government works with the private sector. This innovative program will help researchers and companies speed new uses from the laboratory to the marketplace. The key to AARC's success is its independent with resources focuses solely on coordinating and assisting efforts to get these new products on the market.

In addition to providing first-time funds for AARC, I think it is critical to send a strong message to the USDA that the intent of the authors of subtitle G was that AARC be a separate entity within the Department, and not a part of the Agricultural Research Service [ARS]. There are some indications that the ARS would like to exercise control of AARC which would not, in my opinion, be in the best interests of the long-term development and commercialization of new products. Again, the intent of subtitle G is to create a separate entity with its own board of directors.

We must implement a forward-looking industrial age policy to maintain U.S. competitiveness in the value-added agricultural sector, and not continue to deliver this sector to the Europeans. AARC can be an important part of that agricultural policy. I applaud the conferees for investing in the future of American agriculture by providing funding for AARC. I look forward to working with them and the Department of Agriculture to implement this important program.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2698, the agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. I would like to commend Chairman WHITTEN, my colleague from New York, Mr. MCHUGH, ranking minority member SKEEN, and the members of the subcommittee for their hard work on this bill.

I am especially pleased that the subcommittee has approved my request for much-needed funds for Lyme disease research. As many of my colleagues already know, Lyme disease is a major health concern. In 1990 alone, 45 States reported a total of nearly 8,000 cases of Lyme disease, a 1,600-percent increase in less than a decade.

This disease is especially frustrating because its symptoms mask themselves as other ailments, making it difficult to diagnose. The deer tick, which carries Lyme disease, is so small that many people may not know they have been bitten. In addition, the blood test currently used to detect Lyme disease is not 100 percent accurate and is not guaranteed to catch the disease in every infected individual.

For those reasons, it is very important that we move forward with efforts to prevent Lyme disease at its source. Preventive measures save health care costs and obviously eliminate a great deal of pain and suffering in the long run. One of the most logical ways to prevent the spread of Lyme disease is to curb the growth of infected tick populations, but research on tick control lags far behind that for other insect problems, such as agricultural pests and disease-transmitting mosquitoes.

This legislation will provide USDA assistance to the New York Medical College's work

in this important endeavor. USDA already conducts research on insects, and the 1990 farm bill has called on USDA to fund high priority research which focuses on national and local needs. By recognizing the threat of Lyme disease and the fact the USDA's role should be expanded in this area, the subcommittee generously provided funds for research on the population ecology of deer ticks, and I appreciate the conferees' foresight in retaining that earmark. This is the study of how to reduce deer tick populations and, in turn, prevent Lyme disease from continuing its dramatic spread.

Again, I thank the conferees for recognizing this problem and for their commitment to reducing the spread of Lyme disease.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2698, making agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1992. Among the various programs funded by this legislation is the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children [WIC]. The legislation provides \$2.6 billion for this excellent feeding program.

I note that the conferees have included language in the conference report directing the Department of Agriculture to report back to the Congress on an issue which has become very troublesome to many of us in my own State of Michigan, as well as other parts of the country.

Presently, the Department enforces a regulation which prevents cereals, which would otherwise qualify for the WIC food package, from being included in the package simply because these cereals contain fruit.

I have referred to this policy as inconsistent. I believe it is inconsistent because, while the Department rules out for eligibility cereal that otherwise meets all of its nutritional requirements simply because the cereal contains fruit, the Department distributes literature to WIC participants which encourages them to eat fruit and even urges them to use fruit in cereal.

In addition, funds are included in this legislation now before us which will be used to provide WIC participants with vouchers to purchase fruit. It simply does not make good sense nor does it make good policy to encourage needy participants in the WIC Program to eat fruit and use it on their cereal and at the same time deny them the opportunity to obtain nutritious cereal simply because it contains fruit. Either fruit is good for you or it is not.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is giving the USDA an opportunity to address this inconsistency and take the initiative to correct it before the Congress finds it necessary to correct the inconsistency by passing legislation. I would hope that the USDA has the good sense to acknowledge this inconsistency in its policy and take whatever steps are necessary to discontinue this policy of prohibiting nutritious cereals from being eligible in the WIC Program simply because they contain fruit.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the funding contained for the Wetlands Reserve Program in H.R. 2698, the Agriculture Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1992.

The conferees were correct in including \$46 million for this vital program. I came to support this program this past summer when the Gov-

ernment Operations Subcommittee on Government Information, Justice, and Agriculture, which I chair, conducted field hearings in Freeport, IL and Weston and Charleston, WV—my home State.

At each of these hearings the subcommittee heard from farmers who were already strapped and having problems complying with the regulations surrounding the farming of prior converted wetlands or the prohibition of draining new ones. In spite of my firm belief that we should do everything we can to preserve wetlands I felt profound sympathy for the farmers caught up in wetlands problems.

The farmers said that any prohibition placed upon land they used to earn a living and on upon which they pay taxes amounted to a taking. Without proper compensation they felt that their ability to earn an income was arbitrarily being harmed.

The funding contained in the appropriations bill is not a complete solution to the problem but it is an excellent beginning. Under this agreement 50,000 acres of wetlands can enter the reserve program in a five-State pilot project. I have supported this concept and will continue to do so. We must as a nation reconcile the need to preserve wetlands with the need to build, farm, and create infrastructure.

The Wetlands Reserve Program as envisioned in the 1990 farm bill is by no means a cure for the U.S. wetlands woes. It does, however, impact positively on several fronts. It begins to address wetlands preservation in the agricultural arena; this is an important first step in balancing the needs of our environment with the reality of modern farming. It offers a method to enhance our wetlands inventory—in spite of a no-net-loss policy, we are losing thousands of acres of wetlands due to both natural and unnatural phenomena. And in an area of critical importance it presents an opportunity to study and learn about the creation of wetlands.

My subcommittee's hearings left me with the clear impression that we have a long way to go to perfect the science of wetlands mitigation. This pilot project offers us a chance to document the creation of wetlands on properties which are the prime candidates for success: lands which once were wetlands. Under the Wetlands Reserve Program this is done, quite properly, by giving just compensation to the farmers whose participation in the program is contributing to the preservation of our environment.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2698, the fiscal year 1992 Agriculture appropriations bill. This bill appropriates funds for several child nutrition programs under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, which I chair.

I am especially pleased that the conference report adopted the House funding level of \$2.6 billion for the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC]. This \$250 million increase will enable the program to provide approximately 500,000 additional nutritionally at-risk women, infants, and children with supplemental food benefits. This is a program that saves money by reducing Medicaid costs and premature births, but more importantly, it is a program that saves lives by reducing infant mortality and late fetal death.

The conference report also addresses the issue of cereals containing fruit in the WIC Program by directing the Agriculture Department to submit a report on the issue to the appropriate committees by December 31, 1991. This request is similar to one I made to Secretary Madigan in August. I fully support this effort to correct the contradictory practice of preventing WIC participants from redeeming their coupons for cereals containing fruit, while simultaneously encouraging these same individuals to consume more fruit as a means of improving their diet. It is my hope that this report from the Department will offer a plan for resolving this issue as soon as possible, and I support the Appropriations Committee's efforts.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, although I have serious concerns about the amount of Federal subsidies in the agriculture appropriations conference report, I would like to express my support for the Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children [WIC].

At a time when budget deficits are sending shock waves through the economy, it is crucial that Congress cut wasteful spending, such as crop subsidies, at every available opportunity. This bill contains \$7.8 billion in Federal crop subsidies.

I would like to point out, however, that the conference report increases spending for the very successful WIC Program. Earlier this year, I wrote the agriculture appropriations conferees to urge their support for full funding of WIC. I am pleased that the bill includes \$2.6 billion for the WIC Program.

I have long believed WIC is an effective use of taxpayers' money. Research conducted by the National Bureau of Economic Research, a widely respected center of economic analysis, shows WIC to be the second most cost-effective program for reducing infant mortality in the United States. In fact, the study found WIC to be particularly effective in reducing infant mortality rates among blacks in the United States, who now have rates double those of whites.

There are few investments of Federal dollars as worthwhile as WIC, which results in savings in health care and in helping disadvantaged young children—our future work force—reach their full potential.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order of the House, the amendments in disagreement are considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 14, line 25, strike out "\$58,299,000" and insert: "\$63,978,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$73,979,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1610

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 15, line 2, strike out "\$99,000,000" and insert: "\$100,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$97,500,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendment numbered 28, 31, 61, 68, 75, 94, 111, 116, 125, 127, 138, 162, 178, 202, 209, 212, 213, 214, 215, 219, 222, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 234, 235, 236, 237, 239, and 240 be considered en bloc and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the various Senate amendments referred to in the unanimous-consent request are as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 15, line 2, after "\$99,000,000" insert: ", of which \$25,000,000 shall not be available for obligation until September 30, 1992."

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 15, line 16, strike out all after "amended;" down to and including "expenses;" in line 20 and insert: "\$3,500,000 for higher education graduate fellowships grants under section 1417(b)(6) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(6)), including administrative expenses; \$1,500,000 for higher education challenge grants under section 1417(b)(1) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(1)), including administrative expenses;"

Senate amendment No. 61: Page 24, line 7, after "3109" insert: *Provided further*, That \$99,000 of these funds shall be available for a field office in Hawaii".

Senate amendment No. 68: Page 28, line 23, strike out all after "regulations" over to and including "seq." in line 2 on page 29, and insert: *Provided further*, That funds contained herein shall be available for establishing and maintaining a National Appeals Division provided for under section 426 of the Agricultural Act of 1949."

Senate amendment No. 75: Page 35, line 24, insert:

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to construct buildings and related facilities on federally owned land in Skagit County, Washington, for plant materials purposes: *Provided*, That the total amount of expenditures for the buildings and facilities on the site shall be derived from, and shall not exceed, the amount of money received from the exchange of lands in Skagit County, and Bellingham, Washington.

Senate amendment No. 94: Page 45, line 17, "property" insert: *Provided*, That up to \$35,000,000 of these funds shall be made available for section 502(g), Deferral Mortgage Demonstration".

Senate amendment No. 111: Page 47, line 26, after "\$250,000,000" insert: *Provided*, That loan funds made available herein shall be completely allocated to the States and made available for obligation in the first two quarters of fiscal year 1992".

Senate amendment No. 116: Page 48, line 7, strike out "guaranteed loans" and insert: "unsubsidized guaranteed loans and \$15,350,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans".

Senate amendment No. 125: Page 48, strike out lines 18 to 21 and insert:

Hereafter, no funds in this Act or any other Act shall be available to carry out loan programs under the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund at levels other than those provided for in advance in appropriations Act.

Senate amendment No. 127: Page 49, line 11, after "\$100,000,000" insert: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to make transfers between the above limitations".

Senate amendment No. 138: Page 52, line 9, after "ment" insert: *Provided further*, That \$2,000,000 shall be available for grants to statewide private, nonprofit public television systems in".

Senate amendment No. 162: Page 56, strike out lines 16 to 19, and insert:

Hereafter, no funds in this Act or any other Act shall be available to carry out loan programs under the Rural Electrification and Telephone Revolving Fund at levels other than those provided for in advance in appropriations Acts.

Senate amendment No. 178: Page 59, line 12, after "office" insert: *Provided further*, That none of the salaries and expenses provided to the Rural Electrification Administration, and none of the responsibilities assigned by law to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration may be reassigned or transferred to any other agency or office".

Senate amendment No. 202: Page 69, line 15, strike out "\$155,524,000" and insert: "such sums as necessary".

Senate amendment No. 209: Page 72, after line 25, insert:

Section 3 of the Saccharin Study and Labeling Act (21 U.S.C. 348 nt.) is amended by striking out "May 1, 1992" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 1, 1997".

Senate amendment No. 212: Page 75, line 11, strike out "The" and insert: "Hereafter, the".

Senate amendment No. 213: Page 75, line 12, strike out "under this Act" and insert: "for the Department of Agriculture".

Senate amendment No. 214: Page 76, line 20, strike out "Advances" and insert: "Hereafter, advances".

Senate amendment No. 215: Page 76, line 21, strike out "in this Act".

Senate amendment No. 219: Page 77, line 15, after "Project," insert: "the reserve fund for the Grasshopper and Mormon Cricket Control Programs,".

Senate amendment No. 222: Page 77, line 23, after "Program;" insert: "Office of International Cooperation and Development, Middle-Income Country Training Program;".

Senate amendment No. 227: Page 78, line 6, after "Administration" insert: " *Provided*, That, hereafter, such appropriations are authorized to remain available until expended".

Senate amendment No. 228: Page 78, line 14, strike out "Notwithstanding" and insert: "Hereafter, notwithstanding".

Senate amendment No. 229: Page 81, line 14, strike out "Funds provided" and insert: "Hereafter, funds appropriated to the Department of Agriculture".

Senate amendment No. 230: Page 81, line 22, strike out "Provisions" and insert: "Hereafter, provisions".

Senate amendment No. 231: Page 82, line 11, strike out "Funds provided in this Act" and insert: "Hereafter, funds appropriated to the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration".

Senate amendment No. 232: Page 84, line 8, strike out "When" and insert: "Hereafter, the Department of Agriculture, when".

Senate amendment No. 234: Page 85, after line 2, insert:

SEC. 735. Of the \$200,000,000 made available for the Market Promotion Program pursuant to section 203 (7 U.S.C. 5623) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, \$70,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992.

Senate amendment No. 235: Page 85, line 12, strike out "Notwithstanding" and insert: "Hereafter, notwithstanding".

Senate amendment No. 236: Page 85, line 19, strike out "Funds provided in this Act" and insert: "Hereafter, funds appropriated to the Department of Agriculture".

Senate amendment No. 237: Page 86, line 1, strike out "The" and insert: "Hereafter, the".

Senate amendment No. 239: Page 86, after line 20, insert:

SEC. 741. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, loan subsidy rates used in carrying out loan programs provided for in this Act shall not exceed those estimated by the Office of Management and Budget and published in the Budget of the United States Government for fiscal year 1992.

Senate amendment No. 240: Page 86, after line 20, insert:

EXTENSIONS OF PROVISIONS' OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1949

SEC. 742. (a) RENTAL HOUSING LOAN AUTHORITY.—Section 515(b)(4) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1485(b)(4)) is amended by striking "September 30, 1991" and inserting "September 30, 1992".

(b) MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANT AND LOAN AUTHORITY.—Section 523(f) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490c(f)) is amended by striking "September 30, 1991" and inserting "September 30, 1992".

Section 502(h)(3)(C) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1472 note) is amended by striking all that follows "rural area" and by inserting a "." after "rural area".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 28, 31, 61, 68, 75, 94, 111, 116, 125, 127, 138, 162, 178, 202, 209, 212, 213, 214, 215, 219, 222, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 234, 235, 236, 237, 239, and 240, and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 16, line 1, strike out "\$17,650,000" and insert "\$17,391,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$20,795,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 16, line 13, strike out "\$412,886,000" and insert: "\$419,788,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$430,711,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 36: Page 16, line 21, strike out "\$62,529,000" and insert: "\$60,769,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$75,270,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 18, line 21, strike out "\$9,079,000" and insert: "\$10,397,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$11,347,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 49: Page 18, line 25, strike out "\$17,253,000" and insert: "\$17,149,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$17,715,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 19, line 7, after "improvements" insert: "Provided further, That \$500,000 shall be available for a grant pursuant to section 1472 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3818), in addition to other funds available in this appropriation for grants under this section"

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of

the Senate numbered 50 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$462,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 20, line 4, strike out "\$426,903,000" and insert: "\$415,987,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$430,939,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 25, after line 23, insert:

In fiscal year 1992, \$50,000,000 of section 32 funds shall be used to purchase sunflower and cottonseed oil, as authorized by section 1541 of Public Law 101-624, and such purchases shall be used to facilitate additional sales of such oils in world markets.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

In fiscal years 1992 and 1993, section 32 funds shall be used to promote sunflower and cottonseed oil exports to the full extent authorized by section 1541 of Public Law 101-624 (7 U.S.C. 1464 note), and such funds shall be used to facilitate additional sales of such oils in world markets.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 26, strike out lines 5, 6, and 7 and insert:

"For expenses necessary to capitalize the Laboratory Accreditation Program, \$600,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

"For expenses necessary to recapitalize Dairy Graders, \$1,250,000, and to capitalize the Laboratory Accreditation Program, \$600,000, making a total of \$1,850,000."

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 70: Page 32, strike out lines 1 to 13.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Act, the reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained, but not previously reimbursed, in fiscal year 1992 shall not exceed \$7,250,000,000.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

For fiscal year 1992, CCC shall not expend more than \$3,000,000 for expenses to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9607(g), and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6961: *Provided*, That expenses shall be for operations and maintenance costs only and that other hazardous waste management costs shall be paid for by the USDA Hazardous Waste Management appropriation.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 83: Page 42, line 4, after "channels" insert "*Provided further*, That not to exceed \$10,000,000 of the amount appropriated shall be used for water quality payments and practices in the same manner as permitted under the program for water quality which is authorized by section 1439 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990, such amount to remain available until expended for cost-share payments, incentive payments, technical assistance and other disbursements as may be determined to be needed for this purpose".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

"*Provided further*, That not to exceed \$6,750,000 of the amount appropriated shall be used for water quality payments and practices in the same manner as permitted under the program for water quality authorized in chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838 et seq.)."

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 88: Page 44, after line 19, insert:

WETLANDS RESERVE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the Wetlands Reserve Program pursuant to section 1438 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 3837), \$91,000,000, to remain available until expended, to be used for (1) payments for wetlands easements, either in a lump sum or over a period of five to twenty years for permanent easements, or over a period of five to twenty years for wetland easements which are not permanent but are, for thirty years or the maximum duration allowed under applicable State law; (2) cost-share assistance for the cost of carrying out the establishment of conservation measures and practices as provided for in approved wetland reserve program contracts; (3) other appropriate

cost-share assistance for wetland protection; and (4) technical assistance: *Provided*, That this amount shall be transferred to the Commodity Credit Corporation for use in carrying out this program: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to enter in excess of 98,000 acres in fiscal year 1992 into the Wetlands Reserve Program provided for herein.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

WETLANDS RESERVE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the Wetlands Reserve Program pursuant to subchapter C of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837), \$46,357,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to enter in excess of 50,000 acres in fiscal year 1992 into the Wetlands Reserve Program provided for herein: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the Wetlands Reserve Program.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 103: Page 46, line 9, strike out "\$308,100,000" and insert: "\$319,900,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: "\$319,900,000; and in addition such sums as may be necessary, as authorized by section 521(c) of the Act, to liquidate debt incurred prior to fiscal year 1992 to carry out the Rental Assistance Program under section 521(a)(2) of the Act".

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 107: Page 47, line 17, strike out "\$509,000,000" and insert "\$774,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 207 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$488,750,000".

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 108: Page 47, line 18, strike out all after "loans," down to and including "loans" in line 19 and insert: "\$1,922,140,000, of which \$1,000,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and \$182,140,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: "\$2,832,140,000, of which \$1,800,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and \$182,140,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans".

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 156: Page 56, line 4, after "funds" insert: "Provided further, That no funds appropriated in this Act may be used to develop or implement any other test, ratio, or criteria to deny or reduce loans or loan advances".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: "Provided further, That no funds appropriated in this Act may be used to implement any other criteria, ratio, or test to deny or reduce loans or loan advances".

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 176: Page 59, line 5, strike out all after "than" down to and including "assistance" in line 7 and insert: "\$500,000 nor more than \$1,500,000 of this appropriation shall be expended to provide community and economic development technical assistance and programs".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 176 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: "\$500,000 nor more than \$1,000,000 of this appropriation shall be expended to provide community and economic development technical assistance and programs".

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 177: page 59, line 9, strike out all after "REA" down to and including "office" in line 12 and insert "whose full time responsibilities are to administer such community and economic development programs".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "and whose full-time responsibilities are to administer such community and economic development programs".

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 184: Page 62, line 16, after "1993" insert ", of which up to \$5,000,000 may be used to carry out the farmer's market coupon demonstration project".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$3,000,000".

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 205: Page 71, strike out lines 1 to 21.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of

the Senate numbered 205 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS
(FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For payments in foreign currencies owed to or owned by the United States for research activities authorized by section 104(c)(7) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(c)(7)), not to exceed \$1,062,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$25,000 of these funds shall be available for payments in foreign currencies for expenses of employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), as amended by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 241: Page 86, after line 20, insert:

SEC. 743. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to issue a final regulation to carry out section 214 of Public Law 98-180.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 241 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 743. The Secretary shall ensure that no funds made available to carry out section 515 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, shall be used in a manner that differs from the Department's policies or practices in effect on July 1, 1991.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, may I say that I appreciate the handling of this bill by the vice chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. Speaker, I think that I should say for the RECORD here, in view of the

information which has been given to the membership, that a statement from a legislative committee takes precedence over what the Committee on Appropriations provides. That is absolutely untrue under all the decisions.

The law is that money shall be used for the purposes for which appropriated. I want to make that clear, and I have had to point that out over and over. Section 1301 of title 31 of the United States Code provides that appropriations shall be applied only to the objects for which the appropriations are made. We have repeated that provision of law as section 726 of the bill.

Both the House and Senate reports state there is no money in the bill for the proposed Rural Development Administration. A committee report is the best place to determine the intention of the act.

□ 1620

In the instant case here we have the Farmers Home Administrator, who advised us that he was going to do what he was told to do. I called his attention to the fact that he is going to do what he has appropriations to do. If not, we will have to make such investigation and take such action as should be necessary.

So I want to clear the record by pointing out that the law provides that money shall be used only for the purposes for which appropriated. Any statement from any legislative committee telling us what to do becomes secondary to what the Congress has done through the Appropriations Act. I want to make that plain.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to thank everybody on the subcommittee on the House and the Senate side. There were 241 Senate amendments that we worked out together. We are together on this conference agreement.

Again, Mr. Speaker, agriculture is basic to our general economy. I have tried to point that out time and time again, and it is still true. If we are going to come out of this situation that we face and avoid a real depression, we are going to have to go back to producing. You cannot have \$4 or \$5 trillion of obligations outstanding unless you produce more to handle it. You cannot handle it by cutting back.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say thank you to everybody concerned, including the staff.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving with the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] for a number of years, 25 in fact. What the chairman says is certainly true. Often agencies and departments do for-

get the appropriations process, and after they get the money they do what they want to do with it; but I can tell you that under the leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], there comes a day of reckoning. If that does happen, there will be another day to consider.

So I certainly want to reiterate and support the chairman that this committee is concerned about making sure that the wishes of Congress are carried out by the various agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, so I do thank the gentleman for his remarks.

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

Mr. Speaker, may I say thank you to my friend. It is always a pleasure to work with him. He always does more than his share, and the same goes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME
ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9,
1991, OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER,
CONSIDERATION OF CON-
FERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2942,
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
AND RELATED AGEN-
CIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of clause (2) of rule XXVIII, that it be in order at any time on Wednesday, October 9, 1991, or any day thereafter, to consider the conference report, amendments in disagreement, and motions to dispose of amendments in disagreement, to the bill (H.R. 2942), making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes, and that the conference report and the Senate amendments be considered as read when called up for consideration.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2426,
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AP-
PROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2426) making appropriations for military construction for the Department

of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 3, 1991, at page 25053).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report and the amendments in disagreement on the bill, H.R. 2426, and that I may include extraneous and tabular material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the conference report we present to the House today for military construction and family housing appropriations contains agreements on about 300 line items.

Before I summarize the conference action, I would like to take this time to thank the ranking minority member of the Military Construction Subcommittee, Mr. LOWERY, for his cooperation and diligence all year long so we can be here today to present this conference report to the House. Mr. LOWERY has been very helpful in making this a bipartisan effort. I also want to thank all the other members of the subcommittee for their bipartisan support, especially our committee chairman, JAMIE WHITTEN, for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement on H.R. 2426 that we are presenting to the House provides for \$8.56 billion in budget authority of which \$759 million is to fund both rounds of base closures and realignments.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement is under the President's request by \$55 million. It is within our committee's section 602 allocations for both budget authority and outlays. For about 8 years, the military construction program has been at about the same level with no growth. In fact, when compared to the fiscal year 1985 level, this bill has experienced 30 percent real negative growth. So, the conference agreement is not a budget bust.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement reduces the President's request

for overseas spending by about \$102 million which represents a reduction of about 32 percent. The conference agreement also reduces the President's request for NATO infrastructure funds by \$134 million or 37 percent. In the 10 years that I have been a member of this committee, this committee has consistently reduced the President's budget request for overseas funding and requested our allies share more of the burden. I think we have been successful in this effort. I also believe these overseas reductions have been prudent actions in light of the changes occurring throughout the world and especially in view of the reduced threat in Europe and peace initiatives that are occurring with the Soviet Union.

With regard to construction of a new base in Italy, the conference agreement prohibits the use of unobligated NATO infrastructure funds from being used for construction of a base to support the relocation of the 401st Tactical Fighter Wing to Crotona, Italy. The prohibition is identical to last year's prohibition which in effect holds up obligating any funds for a year.

On the domestic side, the conference agreement provides more funds than were requested by the President for base closures and realignments. In addition, the conference agreement earmarks a floor of \$220 million in order to help expedite cleanup of closed bases so that land can be transferred in a timely manner to mitigate or minimize economic losses.

The conference agreement also provides \$629 million for Guard and Reserve components which is \$61 million below last year's level but over the President's request.

The conference adds funds for two of the most important quality of life programs in the military—housing and medical facilities. For housing, the conference agreement is \$350 million over last year's level and \$27 million over the President's request.

The conference agreement provides \$15,000,000 under the base closure I account to begin initiation of a medical center to replace Womack Army Community Hospital at Fort Bragg, NC. The facility will serve the second largest Army catchment area beneficiary population, both active and CHAMPUS eligibles.

With regard to the construction at Whiteman Air Force Base for basing of the B-2 bomber, the conference agreement provides funding of \$29,500,000 instead of \$49,500,000 as requested. The conferees also direct the Air Force to program its projects consistent with the number of funded operational planes in the event future procurement action limits the number of planes.

The conference agreement provides \$43 million for replacement and repair of facilities destroyed or damaged by a tornado at McConnell Air Force Base, KS.

The agreement provides \$11.4 million instead of the \$36.5 million as requested for a trestle replacement at Earle Naval Weapons Station, NJ. The difference will be funded by the NATO allies.

The conference agreement provides funding in the amount of \$132 million for ammunition demilitarization facilities at four sites—Anniston Army Depot, Umatilla Army Depot, Pueblo Army Depot and Tooele Army Depot.

The conference agreement provides \$80 million for the final phase of funding for the J-6 Large Rocket Test Facility at Arnold Engineering Development Center, TN.

The conference agreement applies a general reduction of \$148 million against various accounts. The general reduction reflects prior year funded projects that are no longer required because of base closure II action. A list of those projects follows, for which funds have been obligated. The conference report makes it clear that the general reduction is to be applied against these projects and not against other funded projects.

The following projects are no longer required due to base closure:

Army:	
Fort Ord, CA: Automated Record Fire Range	\$2,450,000
Sacramento Army Depot, CA: Microwave/Radar Maintenance Facility	3,900,000
Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN:	
Fire Station	21,300,000
Learning Research Center	24,300,000
Navy:	
Moffett Field Naval Air Station, CA: Child Care Center	11,000,000
Tustin Marine Corps Air Station, CA: Flight Line Security Improvements	12,350,000
Long Beach Naval Station, CA: Wharf Utilities Upgrade	23,520,000
New London Naval Underwater Systems Center, CT:	
Electromagnetic Systems Laboratory	12,600,000
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard: Hazardous and Flammable Storage Warehouse	17,000,000
Warminster Naval Air Development Center, PA: Aircraft Technologies Laboratory	210,770,000
Exmouth Harold E. Holt Naval Communications Station, Australia: Fire Protection System	1610,000
Air Force:	
Williams AFB, AZ:	
Water Supply Complex Add to and Alter Flight Simulator	2400,000
Base Engineer Complex Specialized UPT Maint and Ops Support	22,350,000
2900,000	
Baker AFB, AR:	
Civil Engineer Shop Facility	12,700,000

Convoy Road	1,500,000
Water Well and Elevated Storage	1,850,000
Castle AFB, CA:	
Combat Crew Training School	23,000,000
Security Police Operations Facility	22,000,000
Standardized Evaluation Center	22,200,000
Lowry AFB, CO: Precision Measurement Equipment Lab	12,200,000
MacDill AFB, FL:	
F-16 Avionics Shop	13,550,000
Fuels Mobility Support Equipment Warehouse	1,940,000
Upgrade Runway	27,900,000
Grissom AFB, IN:	
Wing Headquarters and Command Post	150,000
Renovate Dormitory	22,500,000
Child Development Center	22,000,000
England AFB, LA:	
Add to and Alter Aircraft Corrosion Control Facility	12,700,000
Alter Dormitories	13,200,000
Base Supply Complex ..	14,100,000
Loring AFB, ME: Dormitory	18,500,000
Wurtsmith AFB, MI: Add to and Alter Child Development Center	2,960,000
Myrtle Beach AFB, S.C.: Add to and Alter Aircraft Maintenance Unit Facilities	12,350,000

Bergstrom AFB, TX: Add to Child Development Center	12,400,000
Carswell AFB, TX:	
Noise Suppressor Support Facility	1,650,000
Aircraft Parking Apron Lighting	21,350,000
Electrical Substation Acquisition	2,566,000
Hydrant Fueling System	29,700,000
Defense agencies: Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, PA: Medical/Dental/Occupational Health Clinic	211,600,000
Air National Guard: Fort Devens Annex, MA: Communications-Electronics Training Complex	13,000,000
Rickenbacker ANGB, OH: Alter Fuel System Maintenance Dock	240,000
Air Force Reserve: Richards-Gebaur AFRS, MO: Jet Fuel Storage Complex	12,350,000
Rickenbacker ANGB, OH: Add/Alter Facilities for Conversion	11,450,000
Add/Alter Hangar	16,800,000
Alter Fuel Maintenance Dock	250,000
¹ Fiscal year 1990:	
Army	\$6,350,000
Navy	23,560,000
Air Force	36,540,000
Air National Guard	3,000,000
Air Force Reserve	10,600,000
Total	80,050,000

² Fiscal year 1991:	
Army	5,600,000

Navy	14,290,000
Air Force	35,826,000
Defense Agencies	11,600,000
Air National Guard	400,000
Air Force Reserve	500,000
Total	68,216,000

Totals:	
Army	11,950,000
Navy	37,850,000
Air Force	72,386,000
Defense Agencies	11,600,000
Air National Guard	3,400,000
Air Force Reserve	11,100,000
Total	148,286,000

I want to assure the Members of this House that this bill is a bipartisan effort. The bill cuts overseas programs, it provides sufficient funds to keep base closures on track. It increases the amount for quality of life projects that contribute to retention of our service men and women. It provides funds for revitalizing an aging physical plant which is, on the average, over 50 years of age. I urge Members to support the conference report.

At this point, I reserve the balance of my time and submit for the RECORD a comparative statement of budget authority.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, FY 1992 (H.R. 2426)

	FY 1991 Enacted	FY 1992 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Military construction, Army 1/	746,137,000	870,170,000	877,585,000	798,770,000	880,820,000	+134,683,000
Rescission	-116,745,000		-39,000,000	-39,000,000	-39,000,000	+77,745,000
Total, Military construction, Army (net)	629,392,000	870,170,000	838,585,000	759,770,000	841,820,000	+212,428,000
Military construction, Navy 2/	1,132,806,000	878,420,000	848,428,000	878,211,000	883,859,000	-248,747,000
Rescission	-8,200,000		-56,392,000	-56,392,000	-56,392,000	-50,192,000
Total, Military construction, Navy (net)	1,126,406,000	878,420,000	792,037,000	821,819,000	827,467,000	-298,939,000
Military construction, Air Force 3/5/	949,094,000	1,151,020,000	1,129,420,000	967,570,000	1,006,954,000	+56,880,000
Rescission	-51,390,000		-94,400,000	-94,400,000	-94,400,000	-43,010,000
Total, Military construction, Air Force (net)	897,704,000	1,151,020,000	1,035,020,000	873,170,000	911,554,000	+13,880,000
Military construction, Defense agencies 4/	601,288,000	725,700,000	745,980,000	654,330,000	724,740,000	+123,452,000
Rescission	-88,119,000					+88,119,000
Total, Military construction, Defense agencies (net)	533,169,000	725,700,000	745,980,000	654,330,000	724,740,000	+191,571,000
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure	192,700,000	358,800,000	158,800,000	254,400,000	225,000,000	+32,300,000
Military construction, Army National Guard	313,224,000	50,400,000	161,281,000	233,274,000	231,117,000	-82,107,000
Military construction, Air National Guard	180,580,000	131,800,000	172,690,000	231,508,000	217,568,000	+37,008,000
Military construction, Army Reserve	77,426,000	57,500,000	94,880,000	114,723,000	110,389,000	+32,963,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve	80,307,000	20,900,000	20,900,000	80,400,000	59,900,000	-20,407,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	38,600,000	20,800,000	20,800,000	22,800,000	9,700,000	-28,900,000
Total, Reserve components	690,117,000	281,400,000	470,531,000	662,703,000	628,672,000	-61,445,000
Total, Military construction:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	4,089,488,000	4,266,510,000	4,040,983,000	4,026,192,000	4,159,253,000	+89,765,000
Appropriations	(4,311,942,000)	(4,266,510,000)	(4,230,755,000)	(4,215,984,000)	(4,349,045,000)	(+37,103,000)
Rescissions	(-242,454,000)		(-189,792,000)	(-189,792,000)	(-189,792,000)	(+52,662,000)
Family housing, Army:						
Appropriation	1,538,267,000	1,534,425,000	1,579,245,000	1,508,975,000	1,557,245,000	+18,978,000
Portion applied to debt reduction	-250,000	-125,000	-125,000	-125,000	-125,000	+125,000
Rescission	-12,864,000					+12,864,000
Total, Family housing, Army (net)	1,525,363,000	1,534,300,000	1,579,120,000	1,508,850,000	1,557,120,000	+31,767,000
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps	898,018,000	879,900,000	908,140,000	880,900,000	902,140,000	+38,122,000
Rescission	-11,037,000					+11,037,000
Total, Family housing, Navy (net)	884,981,000	879,900,000	908,140,000	880,900,000	902,140,000	+47,159,000
Family housing, Air Force 5/	934,399,000	1,083,800,000	1,085,983,000	991,283,000	1,075,283,000	+140,884,000
Rescission	-45,984,000					+45,984,000
Total, Family housing, Air Force (net)	888,435,000	1,083,800,000	1,085,983,000	991,283,000	1,075,283,000	+186,848,000
Family housing, Defense agencies	21,014,000	26,200,000	26,200,000	26,200,000	26,200,000	+5,188,000
Rescission	-300,000					+300,000
Total, Family housing, Defense agencies (net)	20,714,000	26,200,000	26,200,000	26,200,000	26,200,000	+5,488,000
Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense	5,100,000	84,000,000	84,000,000	84,000,000	84,000,000	+78,900,000
Total, Family housing:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	3,294,583,000	3,618,200,000	3,683,443,000	3,471,233,000	3,644,743,000	+350,160,000
Appropriations	(3,364,798,000)	(3,618,325,000)	(3,683,568,000)	(3,471,358,000)	(3,644,868,000)	(+280,070,000)
Rescissions	(-69,985,000)					(+69,985,000)
Applied to debt reduction	(-250,000)	(-125,000)	(-125,000)	(-125,000)	(-125,000)	(+125,000)
Base realignment and closure account, Part I	998,100,000	633,800,000	658,800,000	674,600,000	658,800,000	-339,500,000
Base realignment and closure account, Part II		100,000,000	100,000,000	297,000,000	100,000,000	+100,000,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	8,382,171,000	8,618,310,000	8,483,006,000	8,489,026,000	8,562,566,000	+200,425,000
Appropriations	(8,674,840,000)	(8,618,435,000)	(8,672,923,000)	(8,658,942,000)	(8,752,513,000)	(+77,673,000)
Applied to debt reduction	(-250,000)	(-125,000)	(-125,000)	(-125,000)	(-125,000)	(+125,000)
Rescissions	(-312,419,000)		(-189,792,000)	(-189,792,000)	(-189,792,000)	(+122,827,000)

1/ FY 1992 Estimates include \$18,870,000 requested under the Defense Business Operations Fund (DBOF)

2/ FY 1992 Estimates include \$221,820,000 requested under the DBOF

3/ FY 1992 Estimates include \$25,640,000 requested under the DBOF

4/ FY 1992 Estimates include \$154,100,000 requested under the DBOF

5/ Budget request to repair or replace facilities damaged by a tornado at McConnell AFB, Kansas on April, 26, 1991 was submitted by the President on June 28, 1991 (H. Doc. 102-107) as shown in table to the right:

5/(continued) Military Construction

Seven Projects	\$39,780,000
Planning and design	3,200,000
Family Housing	
Construction	10,000,000
Maintenance	1,800,000
Planning and design	500,000
Total	\$55,280,000

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina, for his leadership and diligence in bringing this bill to conference.

There are many changes taking place in the world today, and this bill reflects those changing realities. As the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] stated, we resolved over 300 differences. We are presenting to the House a conference report which is balanced and fair.

The conference agreement on H.R. 2426 contains \$7.8 billion for military construction and family housing. Also included is \$658.6 million for continued funding of the 1988 base closures and \$100 million for the 1991 base closures.

When combined, the total appropriation is \$8.56 billion. This is within our 602(b) allocation and below the budget request by \$55.7 million. In addition, it is important my colleagues understand that although we are moving the appropriation bill prior to completion of the authorization conference, the projects included in this bill will be subject to that authorization.

Mr. Speaker, an issue that has continued to prompt much debate is the relocation of the 401st Tactical Fighter Wing from Torrejon, Spain, to Crotone, Italy. The conference report before the House includes a provision which prohibits U.S. contributions to the NATO infrastructure account for the construction of Crotone for another year. It is important that my colleagues realize the United States has committed \$46 million, based on current exchange rates, toward the construction of the runway and utilities. It is the conferees' understanding that this construction, which began last summer, has experienced delays and will not be complete until February 1993. While the language in the conference report does not impact this \$46 million, it does prohibit the United States from committing itself any further during fiscal year 1992.

□ 1630

The conferees have expressed support for a minimum cost barebones base at Crotone and it is our intention to revisit this issue next year.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report looks very similar to those which have overwhelmingly passed the House the past few years. We have provided funds in support of weapon systems, taken care of quality of life projects, reduced funding for construction overseas, increased funding for the Guard and Reserves, and provided the necessary funds to implement base closures. It is a good agreement and one which deserves the support of my colleagues.

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

Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], a ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me, and I will be very, very brief. I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], for doing a superb job on a very important and difficult bill. They had an enormous number of disagreements with the Senate, over 300 line items, and they have resolved all of them. They have taken care of the quality-of-life issues which have been referred to, that are the lifeline of the troops of this Nation, the men and women who serve in the Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, it is a lifeline that leads to retention, to morale, to all of those things that are so important to a well-performing and well-rounded group who serve this country at home and abroad.

They have done a superb job in meeting them.

Mr. Speaker, they have done something else that needs the House's attention. They found the money to include \$43 million to replace and repair damaged facilities at McConnell Air Force Base, which was hit by a tornado in April. They did not wait for a supplemental. They found the money in the bill. I congratulate them for doing so.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is clearly within the section 602(b) allocation. I have no hesitancy in recommending that it be adopted by the House.

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking majority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. I rise in support of this conference report.

I want to give particular attention to an amendment I offered. That amendment includes language which has one single purpose: to make clear that Congress intends for the Defense Department to extend the fullest possible cooperation to groups working to formulate and implement reuse plans for those bases on both the 1988 and 1991 closure list.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote the language for the RECORD.

The conferees intend that the Department of Defense and the military departments will extend the fullest cooperation to State and local governments and to local entities constituted to formulate and implement reuse plans for military installations scheduled for closure under recommendations made pursuant to Public Law 100-526 and Public Law 101-510.

Eaker Air Force Base in my district is one of the bases to be closed.

That's not good news.

But, there is good news—the local community has banded together to market this fine facility, to make it home to new businesses and industries.

I recently invited my friend Fred Smith, president and chief executive officer of Federal Express, on a tour of the base to explore the potential for establishing a heavy maintenance facility—and we have high hopes that someday aircraft of FedEx will replace the aircraft of the Air Force.

We are confident that good things will happen at Eaker—but we need a little cooperation from our friends—over across the river in the Pentagon.

In meeting with community leaders working on this reuse project, it was reported to me that they were facing a maze of redtape and formidable bureaucratic roadblocks in their efforts to market this base.

Let me set out just a few examples:

Requests for even the most routine information is being bounced from place to place, when those decisions should be made quickly as the local base level.

The square footage of a building or information on the water treatment plant does not involve national security, and requests for such information should not have to go through so many hands.

In industrial recruitment, time is of the essence.

Recently, an industrial prospect wanted a tour of the base, but only gave local officials a 24-hour notice. The request for the tour was turned down by base officials and the local reuse committee was told 5 days advance notice was required.

Space on the base was denied to me when I wanted to send a member of my Washington staff to Eaker to meet with civilian employees about to lose their jobs. The visit had on purpose: To see if my office could assist these constituents in facing this traumatic situation.

The Air Force first said that space could not be provided because such visits were of a partisan political nature.

I was shocked at such a characterization. I remain shocked and will continue to press this issue until I have the answers I want.

As a result of this decision my staff member had to change locations on each of the 3 days he met with civilian employees.

He met with these constituents, not for partisan political purposes, but to offer a helping hand to people facing a major disruption in their lives.

Mr. Speaker there are other examples—but the end result is the same. For whatever reason, the Pentagon has apparently decided that it's business as usual at these bases.

Well, I'm here to tell them, it's not business as usual.

The closure of Eaker Air Force Base will cause major economic disruption

and deeply affect the lives of many, many people.

We have accepted the closure of the base and are looking to the future. But, to succeed in our efforts, to ensure the future, we must have the cooperation of the Pentagon.

The reuse efforts will succeed, but they will succeed more rapidly if they are not choked by redtape and hindered by bureaucratic roadblocks.

These obstructions aren't what we need.

What we need is a little help from our friends—and this language will ensure that we get it.

I have today written to Air Force Secretary Donald Rice and to the commander at Eaker Air Force Base informing them of this action—and asking that they comply.

I can assure you that I will be in close touch with the situation in the days and weeks ahead.

[The letters referred to are as follows:]

CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, DC, September 9, 1991.

HON. DONALD B. RICE,
Secretary, Department of the Air Force, The
Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed is a copy of a memorandum transmitted to the president of AFGE Local 2840 which represents civilian employees at Eaker AFB, AR. As you know, this facility is slated for closure pursuant to the recommendations of the Commission on Base Closure and Realignment.

During visits to Blytheville, AR where the base is located I have been approached on several occasions by civilian employees and representatives of the union requesting that my office make someone available for one-on-one meetings with employees who will be displaced by the base closure. Naturally, I am anxious to do whatever I can to ease the transition of affected employees through this difficult period and am more than willing to accommodate this request.

During the period August 26-29 a member of my staff traveled to Blytheville to meet with interested employees and provide information and guidance on relocation and retraining assistance which could be provided by the Federal Government. Unfortunately, by that time it had become apparent that the Air Force was going to do whatever it could to complicate this effort by refusing to permit any room on the base to be used for this purpose. Moreover, the Union President was denied his request to use administrative leave allocated to the union to assist in these meetings. The rationale for this decision was that the visit of my staff was of a "partisan political nature".

This characterization of my staff's mission to Eaker is without any foundation or basis in fact. Prior to the visit, the base commander's office and the civilian personnel office both received assurances that no political activities would be involved. Nevertheless, on August 28—while my staff was meeting with civilian employees at a location off base—the enclosed memorandum was delivered to the union president. It strongly insinuates that, notwithstanding my assurances to the contrary, partisan political activity was expected to be a part of this visit.

Base employees who participated in these meetings can assure you that the subject matter addressed related to base closure and

reemployment issues. Any assertion to the contrary is repudiated in fact and truth.

My staff has requested Mr. Bernie Josten of the Air Force Budget Office for the name of the person who determined that this activity was partisan and, accordingly, denied us the use of a room at the base. Additionally, I want to know the precise justification for such a determination—including a definition of what constitutes partisan political activity and what does not.

You will be hearing more from me on this matter in other venues. I hope to be hearing from you soon.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

BILL ALEXANDER,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
HEADQUARTERS 97TH COMBAT SUP-
PORT GROUP (SAC),

Eaker Air Force Base, AR, August 28, 1991.

Subject: Request for Administrative Leave.

To: John F. Bernier, President Local 2840,
A.F.G.E., Eaker AFB AR 72317.

1. Your request for eight hours of administrative leave from the Union's bank of hours is denied.

2. The visit by Congressman Alexander's representative has been deemed by Air Force authorities to be of a partisan political nature. Federal law prohibits the support of partisan political activities by federal agencies or federal employees. Because of this prohibition, it has been determined that base facilities could not be extended to the Congressman's representative for the proposed meetings with base employees. For the same reasons, we cannot authorize you official government time to assist the Congressman's representative. This would be agency support of partisan political activities, which is prohibited.

3. One hour's administrative leave has been granted to any employees wishing to meet with the Congressman's representative solely to ensure that all employees are treated equitably in requesting an opportunity to meet with the representative. This was authorized to preclude some employees being allowed extended lunch hours at varying times, while others were required to take annual leave. Your request was for eight hours to directly assist the representative in his activities, which is an entirely different matter.

4. You are free to take annual leave to pursue your duties as Union Local President in relation to the Congressman's representative visit. Your attention is directed to the prohibitions in the Hatch Act against partisan political activity by Federal government employees and you are specifically cautioned against becoming involved in soliciting votes for Congressman Alexander while assisting his representative.

BARBARA FARMER,
Employee Relations Specialist.

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the fine job they have done and rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2426 and thank the chairman for all of his fine efforts on behalf of Fort Bliss, TX.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 2426, military construction appropriations for fiscal year 1992. I would like to commend my subcommittee chairman,

BILL HEFNER, for his diligence in bringing this report to the floor. It is a pleasure to work with him and all of my distinguished colleagues on this subcommittee. I also want to thank the subcommittee staff for their hard work in working out the details of the bill and the accompanying report.

The bill contains projects vital to the morale, recruitment, and retention of U.S. military personnel across the country and around the world. Not only does the bill relate to new military construction projects but also contains provisions important to diverse items such as weapons systems, environmental concerns, family housing, child care centers, and educational needs of military families.

Of special concern to my congressional district are barracks modernization projects at Fort Bliss, TX. The Department of Defense has omitted military construction and family housing projects for Fort Bliss in the past several years. Barracks on the post are World War II vintage and clearly substandard. As Congress considers the defense needs of our country, these projects will enhance the quality of life, morale, and retention of a well-trained, volunteer Army.

Fort Bliss is home of the U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center, and its soldiers gained international fame during the Persian Gulf war because of its patriot-trained units. Clearly, the air defense mission in the U.S. postwar military strategy will increase, and Fort Bliss' roll will be enhanced. I therefore believe it is critical to go forward with a barracks modernization program at this post, and the projects contained in the bill will complement this plan.

Unfortunately, and without apparent reason, the Department of Defense has included no monies for Fort Bliss in its 1992 budget submission for the Army. I am appreciative of the assistance of the subcommittee in adding the two barracks projects. The projects were authorized by the House Committee on Armed Services, and I also want to thank Chairman SCHROEDER and Chairman ASPIN for their assistance with this matter.

The subcommittee also recommended a deficiency allowance to cover funding shortfalls for prior year barracks modernization projects at Fort Bliss.

In closing, I wish to again thank the conference committee for its consideration of these important matters, and I urge my colleagues to support the report.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to take this time to thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the

ranking minority member on that subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], for their assistance in expediting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think too infrequently we Members, who are not on the Committee on Appropriations, too infrequently do we express our appreciation to the members of the Committee on Appropriations for the hard work and the many, many hours that they take in listening to people from around the country, and Members of Congress expressing their interests and concerns, and I want to commend them for all the time they take and for the excellent product that they brought us today.

□ 1640

Specifically, this Member would like to thank the committee and subcommittee for recognizing the needs of the Nebraska Army National Guard by providing nearly \$12 million in funding for construction projects throughout Nebraska. In this Member's congressional district the conferees provided \$6.6 million for the construction of new barracks at Camp Ashland. Camp Ashland serves as the noncommissioned officer academy for Guard members from an 11-State region. The Nebraska Guard's Officer Candidate School is also located at Camp Ashland. In addition, individual Guard units routinely visit the camp to engage in 2- or 3-day field training exercises. These new barracks, when coupled with the existing wooden barracks, will result in as many as 700 troops being billeted at Camp Ashland.

Furthermore, this Member commends the conferees for approving funding for a new warehouse and fiscal office in Lincoln, NE, in the amount of \$2.3 million. This funding will enable the Nebraska Army Guard to replace its outdated warehouse with a new more efficient facility.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS] for a colloquy.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, in a colloquy concerning the severe environmental problems we face at many bases slated for closure. Earlier this year, Congressman PANETTA, the distinguished chairman of the House Budget Committee, and I were joined by 33 other House Members in writing to the committee in support of increasing funding for the cleanup of bases named for closure in rounds I and II of the base closure process. The Pen-

tagon had informed us that they needed \$413 million in fiscal year 1992 for this job. In my State of Maine, for example, Loring Air Force Base alone has 42 individual sites requiring environmental work. The Defense Department estimated in July that the restoration will require \$52 million next year and over \$300 million to complete at Loring.

Mr. HEFNER. I appreciate the Congressman's concerns. The committee is fully committed to funding the cleanup of all base closure sites. The Department of Defense, however, has not been forthcoming in its explanation of its cost requirements or in providing the committee with a plan for the orderly restoration of these bases.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I note that the committee provided \$220 million for cleanup at round I bases, but did not provide additional funding for restoration at bases in round II. The Department of Defense requested only \$100 million for all round II base closure activities next year, far short of the \$197 million the Pentagon recently told us are needed for the environmental work alone. What is the committee's intent for funding restoration at round II bases in fiscal year 1992?

Mr. HEFNER. I appreciate the gentleman from Maine's inquiry. The committee intends that the \$100 million allocated for base closure activities be made available primarily for environmental restoration. The committee also directs the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Defense Environmental Restoration Account Program, which is not funded by this committee, is also responsible for funding the cleanup work at these sites in fiscal year 1992.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Is it correct that the President requested \$69 million be funded as part of this account for base closure round II sites?

Mr. HEFNER. Yes; \$69 million was identified for this purpose. Beginning in fiscal year 1993, however, the committee expects the Department of Defense to fully fund environmental cleanup in its budget submission as part of the base closure account for round II, which is part of the military construction budget. We look forward to seeing their justification of this program and the Department's plan for environmental work at these bases.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the explanation of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] and his commitment to the restoration of base closure sites. We have been through a very difficult and painful process of identifying military bases across the United States that will permanently close. The pain and difficulty comes from the hardship that these closings will cause the communities in which they are located, communities who for years have been

there to answer their Nation's call in time of military need. Well, now these communities are facing their own time of great need, and unless they have the full support and cooperation of the Federal Government, they could be facing severe economic hardship.

The time to begin assisting these communities is now, and that must begin by cleaning up each and every base that is scheduled to be closed. The communities that are facing the great challenge of economic redevelopment should not be further hampered by a Federal Government that is unwilling to clean up its own mess quickly and completely.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER].

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after I was elected to the House of Representatives in 1982, I visited the Dover Air Force Base in the central part of our State. During the course of that visit I spent some time at our childcare center there. I saw a center that was well run, with children that were well cared for and tended to. I also saw a center 8 years ago that was literally busting at the seams.

Several years later we are in the midst of the Desert Shield/Desert Storm buildup. I revisited the bases I have visited throughout the years, and I found a base whose workload had doubled and tripled and then quadrupled as opposed to peacetime. I visited the same childcare center, and if I thought I had seen a busy, busting at the seams childcare center in 1983, I want to tell my colleagues that by 1990 the situation was far worse. We had over 200 families waiting, trying to get their children into that childcare center and not having the opportunity to do that.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for an extension and expansion of the childcare center, the first one we had at our base for a long, long time.

I just want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], to everyone on the subcommittee, to the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], everybody who has played a role in making this expansion of our center a possibility, how much the families of the Dover Air Force Base appreciate the support that they have shown for this.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2426, the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. This measure contains many important provisions relating to enhancing the quality of life for our military personnel.

I want to give special thanks to Chairman HEFNER and the ranking mi-

nority member, Mr. LOWERY, for accepting my amendment to provide an additional \$15 million in barracks renovation at Fort Hood, in my district. Fort Hood will be gaining over 12,000 troops as a result of the base realignment process, and new housing for soldiers is very much needed.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that Fort Hood sent 25,000 troops to fight for our country in Desert Storm. We have welcomed our soldiers home with parades and yellow ribbons, but now it is time to welcome our troops home with adequate housing and vital training facilities.

The four projects totaling \$46.7 million will include renovating 12 barracks, building a small arms firing range, and completing the consolidated maintenance facility for heavy equipment and vehicles. I am pleased these four projects have received the committee's support and believe our Nation's military is well served by their funding.

Mr. Speaker, as our overall troops levels are drawn down, keeping high quality personnel in the armed services becomes absolutely essential. We cannot keep and train first-class troops in second-class facilities.

I urge my colleagues to join me in strong support of H.R. 2426, and vote "yes" on final passage to ensure our military's infrastructure remains first and foremost.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2426, the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992. This is the 7th conference report on one of the 13 annual appropriations bills to be reported to the House.

This conference report provides \$8.563 billion in total discretionary budget authority and \$8.433 billion in total discretionary outlays, which is \$1 million below the 602(b) subdivision for budget authority and \$49 million below the 602(b) subdivision for outlays, respectively, for this subcommittee.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I will continue to inform the House of the impact of all spending legislation. I have provided a "Dear Colleague" letter describing how each appropriation measure considered so far compared to the 602(b) subdivisions for that subcommittee. I will provide similar information about the remaining conference agreements on the fiscal year 1992 appropriations bills.

I look forward to working with the Appropriations Committee in the future and commend the committee for the work they have done in adhering to the limits set forth in the budget agreement and the 1992 budget resolution.

[Fact Sheet]

CONFERENCE REPORT TO COMPANY—

H.R. 2426, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1992 (H. REP. 102-236)

The House Appropriations Committee filed the conference report to accompany H.R. 2426, the Military Construction Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1992 on Thursday, October 3, 1991. This conference report could be considered at any time.

COMPARISON TO THE 602(B) SUBDIVISION

The conference report provides \$8,563 million of discretionary budget authority, \$1 million less than the Appropriations budget authority 602(b) subdivision for this subcommittee. The bill is \$49 million under the subdivision total for estimated discretionary outlays. A comparison of the bill with the funding subdivisions follows:

COMPARISON TO DEFENSE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING ALLOCATION (In millions of dollars)

	Military Construction appropriations bill		Appropriations Committee 602(b) subdivision		Bill over (+) / under (-) committee 602(b) subdivision	
	BA	0	BA	0	BA	0
Discretionary	8,563	8,433	8,564	8,482	-1	-49
Mandatory						
Total	8,563	8,433	8,564	8,482	-1	-49

BA = New budget authority.
0 = Estimated outlays.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	New outlays
Military Construction:		
Army	842	168
Navy	827	137
Air Force	912	119
Defense agencies	725	87
NATO infrastructure	225	56
Family Housing:		
Army	1,557	1,066
Navy and Marine Corps	902	447
Air Force	1,075	673
Base closure account	759	91

The House Appropriations Committee ordered reported the Committee's subdivision of budget authority and outlays in House Report 102-180. These subdivisions are consistent with the allocation of spending responsibility to House committees contained in House Report 102-69, the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 121, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1992, as adopted by the Congress on May 22, 1991.

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the amendments in disagreement are considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 10, strike out "\$877,585,000" and insert: "\$796,770,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Amendment of

the Senate Numbered 1, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: "\$880,820,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 3: Page 3, line 5, strike out "\$848,429,000" and insert: "\$878,211,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Amendment of the Senate Numbered 3, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: "\$883,859,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1650

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 5: Page 3, line 24, strike out "\$1,129,420,000" and insert: "\$967,570,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Amendment of the Senate Numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: "\$1,005,954,000, provided, that the certification requirements specified in section 210 of title 23 of the United States Code, shall not apply in the case of the renovation of the Suitland Parkway as a defense access road for Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland".

Mr. LOWERY of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order against one section of the amendment.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, in the amendment there is \$6 million for the renovation of the Suitland Parkway,

and I make the point of order against that language that it is not germane to the legislation, and that the language contained includes legislation in an appropriation bill and is, therefore, not eligible for consideration by the House.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, we understand the rules of the House and we realize that the gentleman's point is well taken, but this is purely technical. It is not controversial, and I would ask that the gentleman reconsider his point of order and withdraw it. There is no controversy about it, and this is something that needs to be done. We cannot elaborate on it because there are some bits of it that have to do with national security.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, under my point of order I would simply make the point that, as I understand it, this is one piece of several millions of dollars that are being spent on the Suitland Parkway. I do not know whether there is controversy about it or not. I do understand that there has been some talk about the nature of this as being money to be used for an access road.

I would say to the gentleman that as nearly as I can tell, it is not an overriding emergency, and that through the point of order we can save \$6 million of spending, and so I would insist upon my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The point of order is conceded and sustained. The motion is not germane to Senate amendment No. 5.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute motion.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Amendment of the Senate Numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: "\$1,005,954,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take this opportunity simply to inquire about several other things that are in the amendment. I notice that we have some \$24 million, if I add it up correctly, in this amendment going to overseas facilities. We have had quite a few eloquent speeches on the floor in recent weeks and months indicating that the money we are spending overseas for our military presence there is in fact wasteful spending and should not be permitted to go forward, that in fact we ought to be withdrawing that money and not enhancing it. Obviously the committee has come to a different conclusion than some of the Members who have waxed eloquent on the floor in that respect.

I am just wondering whether or not the committee could offer some justification for these airfield pavements in one case, a child development center in another case, a tower and radar approach facility, and in another case a dedicated aircraft support system, and in yet another case in Canada there is also a forward operating locations and disbursement operating base. This seems to fly in the face of some of the things we have heard a lot of discussion on the floor about, and I simply ask as a point of information whether or not there is some justification for this spending, in light of everything we have been hearing in recent weeks.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, we eliminated funding of \$20.7 million for the only project in Canada, so the gentleman is not correct.

We have cut overseas programs by more than one-third. I could not agree with the gentleman more about cutting overseas programs. I have, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], fought very hard to get more burden sharing from NATO and from our allies.

We cut overseas projects by a third. We made dramatic cuts, but there are some projects that we felt should be funded. It is legitimate funding, and I think we have done a good job. We are going to continue to make cuts overseas.

This is a responsible bill, and the things that we have funded here are necessary. I would ask the gentleman to read pages 14 and 15 of the conference report concerning Canada and Lajes Air Field in Portugal. Some folks would like to cut it all, and I would like to cut it all, too, but I think we have acted in a responsible way in this bill.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, do I understand we are cutting the overseas funding by a third based upon this year's spending? In this bill it will be one-third lower than it was in fiscal year 1991?

Mr. HEFNER. Based on the President's request, and we are lower than last year's level for overseas programs.

Mr. WALKER. In other words, you cut the President's request by one-third?

Mr. HEFNER. Yes.

Mr. WALKER. How much lower are we, then, in this year's spending?

Mr. HEFNER. On a percentage?

Mr. WALKER. Well, either way. If we are reducing spending in this area, how much below the spending for 1991 are we in 1992?

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the gentleman a percentage, but I can just go back to my opening statement. In the last several years we have experienced negative growth in military construction. We have been stagnant in the past 6 years on military

construction, and what we have done is to attempt to improve the quality of life for our forces. I would remind the gentleman also that we have had in effect a moratorium. We have gotten further and further behind on family housing and on things that are so important.

The gentleman has mentioned many times himself, that we need to support our All-Volunteer Force and the people for retention in the Armed Forces, as well as the men who operated so admirably in the Persian Gulf. I agree with the gentleman. This is one of the areas of defense where I think we should absolutely have more money, but we have had to operate under strict budget restrictions, and we have had just so few dollars. In some cases we have our troops operating the highest technological equipment in the world, and they are living in World War II facilities. That also applies to Europe, speaking about some of the living facilities we have there.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am not at all questioning the work of the committee in its attempt to try to do what is right. My point is simply juxtaposed against what we have been hearing here in the House. It seems to me the committee has come to a somewhat different conclusion than some of our colleagues who have come to the House floor recently and suggested we can pull virtually all the money out of Europe and consequently save the taxpayers that amount of money.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am not speaking for our colleagues who have come to the floor and made that proposition. I have made the proposition to the House that we have done a good job on military construction. We have done our best to add to the quality of life in support of our All-Volunteer Military Force and our men and women who operated so admirably in the Persian Gulf.

This committee, I believe, has done what I consider to be a good job for our men and women in the service.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning the gentleman on that point at all. In my view, the committee has done a pretty decent job here, and I was just interested to know how far below—

Mr. HEFNER. It is an excellent job.

Mr. WALKER. I will characterize it in my way, and the gentleman may characterize it in his way.

For instance—and this goes beyond the scope of the amendment before us—when I go down to amendment No. 9, for example, I find that we are appropriating \$225 million for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization instead of \$158 million, as proposed by the House. They went instead to a figure closer to the Senate-passed figure. That is a sub-

stantial increase that was accepted by the conferees in this report.

Then I look over here and I find these millions of dollars in spending in the amendment before us now, amendment No. 5. My only point is that it seems to me that this committee in its wisdom and its responsibility to do the right thing by our military forces has in fact indicated that some continued presence in the European theater, and particularly in the NATO theater, is in fact a reality and is going to be a long-term reality in this country; otherwise we would not be making the kind of investments that are envisioned in this particular amendment.

I happen to think that that is probably worthwhile, but it certainly flies in the face of statements of numerous of our colleagues who have suggested to us that a total pullout from NATO and a total pullout of U.S. Forces from Europe should be countenanced in the near future as a way of saving money.

□ 1700

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, on page 13 of the conference report there is a list of projects. Let me just run through them very briefly.

Thule Air Base, Greenland. It is some \$12.7 million for a second phase upgrade of the airfield pavement. That is a very hostile environment, as the gentleman knows, up there, from a climate standpoint. The airfield is the main supply line for all items arriving at Thule Air Base and is the only means of transportation in or out for 10 months of the year.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving my right to object and reclaiming my time for a moment, I assume we are doing that because we figure that we are going to have some long-term presence at the Thule Air Force Base. Is that right?

Mr. LOWERY of California. If the gentleman will yield further, we will indeed. I am not aware of Thule being on anyone's list for closure. It is extremely important for our missions in the North Atlantic, and that is an installation that will remain open.

Anderson Air Force Base in Guam, this is for a child development center. Anderson is becoming increasingly important. That is not a foreign base. Guam is a U.S. territory. With the closing of Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines, Anderson is going to have increasing importance in the future.

Mr. WALKER. Again, further reserving the right to object, I will go back to the point. If we are going to invest in the families that are going to be at Anderson, I assume that the committee is suggesting that we probably are going to have a long-term presence at Anderson as well..

Mr. LOWERY of California. The gentleman is correct. Then Lajes Field in the Azores, Portugal, that is a control tower and radar approach control. Lajes is extremely important. Any time we have an airlift mission to the southern portion of NATO or to the Middle East, Lajes has a great deal of traffic through it. This control tower has not been updated since 1954.

Mr. WALKER. Reclaiming my time, this is an indication that in our own national interest, we are probably going to be there for some period of time to come.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Indeed we will be. Finally, at Lakenheath, there is an F-15 wing there, and that is one, despite the closures and bringing back a number of wings out of Europe, one that will remain. That is for a fuel facility, of \$3.6 million.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. Again, it seems to me what we are indicating by spending that kind of money on an upgrade is that in the opinion of this committee, and evidently the experts with which you deal, this is another facility where we are probably going to have a long-term presence, and so, therefore, is worth the investment at the present time to assure that that upgrade serves our military mission, as well as the families of our military, in the best possible way in those bases where we are going to be for a long period of time.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will further yield, Secretary Cheney has already proposed numerous facilities around the world for closure. We are not funding construction at those locations. It would make no sense. We are not going to be isolationists and pull back from commitments everywhere around the globe. These are facilities that are very key to our defense needs, and that will remain open.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY]. One reason for the dialog, and I am very grateful to both the chairman and the ranking Republican on the committee for engaging me in this dialog. I have simply heard suggestions over the last few months that there is some 130 to 150 billion dollars' worth of spending now devoted to NATO that could be immediately cut, and thereby pay for all kinds of good things that Members in Congress want to do.

It seems to me that this is a clear indication that while some of that money is certainly available to us through some kind of burden sharing relationships, it is also true in our own national interests, we have some obligations that are long-term obligations, and not all of that money can be recovered for spending on a host of domestic programs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the committee for their hard work in sort-

ing out which is which, and making certain that in this bill that we do meet nationally stated priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Without objection the motion is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 5, line 23, after "pending" insert ": Provided, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise available under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure Account in this or any other Act may be obligated for planning, design, or construction of military facilities or family housing to support the relocation of the 401st Tactical Fighter Wing to Crotona, Italy".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER [pro tempore]. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 7, line 14, strike out "\$20,800,000" and insert: "\$22,800,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: "\$9,700,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 8, line 10, strike out "\$182,440,000" and insert: "\$166,200,000".

MOTION BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: "\$198,440,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 8, line 22, strike out "\$161,583,000" and insert: "\$163,883,0800".

MOTION BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: "\$172,083,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 14, line 24, after "Japan" insert: "and Korea".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 17, after line 14 insert:

SEC. 127. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army shall transfer, no later than September 30, 1992, and without reimbursement, to the Secretary of the Interior the real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of 500 acres located generally adjacent to 7,600 acres transferred by section 126 of Public Law 101-519. The transferred property shall not include a landfill and a sewage pumping station that are associated with the operation of Fort Meade, Maryland.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the property transferred pursuant to subsection (a) as a part of the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center and in a manner consistent with wildlife conservation purposes and shall provide for the continued use of the property by Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, to the extent that such agencies are using it on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior may not convey, lease, transfer, declare excess or sur-

plus, or otherwise dispose of any portion of the property transferred pursuant to subsection (a) unless approved by law. The Secretary of the Interior may enter into cooperative agreements and issue special use permits for historic uses of the 500 acres: *Provided*, That they are consistent with all laws pertaining to wildlife refuges.

(d) The description of the property to be transferred under this section shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service within the Department of the Interior, after consultation with the Department of the Army.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Amendment of the Senate Numbered 29, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the last amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 17, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 128. (a) The Secretary of the Army shall carry out such repairs and take such other preservation and maintenance actions as are necessary to ensure that all real property at Fort Douglas, Utah (including buildings and other improvements) that has been conveyed or is to be conveyed pursuant to section 130 of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-519; 104 Stat 2248) is free from natural gas leaks and other safety-threatening defects. In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall conduct a natural gas survey of the property.

(b) In the case of property referred to in subsection (a) that is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, the Secretary—

(1) shall carry out a structural engineering survey of the property; and

(2) in addition to carrying out the repairs and taking the other actions required by subsection (a), shall repair and restore such property in a manner and to an extent specified by the Secretary of the Interior that is consistent with the historic preservation laws (including regulations) referred to in section 130(c)(2) of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1991.

(c)(1) The secretary of the Army, after consulting with the Governor of Utah regarding the condition of the property referred to in subsection (a), shall certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the repairs and preservation and maintenance actions required by subsection 9a) have been completed.

(2) The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the repairs and restoration of such property has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of subsection (b).

(d) The Secretary of the Army shall complete all actions required by this section not later than September 30, 1992.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: in lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 128. (a) The Secretary of the Army shall carry out such repairs and take such other preservation and maintenance actions as are necessary to ensure that all real property at Fort Douglas, Utah (including buildings and other improvements) that has been conveyed or is to be conveyed pursuant to section 130 of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-519; 104 Stat. 2248) is free from natural gas leaks and other safety-threatening defects. In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall conduct a natural gas survey of the property.

(b) In the case of property referred to in subsection (a) that is within the boundaries of the Fort Douglas National Historic Landmark, the Secretary—

(1) shall carry out a structural engineering survey of the property; and

(2) in addition to carrying out the repairs and taking the other actions required by subsection (a), shall repair and restore such property (but only to the extent that structural repairs are necessary) in a manner and to an extent specified by the Secretary of the Interior that is consistent with the historic preservation laws (including regulations) referred to in section 130(c)(2) of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1991.

(c)(1) The Secretary of the Army, after consulting with the Governor of Utah regarding the condition of the property referred to in subsection (a), shall certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the repairs and preservation and maintenance actions required by subsection (a) have been completed.

(2) The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior shall jointly certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the repairs and restoration of such property has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of subsection (b).

(d) The Secretary of the Army shall complete all actions required by this section not later than September 30, 1992.

Mr. LOWERY of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule

I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after the debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

LIFTING RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTATION OF GOODS FROM CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND HUNGARY

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1724) to provide for the termination of the application of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 to Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1724

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

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND PREPARATORY PRESIDENTIAL ACTION.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the Czechs and Slovak Federal Republic and the Republic of Hungary both have—

- (1) dedicated themselves to respect for fundamental human rights;
- (2) accorded to their citizens the right to emigrate and to travel freely;
- (3) reversed over 40 years of communist dictatorship and embraced the establishment of political pluralism, free and fair elections, and multi-party political systems;
- (4) introduced far-reaching economic reforms based on market-oriented principles and have decentralized economic decision making; and
- (5) demonstrated a strong desire to build friendly relationships with the United States.

(b) PREPARATORY PRESIDENTIAL ACTION.—The Congress notes that the President in anticipation of the enactment of section 2, has directed the United States Trade Representatives to negotiate with the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and the Republic of Hungary, respectively, in order to—

- (1) preserve the commitments of that country under the bilateral commercial agreement in effect between that country and the United States that are consistent with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; and
- (2) obtain other appropriate commitments.

SECTION 2. TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 TO CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND HUNGARY.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATIONS AND EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any provision of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), the President may—

- (1) determine that such title should no longer apply to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic or to the Republic of Hungary, or to both; and
- (2) after making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to a country, proclaim the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of that country.

(b) TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV.—On and after the effective date of the

extension under subsection (a)(2) of nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of a country, title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 shall cease to apply to that country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 1724.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1724 would allow the President to extend nondiscriminatory, most-favored-nation [MFN] status to Czechoslovakia and Hungary on an unconditional basis. It also acknowledges negotiations by the U.S. Trade Representative to preserve existing trade agreement commitments and obtain new ones, in such areas as intellectual property rights protection.

This bill, if enacted, would fully normalize United States trade relations with Czechoslovakia and Hungary and place them on the same footing as virtually all other United States trading partners. Among the former Communist countries in Eastern and Central Europe, Hungary and Czechoslovakia have led the way in the adoption of democratic political systems and market-oriented economies. They have held free and fair elections, freed nearly all prices, and generally taken bold steps to eliminate the remnants of the centrally planned system under which they lived for so long.

Hungary has had MFN status since 1978, and Czechoslovakia received such status in 1990, following congressional approval of a bilateral trade agreement. Enactment of H.R. 1724 would send a strong message of support to the people of Czechoslovakia and Hungary, who are striving to build a better life for themselves and their children. I urge my colleagues to join me in strong support of this bill.

□ 1710

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1724, a bill to normalize trade relations with the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and the Republic of Hungary and I commend the Committee on Ways and Means for reporting this most impor-

tant legislative measure in order that the House may show its strong support for the efforts of the countries to bring themselves into the world community of nations.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, your Special Task Force on the Development of Parliamentary Institutions in Eastern Europe, which I am honored to chair, has been working closely with the democratically elected parliaments of Czechoslovakia and Hungary for the past year and a half. During that time, we have had the privilege of developing a close working relationship with many of the Members of those parliaments and their staffs and we have seen, first hand, the dedication and commitment of these men and women to the process of bringing true democratic reform to their countries. Since our first visit to Prague and Budapest in May of 1990, we have been pleased to see the maturation of these national legislatures, and in spite of the enormous difficulties facing them and their governments, we have seen the transition from a communistic orientation to that of a true democracy. There are few rewards in life of this caliber and I am truly honored to have had the opportunity to have played even a small part in this process.

The Special Task Force on the Development of Parliamentary Institutions in Eastern Europe has, in cooperation with the parliaments of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, developed a comprehensive plan of assistance to those parliaments that we believe has been of enormous help to them in this transition period. For example, this summer, 100 personal computers were delivered to the Federal Assembly of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic. In addition to the computer equipment, the task force has begun to stock the parliamentary library with reference materials, books, and periodicals. A similar program is underway in Hungary and the first shipment of computers should be in Budapest by the end of November. The task force is also providing extensive training for the staff and members of these parliaments which has been extremely important to their development as representative institutions.

In August, the task force was privileged to travel to Prague and Budapest to see, firsthand, the progress that has been made thus far on this project. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the success of this program cannot be underestimated. Our colleagues in Prague and Budapest expressed, over and over, their belief that the commitment of the U.S. House of Representatives to their development has been the key to assuring that the course of democracy in their countries is an irreversible course. It was especially poignant to hear these words of gratitude while at the same time the attempted coup in

Moscow was underway. That trip will certainly be one I will never forget.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that normalizing trade relations with the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and the Republic of Hungary is a critical component of our aid package to these countries. Unless these nations can fully join the world community, their course toward democratic traditions will be unnecessarily rough and rocky. It has been my experience in the past year and a half that the new governments of these countries are truly dedicated to democratic ideals, and that dedication should be rewarded. I believe passage of H.R. 1724 is part of that reward and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1724, a bill which would permanently normalize trade relations with Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

As they have in the past, the products of both countries would continue to receive MFN tariff treatment when imported into the United States. However, under this bill, Czechoslovakia and Hungary would be relieved of the annual Jackson/Vanik review of emigration procedures.

Permanent MFN status is a just reward for the great contribution both countries have made to the political and economic transformation of Eastern Europe.

With respect to Hungary, the President has issued a waiver under the requirements of the Jackson/Vanik amendment every year since 1978. During this time, Hungarians engaged in a long struggle for political reform and succeeded in making a peaceful transition to a Western-style democracy and market economy.

Permanent MFN for Hungary will help cement and nurture a liberalized economy capable of becoming a major customer of United States businesses in the 21st century.

Czechoslovakia, on the other hand, has enjoyed the economic benefits of MFN for a shorter but more dramatic period. Recently, in a well-remembered address to this Body, President Václav Havel described the peaceful political revolution achieved in Czechoslovakia and his hopes for the future.

Congress responded by approving a bilateral trade agreement with Czechoslovakia and granting them MFN status.

Favorable tariff treatment has already given much needed support to Czech industry as it continues to undergo the dramatic and painful transition from a centrally planned to a market economy. Permanent MFN will demonstrate firm U.S. support for these endeavors.

More must be done in Czechoslovakia in terms of political reform. However, there is great potential in this country. It is the only country in the central

European region that has a history of democracy. Between 1918 and 1938, the country enjoyed self-determination and a thriving economy. At that time, the country had the 10th largest GNP in Europe. Even today, the Czech economy consumes \$4 billion annually of United States products.

As the world adjusts to the astounding political developments in Eastern Europe, and most recently in the Soviet Union, it is clear that our bilateral relationship with many of these countries must change. The Jackson/Vanik amendment is no longer appropriate for Hungary and Czechoslovakia in light of their demonstrated commitment to free emigration, human rights, and free market reforms.

Today, we have an opportunity to reward those who struggled for economic reform and political freedom.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1724.

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, for over 50 years the people of Hungary and Czechoslovakia have had their freedom severely limited. They were first invaded by the Nazis in the late 1930's and early 1940's and then by the Russians in 1945. All of that time they had lived without any political freedom and without any economic freedom. They have yearned to be free and they have acted free, and they have earned the opportunity to be free by their own hard work.

When this legislation, having been referred to us by the administration, was considered, we asked for opposition, if there was any opposition to the granting of this unrestricted most-favored-nations treatment to these two countries. There were absolutely no Members who came forward in opposition to this legislation.

These countries badly need this kind of treatment. They need it for the moral lift that it gives them and for the economic lift that will result from all of that. They have adequately earned this right, and we should pass this bill unanimously, granting them this right.

I am sure they will not abuse it. They are doing everything they can to rapidly privatize industry in their own countries and to move to a free economic system, very similar to that that is practiced by the West and by the United States.

They have extended political freedom to all of their people and they are modeling their institutions after a free society.

I urge that all Members support this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1724 granting most-favored-nation trading status to Hungary and Czechoslovakia. I strongly urge my colleagues to lend their support to a measure that will say much about America's continuing commitment to democratization in Eastern Europe.

Since 1978, Hungary has received MFN status subject to the annual Presidential waiver process. This provision is provided for in title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, the so-called Jackson-Vanik amendment. The amendments set forth specific freedom of emigration requirements which must be met, or waived by the President, in order for nondiscriminatory, most-favored-nation status to be granted to a nonmarket economy. For the past 13 years, Hungary has enjoyed the benefits of favorable tariff treatment as it steadily progressed toward the goals of privatization and a market-oriented economy. Then, in 1989, Hungary became the first country ever declared in full compliance with the Jackson-Vanik requirements and now has most-favored-nation status on an open-ended basis. The Jackson/Vanik requirements, however, are perpetually in effect.

Czechoslovakia, on the other hand, was granted most-favored-nation status in November of 1990, when the President exercised his waiver. Normalized tariff treatment has continued subject to annual Presidential review. Recent history has indicated that the Czech leadership has taken its country down the same path of democratization as occurred in Hungary.

Both countries have peacefully ousted Communist regimes in favor of representative governments which are conscious of the will of the people. Laws have been passed guaranteeing the protection of civil rights and the freedom of emigration. Central economic planning has given way to the forces of the free market. These are ideals and principles our Government has tried to foster throughout the developing world. Our commitment to Hungary and Czechoslovakia serves as another example.

Especially given the opportunity to guide the newly developing democracies created through the breakup of the Soviet Union, we must now show a strong and unwavering commitment for assistance toward the ultimate goal of normalization of relations in this part of the world. Today, we have the chance to reach this pinnacle by rewarding the efforts of Hungary and Czechoslovakia and granting them the same unconditional trading status that is enjoyed by the majority of our trading partners.

I urge by colleagues to support H.R. 1724.

□ 1720

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

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us is a clear indication that times are changing. Indeed, America's bitter adversaries of the past are becoming our friends and trading partners of the future.

However, in our haste to grant these nations open access to the U.S. market and the hard currency they desperately need, American firms and workers must not be made to bear the burden of helping such nations modernize.

As the Republics of the former Soviet Union and other Eastern European nonmarket or state-controlled-economy countries make the slow transition to market-based systems, various forms of trade-distortive government subsidies will still be preserved in these nations.

Thus, it is imperative that our trade laws—such as antidumping and countervailing duty statutes—adapt to this reality, so that American producers are not driven out of business. U.S. firms, not presently allowed to combat the subsidy practices of non-market-economy countries, must be permitted to file countervailing duty petitions against these countries to hold them accountable for those subsidies which do remain in place throughout the transition.

Given the vast changes taking place in the world, legislation such as that before us is fully expected, and the normalization of trade and economic relations with the countries of the former Soviet bloc seems inevitable.

In the short term, because these countries make few products that we want to buy, their imports into the United States should have only a limited impact on import-sensitive American industries.

What concerns me, though, is the increasing prospect in the longer term for these countries' dumped and subsidized products causing much greater damage to American industries and workers.

I implore my colleagues—in the Ways and Means Committee and the full House—to work with me to reform the way our antidumping and countervailing duty laws are applied.

If we do so early enough, perhaps we can prevent American workers from having to pay the price of bringing yet another part of the lesser-developed world into the full fold of the global economy.

We can and must do what is best for America. Indeed, our responsibility is to do no less.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to offer the strongest possible support for this important legislation on which he serves as an original cosponsor. While both Hungary and the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic clearly merit permanent MFN tariff status, this Member's remarks will be made with particular reference to Czechoslovakia.

Granting of MFN—more properly called "normal tariff status"—for these two nations has been high on this Member's list of foreign policy and export priorities. Convinced of the importance of rapid action, this Member introduced House Concurrent Resolution 266, a bill to waive Jackson-Vanik limits with regard to Czechoslovakia, on February 20, 1990. House Concurrent Resolution 266 reflected this Member's firm conviction that a timely change in trade policy was and is essential to improved relations between our two nations. The legislation before this body today is wholly consistent with the objectives of this Member's proposal.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 short years ago Czechoslovakia remained under the tight and seeming unshakable grip of a totalitarian dictatorship. But in November 1989, the people took to the streets and cast out their oppressors. This velvet revolution—which, by the way, occurred with almost no loss of life—has resulted in a regime that is enthusiastically and passionately democratic. Perhaps because they understand tyranny so well, Czech and Slovak people have become among the world's most committed converts to democracy and a free market economy.

It should also be noted that the people of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic are among the strongest supporters of the United States. Indeed, some of the most enthusiastic advocates of American-style democracy and economic systems can be found in Prague, in Bratislava, in Pilsen, and in Brno. This Member has had the good fortune to have traveled to Prague on official business, and can testify to the genuinely warm response. Everywhere this Member visited, a deep interest in, and affinity for America and for American democratic principles was evident.

It is understandable that our two nations should have such deep cultural links. There are, after all, very large numbers of Slovaks, Bohemians, and Moravians in the United States, and these ties of ancestry and heritage have not been erased over the decades of Communist rule. In this Member's own constituency—in communities such as Prague, Dwight, Bee, Bruno, Wilber, Crete, David City, Wahoo, Schuyler, and Verdigre, among others—the traditions of the ancestral homeland live on.

Mr. Speaker, the granting of most-favored-nation tariff status is absolutely fundamental to fostering better rela-

tions between the United States and the nations of Hungary and the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic. By approving MFN, of course, this body will merely be granting normal trading status. Czechoslovakia will not be receiving any special favors—it will simply be permitted to trade without the disadvantages of prohibitive tariffs.

Of course, there are other steps that are necessary to assist American businessmen in Czechoslovakia. Businessmen need, and are beginning to receive, the guarantees and insurance that are offered by OPIC and the Export-Import Bank. The first Commercial Service Officer has arrived in Prague and a second is desperately needed. In addition, we must take advantage of the opportunities in Slovakia. To do this the consulate in Bratislava must be made fully operational, a move endorsed by the Bush administration and reflected in the conferenced authorization legislation for the State Department. In short, Mr. Speaker, our new trade relationship requires total change in attitude, and a comprehensive package of policy changes. But graduation from Jackson-Vanik and granting of permanent MFN status is a critical first step—perhaps the critical first step—toward initiating that change.

The action this body takes today will result in important dividends. As Czechoslovakia reduces its dependence on trade with the Soviet Union, it is undoubtedly looking to the West for new trading partners. They do not want to be overwhelmed by German business interests. Instead, the Government of the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic has made it clear that the United States is the preferred source of imports and services in many different areas. As automakers such as General Motors, telecommunications firms such as U.S. West, and electronics giants such as General Electric open operations in Czechoslovakia, it is clear there is great demand for United States goods and services.

This Member would commend the author of H.R. 1724, Mr. CRANE, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, the ranking member, Mr. ARCHER, for bringing the House this legislation for action. This Member also would make special note of the tireless work of the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, Mr. GIBBONS, who has been a farsighted leader on the extension of MFN to these countries. Mr. Speaker, these are colleagues who understand the critical importance of developing export markets, and are true friends of the United States businessman and of democracy in Hungary and the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic.

Mr. Speaker, this Member would urge speedy passage of the legislation.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1724, to provide for the termination of the application of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974

to free the countries of Czechoslovakia and Hungary. The time is right to normalize United States trade relations with Hungary and Czechoslovakia, to welcome these sister countries to the family of international economic trade.

This bill would grant most-favored-nation status to these countries on an unconditional basis. Why do we now favor Czechoslovakia and Hungary? Because their people have paid the price to end communism and its discredited central planning, started democratic policies and free trade, and allowed free emigration across their borders. The process has started and must be encouraged to never stop.

The illegitimate Communist governments of Hungary and Czechoslovakia were originally found guilty of violating emigration requirements of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974. The Iron Curtain was more than a metaphor to people who wanted to leave these countries, it was a real barrier fortified with steel bullets. Now Hungarians and Czechoslovakians have taken back their countries through peaceful means and have dedicated themselves to an open society and economy.

Capitalism will flourish in these countries and indeed around the world because of one simple fact. Capitalism realizes that the basic building block of a society is the individual. That is why every single person should have the power to buy or sell in a market, or vote for and against a politician. Free markets mean free choices for free individuals, in their private lives, political arrangements, and social world.

A vote for H.R. 1724 is a recognition of the progress of human history, the quest and the attainment of personal freedom. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1724.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1724 which would terminate the application of title IV of the 1974 Trade Act of Czechoslovakia and Hungary and, in so doing, normalize our trade relations with these two countries. It is particularly fitting that this legislation be taken up in advance of the upcoming visit by Czechoslovak President Vaclav Havel, who we will welcome in Washington this month.

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I have had the opportunity to make several visits to Hungary and Czechoslovakia over the course of several years. During that time, I have witnessed changes that were truly unthinkable just a few years ago. I have witnessed the steady progression toward political and economic reform in Hungary. In Czechoslovakia, I have seen a recalcitrant regime overthrown in a velvet revolution. In each case, the results are clear: both countries have held free and fair elections at the local and national level; their newly installed governments have passed legislation aimed at substantially restructuring their economies and political systems, in conformity with the CSCE Bonn and Copenhagen Documents; and both countries have guaranteed the freedom of emigration required under the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

These changes are the source of tremendous inspiration to me for many reasons, but for two reasons in particular. First, they illustrate the ability of people to rise above im-

mense, seemingly unbeatable oppression—and that gives me hope for many other regions of the world, where oppression continues unabated. Second, they validate the principal role human rights have played in the foreign policy of the United States. By continuing to shape our foreign policy to address the irrepressible longing of people to be free, we continue to ensure that we stand on the side of right. It is no wonder that the newly liberated peoples of Hungary and Czechoslovakia can be counted among the United States' closest friends.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly endorse the speedy normalization of trade relations reflected in H.R. 1724. This step will enable Hungarian and Czechoslovak businesses to engage in the long-term planning necessary for long-term economic recovery. It will increase the stability and predictability of our trade relations. And it will signify our confidence in the ability of the Hungarians and Czechoslovakians to see through the enormous task they have undertaken: the transformation of Communist, totalitarian societies into democratic, free market ones.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1724, which is before us today. This legislation declares that the Congress of the United States finds that Hungary and Czechoslovakia have dedicated themselves to respect for human rights and that these nations have introduced far-reaching economic reforms based on free-market principles. In addition, these newly free nations are found to have demonstrated a strong desire to build friendly relations with the United States. Accordingly, H.R. 1724 removes Hungary and Czechoslovakia from the list of countries subject to the Jackson-Vanik amendment. The bill authorizes the President to permanently extend nondiscriminatory, most-favored-nation trade status to their products.

Mr. Speaker, I believe strongly in our ability to encourage the newly free markets in the countries of Eastern Europe through increased trade, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation before us today.

Further, I would like to take this opportunity to urge my colleagues to look ahead and to see the benefits of extending most-favored-nation trade status to other newly free countries that are struggling to establish themselves economically.

For example, we have all been inspired by the rebirth of freedom and independence across the Soviet Union. Granting access to American markets to the former republics of the Soviet Union will help them to rebuild their economies, and the mutual trade will be beneficial to exporters in the United States.

This is a practical and cost-effective way to assist those nations that are trying to rid themselves of Communist domination. While we cannot afford a massive foreign aid program, mutual trade with the United States will help to restore economies that have been shattered by decades of socialist mismanagement. This simple step signals our commitment to their future as free nations.

As a sponsor of a bill that would grant most-favored-nation trade status to imports from all of the individual republics that made up the former Soviet Union, I urge my colleagues to consider further legislation that would extend

most-favored-nation trade status to these emerging nations as soon as they become independent with elected governments of their own.

These are exciting times, and I urge my colleagues to consider such legislation and the benefits it will bring in building the economic freedom that must accompany democracy and independence.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, for the past 45 years, the United States led the NATO alliance in defense against an attack from the Warsaw Pact. Few of us could have imagined even 5 years ago that this perennial military standoff would disintegrate before our very eyes.

Fortunately, for the men, women, and children of Central and Eastern Europe, as well as those of the United States, the dark cloud of Communist totalitarianism has now dissipated, freedom and democracy have become entrenched in the nations of the region.

Some in this body and in many international organizations have said that now is the time for another Marshall plan. Now is the time to send billions of dollars to the region without delay. They are right about one thing: We should act without delay, but not by helping support inefficient state bureaucracies through direct aid. Instead, what we need is immediate normalization of trade relations. Give these brave countries and their budding entrepreneurs the opportunity to compete in the international marketplace. Give them the opportunity to establish their own free market system and develop the skills needed to make their system succeed. As the ancient proverb states, "Give a man a fish and he will eat for a day. Teach a man to fish and he will eat for a lifetime."

On the flip side, granting permanent MFN status to Czechoslovakia and Hungary will give United States firms the chance to invest in the future of these nations, and in so doing, help expand economic opportunity here at home. I have visited Czechoslovakia and Hungary and can tell you that they want to trade with the United States. They want to purchase U.S. goods. They want to serve as an equal partner in economic matters with the United States. This legislation will do just that. It is an excellent way for the United States, given its budgetary constraints, to effectively help our new-found allies in Central and Eastern Europe pull themselves out of the mire of the Marxist-Leninist economic disaster that was forced upon them.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1724.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOMEN'S BUSINESS
DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1991

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2629) to amend the Small Business Act to assist the development of small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Women's Business Development Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. WOMEN'S DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

The Small Business Act is amended by adding the following new section:

"SEC. 28. (a) The Administration may provide financial assistance to private organizations to conduct three-year demonstration projects for the benefit of small business concerns owned and controlled by women. The projects shall provide the following types of services and assistance—

"(1) financial assistance, including training and counseling in how to apply for and secure business credit and investment capital, preparing and presenting financial statements, and managing cashflow and other financial operations of a business concern;

"(2) management assistance, including training and counseling in how to plan, organize, staff, direct and control each major activity and function of a small business concern; and

"(3) marketing assistance, including training and counseling in identifying and segmenting domestic and international market opportunities, preparing and executing marketing plans, developing pricing strategies, locating contract opportunities, negotiating contracts, and utilizing varying public relations and advertising techniques.

"(b)(1) As a condition of receiving financial assistance authorized by this section, the recipient organization shall agree to obtain, after its application has been approved and notice of award has been issued, cash contributions from private sector sources as follows:

"(A) if the project first receives its Federal financial assistance prior to fiscal year 1993, an annual amount at least equal to the amount of the Federal financial assistance provided each year; or

"(B) if the project first receives Federal financial assistance in fiscal year 1993, or thereafter, annual amounts as follows: in the first year, one private dollar for each two Federal dollars, in the second year, one private dollar for each Federal dollar, and in the third and final year, two private dollars for each Federal dollar.

"(2) Up to one-half of the private sector matching assistance may be in the form of in-kind contributions which are budget line items only, including but not limited to office equipment and office space.

"(3) The financial assistance authorized pursuant to this section may be made by grant, contract, or cooperative agreement and may contain such provision, as necessary, to provide for payments in lump sum or installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement. The Administration may disburse up to 25 per centum of each year's Federal share awarded to a recipient organization after notice of the award has been issued and before the private sector matching funds are obtained.

"(4) If the recipient organization fails to obtain the required contribution from the private sector during any year of any project, it shall not be eligible thereafter for advance disbursements pursuant to paragraph (3) during the remainder of that project nor on any other project for which it is or may be funded. In addition, prior to approving such organization for other projects, the Administration shall specifically determine and enter a written finding setting forth reasons the Agency believes that such a defaulting recipient will be able to obtain the requisite private sector funding.

"(c) Each applicant organization initially shall submit a three-year plan on proposed fundraising and training activities, and a recipient organization may receive financial assistance under this program for a maximum of three years per site. The Administration shall evaluate and rank applicants in accordance with predetermined selection criteria that shall be stated in terms of relative importance. Such criteria and their relative importance shall be made publicly available and stated in each solicitation for applications made by the Administration. The criteria shall include—

"(1) the experience of the offering organization in conducting programs or on-going efforts designed to impart or upgrade the business skills of women business owners or potential owners;

"(2) the present ability of the offering organization to commence a demonstration project within a minimum amount of time; and

"(3) the ability of the applicant organization to provide training and services to a representative number of women who are both socially and economically disadvantaged.

"(d) For the purposes of this section, the term small business concern, either 'start-up' or existing, owned and controlled by women includes any small business concern—

"(1) that is at least 51 per centum owned by one or more women; and

"(2) whose management and daily business operations are controlled by one or more women.

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated \$4,000,000 per year to carry out the demonstration projects authorized by this section. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administration may use such expedited acquisition methods as it deems appropriate to achieve the purposes of this section, except that it shall ensure that all eligible sources are provided a reasonable opportunity to submit proposals.

"(f) The Administration shall prepare and transmit an annual report, beginning February 1, 1992, to the Committees on Small Business of the Senate and House of Representatives on the effectiveness of all demonstration projects conducted under the authority of this section. Such report shall provide information concerning—

"(1) the number of individuals receiving assistance;

"(2) the number of start-up business concerns formed;

"(3) the gross receipts of assisted concerns;

"(4) increases or decreases in profits of assisted concerns; and

"(5) the employment increases or decreases of assisted concerns.

"(g) The Administration shall not provide financial assistance under this section to any new project after October 1, 1995, except that it may fund projects which commenced prior thereto."

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATIVE.

The Small Business Act is amended by striking subsection (c) of section 8. Projects funded pursuant to the provisions of such subsection shall be deemed to be funded under and shall be treated as if funded under section 28 of the Small Business Act as added by this Act.

SEC. 4. PERMANENT AUTHORIZATION OF SMALL LOAN PROGRAM.

Section 7 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636) is amended by striking from paragraph (19)(B) of subsection (a) "during fiscal years 1989, 1990, and 1991,".

SEC. 5. NATIONAL WOMEN'S BUSINESS COUNCIL.

(a) CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON.—Paragraph 403(b)(2)(G) of the Women's Business Ownership Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-533) is amended to read as follows:

"The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the Council shall be designated by the President and shall be either a representative of the public sector or the private sector. Each shall have a maximum term of two years. No person may be designated to the same office for two consecutive terms nor may consecutive designees as Chairperson be from the public sector. The Chairperson and the Vice Chairperson shall not be from the same sector concurrently."

(b) COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) ADDITION OF TWO MEMBERS.—Section 403(a) of the Women's Business Ownership Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 2694) is amended—

(1) by striking "nine" and inserting "eleven";

(2) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (2);

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting "; and"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) two members shall be appointed by the President, one of whom shall be an African-American woman and one of whom shall be a Hispanic woman."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 403(b) of such Act (102 Stat. 2694-2695) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking "section (a) (2) and (3)" and inserting "paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (a)";

(B) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(1) by striking "subsection (a) (2) and (3)" and inserting "paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (a)";

(ii) by striking "and" at the end of clause (i);

(iii) by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting "; and"; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following new clause:

"(iii) appointments under subsection (a)(4) shall be made within 60 days of the effective date of such subsection."

(C) by moving paragraph (3) to the end of such section; and

(D) in paragraph (2)(C) by striking "subsection (a) (2) and (3)" and inserting "paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (a)".

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

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

□ 1730

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

Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate to be on the floor today speaking on behalf of the Women's Business Development Act. Three years ago this month, the President signed into law the Women's Business Ownership Act of 1988, which is the cornerstone of the legislation now under consideration.

Both pieces of legislation stem from a series of six hearings I held in 1988 as chairman of the Committee on Small Business. During these hearings the committee examined the growing role of women entrepreneurs in the American economy, the effectiveness of programs designed to help them, and the barriers that impede their businesses in particular. The committee heard from over two dozen witnesses and received hundreds of pages of testimony, statements and recommendations, which we published in a report entitled "New Economic Realities: The Rise of Women Entrepreneurs."

I introduced the 1988 Women's Business Ownership Act to implement the committee's findings and recommendations and to address concerns expressed by women entrepreneurs such as access to credit, discrimination in lending, a lack of quality training in business skills, and a need for a congressionally appointed council to ensure that women business owners get the attention and assistance they deserve.

I have closely followed the implementation of the provisions of that law. It has already tangibly helped women business owners by, for example, requiring that the Equal Credit Opportunity Act be extended to business loans in order to combat subtle forms of discrimination in commercial loan transactions.

I am here today because two of the programs begun in 1988 will expire this year unless they are reauthorized. They are the guaranteed small loan program and the demonstration projects in business training and counseling.

During a hearing held earlier this year to assess these programs, I determined that they were meeting Congress' objectives, functioning as intended, and serving an ongoing need in the small business community. Based on these findings I introduced the Women's Business Ownership Act to extend these programs and refine them to make them even more accessible and effective.

Mr. Speaker, I will briefly summarize the provisions of the Women's Business Development Act. Sections 2 and 3 deal with demonstration projects that provide business training and counseling in the areas of finance, marketing, and management. The projects are financed through Federal and private sector funds. During their first three years of operation, the demonstration projects assisted over 2,500 current or potential women business owners at 18 sites across the country.

An interim review prepared by the National Academy of Public Administration reports that this program is meeting a need that other programs have not, and that it is directly responsible for a number of women starting their own businesses and for other women expanding theirs—creating new jobs in the process.

The Women's Business Development Act reauthorizes this program for an additional 4 years. It is my hope that, after the Federal funding is phased out, these models will become self-sufficient or perhaps be continued by State and local governments.

Section 4 of H.R. 2629 permanently authorizes the small loan program in which the Small Business Administration guarantees loans up to \$50,000. Access to credit, including small amounts, is a chronic problem even for successful women business owners. Traditionally, small loans have not been attractive to lenders because they deem the return on such loans as not worth the costs of processing them. To encourage banks to participate in the program, the SBA charges a reduced guarantee fee and uses a simplified application form.

The demand for the program is exemplified by the fact that more than 15 percent of all SBA guaranteed loans in fiscal year 1990 were generated under this program. I would note that this program is not limited to women business owners, but that loans in this amount are generally sought by those in the service sector, which is where many women-owned businesses are found.

Sections 5 and 6 of the legislation deal with the National Women's Business Council. This body, established in 1988, reports to the President and the Congress on ways to assist women's business owners. The Women's Business Development Act requires that the chair of the Council rotate between the private and public sector members and limits a chairperson's term to 2 years.

An amendment adopted by the committee during its markup adds two additional members to the Council, and mandates that one be an African-American woman and the other a Hispanic woman.

The Women's Business Development Act has 33 cosponsors and was unanimously reported out by the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. Speaker, the entire economy benefits when we eliminate barriers that impede women entrepreneurs, for women-owned businesses are the fastest growing sector of the business community. In today's economic environment, we can not afford to miss such opportunities to encourage business growth, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for the Women's Business Development Act of 1991. This bill reauthorizes and revises programs begun in 1988 when President Reagan signed the Women's Business Ownership Act.

Mr. Speaker, 30 percent of the small businesses in this country are owned by women. By the year 2000, that number will rise to nearly 40 percent. If the present trend continues, fully half of the best job-producing and most innovative businesses will be owned by women soon after the turn of the century.

However, there are still very real barriers to women's business ownership. This bill is part of the continuing effort to recognize and eliminate those barriers.

This bill addresses two of the largest problems facing women in business today: inadequate access to capital and a lack of technical skills.

The Women's Business Development Act will reauthorize the demonstration program under which private-sector organizations offer management training and technical assistance to women small-business owners.

This excellent program has provided counseling for thousands of women in how to start and effectively run a business in today's world.

The Women's Business Ownership Act will authorize this program for 4 more years and fine-tune the way it operates.

The bill will also permanently authorize the small loan program for amounts of \$50,000 or less. This will improve and simplify access to the credit market for many fledgling businesses.

Finally, the Women's Business Development Act makes some changes in the operation of the National Women's Business Council.

This group meets regularly to study the problems facing women in business in America and reports its findings to the President and Congress.

Acknowledging that government doesn't always have the answers, this bill requires that a private-sector member chair the Council at least every other term.

Mr. Speaker, the Women's Business Ownership Act is a fine piece of legislation that is definitely needed. America is relying on the small-business sector to continue to create new jobs, jobs that will provide dignity and self-sufficiency for our Nation's unemployed.

Our former colleague, Pat Saiki, summed up the need for this legislation nicely in her first appearance as Administrator of the SBA before the Small Business Committee. She said:

As we move into the 21st century, one of the keys to continued national economic progress is the full advancement of women in business. To do less would deprive this nation of a valuable pool of talent and ability.

Pat Saiki was right on the mark, and so I would urge my colleagues to remember that when we cast our votes today it will be easy for us to say that we are all for small business and all for the opportunity of women in small business, but it will be how we vote that really counts.

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

□ 1740

Mr. BERUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today in strong support of H.R. 2629, the Women's Business Development Act. This Member would also like to take this time to thank the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. LAFALCE], and the ranking minority member on that committee, the distinguished gentleman from Florida, [Mr. IRELAND], for their leadership role in crafting this legislation and advancing it to the floor.

As women entrepreneurs increase their role in the business world they face ever present problems. Some of them, through no fault of their own, face training and experience problems in business skills, and they experience discrimination in lending and access to capital. This legislation, H.R. 2629, will help alleviate these problems by extending and refining programs created in the Women's Business Ownership Act of 1988, which this Member cosponsored.

One provision of the 1988 act which provides for the Small Business Administration's small loan program that guarantees loans up to \$50,000 is permanently reauthorized by H.R. 2629. These small loans are integral in aiding women entrepreneurs in the startup of a new business.

In addition, the bill extends for 3 years a program within the SBA to provide financial assistance to private organizations which conduct demonstration projects for small businesses owned and controlled by women. Such projects help provide the training and support need for business owners and operators to be successful. During a conference this Member held in Lincoln, NE, for women interested and involved in business it was apparent there was wide support and need for such demonstrations and loan programs.

Mr. Speaker, American women have made great strides in creating and operating businesses over the last few years, despite many factors working against them. This legislation will remove some of these roadblocks and set the stage for even greater achievements from women business entrepreneurs in the future. This Member strongly supports the measure and encourages his colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2629—the Women's Business Development Act of 1991.

This legislation will send the proper signal to thousands of women across the Nation that Congress is committed to helping them realize their dreams of building a business.

This act will authorize \$4 million in demonstration projects that were set down in the original legislation, passed, and implemented in 1988. The projects, to be administered by private organizations, will receive grants from the Small Business Administration and are required to obtain matching funds from private sources.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is looking for answers to the remnants of this recession. In my State and district, people are hurting. They are looking for a new future, one filled with hope and long term opportunities.

This legislation will give women the tools and seed capital needed to take a chance, to wed public funds with private sector matching money, acquire training in marketing, finance, and management and help propel them into the free market.

This is not a panacea for the economic shadows of despair that hang over many States, including Connecticut. But is a sound building block to create a stronger economic frame for all Americans to grow from.

Women have born the brunt of discrimination and harassment in many areas of everyday life, including the right to make a go of it as entrepreneurs. Many positive changes have occurred over the last 20 years as women have continued to aspire to positions of esteem and importance in government and corporate America.

But many obstacles remain, such as the glass ceiling, sexual harassment, and a condescending attitude from their male coworkers at all levels of endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, today, H.R. 2629 allows women to take a chance and help rebuild our economy. As a member of the House Committee on Small Business, I am hopeful this legislation will begin that process.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2629 the Women's Business Development Reauthorization Act of 1991. H.R. 2629 reauthorizes the Small Business Administration's [SBA] Women's Demonstration Project for 4 years and reauthorizes the SBA small loan program.

The Women's Business Development Act of 1988—Public Law 100-533—established a grant program to provide business training to women and created a loan program up to \$50,000 for potential women entrepreneurs. Under this program, private organizations are awarded matching grants for demonstration projects which provide training and counseling in finance, management, and marketing to existing women business owners.

H.R. 2629 further restructures the Women's Demonstration Project to limit projects to 3 years. Additionally, the bill reduces the loan program's matching funding requirement from a 100 percent match every year to a 50 percent match in the first year, 100 percent match in the second year, and 200 percent for the third year.

Mr. Speaker, Public Law 100-533 established the National Women's Business Coun-

cil. During the Small Business Committee's markup of H.R. 2629, I attached an amendment to increase the council from 9 to 11. The additional council seats shall be filled by an African-American and a Hispanic woman. I offered this amendment in order to reflect the diverse needs and interests of the women's business community by ensuring adequate representation of various sectors.

In closing, I encourage all of our colleagues to support the Women's Business Development Reauthorization Act and help protect the well-being of women-owned businesses.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2629, the Women's Business Development Act of 1991, and would like to commend the chairman of the Small Business Committee for his leadership in introducing this legislation.

Clearly, women business owners play an essential role in contributing to our national economy. Prior to 1970, women owned less than 5 percent of all small businesses. Today nearly one-third of all small businesses are owned by women and it is expected that women will own 50 percent of all small businesses in the 21st century. Women continue to make significant contributions to the business community and are vital to our country's economic growth and development.

However, there are many barriers that discourage and stop women entrepreneurs from undertaking their own business ventures, including access to capital and a lack of quality training in business skills. This legislation will help reduce these barriers by making a permanent loan program to encourage women to start their own businesses, and by providing resources and advice for women on business development.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the Women's Business Development Act, and urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2629, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on H.R. 2629, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

JOB TRAINING REFORM AMENDMENTS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3033) to amend the Job Training Partnership Act to improve the delivery of services to hard-to-serve youth and adults, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3033

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Job Training Reform Amendments".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title.
- Sec. 2. Table of contents.
- Sec. 3. Declaration of policy and statement of purpose.
- Sec. 4. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 5. Definitions.
- Sec. 6. Establishment of a service delivery area.
- Sec. 7. Private industry council.
- Sec. 8. Job training plan.
- Sec. 9. Review of plan.
- Sec. 10. Performance standards.
- Sec. 11. Selection of service providers.
- Sec. 12. Limitation on certain costs.
- Sec. 13. Recapture and reallocation of unobligated funds under title II.
- Sec. 14. Governor's coordination and special services plan.
- Sec. 15. State job training coordinating council.
- Sec. 16. State education coordination and grants.
- Sec. 17. Additional amendments to part B of title I.
- Sec. 18. Amendments to part C of title I.
- Sec. 19. Benefits.
- Sec. 20. Fiscal controls; sanctions.
- Sec. 21. Reports, recordkeeping, and investigations.
- Sec. 22. Revision of title II.
- Sec. 23. Employment and training assistance for dislocated workers.
- Sec. 24. Native American and migrant programs.
- Sec. 25. Job corps.
- Sec. 26. Amendments to part D of title IV: national activities.
- Sec. 27. Uniform requirements.
- Sec. 28. Amendments to part E of title IV: labor market information.
- Sec. 29. Establishment of the youth opportunity program.
- Sec. 30. Establishment of the microenterprise grants program.
- Sec. 31. Establishment of a new part J of title IV: disaster relief.
- Sec. 32. Technical and conforming amendments.
- Sec. 33. Effective date; transition provisions.
- Sec. 34. State human resource investment council.

SEC. 3. DECLARATION OF POLICY AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—In recognition of the training needs of low-income adults and youth, the Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to—

(1) provide financial assistance to States and local service delivery areas to meet the

training needs of such low-income adults and youth, and to assist such individuals in obtaining unsubsidized employment;

(2) increase the funds available for title II programs as amended by this Act by no less than 10 percent of the baseline each fiscal year to provide for growth in the number of eligible adults and youth served beyond the current 5 percent of the eligible population in need of these services; and

(3) encourage the provision of longer, more comprehensive, education, training, and employment services to the eligible population, which also requires increased funding in order to maintain current service levels.

(b) PURPOSE.—Section 2 of the Job Training Partnership Act (hereafter in this Act referred to as "the Act") is amended to read as follows:

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to establish programs to prepare youth and adults facing serious barriers to employment for participation in the labor force by providing job training and other services that will result in increased employment and earnings, increased educational and occupational skills, and decreased welfare dependency."

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3 of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

"(a) TITLE II AUTHORIZATIONS.—

"(1) PARTS A AND C.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out parts A and C of title II such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1993 and for each succeeding fiscal year. Of the sums appropriated to carry out parts A and C of title II for each such fiscal year, an amount equal to 60 percent of such sums shall be made available to carry out part A of such title and an amount equal to 40 percent of such sums shall be made available to carry out part C of such title.

"(2) PART B.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part B of title II such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1993 and for each succeeding fiscal year."

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b);

(3) by inserting after such subsection (b) the following:

"(c) TITLE IV AUTHORIZATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out parts A, C, D, E, F, and G of title IV for fiscal year 1993 and each succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, not to exceed an amount equal to 7 percent of the sum of the amounts appropriated for parts A and C of title II for such fiscal year.

"(2) RESERVATIONS.—The Secretary shall reserve from the amount appropriated under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year—

"(A) an amount equal to 7 percent of the amount appropriated under paragraph (1) to carry out part C of title IV;

"(B) \$2,000,000 to carry out part F of title IV; and

"(C) \$6,000,000 to carry out section 462(e) and (f).

"(3) YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES UNLIMITED.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 1993 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years to carry out part H of title IV.

"(4) MICROENTERPRISE GRANTS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1993 through 1997 to carry out part I of title IV.

"(5) DISASTER RELIEF EMPLOYMENT.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part J of title IV, \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1993 and such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding fiscal year. Funds appropriated pursuant to this paragraph are authorized to remain available for such part J until expended.

"(6) TRAINING NETWORKS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 457, \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1993 and such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding fiscal year."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3(e)(2) of the Act is amended— (A) by striking "part A" and inserting "parts A and C"; and

(B) by striking "such part" and inserting "such parts".

(2) Section 302(a) of the Act is amended by striking "section 3(c)" and inserting "section 3(b)".

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

Section 4 of the Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking "part A" and inserting "parts A and C"; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by inserting "the Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs, the Center for Employment Training, organizations serving older workers," after "Jobs for Youth," and

(B) by striking "(including the National Urban Indian Council)";

(3)(A) in paragraph (8)(B)(1), by striking "level determined in accordance with criteria established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget" and inserting "income guidelines promulgated each year by the Secretary of Health and Human Services";

(B) in paragraph (8)(C), by inserting "(or has been determined to be eligible to receive)" after "is receiving";

(C) in paragraph (8)(D), by inserting "subsections (a) and (c) of" after "under"; and

(D) in paragraph (8)(F), by striking "adult handicapped individual" and inserting "individual with disabilities";

(4) in paragraph (10), by striking "handicapped individual" and inserting "individual with disabilities";

(5) in paragraph (22), by striking "and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" and inserting "the Freely Associated States, and the Republic of Palau";

(6) in paragraph (24), by inserting "financial assistance (except as a post-termination service), drug and alcohol abuse counseling and referral, individual and family counseling," after "health care," and by inserting "and dependent care" after "child care";

(7) by amending paragraph (29) to read as follows:

"(29) The term 'displaced homemaker' means an individual who has been providing unpaid services to family members in the home and who—

"(A) has been dependent either—

"(i) on public assistance and whose youngest child is within 2 years of losing eligibility under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act; or

"(ii) on the income of another family member but is no longer supported by that income; and

"(B) is unemployed or underemployed and is experiencing difficulty in obtaining or upgrading employment."; and

(8) by adding after paragraph (29) the following new paragraphs:

"(30) The term 'participant' means an individual who has been determined to be eligible to participate in and who is receiving

services (except post-termination services authorized under sections 204(c)(5) and 274(d)(5)) under a program authorized and funded by this Act. Participation shall be deemed to commence on the first day, following determination of eligibility, on which the participant began receiving subsidized employment, training, or services funded under this Act.

"(31) The term 'termination' means the separation of a participant who is no longer receiving services (except post-termination services authorized under sections 204(c)(5) and 254(d)(6)) under a program authorized and funded by this Act.

"(32) The term 'school dropout' means an individual who is no longer attending any school and who has not received a secondary school diploma or a certificate from a program of equivalency for such a diploma.

"(33) The term 'JOBS' means the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program authorized under part F of title IV of the Social Security Act.

"(34) The term 'basic skills deficient' means reading or computing skills at or below the 8th grade level on a generally accepted standard test or equivalent score on a criterion referenced test.

"(35) The term 'case management' means the provision of a client-centered approach in the delivery of services, designed to prepare and coordinate comprehensive employment plans, such as service strategies, for participants to assure access to the necessary training and support services, and to provide job and career counseling during program participation and after job placement."

SEC. 6. ESTABLISHMENT OF A SERVICE DELIVERY AREA.

Section 101(c)(1) of the Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ", except as provided for in sections 106(j) and 164(b)".

SEC. 7. PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL.

Section 102(a)(2) of the Act is amended—
(1) by inserting "local welfare agencies," after "rehabilitation agencies,"; and
(2) by inserting "each of the following groups:" after "representatives of".

SEC. 8. JOB TRAINING PLAN.

(a) RESTRICTION OF PLANS TO TITLE II PROGRAMS.—Section 104(a) of the Act is amended by inserting "for programs under title II" after "appropriated".

(b) CONTENTS OF JOB TRAINING PLANS.—Section 104(b) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each job training plan for the programs conducted for adults under part A of title II and for youth under parts B and C of title II shall contain—

"(1) an identification of the entity or entities which will administer the program and be the grant recipient of funds from the State;

"(2) if there is more than one service delivery area in a single labor market area, provisions for coordinating particular aspects of the service delivery area program with other programs and service providers in the labor market area, including provisions for—

"(A) assessment of needs and problems in the labor market that form the basis for program planning;

"(B) ensuring access by program participants in each service delivery area to skills training and employment opportunities throughout the entire labor market;

"(C) coordinated or joint implementation of job development, placement, and other employer outreach activities; and

"(D) agreements, established pursuant to section 141(e), between service delivery areas to pay or share the cost of services;

"(3) a description of methods of complying with the coordination criteria contained in the Governor's coordination and special service plan;

"(4) a description of linkages established with appropriate agencies, pursuant to sections 205 and 275, designed to enhance the provision of services and avoid duplication, including—

"(A) agreements with appropriate educational agencies;

"(B) arrangements with other education, training, and employment programs authorized by Federal law; and

"(C) efforts to ensure the effective delivery of services to participants in coordination with local welfare agencies and other local agencies, community organizations, volunteer groups, business and labor organizations, and other training, education, employment, and social service programs;

"(5) goals and objectives for the programs, including performance standards established in accordance with standards prescribed under section 106;

"(6) adult and youth program budgets for two program years and any proposed expenditures for the succeeding two program years, in such detail as is determined to be necessary by the entity selected to prepare this portion of the plan pursuant to section 103(b)(1)(B) and to meet the requirements of section 108;

"(7) procedures for identifying and selecting participants, including, where appropriate, outreach efforts to recruit locally determined target groups, and for eligibility determination and verification;

"(8) a description of—

"(A) the assessment process that will identify participant skill levels and service needs;

"(B) the process for providing information and referrals for applicants and participants relating to appropriate programs and service providers;

"(C) the services to be provided, including the means for involving labor organizations and community-based organizations in the provision of services, and the estimated duration of service and the estimated cost of services per participant;

"(D) the competency levels to be achieved by participants as a result of program participation; and

"(E) the procedures for evaluating the progress of participants in achieving competencies;

"(9) a description of the procedures and methods of carrying out title V, relating to incentive bonus payments for the placement of individuals eligible under such title;

"(10) procedures for selecting service providers, consistent with section 107, which take into account past performance in job training or related activities, fiscal accountability, and ability to meet performance standards;

"(11) fiscal control (including procurement, monitoring, and management information system requirements), accounting, audit, and debt collection procedures, consistent with section 164, to assure the proper disbursement of, and accounting for, funds received under title II; and

"(12) procedures for the preparation and submission of an annual report to the Governor, which shall include—

"(A) a description of activities conducted during the program year;

"(B) characteristics of participants; and

"(C) the extent to which applicable performance standards were met."

SEC. 9. REVIEW OF PLAN.

Section 105(b)(1)(E) of the Act is amended by striking "section 121(b)", and inserting "sections 121(b), 205, and 275".

SEC. 10. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.

Section 106 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

"SEC. 106. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress recognizes that job training is an investment in human capital and not an expense. In order to determine whether that investment has been productive, the Congress finds that—

"(1) it is essential that criteria for measuring the return on this investment be developed; and

"(2) the basic return on the investment is to be measured by increased employment and earnings, reductions in welfare dependency, and increased educational attainment and occupational skills.

"(b) TITLE II PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—

"(1) GENERAL OBJECTIVE.—In prescribing performance standards for parts A and C of title II, the Secretary shall ensure that States and service delivery areas will make efforts to increase services and positive outcomes for hard-to-serve individuals.

"(2) ACHIEVEMENT OF BASIC MEASURES.—In order to determine whether the basic measures described in subsection (a) are achieved for programs under parts A and C of title II, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall prescribe performance standards.

"(3) CONTENTS OF ADULT STANDARDS.—The standards for adult programs under part A of title II shall be based on appropriate factors which may include—

"(A) placement and long-term retention in unsubsidized employment;

"(B) the increase in earnings, including hourly wages;

"(C) the reduction in welfare dependency; and

"(D) the acquisition of skills, including basic skills, required to promote continued employability in the local labor market, or the acquisition of a high school diploma or its equivalent, if the acquisition of such skills or diploma is in addition to obtaining one or more of the outcomes described in subparagraphs (A) through (C).

"(4) CONTENTS OF YOUTH STANDARDS.—In addition to appropriate utilization of the factors described in paragraph (3), the standards for youth programs under part C of title II shall include—

"(A) attainment of employability competencies;

"(B) dropout prevention and recovery;

"(C) secondary and postsecondary school completion or the equivalent thereof; and

"(D) enrollment in other education, training, or employment programs or apprenticeships, or enlistment in the Armed Forces.

"(5) COMPETENCY STANDARDS.—The private industry council, in consultation with educational agencies and the private sector, and where appropriate, labor organizations and community-based organizations, shall determine levels for competency standards based on such factors as entry skill levels and other hiring requirements.

"(6) ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS OF STANDARDS.—The standards shall include the provisions governing—

"(A) the base period prior to program participation that will be used;

"(B) a representative period after termination from the program that is a reasonable

indicator of post-program employment and earnings; and

"(C) cost-effective methods for obtaining such data as are necessary to carry out this section and section 454 which, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may include access to earnings records, State employment security records, Federal Insurance Contributions Act records, State aid to families with dependent children records, statistical sampling techniques, and similar records or measures, with appropriate safeguards to protect the confidentiality of the information obtained.

"(7) PROGRAM EXPENDITURES.—The Secretary shall prescribe performance standards relating gross program expenditures to various performance measures. Such standards shall not be taken into consideration in the award of incentive grants pursuant to paragraph (8).

"(8) INCENTIVE GRANTS.—From funds available pursuant to sections 202(c)(1)(B) and 272(c)(1)(B), each Governor shall award incentive grants to service delivery areas conducting programs under parts A and C of title II based on such service delivery areas—

"(A) exceeding the performance standards established by the Secretary pursuant to this subsection (except for the standard established pursuant to paragraph (7)), with respect to services to all participants, while also exceeding the performance standards established for services to the hard to serve populations, such as the target groups listed in sections 203(a) and 273(b) and (d);

"(B) placing participants in employment which—

"(i) provides post-program earnings exceeding the appropriate performance criteria; and

"(ii) includes employer-assisted employment benefits, including health benefits, consistent with the requirements of section 143(a)(4) relating to subsidized employment; and

"(C) exceeding the performance standards established by the Governor for programs under title II pursuant to subsection (e); except that not more than 25 percent of the funds used for incentive grants shall be awarded on performance standards established pursuant to subsection (e) which must include rewards for standards directly encouraging services to the hard to serve populations, such as the target groups listed in sections 203(a) and 273(b) and (d).

"(c) TITLE III PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—The Secretary shall prescribe performance standards for programs under title III based on placement and retention in unsubsidized employment.

"(d) STATE VARIATION OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—

"(1) GOVERNORS' AUTHORITY.—Each Governor shall prescribe, and report in the Governor's coordination and special services plan, within parameters established by the Secretary, variations in the standards issued under subsections (b) and (c) based upon—

"(A) specific economic, geographic, and demographic factors in the State and in service delivery areas and substate areas within the State,

"(B) the characteristics of the population to be served,

"(C) the demonstrated difficulties in serving the population, and

"(D) the type of services to be provided.

"(2) SECRETARY'S RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Secretary shall—

"(A) provide information and technical assistance on performance standards adjustments;

"(B) collect data that identifies hard-to-serve individuals and long-term welfare dependency;

"(C) provide guidance on setting performance standards at the service provider level that encourages increased service to the hard-to-serve, particularly long-term welfare recipients; and

"(D) review performance standards to ensure that such standards provide maximum incentive in serving the hard-to-serve, particularly long-term welfare recipients, including those receiving benefits under title IV of the Social Security Act, relating to aid to families with dependent children, and title XVI of such Act, relating to supplemental security income.

"(e) ADDITIONAL STATE STANDARDS PERMITTED.—The Governor may prescribe performance standards for programs under title II and title III in addition to those standards established by the Secretary under subsections (b) and (c). Such additional standards may include criteria requiring establishment of effective linkages with other programs to avoid duplication and enhance the delivery of services, the provision of high quality services, and successful service to target groups. The additional performance standards established for title II shall be reported in the Governor's coordination and special services plan.

"(f) TITLES IV AND V STANDARDS.—The Secretary shall prescribe performance standards for programs under parts A and B of title IV and for programs under title V.

"(g) ADJUSTMENT FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe a system for variations in performance standards for special populations to be served, including Native Americans, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, disabled and Vietnam era veterans, including veterans who served in the Indochina Theater between August 5, 1964, and May 7, 1975, and offenders, taking into account their special circumstances.

"(h) MODIFICATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may modify the performance standards under this section not more often than once every two program years. Such modifications shall not be retroactive.

"(2) TITLE IV-B STANDARDS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Secretary may modify standards relating to programs under part B of title IV each program year.

"(i) FUNCTIONS OF NCEP.—The National Commission for Employment Policy shall—

"(1) advise the Secretary in the development of performance standards under this section for measuring results of participation in job training and in the development of parameters for variations of such standards referred to in subsection (d);

"(2) evaluate the usefulness of such standards as measures of desired performance; and

"(3) evaluate the impact of such standards (intended or otherwise) on the choice of who is served, what services are provided, and the cost of such services in service delivery areas.

"(j) FAILURE TO MEET STANDARDS.—

"(1) UNIFORM CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall establish uniform criteria for determining whether a service delivery area fails to meet performance standards under this section, and when remedial action authorized under this subsection shall be taken.

"(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Each Governor shall provide technical assistance to service delivery areas failing to meet performance standards under the uniform criteria established pursuant to paragraph (1).

"(3) PROCESS FOR CORRECTION.—Each Governor shall report to the Secretary the final

standards and performance for each service delivery area within the State not later than 90 days after the end of the program year, along with the Governor's plans for providing the technical assistance required pursuant to paragraph (2).

"(4) RECAPTURE AND WITHHOLDING.—If the Secretary accepts the Governor's plans for technical assistance described in paragraph (2), then the Secretary shall only recapture or withhold funds based upon the Governor's failure to appropriately implement such plan. If the Secretary determines, upon appeal under paragraph (7), that the Governor has not provided appropriate technical assistance, then the Secretary shall recapture or withhold an amount not to exceed one-fifth of the State administration set-aside allocated under sections 202(c)(1)(A) and 272(c)(1)(A). The Secretary shall use funds recaptured or withheld under this paragraph to provide appropriate technical assistance.

"(5) REORGANIZATION PLAN.—

"(A) PLAN REQUIRED FOR CONTINUED FAILURE.—If a service delivery area continues to fail to meet such performance standards for 2 program years, the Governor shall notify the Secretary and the service delivery area of the continued failure, and shall develop and impose a reorganization plan. Such plan may restructure the private industry council, prohibit the use of designated service providers, merge the service delivery area into one or more other existing service delivery areas, or make such other changes as the Governor deems necessary to improve performance, including the selection of an alternative entity to administer the program for the service delivery area.

"(B) ALTERNATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY SELECTION.—The alternative administrative entity described in subparagraph (A) may be a newly formed private industry council or any agency jointly selected by the Governor and the chief elected official of the largest unit of general local government in the service delivery area or substate area.

"(6) SECRETARIAL ACTION.—If the Governor has not imposed a reorganization plan as required by paragraph (5) within 90 days of the end of the second program year in which a service delivery area has failed to meet its performance standards, then the Secretary shall develop and impose such a plan, including the selection of an alternative entity to administer the program for the service delivery areas. The Secretary shall recapture or withhold an amount not to exceed one-fifth of the State administration set-aside allocated under sections 202(c)(1)(A) and 272(c)(1)(A) for the purposes of providing technical assistance pursuant to a reorganization under paragraph (5).

"(7) APPEAL.—A service delivery area that is the subject of a reorganization plan under paragraph (5) may, within 30 days after receiving notice thereof, appeal to the Secretary for a revision of the plan. A Governor of a State that is subject to recapture or withholding under paragraph (4) or (6) may, within 30 days after receiving notice thereof, appeal such withholding to the Secretary.

"(k) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'employment' means employment for a minimum of 20 hours per week."

SEC. 11. SELECTION OF SERVICE PROVIDERS.

(a) SELECTION GUIDELINES.—Section 107(a) of the Act is amended by—

(1) inserting "(, in accordance with guidelines established by the Secretary,)" in the first sentence after "demonstrated performance"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following: "In addition, consideration shall be given to

provision of appropriate supportive services, including child care."

(b) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SELECTION.**—Section 107 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The selection of service providers shall be made on a competitive basis to the extent practicable, and shall include—

"(1) a determination of the ability of the service provider to meet program design specifications established by the administrative entity that take into account the purpose of the Act and the goals established in the Governor's coordination and special services plan; and

"(2) documentation of compliance with procurement standards established by the Secretary pursuant to section 164, including the reasons for selection."

SEC. 12. LIMITATION ON CERTAIN COSTS.

(a) Section 108(a) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 108. (a) Except as provided in section 141(d)(3)(A), (B), and (C), funds expended under this Act shall be charged to the appropriate cost categories."

(b) **COST CATEGORIES AND LIMITATIONS.**—Section 108(b) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) The cost limitations contained in this section shall apply separately to the funds allocated for programs under part A of title II, and to the funds allocated for programs under part C of such title.

"(2) Funds expended under parts A and C of title II shall be charged to one of the following categories:

"(A) administration,

"(B) training-related and supportive services, or

"(C) direct training services.

"(3) The Secretary shall, consistent with sections 204(b) and 274(c), define by regulation the cost categories specified in paragraph (2).

"(4) Of the funds allocated to a service delivery area for any program year under parts A or C of title II—

"(A) not more than 20 percent shall be expended for the costs of administration; and

"(B) not less than 50 percent shall be expended for direct training services.

"(5) Each service delivery area shall ensure that for all services provided to participants through contracts, grants, or other agreements with a service provider, such contract, grant, or agreement shall include appropriate amounts necessary for administrative costs and supportive services."

(c) **REFERENCE TO LIMITATIONS.**—Section 108 of the Act is further amended by striking subsection (c), redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively, and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Funds available under title III shall be expended in accordance with the limitations specified in section 315."

SEC. 13. RECAPTURE AND REALLOTMENT OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS UNDER TITLE II.

Part A of title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"RECAPTURE AND REALLOTMENT OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS UNDER TITLE II

"SEC. 109. (a) **WITHIN STATE REALLOCATIONS.**—(1) For program years beginning on or after July 1, 1993, the Governor shall, in accordance with the requirements of this subsection, reallocate to eligible service delivery areas within the State funds appropriated for such program year that are available for reallocation.

"(2) The amount available for reallocation is equal to the amount by which the unobli-

gated balance of the service delivery area allocation under parts A or C of title II at the end of the program year prior to the program year for which the determination under this subsection is made exceeds 15 percent of such allocation for that prior program year, except that the percentage of funds recaptured by the State under section 203(d)(1)(B)(i) shall not be considered as part of the unobligated balance for part A under this subparagraph.

"(3) The Governor shall reallocate the amounts available pursuant to paragraph (2), to eligible service delivery areas within the State which have the highest rates of unemployment for an extended period of time and to those with the highest poverty rates. The Secretary shall establish the unemployment and poverty rates at which service delivery areas are determined to be eligible.

"(4) For purposes of this subsection, an eligible service delivery area means a service delivery area which has obligated at least 85 percent of its allocation under part A or C of title II for the program year prior to the program year for which the determination under this subsection is made.

"(b) **REALLOTMENT AMONG STATES.**—(1) For program years beginning on or after July 1, 1993, the Secretary may, in accordance with the requirements of this subsection, reallocate to eligible States funds appropriated for such program year that are available for reallocation.

"(2) The amount available for reallocation is equal to the amount by which the unobligated balance of the State allotment under part A or C of title II at the end of the program year prior to the program year for which the determination under this subsection is made exceeds 15 percent of such allotment for that prior program year.

"(3) From the amount available pursuant to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall reallocate to each eligible State an amount based on the relative amount allotted to such eligible State under part A or C of title II for the program year the determination under this subsection is made compared to the total amount allotted to all eligible States under part A or C of title II for such program year.

"(4) For purposes of this subsection, an eligible State means a State which has obligated at least 85 percent of its allocation under part A or C of title II for the program year prior to the program year for which the determination under this subsection is made.

"(5) The Governor of each State shall prescribe uniform procedures for the obligation of funds by service delivery areas within the State in order to avoid the requirement that funds be made available for reallocation under this subsection. The Governor shall further prescribe equitable procedures for making funds available from the State and service delivery areas in the event that a State is required to make funds available for reallocation under this subsection."

SEC. 14. GOVERNOR'S COORDINATION AND SPECIAL SERVICES PLAN.

(a) **REQUIREMENTS FOR PLAN.**—Section 121(b) of the Act is amended by—

(1) amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) The plan shall describe the measures taken by the State to ensure coordination and avoid duplication between the State agencies administering the JOBS program and programs under title II in the planning and delivery of services. The plan shall describe the procedures developed by the State to ensure that the State JOBS plan is consistent with the coordination criteria specified in this plan and identify the procedures

developed to provide for the review of the JOBS plan by the State Job Training Coordinating Council."

(2) redesignating paragraphs (3), (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5), (6) and (7), respectively; and

(3) inserting the following new paragraphs after paragraph (2):

"(3) The plan shall describe the projected use of resources, including oversight of program performance, administration and financial management; capacity building; priorities and criteria for State incentive grants; and performance goals for State-supported programs. The description of capacity building shall include the Governor's plans for technical assistance to service delivery areas and service providers, interstate technical assistance and training arrangements, other coordinated technical assistance arrangements pursuant to the direction of the Secretary, and, where applicable, research and demonstration projects.

"(4) The plan shall include, in accordance with the requirements of section 123(c), a description of the programs conducted with funds provided under section 123."

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 121(c)(7) of the Act is amended by inserting "coordination of activities relating to part A of title II with" after "(7)".

SEC. 15. STATE JOB TRAINING COORDINATING COUNCIL.

Section 122(a)(3)(B)(i) of the Act is amended by inserting after "agencies or equivalent," the following: "State agencies primarily responsible for administration of programs for older workers."

SEC. 16. STATE EDUCATION COORDINATION AND GRANTS.

Section 123 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"STATE EDUCATION COORDINATION AND GRANTS

"SEC. 123. (a) **USE OF FUNDS.**—The Secretary shall allot to the Governor for allocation to any State education agency the sums available for this section pursuant to sections 202(c)(1)(C) and 272(c)(1)(C). In allocating such funds to the State education agency, the Governor shall not establish requirements governing the distribution of funds under this subsection. All such funds shall be used to carry out projects (in accordance with agreements under subsection (b)) that—

"(1) provide school-to-work transition services of demonstrated effectiveness that increase the rate of graduation from high school, or completion of the recognized equivalent thereof, including services that increase the rate at which dropouts return to regular or alternative schooling and obtain a high school degree or its equivalent, which may include services to support multiyear dropout prevention programs of demonstrated effectiveness;

"(2) provide literacy and lifelong learning opportunities and services of demonstrated effectiveness that enhance the knowledge and skills of educationally and economically disadvantaged individuals and result in increasing the employment and earnings of such individuals; and

"(3) facilitate coordination of education and training services for eligible participants in programs described under paragraphs (1) and (2), including activities pertaining to a State human resources investment council, which meets the requirements of sections 701 through 705.

"(b) **AGREEMENTS REQUIRED.**—

"(1) **PARTIES TO AGREEMENTS.**—The activities described in subsection (a) shall be conducted pursuant to agreements between the State education agency, administrative enti-

ties in service delivery areas in the State, and other entities, such as other State agencies, local educational agencies, and alternative service providers (such as community-based and other nonprofit or for-profit organizations).

“(2) CONTENTS OF AGREEMENTS.—The agreements described in paragraph (1) shall provide for the contribution by the State from funds other than those available under this Act of a total amount equal to the amount provided under this section. Such matching amount may include the direct cost of employment or training services provided by other Federal, State, or local programs or agencies.

“(c) GOVERNOR'S PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—Any Governor receiving assistance under this section shall include in the Governor's coordination and special services plan, pursuant to section 121, a description developed by the State education agency of the following:

“(1) the goals to be achieved and services to be provided by the school-to-work transition programs receiving assistance, which shall, at a minimum, include—

“(A) the activities and services that will result in increasing the number of youth staying in or returning to school and graduating from high school or the equivalent,

“(B) the work-based curriculum that will link classroom learning to worksite experience and address the practical and theoretical aspects of work,

“(C) the opportunities that will be made available to participants to obtain career-path employment and postsecondary education,

“(D) the integration to be achieved, where appropriate, in the delivery of services between State and local educational agencies and alternative service providers, such as community-based and nonprofit organizations, and

“(E) the linkages that will be established, where feasible, to avoid duplication and enhance the delivery of services, with programs under—

“(1) title II and part B of title IV of this Act,

“(ii) the Elementary and Secondary Education Act,

“(iii) the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act,

“(iv) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act,

“(v) the Adult Education Act,

“(vi) part F of title IV of the Social Security Act (JOBS), and

“(vii) the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act;

“(2) the goals to be achieved and services to be provided by literacy and lifelong learning programs receiving assistance, which shall, at a minimum, include—

“(A) the activities and services that will increase the knowledge and skills of educationally and economically disadvantaged individuals, and result in increased employment and earnings for such individuals;

“(B) the integration to be achieved between projects assisted under this section and the four-year State plan (and related needs assessment carried out for that plan) developed pursuant to section 342 of the Adult Education Act,

“(C) the variety of settings, including workplace settings, in which literacy training and learning opportunities will be provided;

“(D) the linkages that will be established, where feasible, to avoid duplication and enhance the delivery of services, with programs under—

“(i) titles II and III of this Act,

“(ii) the Adult Education Act,

“(iii) the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act,

“(iv) the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act,

“(v) part F of the Social Security Act (JOBS),

“(vi) the Rehabilitation Act of 1973,

“(vii) the National Literacy Act; and

“(viii) the Emergency Immigrant Education Act; and

“(3) the proportion of funds received under this section that shall be used to carry out the program described in paragraph (1) and the proportion that shall be used to carry out the program described in paragraph (2).

“(d) SERVICE REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) PERMITTED SERVICES.—Services funded under this section to carry out the programs described in subsection (a) may include education and training, vocational education services, and related services to participants under title II. In addition, such services may include services for offenders, veterans, and other individuals whom the Governor determines require special assistance.

“(2) LIMITATIONS ON EXPENDITURES.—(A) Not more than 20 percent of the funds allocated under this section may be expended for activities at the State and local levels described in subsection (a)(3).

“(B) At least 80 percent of the funds allocated under this section shall be expended to carry out the Federal share of activities conducted pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a). For the purpose of this subparagraph, the Federal share shall be the amount provided for in the agreements in subsection (b).

“(C) Not less than 75 percent of the funds allocated for activities under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall be expended for activities for economically disadvantaged individuals who experience other barriers to employment. Priority for those funds not expended for the economically disadvantaged shall be given to title III participants and those with other barriers to employment.

“(e) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS IN ABSENCE OF AGREEMENT.—If no agreement is reached pursuant to subsection (b) on the use of funds under this section, the Governor shall notify the Secretary and shall distribute the funds to service delivery areas in accordance with sections 201(b)(2) and 272(b)(2), for purposes of section 123(a)(1), (2), and (3).

“(f) REPORTS AND RECORDS.—

“(1) REPORTS BY GOVERNORS.—The Governor shall report to the Secretary at such intervals as shall be determined by the Secretary on the activities funded under this section. The report shall include such information as the Secretary may require to determine the extent to which the activities supported under this section result in achieving the goals specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c).

“(2) RECORDS AND REPORTS OF RECIPIENTS.—Each recipient, subrecipient, or grantee under this part shall keep records that are sufficient to permit the preparation of reports. Such reports shall be submitted to the Secretary, at such intervals as shall be determined by the Secretary.”

SEC. 17. ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS TO PART B OF TITLE I.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 124 of the Act is repealed.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL IMPOSED REQUIREMENTS.—Part B of title I of the Act is amended by inserting after section 123 the following new section:

“IDENTIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL IMPOSED REQUIREMENTS

“SEC. 124. The imposition of any State or service delivery area rule, regulation, policy, or performance standard relating to the administration and operation of programs funded by this Act (including those based on State or service delivery area interpretation of any Federal law, regulation, or guideline) shall be identified by the State or service delivery area as a State or service delivery area imposed requirement.”

(c) STATE LABOR MARKET INFORMATION PROGRAMS.—Section 125(a) of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (4);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(6) provide training and technical assistance to support comprehensive career guidance and participant outcome activities for local programs assisted under this Act.”

SEC. 18. AMENDMENTS TO PART C OF TITLE I.

(a) RELOCATION.—Section 141(c) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

“(c) No funds shall be used or proposed for use to encourage, induce, or assist in the relocation of establishments, or parts thereof. If such violation is alleged, the Secretary shall determine, in consultation with appropriate businesses, governmental entities or public agencies, and labor organizations in all locations affected, whether a violation has occurred.”

(b) CHARGING OF COSTS.—Section 141(d)(3) of the Act is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” after the paragraph (3) designation; and

(2) by inserting the following new subparagraphs:

“(B) Tuition charges for training or education provided by an institution of higher education (as that term is defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965) or a proprietary institution of higher education (as defined in section 481(b) of such Act), which are not more than the charges for such training or education made available to the general public, do not require a breakdown of cost components.

“(C) Funds provided from the allocation to a service delivery area for any fiscal year, which are expended by any community-based organization for the cost of administering services under part A or C of title II, shall not be subject to the limitation contained in section 108(b)(4)(A) if such funds are expended pursuant to an agreement under which not less than 90 percent of the funds provided to the community-based organization are to be expended for the costs of direct training and training-related and supportive services, and if the service delivery area is in compliance with the requirement under section 108(b)(4)(B) for such fiscal year.”

(c) PLACEMENT.—Section 141(d) of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(4) Placements made in unsubsidized employment shall be, to the extent practicable, in job areas related to the training provided to the participant.”

(d) SERVICE DELIVERY AREA AGREEMENTS.—Section 141(e) of the Act is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “(e)”; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(2) Any service delivery area (including a service delivery area which is a city or county within the same labor market) may enter into an agreement or contract with another

service delivery area to pay or share the cost of educating, training, or placing individuals participating in programs assisted under this Act, including the provision of supportive services. Such agreement shall be approved by each private industry council providing guidance to the service delivery area and shall be described in the job training plan under section 104 of this Act."

(e) ON-THE-JOB TRAINING.—Section 141(g) of the Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(g)"; and
(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(2) On-the-job training authorized under the Act shall be limited in duration to a period not in excess of that generally required for acquisition of skills needed for the position within a particular occupation, but in no event shall exceed 6 months. In making this determination, consideration shall be given to recognized reference material (such as the Dictionary of Occupational Titles), the content of the participant's training, the participant's prior work experience, and the participant's service strategy.

"(3)(A) Each on-the-job training contract shall—

"(i) specify the types and duration of on-the-job training to be developed and other services to be provided in sufficient detail to allow for a fair analysis of the reasonableness of proposed costs; and

"(ii) comply with the applicable requirements of section 164.

"(B) Each on-the-job training contract that is not directly contracted by a service delivery area with an employer (but instead is contracted through an intermediary brokering contractor) shall, in addition to meeting the requirements of subparagraph (A), specify the outreach, recruitment, participant training, counseling, placement, monitoring, followup, and other services to be provided directly by the brokering contractor within its own organization, the services to be provided by the employers conducting the on-the-job training, and the services to be provided, with or without cost, by other agencies and subcontractors.

"(C) Whenever a brokering contractor enters into a contract with a subcontractor to provide training or other services, the brokering contractor shall ensure, through on-site monitoring, compliance with subcontract terms prior to making payment to the subcontractor.

"(4) In accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary, on-the-job training contracts under this Act shall not be entered into with employers who have received payments under previous contracts and have exhibited a pattern of failing to provide individuals, who have previously participated in on-the-job training, with continued long-term employment as regular employees with wages and employment benefits (including health benefits) and working conditions at the same level and to the same extent as other employees working a similar length of time and doing the same type of work."

(f) DISPOSAL OF ASSETS.—Section 141(k) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(k) The Federal requirements governing the title, use, and disposition of real property, equipment, and supplies purchased with funds provided under this Act shall be the Federal requirements generally applicable to Federal grants to States and local governments."

(g) PROGRAM INCOME.—Section 141(m) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(m)(1) Income under any program administered by a public or private nonprofit en-

tity may be retained by such entity only if used to continue to carry out that program, and may be used for such purposes notwithstanding the expiration of financial assistance for that program.

"(2) Income subject to the requirements of paragraph (1) shall include—

"(A) receipts from goods or services (including conferences) provided as a result of activities funded under the Act;

"(B) funds provided to a service provider under the Act which are in excess of the costs associated with the services provided; and

"(C) except as provided by the Cash Management Improvement Act of 1990, interest income earned on funds received under this Act.

"(3) For the purposes of this subsection, each entity shall maintain records sufficient to determine the amount of income received and the purposes for which such income is expended."

(h) CROSS REFERENCE.—Section 141(p) of the Act is amended by striking "part B of the title or part A of title II" and inserting in lieu thereof "parts A and C of title II".

(i) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—Section 141 of the Act is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) No funds available under this Act shall be used for activities to induce, encourage, or assist relocations resulting in loss of employment at the previous existing location. No funds available under this Act shall be used for employment generating activities, economic development activities, revolving loan funds, capitalization of businesses, contract bidding resource centers, and similar activities that do not result in the direct creation of jobs into which participants in programs under this Act are placed. No funds under title II or III of this Act shall be used for foreign travel."

(j) CONCURRENCE.—Section 143(b)(2) of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking ", except that no program" and inserting in lieu thereof ". No program"; and

(2) by striking all that follows "undertake" and inserting in lieu thereof "without the written concurrence of the employer and the labor organization with respect to any elements of the proposed activities which affect such agreement, unless either such party fails to respond to written notification requesting its concurrence within 30 days of receipt thereof."

(k) NONDELEGATION.—Section 144(c) of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall not delegate the responsibilities under this section to any other governmental entity."

SEC. 19. BENEFITS.

Section 142(a) of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) References in paragraphs (2) and (3) to section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act:

"(A) shall be deemed to be references to section 6(c) of that Act for individuals in Puerto Rico,

"(B) shall be deemed to be references to 6(a)(3) of that Act for individuals in American Samoa, and

"(C) shall not be applicable for individuals in other territorial jurisdictions in which section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act does not apply."

SEC. 20. FISCAL CONTROLS; SANCTIONS.

(a) ADVANCE PAYMENT.—Section 162 of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(f) When contracting with nonprofit organizations of demonstrated effectiveness, States, substate areas, and service delivery areas may make advance payments, provided that such payments are based on the financial need of such organization and are not in excess of 20 percent of the total contract amount."

(b) FISCAL CONTROLS.—Section 164(a) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 164. (a)(1) Each State shall establish such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure the proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the recipient under titles II and III. Such procedures shall ensure that all financial transactions are conducted and records maintained in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applicable in each State.

"(2) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations establishing uniform cost principles substantially equivalent to those generally applicable to recipients of Federal grants funds. At a minimum, such standards shall provide that, to be allowable, costs must—

"(A) be necessary and reasonable for proper and efficient administration of the program under this Act;

"(B) be allocable to the program under this Act; and

"(C) not be a general expense required to carry out the overall responsibilities of State, local, or federally recognized Indian tribal governments except as specifically provided by this Act.

"(3) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations establishing uniform procurement standards to ensure fiscal accountability and prevent fraud and abuse in programs administered under this Act. In prescribing such standards, the Secretary shall consult with the Inspector General of the Department of Labor and take into consideration the relevant circulars prescribed by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Such standards shall, at a minimum, include provisions to ensure that, for States, substate areas, and service delivery areas—

"(A) procurements shall be conducted in a manner providing full and open competition;

"(B) the use of sole source procurements shall be minimized to the extent practicable, but in every case shall be justified;

"(C) procurements shall include an appropriate analysis of the reasonableness of costs and prices;

"(D) procurements shall not provide excess program income (for nonprofit and governmental entities) or excess profit (for private for-profit entities), and that appropriate factors shall be utilized in determining whether such income or profit is excessive, such as—

"(i) the complexity of the work to be performed,

"(ii) the risk borne by the contractor, and

"(iii) market conditions in the surrounding geographical area;

"(E) procurements shall clearly specify deliverables and the basis for payment;

"(F) written procedures shall be established for procurement transactions;

"(G) no grantee, contractor, subgrantee, or subcontractor shall engage in any conflict of interest, actual or apparent, in the selection, award, or administration of a contract or grant under this Act;

"(H) all grantees and subgrantees shall conduct oversight to ensure compliance with procurement standards; and

"(I) procurement transactions between units of State or local governments, and any other entities organized principally as the administrative entity for service delivery

areas, shall be conducted on a cost reimbursable basis.

"(4) The Governor shall annually conduct on-site monitoring of each service delivery area and substate area within the State to ensure compliance with the procurement standards established pursuant to paragraph (3).

"(5) If the Governor determines that a service delivery area or substate area is not in compliance with the procurement standards established pursuant to paragraph (3), the Governor shall—

"(A) require corrective action to secure prompt compliance; and

"(B) impose the sanctions provided under subsection (b) in the event of failure to take the required corrective action.

"(6) The Governor shall biennially certify to the Secretary that—

"(A) the State has implemented the procurement standards established under paragraph (3);

"(B) the State has monitored substate areas and service delivery areas to ensure compliance with the procurement standards established pursuant to paragraph (3); and

"(C) the State has taken appropriate action to secure compliance pursuant to paragraph (5).

"(7) If the Secretary determines that the Governor has not fulfilled the requirements of this subsection, the Secretary shall—

"(A) require corrective action to secure prompt compliance; and

"(B) impose the sanctions provided under subsection (f) in the event of failure of the Governor to take the required corrective action.

"(8) The Secretary shall review the implementation of the provisions of this section, and shall submit a report to the Congress, not later than October 1, 1994, evaluating the effectiveness of such provisions in ensuring fiscal accountability and containing such recommendations as the Secretary deems appropriate."

(c) CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURES.—Section 164(b) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) Whenever, as a result of financial and compliance audits or otherwise, the Governor determines that there is a substantial violation of a specific provision of this Act or the regulations, and corrective action has not been taken, the Governor shall—

"(A) issue a notice of intent to revoke approval of all or part of the plan affected, or

"(B) impose a reorganization plan, which may include—

"(i) restructuring the private industry council,

"(ii) prohibiting the use of designated service providers,

"(iii) selecting an alternative entity to administer the program for the service delivery area,

"(iv) merging the service delivery area into 1 or more other existing service delivery areas, or

"(v) other such changes as the Secretary or Governor deems necessary to secure compliance.

"(2)(A) The actions taken by the Governor pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) may be appealed to the Secretary under the same terms and conditions as the disapproval of the plan and shall not become effective until—

"(i) the time for appeal has expired, or

"(ii) the Secretary has issued a decision.

"(B) The actions taken by the Governor pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) may be appealed to the Secretary, who shall make a

final decision within 60 days of the receipt of the appeal.

"(3) If the Governor fails to promptly take the actions required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall take such actions."

SEC. 21. REPORTS, RECORDKEEPING, AND INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) STANDARDIZED RECORDS.—Section 165(a) of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(3) In order to allow for the preparation of national estimates necessary to meet the requirements of subsection (c), recipients shall maintain standardized records for all individual participants and provide to the Secretary a sufficient number of such records to provide an adequate random sample.

"(4)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), records maintained by recipients pursuant to this subsection shall be made available to the public upon request.

"(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to—

"(i) information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy; and

"(ii) trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential.

"(C) Recipients may charge fees sufficient to recover costs applicable to the processing of requests for records under subparagraph (A)."

(b) MONITORING GUIDES.—Section 165(b) is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"(3) In carrying out any audit under this Act (other than any initial audit survey or any audit investigating possible criminal or fraudulent conduct), either directly or through grant or contract, the Secretary, the Inspector General, or the Comptroller General shall furnish to the State, administrative entity, recipient, or other entity to be audited, advance notification of the overall objectives and purposes of the audit, and any extensive recordkeeping or data requirements to be met, not less than 15 working days (or as soon as practicable), prior to the commencement of the audit. If the scope, objectives, or purposes of the audit shall change substantially during the course of the audit, the entity being audited shall be notified thereof, as soon as practicable. The reports on the results of such audits shall cite the law, regulation, policy, or other criteria applicable to any finding. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed so as to be inconsistent with the Inspector General Act of 1978 or government auditing standards issued by the Comptroller General."

(c) MONITORING OF SERVICE PROVIDERS.—Section 165(c) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Each State, each administrative entity designated under title I, and each recipient (other than a subrecipient, grantee or contractor of a recipient) receiving funds under this Act shall—

"(1) make readily accessible reports concerning its operations and expenditures as shall be prescribed by the Secretary;

"(2) prescribe and maintain comparable management information systems, in accordance with guidelines that shall be prescribed by the Secretary, designed to facilitate the uniform compilation, cross tabulation, and analysis of programmatic, participant, and financial data, on statewide and service delivery area bases, necessary for reporting, monitoring, and evaluating purposes, including data necessary to comply with section 167; and

"(3) monitor the performance of service providers in complying with the terms of agreements made pursuant to this Act."

(d) REPORT INFORMATION; RECORD RETENTION.—Section 165 of the Act is further amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(d)(1) The reports required in subsection (c) shall include (but not be limited to) information in such form as to permit cross-tabulation pertaining to—

"(A) the relevant demographic characteristics (including race or ethnicity, sex, or age) and other related information about enrollees and participants;

"(B) the activities in which participants are enrolled, and the length of time that participants are engaged in such activities;

"(C) program outcomes, including occupations, for participants;

"(D) specified program costs; and

"(E) information necessary to prepare reports to comply with section 167 of this Act.

"(2) The Secretary shall ensure that all elements of the information required for the reports described in paragraph (1) are defined and reported uniformly.

"(e) The Governor shall ensure that requirements are established for retention of all records pertinent to all grants, contracts, and agreements, including financial, statistical, property and participant records and supporting documentation. For funds allotted to a State for any program year, records shall be retained for two years following the date on which the annual expenditure report containing the final expenditures charged to such program year's allotment is submitted to the Secretary. Records for nonexpendable property shall be retained for a period of three years after final disposition of the property.

"(f) Quarterly financial reports shall be required by the Secretary. Records shall be maintained to show all program costs by cost category in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles by year of appropriation. Any program income or profits earned by subrecipient shall be separately identified on the records maintained. Costs incurred (such as stand-in costs) that are otherwise allowable except for funding limitation shall also be separately identified.

"(g) The Secretary shall issue final regulations implementing section 167 of this Act within 90 days of the enactment of the Job Training Reform Amendments."

(e) DISCRIMINATION.—Section 167 of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e)(1) The head of the office of the Department of Labor referred to as the 'Directorate for Civil Rights' shall annually prepare a report on the administration and enforcement of this section.

"(2) The report required by paragraph (1) shall include—

"(A) an identification of the service delivery areas and States that have been determined, during the preceding program year, not to be in compliance with this section;

"(B) for each such identification, the date on which the inquiry was begun and whether the inquiry was initiated on the basis of a complaint or at the Department's initiative;

"(C) an identification of the service delivery areas and States awaiting findings by the Directorate;

"(D) the number of service delivery areas and States that, during the preceding year, were determined not to be in compliance with this section, and the number for which insufficient data prevented the making of such a determination, identifying the type of data which is missing or inadequate;

"(E) a statistical summary, broken down by race, sex, national origin, disability, or

age, of the number of inquiries undertaken and their outcomes;

"(F) an identification of any service delivery area or State that has been determined, during the preceding year, to have failed to conduct objective assessments as required by sections 204 and 274 on a nondiscriminatory basis;

"(G) the amount expended by the Department for the administration and enforcement by the Directorate of this section, and the number and percentage of full-time employees, and the full-time equivalent of the part-time employees, engaged in such administration and enforcement;

"(H) the number of onsite visits conducted each year, and whether the visits were initiated by the Department or by complaint;

"(I) the number of cases referred to the Attorney General, and for such cases—

"(i) the civil actions taken by the Attorney General thereon; and

"(ii) the Secretary's use of the authority of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, or section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and

"(J) a description of any other actions taken by the Secretary under or related to the administration and enforcement of this section.

"(3) The report required by this subsection shall be submitted to the Congress as part of the Secretary's annual report under section 169(d).

"(f) In addition to any other sums authorized to be appropriated, there are authorized to be appropriated for the operations and expenses of the Directorate such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of increasing the number of full time equivalent personnel available to the Directorate in order to comply with the requirements of this section."

SEC. 22. REVISION OF TITLE II.

Title II of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—TRAINING SERVICES FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

"PART A—ADULT PROGRAM

"SEC. 201. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

"It is the purpose of this part to establish programs to prepare adults for participation in the labor force by increasing their occupational and educational skills with the result of improving their long-term employability, increasing their employment and earnings, and reducing their welfare dependency.

"SEC. 202. ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION.

"(a) TERRITORIAL ALLOTMENT.—Not more than one-quarter of one percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 3(a)(1) for each fiscal year and available for this part shall be allotted among Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Freely Associated States, the Republic of Palau and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

"(b) GENERAL STATE AND SDA ALLOTMENTS.—

"(1) RESERVATION.—After determining the amounts to be allotted under subsection (a), 81 percent of the remainder shall be allotted by the Secretary to the States for allocation to service delivery areas within each State. Each State shall allocate to the service delivery areas within the State such amounts as determined by the Secretary pursuant to the formula contained in paragraph (2). The remaining 19 percent shall be allotted in accordance with subsection (c).

"(2) FORMULA.—Subject to the provisions of paragraph (3), of the amounts allotted to service delivery areas for this part for each fiscal year—

"(A) 33½ percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative number of unemployed individuals residing in areas of substantial unemployment within each service delivery area as compared to the total number of such unemployed individuals in all service delivery areas in all States;

"(B) 33½ percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative excess number of unemployed individuals within each service delivery area as compared to the total excess number of unemployed individuals in all service delivery areas in all States; and

"(C) 33½ percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative number of economically disadvantaged adults within each service delivery area as compared to the total number of economically disadvantaged adults in all service delivery areas in all States, except that for any service delivery area described in section 101(a)(4)(A)(iii), the allotment shall be based on the higher of the number of adults in families with an income below the low-income level in such area or the number of economically disadvantaged individuals in such area.

"(3) LIMITATIONS ON FORMULA.—(A) No service delivery area shall be allotted less than 90 percent of its allotment percentage for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.

"(B) No service delivery area shall be allotted more than 130 percent of its allotment percentage for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.

"(C) Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), the total allotment for all service delivery areas within any one State shall not be less than one-quarter of 1 percent of the total allotted to all service delivery areas in all States.

"(D) For purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B), the allotment percentage for fiscal year 1993 shall be the percentage of funds allotted under part A of title II to the service delivery area during the preceding fiscal year.

"(4) DEFINITIONS AND DETERMINATIONS.—For the purposes of this section—

"(A) the term 'economically disadvantaged adult' means an individual who is age 22 or older and who has, or is a member of a family which has, received a total family income which, in relation to family size, was not in excess of the higher of (A) the poverty income guidelines promulgated each year by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or (B) 70 percent of the lower living standard income level;

"(B) the Secretary shall, as appropriate and to the extent practicable, exclude college students and members of the Armed Forces from the determination of the number of economically disadvantaged adults and the size of the adult population in a service delivery area; and

"(C) the term 'excess number' means the number which represents the number of unemployed individuals in excess of 4.5 percent of the civilian labor force in the service delivery area, or the number which represents the number of unemployed individuals in excess of 4.5 percent of the civilian labor force in areas of substantial unemployment in such service delivery area.

"(c) SPECIAL ALLOTMENTS.—

"(1) DIVISION OF REMAINDER.—Of the remaining 19 percent of funds available for allotment under this part—

"(A) 5 percent shall be allotted to the States in accordance with paragraph (2) to carry out the overall administration, management, and auditing activities relating to programs under this title and for activities under sections 121 and 122;

"(B) 6 percent shall be allotted to the States in accordance with paragraph (2), to provide incentive grants authorized under section 106(b)(8), which the States in turn shall allot in accordance with paragraphs (3) and (4); and

"(C) 8 percent shall be allotted to the States in accordance with paragraph (2) to carry out section 123.

"(2) FORMULA FOR ALLOTMENT.—The allotments to each State described in paragraph (1) shall be based on the relative amount of funds allocated to all service delivery areas within such State under subsection (b) as compared to the amount of funds allocated to all service delivery areas in all States under subsection (b).

"(3) INCENTIVE GRANTS ALLOTMENT.—The amount reserved under paragraph (1)(B) shall be used by the Governor to provide incentive grants for service delivery areas that exceed applicable performance standards and other measures described under section 106(b)(8). The incentive grants made under paragraph (1)(B) shall be distributed so that not less than ¾ of the funds used for incentive grants are distributed to eligible service delivery areas within the State on an equitable basis, taking into account the extent by which they exceed the requirements of section 106(b)(8) and the size of the eligible population, and the remainder shall be distributed on an equitable basis.

"(4) OTHER USES.—The Governor may use up to ½ of the amount allotted under paragraph (1)(B) for capacity building and technical assistance to service delivery areas and service providers. Such use of funds may include the development and training of service delivery areas and service provider staff and the development of exemplary program activities.

"SEC. 203. ELIGIBILITY FOR SERVICES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c), an individual shall be eligible to participate in the program under this part only if such individual is—

"(1) 22 years of age or older; and

"(2) economically disadvantaged.

"(b) TARGETED GROUPS.—Not less than 60 percent of the participants in the program under this part in each service delivery area shall be individuals who, in addition to meeting requirements of subsection (a), are included in one or more of the following categories:

"(1) basic skills deficient;

"(2) school dropouts;

"(3) recipients of cash welfare payments;

"(4) offenders;

"(5) individuals with disabilities; or

"(6) homeless.

"(c) EXCEPTIONS.—Not more than 10 percent of participants in the program under this part in each service delivery area may be individuals who are not economically disadvantaged if such individuals are age 22 or older and are either included in one of the categories listed in subsection (b) or experience other barriers to employment. Such individuals may include, but are not limited to, those who have limited English language proficiency, or are displaced homemakers, older workers, veterans, alcoholics, or drug addicts.

"(d) SERVICES FOR OLDER INDIVIDUALS.—

"(1) GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.—(A) Each service delivery area shall make special efforts to identify and serve eligible individuals 55 years of age or older. Not less than 8 percent of the funds allocated to each service delivery area under this part shall be expended to provide services to such individuals.

"(B) If the Governor determines that in any program year a service delivery area obligated less than 8 percent of the funds allocated under this part to provide services to eligible individuals 55 years of age or older, the Governor—

"(i) shall recapture, from the funds available to the service delivery area under this part during the subsequent program year, an amount equal to the difference between the amount obligated for such purposes and 8 percent of the amount allocated to the service delivery area under this part in such program year; and

"(ii) shall reallocate, for purposes of providing services to eligible individuals 55 years of age or older, the amount recaptured pursuant to clause (i) to other service delivery areas within the State, which have obligated their funding, in such manner as the Governor deems appropriate, taking into consideration such factors as demonstrated need and the quality of services provided to such individuals by the service delivery areas; or

"(II) shall contract with a different service provider of demonstrated effectiveness to provide services within the service delivery area from which funds have been recaptured, in order to continue to make services available to eligible individuals in the service delivery area.

"(2) COORDINATION.—In providing the services required by paragraph (1), the State job training coordinating council and the service delivery area shall make efforts to coordinate the delivery of such services with the delivery of services pursuant to title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965.

"(3) SERVICE PROVIDER SELECTION.—(A) In the selection of service providers to serve older individuals, the service delivery area shall give priority to those national, State, and local agencies and organizations that have a record of demonstrated effectiveness in providing training and employment services to such older individuals.

"(B) Those service delivery areas within a State that choose to utilize the services of area agencies on aging or organizations of demonstrated effectiveness in providing services, including recruitment and placement, to older individuals, may combine funds under this subsection to contract with such area agencies or organizations for the provision of such services among the service delivery areas.

"SEC. 204. PROGRAM DESIGN.

"(a) ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The program under this part shall include—

"(A) an objective assessment of each participant's skill levels and service needs, which shall include a review of basic skills, occupational skills, prior work experience, employability, interests, aptitudes (including interests and aptitudes for nontraditional jobs), and supportive service needs, except that a new assessment of a participant is not required if the program determines it is appropriate to use a recent assessment of the participant conducted pursuant to another education or training program (such as the JOBS program), and such assessments shall comply with the requirements of section 167;

"(B) development of service strategies which shall identify the employment goal (including, where appropriate, nontraditional employment), appropriate achievement objectives, and appropriate services for participants taking into account the assessments conducted pursuant to paragraph (1), except that a new service strategy is not re-

quired if the program determines it is appropriate to use a recent service strategy developed for the participant under another education or training program (such as the JOBS program);

"(C) a review of each participant's progress in meeting the objectives of the service strategy; and

"(D) the following services, which shall be provided either directly or through arrangement with other programs to a participant where the assessment and the service strategy indicate such services are appropriate:

"(i) basic skills training;

"(ii) occupational skills training; and

"(iii) supportive services.

"(2) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—(A) Each service delivery area shall ensure that each participant or applicant who meets the minimum income eligibility criteria be provided—

"(i) information on the full array of applicable or appropriate services that are available through the service delivery area or other service providers, including, but not limited to, those receiving funds under this Act, and

"(ii) referral to appropriate training and educational programs that have the capacity to serve the applicant either on a sequential or concurrent basis.

"(B)(i) Each service provider shall ensure that an eligible applicant who does not meet the enrollment requirements of its particular program or who cannot be served shall be referred to the service delivery area for further assessment, as necessary, and referral to appropriate programs to meet the applicant's basic skills and training needs.

"(ii) The service delivery area shall ensure that appropriate referrals are made pursuant to this subparagraph, and shall maintain appropriate records of such referrals and the basis for such referrals.

"(b) AUTHORIZED SERVICES.—Services which may be made available to participants under this title may include, but need not be limited to—

"(1) direct training services, including—

"(A) basic skills training, including remedial education, literacy training, and English-as-a-second-language instruction;

"(B) institutional skills training;

"(C) on-the-job training;

"(D) assessment of participants' skill levels and service needs;

"(E) counseling, such as job counseling and career counseling;

"(F) case management services;

"(G) education-to-work transition activities;

"(H) programs which combine workplace training with related instruction;

"(I) work experience;

"(J) programs of advanced career training which provide a formal combination of on-the-job and institutional training and internship assignments which prepare individuals for career employment;

"(K) training programs operated by the private sector, including those operated by labor organizations or by consortia of private sector employers utilizing private sector facilities, equipment, and personnel to train workers in occupations for which demand exceeds supply;

"(L) skill upgrading and retraining;

"(M) bilingual training;

"(N) entrepreneurial training, such as training activities for microenterprises;

"(O) vocational exploration;

"(P) training programs to develop work habits to help individuals obtain and retain employment;

"(Q) attainment of certificates of high school equivalency;

"(R) preapprenticeship programs;

"(S) on-site, industry-specific training programs supportive of industrial and economic development;

"(T) customized training conducted with a commitment by an employer or group of employers to employ an individual upon successful completion of that training; and

"(U) use of advanced learning technology for education, job preparation and skills training; and

"(2) training-related and supportive services, including—

"(A) job search assistance;

"(B) outreach to make individuals aware of, and encourage the use of, employment and training services, including efforts to expand awareness of training and placement opportunities for the limited English proficient and individuals with disabilities;

"(C) specialized surveys not available through other labor market information sources;

"(D) disseminating information on program activities to employers;

"(E) development of job openings;

"(F) coordinated programs with other Federal employment-related activities;

"(G) supportive services, as defined in section 4(24) of this Act, necessary to enable individuals to participate in the program, and to assist them, for a period not to exceed 12 months following completion of training, to retain employment;

"(H) needs-based payments and financial assistance;

"(I) follow-up services with participants placed in unsubsidized employment; and

"(J) obtaining job placements for participants.

"(c) DESIGN OF SERVICES.—

"(1) BASIC SKILLS TRAINING.—Basic skills training authorized under this part shall, where appropriate, have a workplace context and be integrated with occupational skills training.

"(2) ADDITIONAL SERVICES IN CONJUNCTION WITH SKILLS TRAINING.—(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), job search assistance, job search skills training, job clubs, and work experience authorized under this part shall be accompanied by other services designed to increase a participant's basic education or occupational skills.

"(B) The program under this part may provide job search assistance, job search skills training, and job club activities to a participant without the additional services described in subparagraph (A) only if—

"(i) the participant's assessment and service strategy indicate that the additional services are not appropriate; and

"(ii) the activities are not available to the participant through the Employment Service or other public agencies.

"(3) LIMITATION ON ON-THE-JOB TRAINING.—In each service delivery area, the ratio of participants in on-the-job training assisted under this part in the public sector to participants in such training in the private sector shall not exceed the ratio between civilian governmental employment and non-governmental employment in such area.

"(4) NEEDS-BASED PAYMENTS.—Needs-based payments and financial assistance authorized under this part shall be limited to payments necessary to participation in the program under this part in accordance with a locally developed formula or procedure.

"(5) COUNSELING AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—Counseling and supportive services authorized under this part may be provided to

a participant for a period up to one year after termination from the program.

"(6) **NONCONTRACT TREATMENT.**—The service strategy developed pursuant to section 204(a)(2) shall not be considered a contract.

"(7) **VOLUNTEERS.**—The service delivery area shall make opportunities available for successful alumni of programs under this part to volunteer assistance to participants in the form of mentoring, tutoring, and other activities.

"SEC. 205. LINKAGES.

"(a) **PROGRAM LINKAGES.**—In conducting the program under this part, the service delivery area shall establish appropriate linkages with other programs authorized under Federal law. Such programs shall include, where feasible, programs assisted under—

- "(1) the Adult Education Act;
- "(2) the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act;
- "(3) the Rehabilitation Act of 1973;
- "(4) the Wagner-Peyser Act;
- "(5) part F of title IV of Social Security Act (JOBS);
- "(6) the Food Stamp Act;
- "(7) the National Apprenticeship Act;
- "(8) the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act;
- "(9) the United States Housing Act;
- "(10) the National Literacy Act of 1991;
- "(11) the Head Start Act (for purposes of child care services); and
- "(12) any other provisions of this Act.

"(b) **OTHER LINKAGES.**—In addition to the linkages required under subsection (a), service delivery areas shall establish other appropriate linkages to enhance the provision of services under this part. Such linkages may be established with State and local educational agencies, local service agencies, public housing agencies, community organizations, business and labor organizations, volunteer groups working with disadvantaged adults, and other training, education, employment, economic development and social service programs.

"SEC. 206. TRANSFER OF FUNDS.

"A service delivery area may transfer up to 10 percent of the funds provided under this part to the program under part C of this title if such transfer is—

- "(1) described in the job training plan; and
- "(2) approved by the Governor.

"PART B—SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 251. PURPOSE.

"The purpose of programs assisted under this part is—

- "(1) to enhance the basic educational skills of youth;
- "(2) to encourage school completion, or enrollment in supplementary or alternative school programs; and
- "(3) to provide eligible youth with exposure to the world of work.

"SEC. 252. ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION.

"(a) **TERRITORIAL AND NATIVE AMERICAN ALLOCATION.**—From the funds appropriated under section 3(a)(2), the Secretary shall first allocate to Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Freely Associated States and the Republic of Palau, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, and entities eligible under section 401 the same percentage of funds as were available to such areas and entities for the summer youth program in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.

"(b) **USE OF PART C FORMULA FOR ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION.**—The remainder of sums appropriated pursuant to section 3(a)(2) shall be allotted among States and allocated

among service delivery areas in accordance with section 272(b).

"SEC. 253. USE OF FUNDS.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Funds available under this part may be used for—

- "(1) basic and remedial education, institutional and on-the-job training, work experience programs, employment counseling, occupational training, preparation for work, outreach and enrollment activities, employability assessment, job referral and placement, job search and job club activities, activities described in section 275(b), and any other employment or job training activity designed to give employment to eligible individuals or prepare them for, and place them in, employment;
- "(2) supportive services necessary to enable such individuals to participate in the program; and
- "(3) administrative costs, not to exceed 15 percent of the funds available under this part.

"(b)(1) **BASIC AND REMEDIAL EDUCATION.**—A service delivery area shall expend funds (from this Act or otherwise available to the service delivery area, or both) for basic and remedial education as described in the job training plan under section 104.

"(2) The funds for basic and remedial education or training described in paragraph (1) may be provided by—

- "(A) the year-round program under this part;
- "(B) the Job Corps;
- "(C) the JOBS program;
- "(D) alternative or secondary schools; or
- "(E) other education and training programs.

"(c) **ASSESSMENT.**—Each participant under this part shall be provided with an objective assessment of basic skills and supportive services, which may include a review of occupational skills, prior work experience, employability, interests, and aptitudes, except that such assessment, or factor thereof, is not required if the program uses recent assessments conducted pursuant to another education or training program (such as the JOBS program or high school academic records). It shall be the responsibility of the service delivery area to develop a service strategy for participants which may identify achievement objectives, appropriate employment goals, and appropriate services for participants, taking into account the assessments conducted under this subsection or under other education or training programs.

"(d) **FOLLOWUP SERVICES.**—Followup services shall be made available for participants for whom a service strategy is developed in accordance with this section.

"SEC. 254. LIMITATIONS.

"(a) **USE DURING SUMMER MONTHS OR EQUIVALENT VACATION PERIOD.**—Programs under this part shall be conducted during the summer months, except that a service delivery area may, within the jurisdiction of any local educational agency that operates its schools on a year-round, full-time basis, offer the programs under this part to participants during a vacation period treated as the equivalent of a summer vacation.

"(b) **CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT.**—(1) An eligible individual participating in a program assisted under this part may concurrently be enrolled in programs under part C of this title. Appropriate adjustment to the youth performance standards (attainment of competencies) under section 106(b)(3) of this Act shall be made to reflect the limited period of participation.

"(2) Youth being served in this part or in the part C youth program do not need to be

terminated from participation in one program in order to enroll in the other. The Secretary shall provide guidance to service delivery areas on simplified procedures for concurrent enrollment and transfers for youth from one program to the other.

"(c) **ELIGIBLE YOUTH.**—The individuals who are eligible to participate in programs under this part are individuals who are economically disadvantaged and aged 14 through 21.

"SEC. 255. APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.

"(a) **COMPARABLE FUNCTIONS OF AGENCIES AND OFFICIALS.**—Private industry councils established under title I, chief elected officials, State job training coordinating councils, and Governors shall have the same authority, duties, and responsibilities with respect to planning and administration of funds available under this part as private industry councils, chief elected officials, State job training coordinating councils, and Governors have for funds available under parts A and C of title II.

"(b) **PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES.**—In accordance with the provisions of subsection (a), each service delivery area shall establish written program goals and objectives which shall be used for evaluating the effectiveness of programs conducted under this part. Such goals and objectives may include—

- "(1) improvement in school retention and completion;
- "(2) improvement in academic performance, including mathematics and reading comprehension;
- "(3) improvement in employability skills; and
- "(4) demonstrated coordination with other community service organizations such as local educational agencies, law enforcement agencies, and drug and alcohol abuse prevention and treatment programs.

"PART C—YOUTH PROGRAM

"SEC. 271. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

"The purpose of the programs assisted under this part is to—

- "(1) improve the long-term employability of youth;
- "(2) enhance the educational and occupational skills of youth;
- "(3) encourage school completion or enrollment in alternative school programs;
- "(4) increase the employment and earnings of youth;
- "(5) reduce welfare dependency; and
- "(6) assist youth in addressing problems which impair their ability to make successful transitions from school to work, apprenticeship, the military, or postsecondary education and training.

"SEC. 272. ALLOTMENT.

"(a) **TERRITORIES.**—Not more than one quarter of one percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 3(b) for each fiscal year and available for this part shall be allotted among Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Freely Associated States and the Republic of Palau, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

"(b) **GENERAL STATE AND SDA ALLOTMENT.**—

"(1) **RESERVATION.**—After determining the amounts to be allotted under subsection (a), 81 percent of the remainder shall be allotted by the Secretary to the States for allocation to service delivery areas within each State. Each State shall allocate to the service delivery areas within the State such amounts as determined by the Secretary pursuant to the formula contained in paragraph (2). The remaining 19 percent shall be allotted in accordance with subsection (c).

"(2) FORMULA.—Subject to the provisions of paragraph (3), of the amounts allotted by the Secretary for this part for each fiscal year—

"(A) 33½ percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative number of unemployed individuals residing in areas of substantial unemployment within each service delivery area as compared to the total number of such unemployed individuals in all service delivery areas in all States;

"(B) 33½ percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative excess number of unemployed individuals within each service delivery area as compared to the total excess number of unemployed individuals in all service delivery areas in all States; and

"(C) 33½ percent shall be allotted on the basis of the relative number of economically disadvantaged youth within each service delivery area as compared to the total number of economically disadvantaged youth in all service delivery areas in all States except that, for the allotment for any service delivery area described in section 101(a)(4)(A)(iii), the allotment shall be based on the higher of the number of youth in families with an income below the low-income level in such area or the number of economically disadvantaged individuals in such area.

"(3) LIMITATIONS.—(A) No service delivery area shall be allotted less than 90 percent of its allotment percentage for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.

"(B) No service delivery area shall be allotted more than 130 percent of its allotment percentage for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.

"(C) Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), the total allotment for all service delivery areas within any one State shall not be less than one-quarter of 1 percent of the total allotted to all service delivery areas in all States.

"(D) For the purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B), the allotment percentage for fiscal year 1993 is the percent of the funds allocated for youth programs (as determined by the Secretary) under title II to the service delivery area during the preceding fiscal year.

"(4) DEFINITIONS AND DETERMINATIONS.—For the purposes of this section—

"(A) the term 'economically disadvantaged youth' means an individual who is aged 16 through 21 and who has, or is a member of a family which has, received a total family income which, in relation to family size, was not in excess of the higher of (i) the poverty income guidelines promulgated each year by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or (ii) 70 percent of the lower living standard income level;

"(B) the term 'excess number' means the number which represents the number of unemployed individuals in excess of 4.5 percent of the civilian labor force in the service delivery area, or the number which represents the number of unemployed individuals in excess of 4.5 percent of the civilian labor force in areas of substantial unemployment in such service delivery area; and

"(C) the Secretary shall, as appropriate and to the extent practicable, exclude college students and members of the armed forces from the determination of the number of economically disadvantaged youth and the size of the youth population in a service delivery area.

"(c) SPECIAL ALLOTMENTS.—

"(1) DIVISION OF REMAINDER.—Of the remaining 19 percent of funds available for allotment under this part—

"(A) 5 percent shall be allotted to the States in accordance with paragraph (2) to carry out the overall administration, management, and auditing activities relating to programs under this title and for activities under sections 121 and 122;

"(B) 6 percent shall be allotted to the States in accordance with paragraph (2) to provide incentive grants authorized under section 106(b)(8), and the State shall, in turn, allot these grants in accordance with paragraph (3); and

"(C) 8 percent shall be allotted by the States in accordance with paragraph (2) to carry out section 123.

"(2) FORMULA FOR ALLOTMENT.—The allotments to each State described in paragraph (1) shall be based on the relative amount of funds allocated to all service delivery areas within such State under subsection (b) as compared to the amount of funds allocated to all service delivery areas in all States under subsection (b).

"(3) INCENTIVE GRANT ALLOTMENT.—The amount reserved under paragraph (1)(B) shall be used by the Governor to provide incentive grants for service delivery areas that exceed applicable performance standards and other measures described under section 106(b)(8). The incentive grants made under this subparagraph shall be distributed so that not less than ¼ of the funds used for incentive grants are distributed to eligible service delivery areas within the State on an equitable basis, taking into account the extent by which they exceed requirements of section 106(b)(8) and the size of the eligible population, and the remainder shall be distributed on an equitable basis.

"(4) OTHER USES.—The Governor may use up to ½ of the amount allotted under paragraph (1)(B) for capacity building and technical assistance to service delivery area and service providers. Such use of funds may include the development and training of service delivery area and service provider staff and the development of exemplary program activities.

"SEC. 273. ELIGIBILITY FOR SERVICES.

"(a) IN-SCHOOL YOUTH.—An individual who is in school shall be eligible to participate in the program under this part only if such individual is—

"(1) aged 16 through 21 or, if provided in the job training plan, aged 14 through 21; and

"(2) economically disadvantaged, or participates in a compensatory education programs under chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

"(b) TARGETED GROUPS OF IN-SCHOOL YOUTH.—Not less than 60 percent of the in-school individuals who participate in a program under this part shall be individuals who, in addition to meeting the requirements of subsection (a), are included in one or more of the following categories:

"(1) basic skills deficient;

"(2) educational attainment that is one or more grade levels below the grade level appropriate to that individual's age;

"(3) pregnant or parenting;

"(4) individuals with disabilities, including a learning disability;

"(5) homeless or run-away youth; or

"(6) offender.

"(c) OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH.—An individual who is out of school shall be eligible to participate in the program under this part only if such individual is—

"(1) aged 16 through 21; and

"(2) economically disadvantaged;

"(d) TARGETED GROUPS OF OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH.—Not less than 60 percent of the out-of-school individuals who participate in a

program under this part shall be individuals who, in addition to meeting the requirements of subsection (c), are included in one or more of the following categories:

"(1) basic skills deficient;

"(2) school dropouts (subject to the conditions described in section 274(d)(2));

"(3) pregnant or parenting;

"(4) individuals with disabilities, including a learning disability;

"(5) homeless or run-away youth; or

"(6) offenders.

"(e) EXCEPTIONS.—Not more than 10 percent of participants in the program under this part in each service delivery area may be individuals who do not meet the requirements of subsection (a)(2) or (c)(2) if such individuals experience one or more barriers to employment. Such barriers may include, but need not be limited to, the categories described in subsections (b) and (d), or categories such as limited English language proficiency, alcoholics, or drug addicts.

"(f) RATIO OF OUT-OF-SCHOOL TO IN-SCHOOL YOUTH.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided for in paragraphs (2) and (3), not less than 60 percent of the participants in the program under this part in each service delivery area shall be out-of-school individuals who meet the requirements of subsections (c), (d), or (e).

"(2) EXCEPTION.—The minimum percentage of participants in a service delivery area required to be out-of-school individuals pursuant to paragraph (1) may be reduced to a percentage that is not less than 40 percent if, in accordance with guidelines established by the Secretary—

"(A) a service delivery area conducting a program under this part submits a request to the Governor specifying an alternative percentage requirement and such request is justified by a dropout rate of less than 10 percent for the youth population in the service delivery area, and

"(B) the Governor approves the request submitted pursuant to subparagraph (A) and includes a description of the requests approved, and basis for such approval in the Governor's coordination and special services plan.

"(3) COUNTING OF IN-SCHOOL INDIVIDUALS.—In-school individuals served as a part of a schoolwide project in subsection (g) shall not be counted as a part of the ratio of in-school individuals to out-of-school individuals.

"(g) SCHOOL-WIDE PROJECTS FOR LOW-INCOME SCHOOLS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the individuals described in subsection (e), an individual who does not meet the requirements of subsection (a)(2) may participate in the program assisted under this part if such individual is enrolled in a public school—

"(A) which is located in a poverty area;

"(B) served by a local educational agency which is eligible for assistance under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

"(C) in which not less than 75 percent of the students enrolled are included in the categories described in subsection (b); and

"(D) which conducts a program pursuant to a cooperative arrangement which meets the requirements of section 275(d).

"(2) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'poverty area' means an urban census tract or a nonmetropolitan county with a poverty rate of 30 percent or more as determined by the Bureau of the Census.

"SEC. 274. PROGRAM DESIGN.

"(a) YEAR-ROUND OPERATION.—The program under this part shall be conducted and

services shall be made available during the year or on a multiyear basis as appropriate.

“(b) ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The program under this part shall include—

“(A) an objective assessment of each participant's skill levels and service needs, which shall include a review of basic skills, occupational skills, prior work experience, employability, interests, aptitudes (including interests and aptitudes for nontraditional jobs), and supportive service needs, except that a new assessment of a participant is not required where the program determines it is appropriate to use a recent assessment of the participant conducted pursuant to another education or training program (such as the JOBS program);

“(B) development of service strategies which shall identify achievement objectives, appropriate employment goals (including, where appropriate, nontraditional employment), and appropriate services for participants taking into account the assessments conducted pursuant to paragraph (1), except that a new service strategy is not required where the program determines it is appropriate to use a recent service strategy developed for the participant under another education or training program (such as the JOBS program);

“(C) a review of each participant's progress in meeting the objectives of the service strategy; and

“(D) the following services, which shall be provided either directly or through arrangement with other programs to a participant where the assessment and service strategy indicate such services are appropriate:

“(i) basic skills training;

“(ii) occupational skills training;

“(iii) preemployment and work maturity skills training;

“(iv) work experience combined with skills training; and

“(v) supportive services.

“(2) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—(A) Each service delivery area shall ensure that each participant or applicant who meets the minimum income eligibility criteria be provided:

“(i) information on the full array of applicable or appropriate services that are available through the service delivery area or other service providers, including, but not limited to, those receiving funds under this Act, and

“(ii) referral to other appropriate training and educational programs that have the capacity to serve the applicant either on a sequential or concurrent basis.

“(B)(1) Each service provider shall ensure that an eligible applicant who does not meet the enrollment requirements of its particular program or who cannot be served shall be referred to the service delivery area for further assessment, as necessary, and referral to appropriate programs to meet the applicant's basic skills and training needs.

“(i) The service delivery area shall ensure that appropriate referrals are made pursuant to this subparagraph, and shall maintain appropriate records of such referrals and the basis for such referral.

“(c) AUTHORIZED SERVICES.—Services which may be made available to youth with funds provided under this part may include, but need not be limited to—

“(1) direct training services, including:

“(A) the services described in section 204(b)(1);

“(B) tutoring and study skills training;

“(C) alternative high schools services that meet the requirements of section 141(o)(1);

“(D) instruction leading to high school completion or its equivalent;

“(E) mentoring;

“(F) limited internships in the private sector;

“(G) training or education that is combined with community and youth service opportunities in public agencies, nonprofit agencies, and other appropriate agencies, institutions, and organizations;

“(H) entry employment experience programs;

“(I) school-to-work transition services;

“(J) school-to-postsecondary education transition services;

“(K) school-to-apprenticeship transition services; and

“(L) preemployment and work maturity skills training; and

“(2) training-related and supportive services, including:

“(A) the services described in section 204(b)(2);

“(B) drug and alcohol abuse counseling and referral;

“(C) services encouraging parental, spousal, and other significant adult involvement in the participant's program;

“(D) cash incentives and bonuses based on attendance and performance in a program.

“(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) STRATEGIES AND SERVICES.—In developing service strategies and designing services for the program under this part, the service delivery area and private industry council shall take into consideration exemplary program strategies and practices.

“(2) ENROLLMENT REQUIREMENTS.—Each service delivery area shall make available, concurrently or sequentially, at least 2 or more of the following options to enable an individual who is under the age of 18 and is a school dropout, as a part of such individual's training:

“(A) to reenroll in and attend school;

“(B) to enroll in and attend an alternative high school;

“(C) to enroll in and attend an alternative course of study approved by the local educational agency; or

“(D) to enroll in and attend a high school equivalency program.

“(3) SKILLS TRAINING.—(A) Preemployment and work maturity skills training authorized by this part shall be accompanied by either work experience or other additional services designed to increase a participant's basic or occupational skills. The additional services may be provided, sequentially or concurrently, under other education and training programs, including the Job Corps and the JOBS program.

“(B) Work experience, job search assistance, job search skills training, and job club activities authorized by this part shall be accompanied by additional services designed to increase a participant's basic education or occupational skills. The additional services may be provided, sequentially or concurrently, under other education and training programs, including the Job Corps and the JOBS program.

“(4) NEEDS-BASED PAYMENTS.—Needs-based payments authorized under this part shall be limited to payments necessary to participate in the program in accordance with a locally developed formula or procedure.

“(5) COUNSELING AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—Counseling and supportive services authorized under this part may be provided to a participant for a period of up to one year after termination from the program.

“(6) NONCONTRACT TREATMENT.—The service strategy developed pursuant to section 274(b)(1)(B) shall not be considered a contract.

“(7) VOLUNTEERS.—The service delivery area shall make opportunities available for successful alumni of programs under this part to volunteer assistance to participants in the form of mentoring, tutoring and other activities.

“SEC. 275. LINKAGES.

“(a) EDUCATIONAL LINKAGES.—In conducting a program under this part, service delivery areas shall establish linkages with the appropriate educational agencies responsible for service to participants. Such linkages shall include but are not limited to—

“(1) formal agreements with local educational agencies that will identify—

“(A) the procedures for referring and serving in-school youth;

“(B) the methods of assessment of in-school youth; and

“(C) procedures for notifying the program when a youth drops out of the school system;

“(2) arrangements to ensure that the program under this part supplements existing programs provided by local educational agencies to in-school youth;

“(3) arrangements to ensure that the program under this part utilizes, to the extent possible, existing services provided by local educational agencies to out-of-school youth;

“(4) arrangements to ensure that for in-school participants there is a regular exchange of information between the program and the educational agency relating to participant progress, problems and needs, including, where appropriate, interim assessment results.

“(b) EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM LINKAGES.—In conducting the program under this part, the service delivery area shall establish appropriate linkages with other education and training programs authorized under Federal law. Such programs shall include, where feasible, programs authorized by—

“(1) part B of title IV of this Act (the Job Corps);

“(2) parts A through D of chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

“(3) the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act;

“(4) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;

“(5) the Wagner-Peyser Act;

“(6) part F of title IV of the Social Security Act (JOBS);

“(7) the Food Stamp Act;

“(8) the National Apprenticeship Act;

“(9) the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act;

“(10) the National Literacy Act of 1991; and

“(11) any other provisions of this Act.

“(c) OTHER PROGRAMS.—In addition to the linkages required under subsections (a) and (b), service delivery areas shall establish other appropriate linkages to enhance the provision of services under this part. Such linkages may be established with State and local service agencies, public housing agencies, community organizations, business and labor organizations, volunteer groups working with at-risk youth, parents and family members, juvenile justice systems, and other training, education, employment and social service programs, including programs conducted under part A of title II.

“(d) SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS FOR LOW-INCOME SCHOOLS.—In conducting a program serving individuals specified in section 273(g), the service delivery area shall establish a cooperative arrangement with the appropriate local educational agency which shall, in addition to the other requirements of this section, include—

"(1) a description of how the program will supplement the educational program of the school;

"(2) identification of measurable goals to be achieved by the program and provision for assessing the extent to which such goals are met;

"(3) a description of how the program will use resources provided under this part and resources provided under other education programs to achieve the goals identified in paragraph (2);

"(4) a description of the number of individuals to be served; and

"(5) assurances that the resources provided under this part shall be used to supplement and not supplant existing sources of funds.

"SEC. 276. TRANSFER OF FUNDS.

"A service delivery area may transfer up to 10 percent of the funds provided under this part to the program under part A of this title if such transfer is—

"(1) described in the job training plan; and

"(2) approved by the Governor."

SEC. 23. EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ASSISTANCE FOR DISLOCATED WORKERS.

(a) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 314(f) of the Act is amended by—

(1) inserting "(1)" after "(f)"; and

(2) adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) An eligible dislocated worker participating in training (except for on-the-job training) pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be in training with the approval of the State agency for purposes of any other provisions in law."

(b) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.—Section 324(a) of the Act is amended by striking "1989, 1990, and 1991," and inserting "1991 through 1996,".

(c) UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Section 303 of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "RECAPTURE AND REALLOTMENT OF FUNDS UNDER TITLE III PROGRAMS";

(2) by striking "unexpended" each place it appears in subsection 303(b) and inserting in lieu thereof "unobligated";

(3) by inserting "and obligation" after "expenditure" in subsection (d); and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking "has expended" and inserting in lieu thereof "has obligated".

(d) USE OF FUNDS.—(1) Section 315(a)(1) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 315. (a)(1) Of the funds allocated to a substate grantee under part A of this title for any program year, not less than 50 percent shall be expended for retraining services specified under section 314(d)."

(2) Section 315(b) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Of the funds allocated to a substate grantee or to the Governor under part A of this title for any program year, not more than 25 percent may be expended to provide needs-related payments and other supportive services."

(3) The first sentence of section 315(c) of the Act is amended to read as follows: "Of the funds allocated to a substate grantee or to the Governor under part A of this title for any program year, not more than 15 percent may be expended to cover the administrative cost of programs."

(4) Section 315 of the Act is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Substate grantees within a State may combine funds under this title for the provision of services to eligible dislocated workers from 2 or more substate areas."

SEC. 24. NATIVE AMERICAN AND MIGRANT PROGRAMS.

(a) NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS.—Section 401 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k)(1) The Secretary shall designate a single organizational unit which shall have as its primary responsibility the administration of all Native American programs authorized under this Act.

"(2) Such organizational unit shall—

"(A) be accountable for administering the provisions of all Native American programs authorized under this Act, including the monitoring of such programs and making recommendations regarding the selection of all recipients of financial assistance;

"(B) be accountable for the development of all policies and procedures related to the implementation of such programs; and

"(C) coordinate the development of policy and procedures for all employment and training programs within the Department relating to services for Native American workers.

"(3) In the hiring and promotion of all professional staff for the organizational unit designated under paragraph (1), special consideration shall be given to individuals who have field experience in the daily operation of service and training programs for Native Americans, and individuals who are Indians or Native Alaskans. The Secretary shall take such additional actions as may be necessary to promote the recruitment and promotion of Indians, Native Alaskans, and Native Hawaiians to positions in such unit."

(b) CLARIFICATION.—Section 401(f) of the Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", such as activities described in section 499(b)".

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 401(j) of the Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "and part C" after "part A", and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", in addition to any other amounts made available from appropriations for purposes of this section".

(d) PERMANENT ADVISORY COUNCIL.—Section 401 of the Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1)(1) There is hereby established a Native American Employment and Training Council (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "Council") which shall consist of not less than 17 Indians, Native Alaskans, and Native Hawaiians appointed by the Secretary from among individuals nominated by Indian tribes or Indian, Native Alaskan, or Native Hawaiian organizations. The Council's membership shall represent all geographic areas of the United States with a substantial Indian, Native Alaskan, or Native Hawaiian population and shall include representatives of tribal governments and of nonreservation Native American organizations who are service providers under this Act. A majority of the members of the Council shall have field experience in the daily operation of the program authorized under this section.

"(2) The Council shall be chaired by a Council member elected by a majority of the Council's membership. The Council shall meet not less than twice each program year.

"(3) Members of the Native American Programs Advisory Committee which existed before the enactment of this subsection—

"(A) shall serve as members of the Council until successors are appointed; and

"(B) may be appointed as members of the new Council, if such appointment is consistent with the provisions of this subsection.

"(4) The term of office for members of the Council shall be 2 years, except that—

"(A) the Secretary shall designate one-half of the initial appointments of members of the Council for terms of 1 year;

"(B) any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment;

"(C) any member appointed to such a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the term for which his or her predecessor was appointed; and

"(D) members may be reappointed.

"(5) The membership of the Council shall be appointed by the beginning of program year 1992.

"(6) The Council shall—

"(A) solicit the views of a wide variety of tribes and Native American groups, including those operating employment and training programs funded under this section, on issues affecting the operation and administration of such programs;

"(B) advise the Secretary with respect to all matters concerning the implementation of programs under this section and other programs providing services to Native American youth and adults under this Act;

"(C) advise and make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to the design and implementation of performance standards developed under subsection (h) of this section;

"(D) advise and make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to any services obtained or to be obtained by the department through contracts or arrangements with non-Federal agencies or entities which involve the program authorized by this section;

"(E) evaluate the effectiveness of Native American job training programs and make recommendations with respect to the improvement of such programs;

"(F) advise the Secretary with respect to individuals to be considered to fill the position of the official in charge of the organizational unit designated under subsection (k)(1) whenever a vacancy in such position occurs; and

"(G) submit a report directly to the Secretary and to the Congress no later than January 1 of each even numbered year on the progress of Native American job training programs and making recommendations for improving their administration and effectiveness.

"(7) Members of the Council shall serve without compensation but shall be entitled to reimbursement for their expenses in the performance of their duties. The Secretary shall provide the Council with such administrative support as may be necessary to the performance of its functions."

(e) COMPETITION FOR SECTION 402 GRANTS.—Section 402 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Procedures for awarding grants under this section shall be consistent with the standard competitive procurement procedures. The competition for grants under this section shall be conducted every 2 years, except that when a grantee has performed satisfactorily under the terms of an existing grant agreement, the Secretary may waive the requirement for such competition upon receipt from the grantee of a satisfactory 2-year program plan for the succeeding 2-year grant period."

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 402(f) of the Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "and part C" after "part A", and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", in addition to any other amounts made available from appropriations for purposes of this section".

(f) GRANT PROCEDURES.—Part A of title IV of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"GRANT PROCEDURES

"SEC. 403. Grants under sections 401 and 402 shall be subject to the Single Audit Act and charging of costs shall be subject to appropriate circulars issued by the Office of Management and Budget, including Circulars A-87, A-102, A-110, and A-122."

SEC. 25. JOB CORPS.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 423(1) of the Act is amended by—

(1) inserting after "except that", the words "not more than 20 percent of the individuals enrolled may be from age 22 through 24, and that any";

(b) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER PARTICIPANTS TO AND FROM PROGRAMS UNDER TITLE II.—Section 426 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit an individual who has been a participant in the Job Corps from concurrently or subsequently participating in programs under title II of this Act, or to prohibit an individual who has been a participant in programs under title II of this Act from concurrently or subsequently participating in the Job Corps."

(c) NONRESIDENTIAL PARTICIPANTS.—Section 427(a)(2) of the Act is amended by—

(1) striking "10 percent" and inserting "20 percent"; and

(2) adding at the end of paragraph (2) the following new sentences: "In enrolling individuals who are to be nonresidential participants, priority shall be given to those eligible individuals who are single parents with dependent children. The Secretary shall not reduce the number of residential participants in Job Corps programs under this part during any program year below the number of residential participants during program year 1991 in order to increase the number of individuals who are nonresidential participants in the Job Corps."

(d) CONSERVATION CENTERS.—Section 427 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) No funds appropriated to the Department of Labor for any fiscal year may be used to execute or carry out any contract with a nongovernmental entity to administer or manage a Civilian Conservation Center of the Job Corps on public land."

(e) ADDITIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES REQUIRED.—Section 428 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(e) The Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, provide child care at or near Job Corps centers, for individuals who require child care for their children in order to participate in the Job Corps.

"(f) Each Job Corps center shall provide to enrollees who are dependent on, or who have a history of abuse of, alcohol or drugs with counseling and referral to related services necessary to prevent the continuance or recurrence of such dependency or abuse."

(f) MANAGEMENT FEES.—Section 437 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The Secretary shall provide all Job Corps contractors with an equitable and negotiated management fee of not less than one percent of the contract amount."

SEC. 26. AMENDMENTS TO PART D OF TITLE IV: NATIONAL ACTIVITIES.

Section 455 of the Act is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall provide guidance and technical assistance to States and service delivery areas relating to the documentation required to verify the eligibility of participants under parts A, B, and C of title II of this Act as amended by the Job Training Reform Amendments, particularly those participants in the target groups listed in sections 203(a) and 273 (b) and (d). Such documentation shall, to the extent practicable, be uniform and standard.

"(2) The guidance provided pursuant to paragraph (1), while maintaining program integrity, shall—

"(A) limit the documentation burden to the minimum necessary to adequately verify eligibility, and

"(B) ensure, to the extent practicable, that the documentation requirements shall not discourage the participation of eligible individuals.

"(3) The guidance provided pursuant to paragraph (1) shall specifically address income eligibility, assessment, the determination of additional barriers to employment (in sections 203(b) and 273 (b) and (d)), and specific uniform or standardized documentation or procedures (including simplified standardized forms, automated intake procedures, self-certification documents) and other documentation proxies (such as JOBS and Job Corps eligibility forms).

"(4) The guidance described in paragraph (1) shall be provided not later than July 1, 1992."

SEC. 27. UNIFORM REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPORTING; TRAINING NETWORK.—Part D of title IV of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

"SEC. 456. UNIFORM REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

"(a) FINDING.—The Congress finds that closer coordination and more effective use of resources among a variety of employment and training programs can be facilitated if these programs have common data elements and definitions.

"(b) DATA ELEMENTS.—The Secretaries of Labor, Education, and Health and Human Services, in consultation with other appropriate departments, shall identify a core set of consistently defined data elements for employment and training programs, including (but not limited to) those funded under titles II, III, and IV of this Act, the Wagner-Peyser Act, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, title II of the Family Support Act, and title V of the Older Americans Act.

"(c) REPORT.—The Secretary shall report to the Congress no later than January 1, 1994, listing recommended data elements and their definitions, and containing an analysis of the benefits of their adoption.

"(d) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with experts and practitioners at the Federal, State, and local levels, in the various program areas, in fulfilling the requirements of this subsection. The Secretary shall also consult with the United States General Accounting Office in fulfilling the requirements of this section.

"SEC. 457. TRAINING NETWORK.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish a Capacity Building and Information and Dissemination Network (hereafter referred to as the 'Network') to enhance the effectiveness of and to strengthen the caliber of services provided through the various Federal, State, and local employment and training programs including programs not authorized under this Act. To initiate and maintain this Network, the Secretary may, on a competitive basis, award a grant or contract to a single entity, or coordinate a system of en-

titles with current and specialized employment and training expertise. The Secretary shall ensure that such Network develops a national strategy—

"(1) to coordinate and support the development of, and (where necessary) develop, and provide appropriate training, technical assistance, staff development, and other activities which will—

"(A) enhance the skills, knowledge, and expertise of the personnel who staff employment and training and other closely related human service systems, including service providers;

"(B) improve the quality of services provided to individuals served under the Act and other Federal employment and training programs and encourage integrated service delivery under multiple Federal statutes using, where possible, interactive communication systems and cross trained teams;

"(C) improve the planning, procurement, and contracting practices pursuant to this Act; and

"(D) provide broad human services policy and planning training to private industry council volunteers and members of State human investment coordinating councils;

"(2) to prepare and disseminate staff training, curricula, and materials, including software, for employment and training professionals and support staff which focus on enhancing staff competencies and professionalism, including instruction on the administrative requirements of this Act, such as procurement and contracting standards and regulations; and

"(3) to disseminate innovative and successful models, materials, methods, and program information using computer-based technologies for organizing the data base and dissemination and communication system, and provide training in the techniques learned from those sources to foster improved program quality and professional growth among managers, service delivery providers, and administrators involved in the delivery of employment and training services.

"(b) CHARGES.—The training Network established pursuant to subsection (a) may charge appropriate tuition or fees to offset the costs of institute training, materials acquisition, or information dissemination.

"(c) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide guidance, technical assistance, and direction to the Network to ensure that it responds to employment and training staff needs, furnishes high quality training and materials, meets program objectives without duplication, and encourages the use of the latest computer-based technologies for training and program management.

"(d) DISSEMINATION.—(1) The Secretary is authorized to establish a Clearinghouse within the Network to regularly identify, develop, and disseminate innovative materials and successful program models which enhance the knowledge and quality of performance of employment and training personnel and which will—

"(A) facilitate effective communications and coordination among employment and training personnel;

"(B) establish a computer-based communications and dissemination network to share information among employment and training personnel and institutions;

"(C) establish linkages with existing human resources clearinghouses, including (but not limited to) the Education Research Information Centers and the National Network for Curriculum Coordination in Vocational and Technical Education; and

"(D) identify and disseminate, using the techniques of subsection (b), innovative ma-

terial and successful program models which enhance the knowledge and quality of performance of employment and training personnel and thus improve the services provided to program participants.

"(2) In selecting such successful program models, consideration shall be given to—

"(A) the size and scope of the program;

"(B) the length of time that the program has been operating;

"(C) the nature and reliability of measurable outcomes for the program;

"(D) the capacity of the sponsoring organization to provide the technical assistance necessary for States and service delivery areas to replicate the program; and

"(E) the likelihood that the program will be successful in diverse economic, geographic, and cultural environments.

"(f) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the Secretaries of Education and Health and Human Services, as appropriate, to coordinate the activities of the Network of training clearinghouses with other relevant institutes, centers, laboratories, clearinghouses, or dissemination networks, such as the National Diffusion Network.

"(g) GOALS.—The initial goals of the Network shall include—

"(1) establish computer-based training packages for key job training professions in cooperation with service delivery areas and community-based organizations.

"(2) design and implement a dissemination network to identify at the State and community level, programs and organizations with exemplary systems and practices applied to the delivery of job training services;

"(3) design and implement computer-based systems and networks to provide access and retrieval for job training organizations and professionals to—

"(A) relevant training, technical assistance, and knowledge development materials; and

"(B) inventories of training and technical assistance providers and services;

"(4) develop training and staff development programs in cooperation with existing providers and offer them, at a minimum, in each Federal region, which programs may include training for case managers, job developers, assessment specialists, and program managers; and

"(5) enhance and broaden the content and user base for information systems and networks.

SEC. 28. AMENDMENTS TO PART E OF TITLE IV: LABOR MARKET INFORMATION.

(a) COOPERATIVE LABOR MARKET INFORMATION.—Section 462 of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) The Bureau of Labor Statistics shall engage in research, demonstration, or other activities, including those which might be carried out by States, designed to determine the feasibility of various methods of organizing and making accessible nationwide information on the quarterly earnings, establishment and industry affiliation, and geographic location of employment for all individuals for whom such information is collected by the States, and/or to demonstrate the policy research and program evaluation applications of such information.

"(2) In cooperation with the States, the Bureau shall determine appropriate procedures for establishing and maintaining such information in a longitudinal manner and appropriate policies for making such information available for policy research or program evaluation purposes or both, while en-

suring the confidentiality of information and the privacy of individuals.

"(3) The Secretary of Labor shall make a report to Congress not later than 12 months after the enactment of the Job Training Reform Amendments which shall describe the costs and benefits, including savings on program followup surveys, of such a database and the steps that have been taken and the schedule for any remaining steps necessary to implement the provisions of this section."

(b) SPECIAL FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—Section 463 of the Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting "the Secretary of Health and Human Services," after "the Secretary of Education,"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The Secretary, acting through the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, shall report to Congress not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, and biennially thereafter, listing recommended common and complementary data elements and their definitions, containing an analysis of the benefits of their adoption and the implications for State and local purposes, and identifying plans and schedules for developing and maintaining this common core of data. The Secretary shall consult with experts and practitioners at the Federal, State, and local levels in the various program areas in fulfilling the requirements of this subsection."

(c) NATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—Section 464 of the Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1) by striking "more than \$5,000,000 is authorized to be reserved" and inserting "less than \$6,000,000 shall be available";

(2) in subsection (a)(2) by striking "for Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics" and inserting "Force Management and Personnel";

(3) in subsection (b)(2) by inserting after "give special attention to" the following: "career development and"; and

(4) in subsection (b)(5) by inserting after "any aspect of occupational and career information systems" the following: "and coordination and compatibility of human resources data systems operated by Federal agencies or the States or both, including systems to assist economic development activities and where appropriate provide support to States in the implementation of such system enhancements."

SEC. 29. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE YOUTH OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM.

Title IV of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"Part H—Youth Opportunities Unlimited Program

"SEC. 491. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

"It is the purpose of the Youth Opportunities Unlimited program to—

"(1) ensure access to education and job training assistance for youth residing in high-poverty areas of urban and rural communities;

"(2) make provisions for a comprehensive range of education, training, and employment services to disadvantaged youth who are not currently served or are underserved by Federal education and job training programs;

"(3) enable communities with high concentrations of poverty to establish and meet goals for improving the opportunities available to youth within the community; and

"(4) facilitate the coordination of comprehensive services to serve youth in such communities.

"SEC. 492. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary is authorized to establish a national program of Youth Opportunities Unlimited grants to pay the Federal share of providing comprehensive services to youth living in high poverty areas in the Nation's cities and rural areas.

"(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.—

"(1) RECIPIENTS.—The Secretary may only award grants under this part to—

"(A) the service delivery area in which the target area is located, or

"(B) grantees designated under sections 401 and 402, or a consortium of such grantees and the State, when the target area is located in an Indian reservation, Native Alaskan Village, or migrant or seasonal worker community.

"(2) NUMBER OF GRANTS.—The Secretary may award not more than 50 grants during the first fiscal year the program is authorized.

"(c) RENEWABILITY OF GRANTS.—Grants awarded under this part shall be for a 1-year period and are renewable for each of the two succeeding fiscal years if the Secretary determines the grant recipient complied with conditions of the grant during the previous fiscal year.

"(d) FACTORS FOR AWARDS.—In awarding grants under this part, the Secretary shall consider the quality of the proposed project, the goals to be achieved, the likelihood of the project's successful implementation, the extent of community support other Federal and non-Federal funds available for similar purposes, and the new State, local, or private resources. The Secretary shall give priority to target areas with the highest rates of poverty.

"SEC. 493. APPLICATION.

"(a) ELIGIBILITY TO APPLY.—Participating communities which have the highest concentrations of poverty shall be eligible to apply for a Youth Opportunities Unlimited grant.

"(b) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.—Each participating community desiring a grant under this part shall, through the individuals set forth in subsection (c), submit an application to the Secretary at such time in such manner and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require. Each such application shall—

"(1) include a comprehensive plan for the Youth Opportunities Unlimited initiative designed to achieve identifiable goals for youth in the target area;

"(2) set forth measurable program goals and outcome, which may include increasing the proportion of—

"(A) youth completing high school or its equivalent,

"(B) youth entering into postsecondary institutions, apprenticeships, or other advanced training programs,

"(C) youth placed in jobs; or

"(D) eligible youth participating in education, training, and employment services;

"(3) include supporting goals for the target area such as increasing security and safety, or reducing the number of drug-related arrests;

"(4) provide assurances that the conditions set forth in section 494 will be met;

"(5) demonstrate how the participating community will make use of the resources, expertise, and commitment of institutions of higher education, educational agencies, and vocational and technical schools and institutes;

"(6) ensure that all youth in the target areas have access to a coordinated and com-

prehensive range of education and training opportunities which serve the broadest range of youth interests and needs and simultaneously mobilizes the diverse range of education and training providers in the participating community;

"(7) support services necessary for successful participation by eligible youths, including but not limited to child care, transportation, and assistance in resolving personal or family crises such as those related to substance abuse, homelessness, migration, and family violence;

"(8) a system of common intake, individualized assessment, and case management;

"(9) include an estimate of the expected number of youth in the target area to be served;

"(10) include a description of the resources available in the participating community from private, local government, State and Federal sources which will be used to achieve the goals of the program; and

"(11) provide evidence of support for accomplishing the stated goals of the participating community from—

"(A) local elected officials,

"(B) the local school system,

"(C) postsecondary education and training institutions;

"(D) the applicable private industry council,

"(E) local community leaders,

"(F) business,

"(G) labor organizations, and

"(H) other appropriate organizations.

"(c) SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION.—The application for funds for a participating community may only be submitted to the Secretary by—

"(1) the mayor of a city or the chief elected official in a metropolitan statistical area, after the Governor of the State has had an opportunity to comment on the application;

"(2) the chief elected official of a nonmetropolitan county or the designated chief elected official of contiguous nonmetropolitan counties, after the Governor of the State has had an opportunity to comment on the application; or

"(3) the grantee designated under sections 401 or 402, or jointly by the grantee and the Governor or the State in which such grantee is located, in applications for Native American or migrant or seasonal worker communities.

"SEC. 494. GRANT AGREEMENT.

"Each grant recipient under this part shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary. Each such agreement shall—

"(1) designate a target area that will be the focus of the demonstration project and which shall have a population of not more than 25,000, except that in the event that the population of an area from which a high school draws a substantial portion of its enrollment exceeds this limit, the target area may encompass such boundary;

"(2) contain assurances that funds provided under this part will be used to support education, training, and supportive activities selected from a set of youth program models designated by the Secretary or from alternative models described in the application and approved by the Secretary, such as—

"(A) nonresidential learning centers;

"(B) alternative schools;

"(C) combined summer remediation, work experience and work readiness training, and school-to-work/apprenticeship/post-secondary education program;

"(D) teen parent programs;

"(E) special programs administered by community colleges;

"(F) youth centers;

"(G) initiatives aimed at increased rural student enrollment in post-secondary institutions;

"(H) public-private collaborations to assure private sector employment and continued learning opportunities for youth; and

"(I) initiatives that combine community and youth service opportunities with education and training activities;

"(3) provide that funds received under this section will be used for services to youth ages 14 through 21 at the time of enrollment;

"(4) contain assurances that the local educational agency and any other educational agency which operates secondary schools in the target area shall provide such activities and resources as are necessary to achieve the educational goals specified in the application;

"(5) contain assurances that the participating community will provide such activities and local resources as are necessary to achieve the goals specified in the application;

"(6) contain assurances that the participating community shall undertake outreach and recruitment efforts in the target area to encourage, to the maximum extent possible, participation by those disadvantaged youth who are currently unserved or underserved by education and training programs, including targeted measures specifically designed to enlist the participation of minority youth particularly males and youth under the jurisdiction of the child welfare, juvenile justice, and criminal justice systems.

"(7) provide that the participating community will carry out special efforts to establish coordination with Federal, State, or local programs that serve the target population;

"(8) provide assurances that funds provided under this part will be used only to pay the Federal share of the cost of programs and services not otherwise available in the target area and will supplement, and not supplant, funding from other local, State and Federal sources available to youth in the target area during the previous year; and

"(9) not permit funds provided under this part to be used to support paid work experience programs unless such programs are combined with other education and training activities.

"SEC. 495. JOB GUARANTEES.

"(a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall permit a significant number of the grant recipients under this part to enter into an agreement to provide, in accordance with this section, a job guarantee program to youths meeting prior school attendance and performance standards.

"(b) GUARANTEE AGREEMENTS.—A grant recipient providing a job guarantee program shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary. Such agreement shall—

"(1) provide that the program be available to youth age 16 to 19 who undertake a commitment to continue and complete their high school education;

"(2) require the grant recipient to guarantee employment to each youth undertaking that commitment if such youth meets school attendance and performance standards for the previous school semester, as established by the Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of Education;

"(3) provide that the grant recipient will make additional services available to support the undertaking of any such youth, which shall include counseling, job development and placement, and support services (including child care and transportation);

"(4) specify the conditions under which funds provided under this part may be used to provide wage subsidies of up to 50 percent through employers, which shall—

"(A) encourage subsidies to employers who provide advanced or specialized training, or who provide a structured and integrated learning experience involving the school and employer; and

"(B) limit the duration of such subsidies to not more than 1 year;

"(5) require that the employment provided to any such youth shall not exceed 15 hours per week during the school year;

"(6) permit employment to continue through the summer following high school graduation, or until the youth reaches age 19, whichever is later; and

"(7) contain such other terms and conditions as the Secretary requires by regulation.

"(c) SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.—In determining which grant recipients to require to enter an agreement under this section, the Secretary shall seek to target funds to areas of poverty as determined in section 498A(2).

"(d) YOUTH ELIGIBILITY.—All youth, regardless of income, residing in the eligible poverty area shall be eligible to participate in the job guarantee.

"(e) PRIVATE FUNDS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the grant recipient from raising funds to augment such grant if such funds are utilized under the conditions of this grant, except that such funds shall not be used for administration purposes.

"SEC. 496. PAYMENTS; FEDERAL SHARE.

"(a) PAYMENTS REQUIRED.—In any fiscal year, the amount of the grants awarded under this part shall be based on the size of the target area and the extent of the poverty in such area, and shall be of sufficient size and scope to carry out an effective program.

"(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Federal share for each fiscal year a grant recipient receives assistance under this Act shall be 50 percent.

"(2) The Federal share for grantees designated under sections 401 and 402 shall be 100 percent.

"(c) USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS TO MATCH.—Each grant recipient may provide not more than 35 percent of its share from Federal sources other than funds received pursuant to this part.

"SEC. 497. REPORTING.

"The Secretary is authorized to establish such reporting procedures as necessary to carry out the purposes of this part.

"SEC. 498. FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES.

"(a) ASSISTANCE IN IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance in the implementation of this project in participating communities.

"(b) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall provide for a thorough, independent evaluation of the activities assisted under this part. Such evaluation shall include an assessment of—

"(1) the impact on youth residing in target areas, including (but not limited to) their rates of school completion, enrollment in advanced education or training, and employment;

"(2) the extent to which participating communities fulfilled the goal of guaranteeing access to appropriate education, training, and supportive services to all eligible youth residing in target areas who seek to participate;

"(3) the effectiveness of guaranteed access to comprehensive services combined with

outreach and recruitment efforts in enlisting the participation of previously unserved or underserved youth residing in target areas; and

"(4) the effectiveness of efforts to integrate service delivery in target areas, including (but not limited to) systems of common intake, assessment, and case management.

"(c) REPORT.—The Secretary shall prepare a report describing the results of the independent evaluation conducted pursuant to subsection (b).

"(d) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary may reserve not more than 5 percent of the amount appropriated under this part in each fiscal year to carry out the provisions of this section.

"SEC. 498A. DEFINITIONS.

"For the purposes of this part—

"(1) The term 'participating community' means a city when referring to urban areas, a nonmetropolitan county or contiguous nonmetropolitan counties, and to the section 401 or 402 grantee, or consortia of the State and section 401 or 402 grantee, when referring to Native America and migrant or seasonal worker areas.

"(2) The term 'high poverty area' means (A) an urban census tract, a nonmetropolitan county, an Indian reservation, or an Alaskan native village, with a poverty rate of 30 percent or more as determined by the Secretary based on the latest Bureau of the Census estimates, (B) a migrant or seasonal farmworker community, or (C) a unit of general local government if its ratio of the number of food stamp recipients to its population exceeds the State ratio of food stamp recipients to population by 30 percent or more.

"(3) The term 'target area' means a high poverty area or set of contiguous high poverty areas that will be the focus of the program in each participating community."

SEC. 30. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MICROENTERPRISE GRANTS PROGRAM.

Title IV of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part.

"Part I—Microenterprise Grants Program

"SEC. 499. MICROENTERPRISE GRANTS.

"(a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—From the amount available to carry out this section for fiscal years 1992 through 1996, the Secretary of Labor shall make grants of not more than \$500,000 per year to not more than 10 States per year to implement and enhance community-based microenterprise activities. Such grants shall be an amount adequate to assure that the activities will be of sufficient size and scope to produce substantial benefits. Such activities shall be for the benefit of persons whose annual income does not exceed 100 percent of the most recent official poverty threshold established by the Department of the Census for the relevant family size.

"(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Such funds shall be used—

"(1) to train staff in such entrepreneurial activities as business plan development, business management, resource inventory design, marketing approaches, and other activities necessary to provide effective entry level training to persons developing a microenterprise;

"(2) to provide to owners or potential owners such technical assistance (including business planning, securing funding, marketing and production of marketing materials, and other assistance as may be necessary to develop microenterprise activities); and

"(3) to provide microenterprise support (such as peer support programs and counseling).

"(c) APPLICATION AND SELECTION.—The Secretary shall award grants competitively under this section on the basis of—

"(1) State commitment as evidenced by official commitment, existing or proposed related programs and support;

"(2) evidence of ability to conduct and monitor the microenterprise programs;

"(3) evidence of linkage to private, community-based credit and technical assistance providers; and

"(4) size of the non-Federal match.

"(d) TIMING.—Not later than April 1 of any fiscal year, a State may submit to the Secretary an application. Not later than the following June 1, the Secretary shall approve not more than 10 of the applications. Not later than the following July 1, the Secretary shall authorize the applicant to begin the programs. The Secretary may consider making multiyear grants.

"(e) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—No State shall receive a grant under this section unless the State agrees to provide, to carry out the microenterprise programs, an amount equal to 100 percent of such grant from non-Federal sources. In determining if the State has provided such a match, the Secretary shall count toward the 100 percent the following:

"(1) cash;

"(2) the value of in-kind contributions; and

"(3) letters of commitment to provide the funds.

"(f) REPORTS.—Each State receiving a grant under this section shall, for each fiscal year for which funds are received, submit to the Secretary a report which describes—

"(1) the programs that have been established and developed with such funds, including a description of the persons participating and the microenterprises they developed;

"(2) the quantitative and qualitative benefits of such programs; and

"(3) the contributions of such programs to economic self-sufficiency and economic development.

"(g) MICROENTERPRISE DEFINED.—As used in this section, the term 'microenterprise' means a commercial enterprise—

"(1) which has 5 or fewer employees, 1 or more of whom owns the enterprise; and

"(2) none of the owners of which has income exceeding 100 percent of the most recent official poverty threshold established by the Department of Commerce for the relevant family size."

SEC. 31. ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW PART J OF TITLE IV: DISASTER RELIEF.

Title IV of the Job Training Partnership Act is amended by inserting after section 481 (29 U.S.C. 1781) the following new part:

"Part J—Disaster Relief Employment Assistance

"SEC. 499A. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

"(a) QUALIFICATION FOR FUNDS.—Funds available under this part shall be allocated in a timely manner by the Secretary to the Governor of any State within which is located an area which has suffered a major disaster as defined in section 102 (1) and (2) of the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5122 (1) and (2)), referred in this part as the 'disaster area'.

"(b) SUBSTATE ALLOCATION.—Not less than 80 percent of the funds made available to any Governor under subsection (a) shall be allocated by the Governor to units of general local government located, in whole or in part, within such disaster areas. The remainder of such funds may be reserved by the Governor for use, in concert with State agencies, in cleanup, rescue, repair, renovation, and rebuilding associated with such major disaster.

"(c) COORDINATION.—Funds made available under this part to Governors and units of general local government shall be expended in consultation with—

"(1) agencies administering programs for disaster relief provided under the Disaster Relief Act of 1974; and

"(2) the administrative entity and the private industry council under this Act in each service delivery area within which disaster employment programs will be conducted under this part.

"SEC. 499B. USE OF FUNDS.

"(a) PROJECTS RESTRICTED TO DISASTER AREAS.—Funds made available under this part to any unit of general local government—

"(1) shall be used exclusively to provide employment on projects to provide food, clothing, shelter, and other humanitarian assistance for disaster victims and on projects of demolition, cleanup, repair, renovation, and reconstruction of damaged and destroyed structures, facilities, and lands located within the disaster areas; and

"(2) may be expended through public and private agencies and organizations engaged in such projects.

"(b) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—An individual shall be eligible to be offered disaster employment under this part if such individual is—

"(1) eligible to participate or enroll, or is a participant or enrolled, under title III of this Act, other than an individual who is actively engaged in a training program; and

"(2) unemployed as a consequence of the disaster.

"(c) LIMITATIONS ON DISASTER RELIEF EMPLOYMENT.—No individual shall be employed under this part for more than 6 months for work related to recovery from a single natural disaster.

"(d) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to protect the Federal fiscal interest in funds made available under this part."

SEC. 32. STATE HUMAN RESOURCE INVESTMENT COUNCIL.

The Act is amended by adding the following new title at the end thereof:

"TITLE VII—ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE HUMAN RESOURCE INVESTMENT COUNCIL

"SEC. 701. STATE HUMAN RESOURCE INVESTMENT COUNCIL.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each State may establish a single State human resource investment council (hereafter in this title referred to as the 'State Council') to—

"(1) review the provisions of services and the use of funds and resources under applicable Federal human resource programs and advise the Governor on methods of coordinating such provision of services and use of funds and resources consistent with the provisions of the applicable Federal human resource programs;

"(2) advise the Governor on the development and implementation of State and local standards and measures relating to applicable Federal human resource programs and coordination of such standards and measures; and

"(3) carry out the duties and functions prescribed for a State Council under the laws relating to the applicable Federal human resource programs.

"SEC. 702. MEMBERSHIP.

"Each State Council authorized by section 701 shall consist of the following members appointed by the Governor:

"(1) not less than 30 percent shall be appointed from representatives of business and industry (including agriculture, where appropriate), including individuals who are representatives of business and industry on private industry councils within the State established under section 102 of this Act;

"(2) not less than 30 percent shall be appointed from representatives of organized labor and representatives of the community-based organizations in the State;

"(3) not more than 20 percent shall consist of—

"(A) the chief administrative officer from each of the State agencies primarily responsible for administration of an applicable program; and

"(B) other members appointed from representatives of the State legislature and State agencies and organizations, such as the State educational agency, the State vocational education board, the State board of education (if not otherwise represented), the State public assistance agency, the State employment security agency, the State agency responsible for job training, the State housing agency, the State rehabilitation agency, the special education unit of the State educational agency, the State occupational information coordinating committee, State postsecondary institutions, the State economic development agency, the State agency on aging, the State veterans' affairs agency (or its equivalent), State career guidance and counseling organizations, the State unit which administers the State vocational rehabilitation program, and any other agencies the Governor determines to have a direct interest in the utilization of human resources within the State; and

"(4) not less than 20 percent shall be appointed from—

"(A) representatives of units of general local government or consortia of such units, appointed from nominations made by the chief elected officials of such units or consortia;

"(B) representatives of local educational agencies and postsecondary institutions, which appointments shall be equitably distributed between such agencies and such institutions and shall be made from nominations made by local educational agencies and postsecondary institutions, respectively;

"(C) representatives of local welfare and public housing agencies; and

"(D) individuals who have special knowledge and qualifications with respect to the special education and career development needs of individuals who are members of special populations, women, and minorities, including 1 individual who is a representative of special education.

"SEC. 703. BUDGET OF COUNCIL.

"(a) PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION.—In order to carry out its functions, the State Council shall prepare a budget for itself and submit the budget to the Governor for approval.

"(b) SERVICES.—Each State Council may obtain the services of such professional, technical, and clerical personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions.

"(c) CERTIFICATION.—Each State shall certify to the Secretary the establishment and membership of the State Council at least 90 days before the beginning of each period of 2 program years for which a job training plan is submitted under this Act.

"SEC. 704. USE OF FUNDS.

"Each State establishing a State Council under this part may use the funds otherwise available for State Councils under the applicable Federal human resource programs to

carry out the functions of the State Council. If the State's job training program under this Act is one of the applicable Federal human resource programs included in an agreement which provides for the establishment of a single State council under this title, the State shall not reduce its fiscal effort in utilizing funds made available under section 202(c)(1)(A) for purposes of section 122, to carry out the functions of such State council.

"SEC. 705. DEFINITION.

"For the purposes of this title, the term 'applicable Federal human resource program' means any federally assisted human resource program included in an agreement reached by the State agencies responsible for administering the affected programs."

SEC. 33. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) Section 122(b)(2) of the Act is amended by striking "section 202(a)" and inserting "sections 203(c) and 253(c)".

(b) Section 123(a) of the Act (as redesignated by section 111 of this title) is amended by striking "section 202(b)(4)" and inserting "sections 202(d)(2)(A) and 252(d)(2)(A)".

(c) Section 161(b)(2) of the Act is amended by striking "through 455" and inserting "and 453".

(d) Section 161(c) of the Act is repealed.

(e) Section 172 of the Act is redesignated the second place it appears as section 173.

(f) Section 181 of the Act is repealed.

(g) Section 302(b)(2) of the Act is amended by striking "part B and this part" and inserting "part A".

(h) Section 433(c)(1) of the Act is amended by striking "455" and inserting "453".

(i) Section 463(a)(3) of the Act is amended by striking "section 124" and inserting "section 123".

(j) Section 464(a)(3) of the Act is amended by striking "section 124" and inserting "section 123".

(k) Section 481(a) of the Act is amended by striking "(a)(1)" after "203".

(l) The table of contents of the Act is amended—

(1) by inserting after the item pertaining to section 108 the following:

"Sec. 109. Recapture and reallocation of unexpended funds under title II.";

(2) by striking the item pertaining to sections 123 and 124 and inserting the following: "Sec. 123. State education coordination and grants.

"Sec. 124. Identification of additional imposed requirements.";

(3) by striking the item relating to section 172 and inserting the following:

"Sec. 172. Presidential awards for outstanding private sector involvement in job training program.

"Sec. 173. Construction."

(4) by striking the item relating to section 181;

(5) by amending the items relating to title II to read as follows:

"TITLE II—TRAINING SERVICES FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

"PART A—ADULT PROGRAM

"Sec. 201. Statement of purpose.

"Sec. 202. Allotment and allocation.

"Sec. 203. Eligibility for services.

"Sec. 204. Program design.

"Sec. 205. Linkages.

"Sec. 206. Transfer of funds.

"PART B—SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"Sec. 251. Purpose.

"Sec. 252. Allotment and allocation.

"Sec. 253. Use of funds.

"Sec. 254. Limitations.

"Sec. 255. Applicable provisions.

"PART C—YOUTH PROGRAM

"Sec. 271. Statement of purpose.

"Sec. 272. Allotment.

"Sec. 273. Eligibility for services.

"Sec. 274. Program design.

"Sec. 275. Linkages.

"Sec. 276. Transfer of funds.";

(6) by striking the item pertaining to section 303 and inserting the following:

"Sec. 303. Recapture and reallocation of funds under title III programs.";

(7) by inserting after the item pertaining to section 402 the following:

"Sec. 403. Grant procedures.";

(8) by inserting after the item pertaining to section 455 the following:

"Sec. 456. Uniform reporting requirements.

"Sec. 457. Training network.";

(9) by inserting after item relating to section 481 the following:

"PART H—YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES AND UNLIMITED PROGRAM

"Sec. 491. Statement of purpose.

"Sec. 492. Program authorized.

"Sec. 493. Application.

"Sec. 494. Grant agreement.

"Sec. 495. Job guarantees.

"Sec. 496. Payments; Federal share.

"Sec. 497. Reporting.

"Sec. 498. Federal responsibilities.

"Sec. 498A. Definitions.

"PART I—MICROENTERPRISE GRANTS PROGRAM

"Sec. 499. Microenterprise Grants.

"Part J—Disaster Relief Employment Assistance

"Sec. 499A. General authority.

"Sec. 499B. Use of funds."; and

(10) by adding after the items pertaining to title VI the following:

"TITLE VII—ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE HUMAN RESOURCE INVESTMENT COUNCIL

"Sec. 701. State Human Resource Investment Council.

"Sec. 702. Membership.

"Sec. 703. Budget of Council.

"Sec. 704. Use of funds.

"Sec. 705. Definition."

SEC. 34. EFFECTIVE DATE; TRANSITION PROVISIONS.

(a) The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on July 1, 1992.

(b) Performance standards shall be issued pursuant to the amendments contained in section 106 as soon as the Secretary determines sufficient data are available, but no later than July 1, 1993.

(c) The Secretary shall evaluate the impact of programs under title II of the Job Training Partnership Act as amended by this Act on participant employment, earnings and welfare dependency in multiple sites using the random assignment of individuals to groups receiving services under title II and to groups not receiving such services.

(d) The Secretary may establish such rules and procedures as may be necessary to provide for an orderly transition to and implementation of the amendments made by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, I bring before the House today H.R. 3033, the Job Training Reform amendments, as unanimously reported from the Education and Labor Committee.

Just a few days ago we were in this Chamber debating the merits of extending the unemployment insurance benefits for millions of Americans. I stand in strong support of this measure and urge the President to sign the legislation into law. But the complement to any temporary assistance is the training that makes a permanent change in one's life. This second step is where the Job Training Partnership Act steps into the picture.

I believe that this package of amendments signifies an important step in the overall strategy of the congressional effort to present a strong and reliable platform of assistance to America's workers. The Job Training Partnership Act should be seen as an integral plank in this comprehensive structure. The legislation that is presented to the House today will ensure that there is the same level of accountability in the JTPA program as there should be in each and every other Federal effort.

As the Congress pursues reform in education, as well as safety in the workplace, it is also timely to look at the health of the Nation's primary job training program. Each system's reform impacts on the other. Thus, the integration of effort remains critically important to the success of each. In this legislation we place a higher emphasis on the individual assessment of each participant and on the improvement of basic skills for those in need. In doing so, this program is not designed to replace educational entities, but to complement and work with the resources the education community is able to make available.

Many Members are aware of the reports and investigations of the program that have had a tendency to paint with a broad brush the entire program as rife with abuse. If I had found this to be the case I would not be here today reforming the program—I would be replacing it. The program works, but to make it more effective we have drawn from countless reports written over the last few years, including those by the inspector general's office and the General Accounting Office. We have also brought the Department of Labor in as a much more active participant in the oversight and implementation of this program.

This legislation targets the problem of abuse in the contracting process by increasing Federal oversight and cost accountability at the local level. It answers the charge that the program helps those who need it the least by

improving access for the disadvantaged, such as the chronically unemployed, dropouts, and the poor by providing them with comprehensive, long-term services, as well as child care, transportation, and financial assistance.

A primary driving force behind this legislative effort is the fact that we must remove any doubt or cynicism about the program's ability to serve the disadvantaged in order to leverage more funds for the millions of Americans that need job training services. We have seen stagnant funding levels for JTPA programs over the last decade. How can we say we are preparing for the ongoing economic battle for the world's market place while only attempting to train 5 percent of the eligible population. If this remains our commitment then let us concede the fight now because we will never have the work force that is prepared for the challenge.

Since this program is targeted toward the disadvantaged, those with the most barriers to employment, some recent figures are of particular interest. In this age of cost conscious legislating, we need to remember who the audience is for each program and what their alternatives are in life. Since we know that 80 percent of the prison inmates are high school dropouts and 25 percent never finish junior high school, we should contrast the cost of Government programs. The average cost of putting a person through a job training program is approximately \$2,700 as opposed to the average cost of housing someone in a prison for 1 year at \$14,000.

I must ask how can we afford to not push ahead with this program when we are facing multiple challenges in the form of world market competition, fewer Federal dollars, rising rates of poverty and unemployment, and a changing work force that is looking to us for help.

Evidence of the effectiveness and potential of this program I feel is supported by the bipartisan nature of the work that has gone into crafting H.R. 3033. I want to first thank my full chairman, Chairman WILLIAM FORD, of the Education and Labor Committee, for his assistance in pursuing the financial reform of this program as well as many other important aspects of the legislation. I also want to convey my appreciation to Mr. GOODLING and Mr. GUNDERSON for their bipartisan cooperation and contributions. Many other Members, on both sides of the aisle, have also contributed language or ideas, including Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HENRY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. HALL.

The Department of Labor, under the direction of Secretary Martin, has also worked very closely with the staff as the amendments were being prepared

and have clearly signaled their willingness to dramatically increase their leadership and involvement in the program in a positive and desirable fashion.

There are many others that have contributed to the forging of a strong and reasoned bill. Congressmen CONYERS and LANTOS, of the Government Operations Committee, also contributed to the process as they held a hearing on the ability of the system to provide uniformity of service to all who enter the program. We have included language to address many of their concerns and have improved the documentation sections to help to enforce this aim.

There are many other positive improvements and issues that are included in the package but are far too many to go into detail about at this time. The fact is that JTPA provides more than just hope to millions of Americans, it provides the means of self-improvement in the form of training and education. I ask the House to join us in pressing forward with these changes and support the passage of H.R. 3033. Similar legislation passed last year by a vote of 416 to 1, I ask that we make it unanimous this year.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the bill before us today. By passing these amendments, the House of Representatives is taking an important step to ensure that the Job Training Partnership Program can continue to serve this Nation's disadvantaged and dislocated workers.

This bill enjoys strong support on both sides of the aisle. It is a tribute to Chairman PERKINS of the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, Chairman FORD and their staff, and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, STEVE GUNDERSON, that this is truly a bipartisan bill in which we all can take ownership. I understand that this is Chairman PERKINS' first bill to go to the full House of Representatives since he became Chair of the subcommittee. Congratulations.

I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing my appreciation to Beth Buehlmann, who has been a driving force behind the Job Training Partnership Act since its inception in 1982. Beth has left the House Education and Labor Committee for a new job with the California State University system. We could not have reached this important pinnacle without you. Thank you for all your contributions in the area of job training and education. You made a difference in many lives that are touched by these programs.

This is a good time to assess what we have accomplished under JTPA as this

important program approaches the end of its first decade in operation. The Job Training Partnership Act was enacted in 1982 as a permanent authorization. It authorizes the major Federal legislation regarding employment and training programs for this Nation's disadvantaged and dislocated workers. For the most part, this program has worked well to bring together State and local governmental entities with the private sector in order to provide supportive services and job training so that those most at risk in our labor market can obtain and retain employment.

In its first 8 years of operation, JTPA has accomplished much to bring disadvantaged individuals into the economic mainstream and to give them a hopeful future. Indeed, in my own State, JTPA has served nearly 600,000 residents, half of whom were on welfare before joining the program. But this success has been clouded by criticism that JTPA has failed to serve those most in need and provide them with meaningful services and has been vulnerable, at times, to waste, abuse, and mismanagement.

These amendments address these issues head-on. Services will be targeted to those at greatest risk in the labor market. They assure accountability for the use of Federal funds through enhanced fiscal integrity and uniform data requirements.

Through the requirement to provide assessment and a set of core services to participants, we are meeting the issue of the quick-fix mentality that has been leveled at the program. We have devised ways to encourage greater coordination of services with other human resource programs and education.

These amendments do not affect the basic structure of the act. Rather they build on JTPA strengths, correct problems that could have undermined the program, and establish JTPA as a model for employment and training programs of the future.

I hope the other body will, in the near future, take up similar legislation. We need a good piece of legislation, which this bill is, to present to the President, that strengthens JTPA and gives it the support it needs to meet the challenges we have mandated it address.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS], a member of the committee.

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] for putting together a bipartisan coalition to make this amendment work.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman and thank him for his leadership on this measure.

Earlier today there were fireworks on the floor, considerable fireworks over the question of whether we should help people who are victims of unemployment. There is also the question of how we should stimulate our economy and create jobs so there are more opportunities for people who are unemployed. We hear very little about that around here, far too little. But there is not much in the way of fireworks over this because this is the hard work of answering the question: How do we make sure that those who are unemployed have the skills that are necessary to fill the jobs that our economy can create?

Mr. Speaker, I commend all the members of the committee for working diligently on these amendments to try to answer that question. This bill is designed to speak to the person who has been chronically unemployed, the young woman who went through high school, and had to drop out before she finished because she became an unwed mother and has never had a job.

This bill is designed to speak to that 55-year-old homemaker who finds herself widowed or divorced without skills that work in 1991. It says to her this is the way we are going to help you get back into the job market.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill does speak to those people who were talking on the floor earlier about those victimized by this recession, who worked at a food plant or an auto plant that no longer exists, and need to find a new job and a new skill to match it.

That is what this bill does. It also says to those local grantees, the cities and counties all over America, that we are going to hold you more accountable for what you do, make sure you focus the dollars we give you to help the people who are unemployed and not flush them away in bureaucracies.

This is an example of how we can work together. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the chairman's leadership and to be a part of it, in making it happen, and I fully support the legislation before us.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in strong support of H.R. 3033, the Job Training Reform Amendments. This bill is the culmination of 3 years of hard work to strengthen the Job Training Partnership Act—to make a good program even better. On May 9, 1991, at the start of this most current effort to amend JTPA, Chairman PERKINS and Chairman FORD, Mr. GOODLING, and I pledged to work together to craft a bipartisan effort that would address the needs of the JTPA Program and its participants. Today, I am proud to say that we accomplished our goal.

I want to thank CHRIS PERKINS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Em-

ployment Opportunities. H.R. 3033, the Job Training Reform Amendments is Chairman PERKINS' first bill to be taken up by the House of Representatives since he became chairman of the subcommittee. He and his staff—Orner Waddles and Pat Fahy—have done a great job of keeping this a bipartisan effort and bringing to the floor today a well-crafted bill that has tremendous support. I appreciate the encouragement of Chairman FORD for our efforts and the invaluable assistance from Dick Johnson and Ross Eisenbrey on Chairman FORD's staff. I particularly want to thank the ranking minority member of the committee, BILL GOODLING, for his leadership in making this bill possible. Finally, I want to thank the staff for the minority—Beth Buehlmann, Tracy Hatch, and Mary Ann Donovan. Beth, who has been with the committee for 12 years, could not be here for this vote since this is her first week on the job as director of federal relations and assistant to the chancellor for the California State University system. I am sure that I am speaking for many who have known and worked with Beth over the years—Beth, thanks for all your contributions to the committee and the education and job training communities and good luck.

Turning to the bill, I particularly want to stress, at the outset of my remarks, that H.R. 3033 maintains the unique principles and features of the JTPA Program. JTPA is built on a foundation of partnerships—public and private, as well as Federal, State, and local. It provides employers and State and local JTPA administrators with the flexibility necessary to meet the needs of economically disadvantaged individuals in their communities and to respond to local circumstances. JTPA stresses outcomes over process. It is a program that we hold accountable for its ability to serve the disadvantaged and unemployed. Finally, JTPA stresses coordination and working closely with related human resource programs that can also contribute to building a better future for the disadvantaged. The amendments leave this remarkable foundation intact.

The value of this foundation is seen in JTPA's strong record during the past 8 years of serving young people and adults at risk of not being able to enter or succeed in the labor market. More than 10 million economically disadvantaged individuals have been served since 1982 in the basic grant program (title II-A) for the economically disadvantaged and in the summer youth program. Over 3 million of those have been permanently placed in good, well-paying jobs, with the opportunity to improve their life and livelihood. Other participants, many who are youth, have returned to school to complete their education, gone on to further training or obtained needed em-

ployability skills and competencies that will lead to a better life including the opportunity to enjoy the satisfaction that comes with a job.

It is appropriate that we look closely and reassess the experience of JTPA since its implementation in July 1983. To date, only technical amendments have been made to the law. The bill before us today draws upon the JTPA experience—upon the views of the men and women who are a part of the JTPA community and who represent the individuals served by JTPA. It also reflects the considerable input of the Department of Labor. H.R. 3033 addresses issues related to fiscal and programmatic integrity which if left untouched could undermine support for JTPA. But in large part, H.R. 3033 reflects an evolving understanding on how to better meet the needs of those individuals who need assistance to become self sufficient.

At the heart of the legislation are new provisions to strengthen services to individuals who are considered hard to serve. In crafting this bill, we have sought to remove any existing barrier that discourages the long-term and comprehensive services that many JTPA eligible clients require in order to obtain and keep a job.

We start out by requiring that JTPA serve the hard to serve. Sixty percent of a local service delivery area's clients—adults and youth—must have one or more barriers to employment. For adults, these barriers include: Basic skills deficient, school dropouts, recipients of cash welfare payments, offenders, individuals with disabilities, or homelessness.

In addition, the bill creates a new and separate youth program to better address the different and specific needs of at-risk youth. Sixty percent of the youth in this new program must be out of school and 60 percent of the youth served must possess one or more of these barriers to employment: Basic skills deficient, educational attainment one or more grade level below the grade level appropriate to the individual's age, pregnant or parenting, individuals with disabilities, homeless or run-away, school dropouts, or offenders.

While retaining the necessary flexibility at the local level to determine needed services, H.R. 3033 requires that an individual is assessed and receive a service strategy plan to assure a plan of action that addresses how the client can gain skills, and ultimately enter and succeed in the labor market. I strongly believe that these changes, along with the many other provisions that enhance the quality of services to JTPA clients, will ensure that we are getting the best return on our investment in JTPA.

I am also particularly pleased that this bill retains a separate summer youth program. Without this program,

many disadvantaged youth would not have the opportunity to participate in work experience programs that give them a chance to gain needed employment experience and contact with the workplace. I expect that the summer youth program and the new separate year-round youth program will complement one another. JTPA youth can be coenrolled to allow the year-round program to build upon accomplishments achieved during the summer months and to provide followup services. Similarly, participation in the summer programs can improve the skills learned during the year-round program.

A number of problems relating to fiscal and program accountability were identified by the Department of Labor's Office of the Inspector General, the General Accounting Office, and the press. This bill contains appropriate provisions to respond to criticisms that were legitimate including requiring the Secretary of Labor to issue minimum procurement standards. All JTPA costs, with few exceptions, must be charged back to specific cost categories. The bill addresses issues that have arisen with on-the-job training contracts and the Secretary of Labor has been directed to issue guidelines on the employer's role when entering into an OJT contract. These provisions are necessary to ensure the continued public support for JTPA that is essential for this program to carry out its legislative mandate.

Although most all provisions in this bill address title II of JTPA—the basic grant program for the disadvantaged, we have also made a number of corrections to title III which will help States better serve dislocated workers. Allowing substate areas to pool funds to serve eligible workers and to assign costs based on obligations rather than expenditures will bring about better planning and programs in this vital part of JTPA.

This bill continues and enhances JTPA's commitment to coordination. The bill establishes new linkages between local JTPA programs and schools and other human resource systems. The current State education coordination set aside is strengthened to focus on two critical needs: school-to-work transition and literacy and life-long learning. The bill contains a new youth opportunities unlimited initiative that is targeted to youth living in high-poverty urban and rural areas to allow communities to provide a wide range of services to low-income youth.

In addition to these other changes to the Job Training Partnership Act, the bill provides States with the option of combining existing advisory bodies into a single Human Resource Investment Council. This language is designed to foster more understanding of the coordination that is needed between human resource programs to

provide better services to individuals that are served by these programs. This is not intended or designed in any way to eliminate jurisdiction between programs. Education and job training programs will only become more essential as we approach the 21st century. And I believe the opportunity exists for funding for these programs to significantly expand to reflect this growing importance. It would serve us well for States to put in place a structure, such as a State human resource investment council, to guarantee that this increased funding takes place in a coherent manner.

The bill does contain one provision that I believe does not belong in this otherwise fine bill which truly strengthens JTPA across the board. That provision authorizes \$15 million for a disaster relief employment program and undermines the importance of training as the basic purpose of JTPA.

Nevertheless, in spite of this one objection, I believe we have a strong bill that will keep JTPA as a key element in our efforts to be responsive to the labor market of the 1990's and the 21st century. By holding JTPA accountable to the highest standards of performance and integrity, we will be able to provide the services and opportunities needed for those who are disadvantaged to succeed in a changing world and to help us all retain our competitive edge.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. STALLINGS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3033, the Job Training Reform Amendments.

In 1982, Congress passed the Job Training Partnership Act. This legislation wisely established several programs to provide training for economically disadvantaged adults and youths. It is a worthy accomplishment to help individuals become self-sufficient and productive members of society. By helping these individuals, we also ease the financial drain on our social services systems.

The bill that we are considering today does many things. Primarily, these amendments attempt to target the populations that are in greatest need. The youth in our country are a priority group. In addition to being economically disadvantaged, participants must possess an additional barrier to employment, such as lacking basic skills, pregnancy, a parent, a high school dropout, homeless, or welfare recipient.

Older Americans are also worthy of special consideration. These individuals have contributed their fair share, but unfortunately many must return to the work force. The fixed income that used to be sufficient will no longer pay the bills.

I am deeply concerned about the elimination of the 3-percent set-aside at the State level for the older worker programs. It is replaced by an 8-percent set-aside of service delivery funds for adult programs to be targeted at participants 55 or older. This is not satisfactory for two reasons.

Under the existing 3-percent set-aside, the Governor of each State decides how the older worker program will be delivered. Many use the local service delivery area, but others choose to administer the program through the State office on aging. By eliminating this existing arrangement, the Federal Government is taking control of the older worker program out of State hands. This would cause the dismantling of effective, coordinated, and State-determined delivery systems. Second, anything less than the existing 3 percent will mean diminished services for our older citizens.

Idaho has an outstanding and coordinated Older Worker Program at the State level through the Office on Aging. It routinely performs at over 100 percent of projected goals. I trust our State authorities to implement the best possible employment and training programs for our older workers.

Whereas I support this legislation, I hope that we can retain State control and the 3-percent set-aside somewhere down the road, which is where we don't want our older workers to be.

□ 1800

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

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

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] very much for yielding to me, and I just want to mention that I add my appreciation to Beth Buehlmann, my constituent who came from our State of Nebraska after making many contributions to education and continued her work here for the Congress over a number of years, and I join the chairman and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin in wishing her well and thanking her very much.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3033, the Job Training Reform Amendments Act of 1991, and I urge my colleagues to pass the bill.

Students have indicated that by the year 2000, most new jobs will require that the average worker will need to have at least 13.5 years of education. That means that virtually all workers will need to have advanced education at some point in their careers. The days when a high school diploma will do, are over.

The Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA] has been a highly successful

program, because it incorporates a strong public-private sponsorship. The program has demonstrated its effectiveness in providing quality training to low-income adults and youth, and helps retain dislocated workers.

However, the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], has cited that we on this side of the aisle, are concerned about the inclusion of public service employment because it may undermine future success of JTPA, because in some cases it takes the focus away from job training and makes it a temporary employment program—reminiscent of the much maligned forerunner of JTPA, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act [CETA].

Mr. Speaker, the JTPA's success in Nebraska has been outstanding. According to figures I've received, the number of those served by JTPA has been reduced by more than 1,200 people and funding has decreased from \$9.5 million in 1989 to \$7.9 million in 1991, because Nebraska continues to lead the Nation in job growth and low unemployment rates. I know this is due, in part, because of the outstanding efforts of our Department of Labor, and of our pro-business tax policy in the State.

However, I'd like to note for the record, the concerns of the Nebraska Council on Vocational Education, which is concerned with title VII of the bill, that allows States to establish a single State human resource investment council to replace other councils and boards responsible for job training. I am submitting a letter I received from the Nebraska council for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] are to be commended for bringing to the House a well-crafted and sensible bill.

NEBRASKA COUNCIL ON
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
Lincoln, NE, September 20, 1991.

Hon. BILL BARRETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BARRETT: We understand that next Tuesday, September 24, the Committee on Education and Labor is scheduled to take action on H.R. 3033, the JTPA amendments. The bill that was approved by the ranking members of both the subcommittee and the full committee.

The Council has learned that when the full committee addresses this legislation next week a substitute bill will be introduced, and that the legislation will include a provision which would make it permissible for states to consolidate their State Council on Vocational Education with the State Job Training Coordinating Council. In our opinion that action would not enhance the coordination and cooperation between JTPA and Vocational Education but in fact would greatly diminish the input from business, industry, and labor that is so desperately needed to insure an adequate workforce here in Nebraska and the Country.

Last year the Congress passed the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology

Education Act. Included in that act were independent and autonomous citizen Councils on Vocational Education. We do not feel that the situation has changed to cause the Congress to question its decision. This inclusion of State Councils was a continued affirmation by the Congress of the necessity for independent oversight and advice. If the JTPA amendments are passed allowing consolidation, State Councils will remain independent only as long as their input agrees with the appointing authority.

The Nebraska Council on Vocational Education has enjoyed its working relationship with you while you were in the Nebraska Legislature and looks forward to assisting you with your work in the Congress for many years to come. If there is any information, or questions that you may have regarding these comments please feel free to contact me or the Council's staff.

Sincerely,

DON PFIEL,
Chairperson.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] for having yielded me this time and for the outstanding work that he has done in Congress, on this day particularly for the Job Partnership Training Act.

In the city of Louisville in the County of Jefferson, which I am privileged to represent, we have a very strong private industry council which is the administrator of all the JTPA programs in Louisville and Jefferson County, and we are very proud of our programs. We have done a tremendous job over the years with regard to both in-school programs and for the people who are out of school who are trained to get proper training.

Very recently; as a matter of fact I think it was last month, some 13 of the alumni; I guess these were people who had come through the program, were honored, as some 400 communities around the country honored their own alumni. PIK, along with Metro United Way, the city school system, the county school system, as well as a series of other organizations, cooperated in putting together what is called the Louisville Education and Employment Partnership, and the partnership itself is doing great work on working with the at-risk students. Some 1,200 students are currently receiving assistance, and, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], my friend, recollects, a few weeks ago I had a meeting with the PIK people who are concerned about the service level of 60 percent for out of school and 40 percent for in school. When I came back to Washington, I talked to my friend, and it has been worked out, and I believe I am correct that in the bill there is a waiver provision that permits programs like ours who feel that their in-school program is a very effective use of the money, are able to keep it on a different relationship than the 60-40 percent written in the bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], who together have put forth a very good bill. It has the proper kind of flexibility, and I think it is a step forward in training our people for productive jobs on the future.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. LAROCO].

Mr. LAROCO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of Idaho's senior Member. While I am sure the intent is to improve the JTPA Program, Idaho's successful and productive program may be eliminated as a result of these amendments. Furthermore, Idaho may not be alone; other State programs, including those in Colorado, New Jersey, Arkansas, Wisconsin, and Louisiana, could experience the same result.

Idaho has an outstanding and well-coordinated Older Workers Program, administered at the State level through the Office on Aging. JTPA older worker resources are used in concert with title V, Older Americans Act moneys, which provide subsidized community employment opportunities for low-income older persons. Idaho's JTPA 3-percent older worker set-aside performs routinely at over 100 percent of projected goals, and the State-operated title V program has ranked in the top three nationally.

Without the 3-percent set-aside, and without the State-option provisions that currently exist, Idaho's program may be eliminated. In combination, these changes may mean that our highly successful, coordinated older worker employment and training system will have to be dismantled. For older workers in Idaho, this means diminished services.

Mr. Speaker, Idaho's JTPA Program is a model for cooperation between Federal and State programs, and a model for effective administration. While I plan to support final passage of H.R. 3033, on behalf of older workers in Idaho who benefit from the currently authorized older worker set-aside within the JTPA Program, I urge my colleagues to support restoration of the 3-percent older worker set-aside in conference with the other body, as well as the State option to determine appropriate program service delivery.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3033, the job training reform amendments. Overall, the legislation we are considering today carries on the intent that Congress had in 1982 when passing the Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA]—to target those disadvantaged adults and youth who are the most difficult to serve and are the least prepared to get a job, and improve these individuals' access to job training programs.

While H.R. 3033 includes many provisions to improve the delivery of services to disadvantaged youth, the continuation of programs aimed at older Americans who have

found it necessary to supplement their fixed and limited incomes by returning to the work force is also of utmost importance.

I have particular reservations over a provision in the bill which would eliminate the 3-percent State level set-aside for older worker programs. The existing method of allocating funds under the JTPA has allowed States to develop highly specialized services for the disadvantaged elderly. I am concerned that should this arrangement be eliminated, programs that have proven to be successful could be eliminated or relegated to a lesser role. This, of course, would be to the detriment of the same senior citizens who have historically benefited from the special set-aside.

Arkansas' Older Worker Program is a very effective and highly recognized vehicle for helping older individuals in the State find employment. Our program has done an excellent job of meeting the ever-increasing demand for services from older adults and employers seeking mature, dependable, and experienced workers. Since 1982, more than 5,784 older Arkansans have found jobs through our State's network of senior employment centers.

While I support the legislation we are considering here today, I must also express my concerns that States be allowed to continue with such successful programs and services that have been developed over the years. I would hope that we could retain some sort of State control and special State level set-aside for older workers, thereby ensuring the continuation of effective older worker employment programs.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3033, the job training reform amendments. I would like to commend the gentleman from Kentucky for his leadership and hard work on this legislation. Through his leadership, JTPA will be serving the poorest of the poor and those most in need of assistance.

I am pleased to say that this legislation includes two of my proposals—taken from the H.R. 2258, the Freedom From Want Act—to develop microenterprise programs for the poor. For many people, the route out of poverty is through their own small business. H.R. 3033 clarifies that JTPA funds can be used for microenterprise training, and authorizes the Department of Labor to set up 10, \$500,000 competitive grants for States to develop community-based microenterprise programs.

This legislation represents a significant step forward in developing microenterprise programs for the poor. But in order these programs to work, we must ensure that the asset limit of \$1,000 in AFDC be raised. Otherwise, poor people won't be able to get the loans or set aside the assets they need to start their businesses. They will be forced to stay on public assistance. The Select Committee on Hunger, of which I am the chairman, will examine this issue in detail tomorrow.

H.R. 3033 is solid legislation that will help a lot of people. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the subcommittee Chairman, Mr. PERKINS, and the Education and Labor Committee Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, for bringing this legislation to the floor.

We recently engaged in a debate regarding the appropriate course we should follow with

respect to providing a bridge to the unemployed in our Nation. I hope that we are able to prevail upon, or if need be, prevail over President Bush on enacting the unemployment bill because it, like H.R. 3033, focuses our attention on maintaining economic opportunity for Americans.

Our economy is in recession, Americans are out of work and too many of them can no longer provide for themselves and their families.

It is in such troubled times that most of us have come to believe that government has a critical and necessary role.

There are, however, Mr. Speaker, a large number of Americans for whom unemployment is not simply a very traumatic episode in their lives—terrible, but temporary—an interruption in a lifetime of work.

For too many people in our society the recession is simply a deepening of an ever-present gloom.

For too many people in our society unemployment is all but a permanent condition.

For too many people, including our children, employment means running drugs, not going to work.

The Job Training Partnership Act of 1982 became a bipartisan attempt at genuine reform of a national system to provide training to economically disadvantaged adults and young people. The Job Corps, a program which actually predates the JTPA, has been tremendously successful in targeting the most difficult population of young people and providing to them skills, hope, and a future.

One of the general criticisms of JTPA, however, is that it has failed to adequately reach down to help those individuals most in need. This bill provides reforms which better target job training programs to individuals who are hardest to serve and least prepared to enter the workforce by providing them more intense, tailored, and comprehensive services.

For example, the youth program tightens eligibility by requiring that 60 percent of participants face additional barriers to employment like being a parent or being deficient in basic skills. It also requires a dropout to return to school.

The Block Grant Program local service delivery areas must more carefully target out-of-school youth and young people with multiple barriers to unemployment.

H.R. 3033 is an honest and useful effort to improve a program that works. H.R. 3033 is consistent with a broadly shared vision of what America is all about—ensuring progress by assuring opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again congratulate the subcommittee and Chairman PERKINS for bringing this legislation to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3033.

Mr. LAROCO. Mr. Speaker, later today on the Suspension Calendar, the House will consider H.R. 3033, legislation to amend the Job Training and Partnership Act. While I am sure the intent is to improve the JTPA Program, older workers in Idaho tell me this bill may well eliminate our State's successful and productive program. Furthermore, Idaho is not alone; other State programs, including those in Colorado, New Jersey, Arkansas, Wisconsin, and Louisiana, are likely to experience the same damage.

Where I come from, people don't fix what isn't broken. Idaho is a State with an outstanding and well-coordinate Older Worker Program, administrated at the State level through the Office on Aging. JTPA older worker resources and used in concert with title V, Older Americans Act money, which provide subsidized community employment opportunities for low-income older persons. Idaho's JTPA 3-percent older worker set-aside performs routinely at over 100 percent of projected goals, and the State-operated title V program has ranked in the top three nationally.

I believe members are unaware of two specific provision that will inadvertently eliminate effective programs already in place. Specifically, the bill eliminates the 3-percent older worker set-aside which allows Idaho's Office on Aging to directly serve numerous Idahoans. For older workers in Idaho, this means diminished services. In addition, the elimination of the current option that allows States to decide the best way to provide older worker services further compounds the problem. These changes are bad news for Idaho. In combination, they mean that our highly successful, coordinated older worker employment and training system will have to be dismantled.

Mr. Speaker, Idaho's JTPA Program for older workers is not broken. In fact, it is a model for cooperation between Federal and State programs, and a model for effective administration. Let's not fix what isn't broken.

On behalf of older workers throughout this country who benefit from the currently authorized older worker set-aside within the JTPA Program, I urge my colleagues to support restoration of the 3-percent older worker set-aside, and the State option to determine appropriate program service delivery.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the legislation before us, the Job Training Partnership Act amendments contained in H.R. 3033.

Mr. Speaker, the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982 established a number of exceptional programs that link the tasks of job training and job placement for disadvantaged and unemployed youths and adults.

Since its enactment, the JTPA has been noted as a great success; through the local private industry councils, it has brought together representatives from the private business sector, from the education sector, from organized labor, and from employment agencies to join forces in placing the unemployed into on-the-job training programs in the private sector.

By accomplishing both the training and placement of these jobseekers in one concerted effort, the JTPA has effectively bridged the gap that is so wide in our country, between education and employment. I can tell you that other countries, such as Germany and Japan, make sure that their youth are matched with employment and training when they finish or leave school.

It is my hope that these amendments will enhance the JTPA's effectiveness. In one provision, for example, the bill ensures that those in most need of this assistance receive it, by extending the title IIA adult and youth programs to youths who are especially disadvantaged—those who experience the additional barriers to employment such as being deficient

in basic skills, homeless, pregnant, a parent, or a high school dropout.

Other provisions of the bill are designed to facilitate the participation in the program of youths attending schools in high-poverty areas.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill before us because it attempts to fine-tune and enhance the JTPA. It is my hope that the adjustments in the administrative aspects of the program that it also effects, will not hamstring the local agencies that are the nuts and bolts of the program.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3033, the job training reform amendments, was developed and considered in the Committee on Education and Labor on a bipartisan basis. Mr. PERKINS, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities, and Mr. GOODLING and Mr. GUNDERSON, as the ranking Republican members of the full committee and the subcommittee, cooperated closely in crafting this legislation. The Department of Labor was consulted throughout all stages of considering the legislation.

The job training reform amendments mandate several major changes in the Job Training Partnership Act. This legislation is the first substantial overhaul of JTPA since its enactment in 1982, and incorporates corrective actions suggested in many evaluations and audits of the program. Let me summarize some of the major reforms.

H.R. 3033 would limit subsidies for on-the-job training [OJT] to the duration of time needed for acquiring skills for the job, with the subsidy never to exceed 6 months.

In addition, the Department of Labor would be required to issue regulations to ensure that OJT subsidies will not be renewed for employers who exhibit a pattern of failing to retain OJT participants.

The legislation explicitly prohibits any assistance to establishments taking jobs out of one area to another. The bill prohibits use of JTPA funding for employment-generating activities, and similar activities which do not provide training leading directly to jobs.

H.R. 3033 requires that training resources be targeted on the hard-to-serve, in order to end the practice of "creaming" participants. Job training programs have too often been concentrating on the most job-ready individuals, instead of those who are in greater need of long-term training and intensive services.

An assessment of each individual's need for training and services must be undertaken upon entry into the program, and a service strategy developed for the participant. At least 60 percent of the participants in adult and youth program activities must be skills-deficient or face another barrier to employment, in addition to being economically disadvantaged.

The bill requires that the majority of allocated funds be used for training. Limits are placed on administrative costs, which cannot exceed 20 percent of allocations. Up to 30 percent may be used for supportive and training-related services.

This legislation mandates contracting procurement reforms and requires strict cost accounting, in response to recommendations resulting from audit reviews by the General Accounting Office and the Department of Labor's Inspector General.

I am convinced that the implementation of this job training reform legislation is absolutely essential to the future prospects for increased funding of job training programs in the appropriations process.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my strong support for job training reform (H.R. 3033).

George Bush has an interesting way of tackling tough domestic problems. To combat unemployment, Bush vetoed good legislation that would have extended benefits to those workers hardest hit by the recession. To solve the education crisis, Bush spent hours in front of a Government-financed film crew that taped him chatting with middle school students about education problems. Mr. Speaker, these are the actions of a President who, after dedicating the majority of his first 2 years in office to help foreign countries, has now decided that maybe he ought to put together a domestic agenda. It's time to stop politicking and filming flashy campaign commercials at the taxpayer's expense and start helping the average American. H.R. 3033 is yet another example of how we all should be working to ease the pain of the recession and it's something the President should take notice of.

Although this legislation does not offer Americans any of Mr. Bush's rhetoric, it does offer them the opportunity to rebuild their lives. The bill improves the current job training partnership programs by targeting those individuals who are least prepared to get a job for training. The reforms aim to provide the most at-risk individuals with more intense and comprehensive services to make them productive members of our society. Not only does H.R. 3033 fine-tune the existing program by establishing separate programs for adults and youth, but it also creates new programs that give grants to small businesses and give jobs to those in States rebuilding after suffering major disasters like hurricanes, tornados, and earthquakes.

This bill could mean a great deal to my home district where close to a thousand defense workers from the Electric Boat Shipyard in Groton, CT have been laid off within the past year because of defense cutbacks. This bill gives them the tools they need to get back on their feet and become self-sufficient. Job training is one small way we can repay these workers who, during the cold war, gave their talent and toil to construct strong national defense programs.

I hope my colleagues in the House recognize that this is not the time for campaign commercials but for real solutions to get all Americans back to work.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3033, the job training reform amendments. In a time when nearly 9 million Americans are unemployed, additional job training for our workers is needed now more than ever.

The JTPA was established in 1982 to provide training for economically disadvantaged adults and youths. Since then the act has helped to improve the working skills of millions of Americans through partnerships with State governments, the private sector, educational agencies, organized labor, rehabilitation agencies, community-based organizations, economic development agencies, and the public

employment service. The JTPA is widely regarded as one of the most successful economic programs of the Federal Government.

Now we have the opportunity to make the JTPA even better by widening the scope of people it helps. This bill will expand the youth program to give even greater service to economically disadvantaged 16- to 21-year-olds, the ones who have even greater barriers to finding work because they are pregnant, homeless, illiterate, high school dropouts, or with children.

These youths may never find their way unless H.R. 3033 enables us to make contact and provide the means to self-improvement. I am personally acquainted with the importance of this bill to the people of Hawaii, who benefit from the JTPA in the full range of training and employment services of the JTPA. Our native Hawaiians have especially benefited through programs such as Alu Like.

We now live in a new economic era, one in which a country's wealth can only be measured by the specific skills of its workers. No one can doubt that the period of post-World War II industrial hegemony has been over for some time.

Computers, robotics, fax machines, and jet travel are the fruits of a communication and transportation revolution. These factors decrease the relevance of geographic location, and increase the importance on quality and price. Global designing, financing, production, and distribution networks are now a way of life. This is good news for trained workers all around the world. But this change means it is no longer possible to guarantee a good job and high standard of living to all Americans. Now, the only sure route to success for a U.S. worker is to have the training and skills necessary to produce a product or service that can compete in the world market.

The surest way government can help its economy and all of its citizens is by guaranteeing training and adding value to any worker who needs it. In this time of recession and displacement of workers there can be no greater economic goal for our country than creating a well-trained work force. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for H.R. 3033.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairmen FORD and PERKINS for their leadership on the Education and Labor Committee in creating a more equitable Federal job training program, a critical program which in my judgment has been poorly administered over the last 9 years. It is one of literally hundreds of programs this administration is still failing to properly manage.

Over the last several years, the lack of leadership in the Job Training Partnership Act Program and the resultant shortcomings have been more than apparent. My worst fears proved true, and the sad facts were revealed in a General Accounting Office [GAO] investigation. Several months ago the House Government Operations Committee held a hearing on race and sex discrimination in the operation of JTPA.

The GAO found that despite the large representation of women, and racial and ethnic minorities in the JTPA Program, there are widespread disparities in the services provided to women and minorities. In 34 percent of the

service delivery areas analyzed, the GAO found that disparities existed in at least one training mode for at least one ethnic group. Further, while 65 percent of the women received the preferred classroom training they were less likely to get training for jobs with higher placement wages. These disparities are related to systemic problems in the way local projects operate the JTPA Program that restrict the training options for participants—such as channeling participants to a narrow set of options, limiting the mix of services available and limiting the availability of support services. Also, in many cases, these disparities appear related to discriminatory practices of employers and service providers.

I am pleased that H.R. 3033, the job training partnership reform amendments, includes provisions that will help ensure that blacks and women are treated the same as their white male counterparts when it comes to receiving services under JTPA. Thanks are due to our colleague MATTHEW MARTINEZ, the gentleman from California, a member of both the Education and Labor and Government Operations Committees, who worked tirelessly with us to secure language which would correct discrimination in the JTPA Program.

H.R. 3033 requires the Labor Department to collect more adequate data which will enable it to identify service disparities. Even today, neither the Department of Labor, its Directorate for Civil Rights, nor the local JTPA agencies even know the extent of race and gender discrimination because they have not taken the trouble to set up a rudimentary information system.

H.R. 3033 includes provisions designed to assure that JTPA participants are assessed more objectively by including a requirement that those performing client assessments comply with the law's nondiscrimination provisions. The reform amendments also direct the Labor Department to publish final regulations establishing compliance and enforcement procedures to accompany the nondiscrimination provisions. This important addition would provide JTPA administrators around the country with guidance on recognizing and acting on discrimination cases.

Additionally, the reform amendments authorize additional funding for the Labor Department's Directorate of Civil Rights, which currently lacks the resources to adequately combat discrimination within JTPA programs and expedite action on bias cases. Finally, the Secretary of Labor would be required to annually evaluate the directorate's work and report the results to the Congress.

Unfortunately employment discrimination against minorities and women remains widespread. It seems that even the Bush administration's lip service to job training is infected with race and gender bias. We are addressing one aspect of that discrimination in this bill. However, we need a more comprehensive solution to this problem, like that contained in H.R. 1, the Civil Rights Act of 1991. The JTPA reform amendments are a first step to a kind of equal opportunity that H.R. 1 would insure women and minorities throughout the employment process.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to support H.R. 3033, the job training reform amendments.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank Mr. PERKINS, the gentleman from Kentucky, for the outstanding work he has done in Congress, and in particular for his work for the Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA].

In the city of Louisville and the county of Jefferson, which I am privileged to represent, we have a very strong Private Industry Council [PIC] which administers the JTPA programs in Louisville and Jefferson County. We are very proud of our programs, and we have done a tremendous job over the years with regard to both in-school programs and for the people who are out of school. Very recently, as a matter of fact last month, some 13 JTPA program alumni in Louisville and Jefferson County were honored, just as some 400 communities around the country honored their alumni.

The PIC, along with Metro United Way, the Jefferson County Public Schools, the City of Louisville, Jefferson County government, and the Louisville Chamber of Commerce cooperated in putting together what is called the Louisville Education and Employment Partnership. The partnership is doing great work with in-school at-risk students. In fact, some 1,200 students are served each year through the partnership.

Mr. PERKINS, the gentleman from Kentucky and my friend, recalls that a few weeks ago I had a meeting with Louisville and Jefferson County PIC officials who are concerned about a provision of the legislation that requires a service level of 60 percent for out-of-school youth and 40 percent for in-school youth. When I came back to Washington, I talked to Mr. PERKINS and I understand it has been worked out in the bill to allow a waiver provision that permits successful in-school programs like ours to continue.

Again, I thank Mr. PERKINS for putting forth a very good bill. It has the proper kind of flexibility, and I think it is a step forward in training our people for productive jobs in the future.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3033, legislation to reauthorize and amend the highly successful Job Training Partnership Act established by the 97th Congress.

The people and businesses of Pinellas County, FL, whom I represent have benefited greatly from this program under the direction of the Pinellas Private Industry Council. The council is a partnership of private and public sector leaders which provides the only forum for the consideration of the education, job training, and employment needs of our community.

The Pinellas Private Industry Council has been recognized nationally for the success and innovation of its programs and was named the Nation's Outstanding Private Industry Council by the Secretary of Labor. The Pinellas Council, originally established as a job training program in 1979, incorporated as a private industry council in 1982, and since then has drawn on the experience of our county's brightest business leaders. Joe Wheller, Judith Flynn, and currently Leslie Reagan have chaired the 14 business leaders who serve on its board. Other board members come from public education, organized labor, community organizations, local economic development programs, and State agencies.

Primarily utilizing funds authorized and appropriated under the Job Training Partnership Training Act, the council evaluates local job training needs from the perspective of employers and the unemployed. The council contracts with private and public agencies and employers to provide job training adhering to strict performance standards. Under the direction of its executive director Sarah Snyder, the council also seeks to develop community support for education reform, adult literacy programs, quality day care, and other community needs critical to building and maintaining a high quality work force. The council's goal, as established by the Job Training Partnership Act, is to increase the effectiveness of taxpayer investment in education and job training by eliminating overlapping community programs and inefficiencies.

The number of Pinellas County youth and adults helped by the program are the most important gauge to its success. Over its 8-year history, the council has served more than 20,200 unemployed youth and adults from low-income families, placing 6,800 youth in summer jobs and 5,600 adults in permanent full-time jobs. Overall, 71 percent of the adults who complete training programs were placed in jobs.

Mr. Speaker, under the auspices of the Job Training Partnership Act, the Pinellas Private Industry Council has been able to assist thousands of our community's economically displaced and disadvantaged workers who are now proudly employed, taxpaying citizens contributing to our county's economic growth. The council's formula for success is one that should be emulated by other communities throughout our Nation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3033, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed, and the time for the resumption of further proceedings is hereby redesignated to Wednesday, October 9, 1991.

□ 1810

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 3033.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 3, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Due to the pressures of additional responsibilities I recently assumed, I would like to resign my membership on the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families.

I have enjoyed my service on this important committee and will continue to follow its deliberations with interest.

Sincerely,

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Member of Congress.

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

ANNUAL REPORTS OF DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, October 8, 1991.)

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2369, ESTABLISHING FLINT HILLS PRAIRIE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-245) on the resolution (H. Res. 240) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2369) to establish the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1470, ESTABLISHING EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS FOR FEDERAL CIVIL ANTITRUST CLAIMS BASED ON RESALE PRICE FIXING

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-246) on the resolution (H.

Res. 241) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1470) to establish evidentiary standards for Federal civil antitrust claims based on resale price fixing, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1415, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1992 AND 1993

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1415) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for the Department of State, and for other purposes; and ask for its immediate consideration by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 3, 1991, at page H7460).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], with whom I had the privilege of working on my first State Department authorization bill, and whose help and the help of whose staff allowed us to reach this stage with a bill that has a broad base of support and makes many improvements in operations of the State Department, the USIA, and the BIB.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1415, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1992 and 1993. This is an important funding measure for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting. The conference report the Members have before them provides a careful allocation of funding for American diplomacy within the ceiling set by the Budget Enforcement Act with respect to fiscal year 1992. The conference report also provides full authorization of appropriations for these agencies for fiscal year 1993 as well and enables these agencies to continue to do their work in a world where they are facing new challenges. These challenges range from nurturing U.S. relationships with emerging democracies to providing accurate news and information to those nations which have not yet had their democratic revolutions. Through the funding and administrative authorities provided in this bill, many requested by the executive branch, these agencies will be empow-

ered to respond to the demands of this new world.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations, Mr. BERMAN, and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Ms. SNOWE, for creating a legislative measure that can accomplish U.S. foreign policy goals amid a climate of scarce budget resources. I also congratulate all of the members of the subcommittee for their efforts.

In addition to the excellent work done by the subcommittee members and staff, let me emphasize the contributions of other committees of the House which had jurisdiction over selected provisions in the bill. In particular, I would like to thank the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

One of the more difficult policy issues to resolve in this conference was the Senate provision on chemical and biological weapons control. I am pleased to report that a satisfactory resolution on this vital arms control measure was reached. Without the concerted efforts of the leadership of both Houses, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the executive branch, this agreement would not have been possible. With regard to the chemical weapons sanctions regime, the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, which has jurisdiction over aviation matters, formulated the language found in section 507(b)(2)(E) on landing rights. That committee's expertise on this subject, and the assistance of committee staff, was crucial to the final resolution of this section. I thank the chairman and ranking member of the full committee, Mr. ROE and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, Mr. OBERSTAR and Mr. CLINGER for their cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, in sum, this conference agreement represents the authorization process at its best and I urge the adoption of the conference report.

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

Mr. Speaker, the conference report before us provides for the operation of the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting.

This legislation is a comprehensive response to the need for funding and statutory authority for the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs. It meets the demands of U.S. diplomacy in a rapidly changing world. At the same time, H.R. 1415 represents a responsible fiscal approach in tight budget times. As re-

ported by the conference committee, the bill provides a total in new authorization of \$5,496,878,500 for fiscal year 1992, and \$5,779,898,000 for fiscal year 1993. For 1992, the bill as a whole adheres to the administration's request, with one important exception: provision for \$140 million in additional funding for refugee programs. For fiscal year 1993, the conference committee allowed aggregate authorization levels to keep pace with inflation, with increases totaling approximately 5 percent. For both years, the bill's totals are consistent with caps provided for under the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act.

The substantial increase in refugee assistance is necessitated by the recent rapid increase in refugee populations since the administration's estimates were drawn up. Spending for the stabilization of humanitarian emergencies is not only supported by humane considerations, but is also a prudent device which serves our national security interests by lessening regional instability around the world.

Aside from this, the outstanding budgetary feature of this bill is its relationship to the appropriations it authorizes. In almost all categories, appropriations passed to date track the bill's ceilings very tightly. This is the obvious product of a lot of very close work between the staffs of the International Operations Subcommittee, the full Foreign Affairs Committee, and the appropriations subcommittee in question. There was a lot of give and take on both sides, and I thank Chairman NEAL SMITH for his cooperation on this bill.

The Congressional Budget Office has advised that nothing in this bill violates the Budget Enforcement Act or has any direct spending implications.

On other issues, the bill as reported provides significant new administrative authorities requested by the executive branch, including higher reprogramming thresholds, greater latitude in closing posts, and greater flexibility in leasing and lease-purchasing. The bill also comprises a number of committee initiatives, for example on chemical and biological weapons, conventional arms control, program management, personnel reform and other matters.

With respect to the Moscow Embassy the conference agreement on H.R. 1415 leaves a final decision on a construction option up to the executive branch.

The bill also includes important language dealing with a particularly abusive aspect of the Arab boycott of Israel: the refusal of many Arab governments to honor United States passports bearing Israeli visas or entry stamps. The United States Government has responded to this by issuing special "Israel only" passports so that Americans may conceal evidence of their travel to Israel, in the form of visas

and entry stamps, from Arab governments. "Special" passports are used only for travel to Israel, and regular passports for travel everywhere else. Section 129 of the bill prohibits this practice. It also requires negotiations with Arab governments to end their practices and directs the State Department to cancel all existing "Israel only" passports. Travel by private U.S. citizens would be unaffected; State could, at its discretion, issue "Arab League only" passports. Effective 90 days after the signing of this bill, however, special diplomatic and official passports, however, could not be issued for the purposes of acquiescing in the Arab League boycott.

This 90-day delay should not be misinterpreted; it is meant solely to allow for orderly implementation. It may well be necessary to issue a few "Arab League only" diplomatic passports during this time, for example to those directly involved in the upcoming Middle East peace conference. It would clearly be excessive, however, for such issuances to go far into the double digits.

Section 129 does nonetheless incorporate the core provisions of H.R. 2254, the Anti-Boycott Passport Act of 1991, which Representative SNOWE and I introduced on May 8. Like H.R. 2254, section 129 permits the issuance of more than one diplomatic or official passport for purposes unrelated to the Arab boycott. This will facilitate essential operational and intelligence-related travel on the part of executive branch employees.

I would expect the State Department to implement as many of the provisions in question as possible immediately. Some may argue that this issue is only one of many between the Arab States and Israel. I disagree. This is an issue between our Arab allies and the United States, and should be dealt with decisively as such.

This bill also provides for significant reforms in the administration of the State Department's emergencies account, the so-called K fund. It requires declassification of all reports on travel, entertainment, and gift expenditures charged to that account. The intent of this initiative is clear: That all such expenditures be reported and that no such expenditures be classified. This is simply put, a good government initiative, in which I hope for full cooperation on the part of the administration.

I am particularly pleased with the bill's chemical and biological weapons provisions. Legislation on this issue is not only appropriate, but more than timely, given the past year's events in the Persian Gulf. I note that a separate chemical and biological weapons bill, including critically needed import sanctions, will shortly be considered by the Ways and Means Committee. I wish to thank Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI, subcommittee chairman GIBBONS, and

Speaker FOLEY's office for their cooperation in this regard, and to express my particular appreciation to Senator HELMS and his staff for their constructive work toward a compromise which has allowed this conference report to go forward.

I would also like to express a special note of thanks for the efforts of the distinguished ranking member of our subcommittee, Ms. SNOWE, in putting together this bill. Most of its provisions are representative of agreement between us and, I think more importantly, the bill as a whole can genuinely be described as the product of a lot of cooperative joint hard work. The same must also be said of my Senate counterpart, Senator KERRY, and his subcommittee's ranking member, Senator BROWN, and their staffs.

Finally, I must make note of Chairman FASCELL's leadership and support. Having begun the process barely a month into my chairmanship of the International Operations Subcommittee, it is an understatement to say that I couldn't have done it without him, and those of his staff who worked long and hard to get us where we are today.

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

□ 1820

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has already described the main outlines of this conference report. I would just like to highlight some of the bill's major features.

But first, I would like to commend the gentleman from California for his work in managing this legislation as the new chairman of the International Operations Subcommittee. I have served at the subcommittee as ranking Republican for 6 years; this is the fourth time I have been Republican manager of this legislation. Even though we have at times disagreed on certain aspects of this legislation, we have worked together closely throughout the State Department authorization process. I am proud that the International Operations Subcommittee has a long history of accomplishing serious work in a bipartisan fashion, and I am pleased that the new chairman is continuing this tradition.

Let me emphasize once again that the conference report before us now is not the foreign aid bill. This bill authorizes the internal budgets and operations of the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, and other foreign affairs agencies. It also authorizes refugee programs, U.S. assessed contributions to the United Nations, and governs the operations of our international broadcasting services, such as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe.

This conference report closely follows the funding and legislative re-

quests of the administration. I understand that the administration supports the bill in its final form, and that the conference report will be signed into law if passed. The bill's authorization levels also adhere strictly to the funding restrictions under the budget resolution.

In fact, with one single exception, this conference report comes in \$35 million below the administration request. The one area where this legislation exceeds the original administration request is in refugee funding, which was enhanced during the legislative process due to increased refugee needs that had not been anticipated at the time the request was submitted. This bill increases the authorization for refugee funding by \$140 million, primarily for enhanced needs for Soviet, Kurdish, Southeast Asian, and African refugees.

I would like to emphasize, however, that even this increase has been fully offset legislatively to ensure compliance with the Budget Act and to remain consistent with the overall administration request level. Those offsets were made in the foreign aid bill rather than the State Department authorization bill. This was done because refugee funding comes through the foreign aid appropriations process rather than through the Commerce-Justice-State appropriation process.

As the chairman has mentioned, this conference report also includes several major congressional initiatives. Among these are:

A formal policy and procedure for applying sanctions to countries and firms involved in the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons;

Strengthened procedures for sanctions on countries supporting international terrorism;

Authorization for the establishment of full embassies in the Baltic Republics and other former Soviet republics that achieve full independence; and

A procedure for acquiring a safe and secure new U.S. Embassy in Moscow.

I would like to expand further on the Moscow Embassy issue. Last spring, the House debated at great length what to do with the partially completed, bugged new U.S. Embassy in Moscow. In the end, this House decided to refrain from dictating one particular solution to the problem. We did, however, establish stringent security requirements acquiring a new secure embassy and strict procedures for the administration to follow in deciding what option to follow. Among those procedures was submission of a review within 180 days of the advantages and disadvantages of each of the opinions. Also required was a formal dual certification by the Secretary of State and the Director for Central Intelligence that whatever option was chosen would provide a fully safe and secure embassy with adequate classified space for current and future needs.

After everything the House went through to arrive at this position, last week the State Department attempted to bypass the regular legislative process and short-circuit the procedure provided in this authorization bill. Last week the State Department made a secret agreement with two members of the Appropriations Committee to insert in the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations conference report an earmark for an entirely new option that had never been approved by the House or the Senate, and had never been presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee or Intelligence Committee, or even any of the Republicans on the Appropriations Committee. This is for construction of yet another third embassy building in Moscow, which is similar to a 1987 proposal made by Dr. Schlesinger—a proposal that was immediately rejected by the intelligence community and administration security professionals.

Fortunately, last Thursday, the House strongly supported my motion to strip that earmark from the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations conference report. I hope that the State Department will learn from this defeat that the House does not view favorably such blatant disregard for normal congressional procedures. This sorry episode further strengthens my concern over State Department inattention to necessary security procedures and standards at U.S. diplomatic missions. I will be carefully following the extent to which the State Department adheres to all of the Moscow Embassy strictures and procedures required by the legislation before us today.

I would also like to highlight several initiatives I included in this bill. One of these provisions requires increased competition in the USIA grant making process. This will address a shocking finding by USIA's inspector general that in the past more than 77 percent of all USIA grant funds were awarded without full and open competition. Other provisions I included in this bill are:

A study by the State Department inspector general on the Department's severe weaknesses in security issues;

An additional study by the State Department IG on the reasons for the Department's refusal to comply with deadlines in a sexual harassment amendment I included in the last authorization bill;

Improvement in the National Endowment for Democracy's financial procedures and grant evaluation process; and

Improvement in the State Department's procedures for billing other agencies for shared administrative costs.

Again, I would like to express my appreciation to the new subcommittee chairman, Mr. BERMAN, for his energy

and willingness to work with both sides of the aisle in fashioning a consensus legislative product. I would also like to thank my colleagues and staff on the Subcommittee on International Operations and at the full committee who have put in a tremendous amount of work on this bill.

This has been the smoothest State Department authorization process since 1985, my first year as House Republican manager of this legislation. Even so, we had to work out during conference 128 provisions that were different in the House- and Senate-passed bills. But because we also had a functioning foreign aid authorization process this year, the State Department authorization bill was not overwhelmed with Senate nongermane foreign aid provisions.

We still had 30 such provisions on the Senate bill that we had to address in conference. While this number was manageable compared with what we have faced in previous years, it was still unnecessary and inappropriate, and I hope that in the next bill we will be able to convince the other body to respect fully the State Department authorization process.

Finally, I appreciate the support our subcommittee has always received from the full committee chairman, Mr. FASCELL, and the ranking Republican, Mr. BROOMFIELD. During the 6-year hiatus between foreign aid authorizations—from 1985 to the present—we never failed to enact into law this legislation, which is the committee's second important authorization bill.

I urge adoption of this conference report.

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

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Speaker, if the chairman of the subcommittee would allow it, I would like to engage him in a colloquy.

I would like to clarify the provisions in H.R. 1415 that amend the Export Administration Act and the Arms Export Control Act to provide for sanctions against foreign companies involved in the development or production of chemical and biological weapons. These provisions mandate sanctions once the President makes a determination that a foreign person has "knowingly and materially" contributed to the efforts by any foreign country to develop or use biological or chemical weapons.

I strongly endorse this effort to sanction foreign companies involved in the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons. I rise to clarify one point concerning the Presidential determinations called for in these provisions. It has come to my attention that, in rare circumstances, a premature determina-

tion might inhibit the flow of information which is necessary to the full imposition of sanctions against all violators. It seems to me that the President should be allowed to delay such a determination where it is necessary to protect intelligence sources and methods which are being used to acquire further, possibly more important, information on CBW proliferation.

Is it your understanding that the protection of intelligence sources or methods for the stated purpose may be a factor in deciding on the timing of a Presidential determination that a foreign person is contributing to CBW proliferation?

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, to answer the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY], chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, it is my understanding that the President, in rare circumstances, could delay a determination that a foreign person has knowingly and materially contributed to CBW proliferation if such a delay is necessary to protect intelligence sources or methods essential to the acquisition of further intelligence about CBW proliferation. Such a delay would be appropriate, for example, where the United States is using the sensitive intelligence sources or methods to gather information on other CBW proliferators, or where additional time is needed to develop nonsensitive information that could be used to explain publicly the imposition of sanctions. However, such a delay should not be indefinite, because the ultimate purpose of these provisions is to sanction those foreign persons that we know to be knowingly and materially involved in CBW proliferation. Moreover, the delay should only be for the purpose of furthering our policy of sanctioning those proliferators. A delayed determination would not be justified to further any other policy.

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I thank my colleague for this clarification. I, too, would like to add my congratulations to the chairman of the subcommittee for his stewardship of this bill this year.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I simply want to point out to the body the situation on the chemical weapons sanctions legislation.

□ 1830

On numerous occasions the House has passed legislation of this nature; the Senate has passed legislation of this nature. In this particular case, an agreement has finally been reached on a bill that the administration indicates that it will support dealing with both country sanctions and company sanctions.

One of the most important sanctions against countries and companies for

continued and severe violations is import sanctions. Those particular sanctions are not included in this provision in this conference report because they originated in the Senate. They constitute a revenue measure. It is within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee rightfully insisted that revenue measures must originate in the House. The Ways and Means Committee is working to ensure that we can pass that kind of provision in the free-standing bill in an environment where no other revenue measures will be attached to it, as sometimes occurs in the other body.

So to put our earlier expressions of appreciation to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and to the Subcommittee on Trade, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], for their help in allowing this process to go forward, and their efforts to help us achieve the full menu of sanctions that we think are appropriate, I just wanted to share this background.

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

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Banking Committee and Foreign Affairs Committee, and a conferee for the former committee, this Member rises in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 1415. This legislation is absolutely essential to the proper adaptation and functioning of U.S. foreign policy and trade, and I particularly commend the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] and the distinguished gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] for crafting authorization legislation in difficult and controversial subject areas that now, as a result of the conference, enjoys wide bipartisan support.

This Member would like to single out one of many important elements of this legislation by taking particular note of the legislative initiative contained herein regarding Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Mr. Speaker, through more than 50 years of Soviet domination, independence for the three reemerging nations has often seemed to be an elusive and unattainable dream—an aspiration to be desired but difficult to realize. Yet, today, the dream has, in fact, become a fragile reality which we and the community of democratic nations must re-enforce. Moscow has finally recognized the right of the Baltic people to go their own way, and the drive for independence is well underway.

The United States now has restored full diplomatic recognition with these Baltic nations, but it is essential to approve the implementing language that will restore a full and official U.S. diplomatic presence in the Baltic. This

conference report provides that authorization for restarting our physical diplomatic presence in Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. In particular, the report authorizes a fully staffed embassy, the placement of commercial service officers, and access to U.S. Information Agency and AID programs for each of these reemerging nations. In addition, this legislation establishes an exchange program in public administration and business training for highly qualified students from the Baltic nations. In short, Mr. Speaker, the conference report formally recognizes that Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia are independent nations, and deserve to be treated as such by the United States of America.

Again, this Member would like to commend the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee for recognizing and responding and responding to this need in a timely manner. Our national interest will be well served by U.S. Embassies in Riga, Vilnius, and Tallinn. It demonstrates America's support for the drive toward independence, and offers important moral support to the governments and citizens of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia—a goal enthusiastically supported by the substantial Latvia-American and Lithuania-American communities in my home State.

For this reason, and for many others, I urge my colleagues to strongly support the conference report on H.R. 1415.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that deals with the Department of State.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the subcommittee and the committee for working out this bill. I know it has been very, very difficult. Our subcommittee tries to work with this subcommittee and with the full committee, and we had to eventually incorporate, with your permission, some legislation into the appropriations bill, especially with regard to passports and other things. Whenever we find ourselves in a position that we cannot resist, we do incorporate the language that you work out, and it has been good.

Also, I want to agree with the gentleman that we have some problems that we do not know exactly how we are going to handle in the Baltics and in the republics in Eastern Europe. We know that expenditures will be necessary that we cannot anticipate and that no one would even have thought it would have been necessary at the time the gentleman started to work on this bill. But you have incorporated the flexibility in here, and we hope that we have the money so that under the

reprogramming procedures we can take care of these problems as they emerge. And I am sure that we will work these things out to the benefit of the whole world, as a matter of fact.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentleman for his generous comments. My nearly unlimited respect and admiration for the Appropriations Committee only increased after having the opportunity to work with him on this item.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield again, I want to mention one other thing. This is one subcommittee that has tried to work on 2-year authorizations, and this is something that is terribly important around this place. Most committees have not done that, and I want to commend the committee for that also.

Mr. BERMAN. Again, I thank the chairman. It came rather late in the day to me to want to work on a 2-year authorization on all aspects of this bill. But I ultimately saw the wisdom of this approach.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the conference report to H.R. 1415, the fiscal year 1992 State Department authorization conference report.

I would like to thank Chairman HOWARD BERMAN and the other members of the subcommittee for their hard and, many times, thankless work on this legislation. In particular, I would like to give special recognition to their willingness to accept language, similar to that which I submitted in the subcommittee markup, regarding protection for foreign missions, dignitaries, and officials.

As you may know, there has not been an increase in the Diplomatic Protection Program since 1982. During this period the cost of providing diplomatic security has risen significantly and the State Department has fallen behind in its ability to adequately reimburse cities.

This bill will attempt to rectify the problem. It includes a provision that increases the annual reimbursement authority by \$3 million, while also providing a separate authorization of \$8 million for retroactive reimbursements.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sound provision that serves a dual purpose. First, it allows the State Department to operate a cost effective, high-quality diplomatic service that, until now, is the best in the world. And second, it allows the individual cities to attract Federal revenue for a job well done.

This provision has received bipartisan support in both the House and Senate and I hope that my colleagues will recognize the importance of this provision and support the passage of this conference report.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report on H.R. 1415—the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 1992 and 1993.

This is basically a good bill. It provides a 2-year authorization for activities of the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting.

The bill responds to numerous executive branch requests for greater flexibility in managing programs during the current tight budget situation. Legislation on policy matters that

would complicate the conduct of foreign affairs has been kept to a minimum.

For the most part, the conference report stays within the funding levels established in the budget agreement. The single exception are the additional funds for migration and refugee assistance.

This bill has its defects, however. For example, it attempts to dictate the organization of the Department of State, creating a new Bureau of South Asian Affairs at a key time of change in the world. It also calls for no fewer than 62 new reports.

That said, this is essentially good and necessary legislation that reflects considerable work by both Houses of Congress. On the House side, special praise is due Chairman FASCELL; the chairman of the subcommittee, Congressman BERMAN; and the ranking Republican member, Ms. SNOWE.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report for H.R. 1415, the fiscal years 1992 and 1993 Foreign Relations Authorization Act. I am particularly encouraged that the conferees authorized \$30 million for the National Endowment for Democracy. This is a very worthy organization which has been tremendously successful in helping people around the world achieve their democratic aspirations.

The National Endowment for Democracy was established back in 1983 by President Reagan to help foster democratic growth around the world. Under the umbrella of the National Endowment are four special institutes, the National Republican Institute for International Affairs, of which I serve as chairman, the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, of which former Vice President Walter Mondale serves as chairman, the Free Trade Union Institute, which is associated with the AFL-CIO, and the Center for International Private Enterprise, which is associated with the chamber of commerce.

As I said, the work of these institutes, and the NED itself, has been tremendously successful. By providing technical assistance and training, NED grants have made the difference in making democratic movements succeed in Latin America, Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Pacific. One of the four basic objectives of American foreign aid and a key element in preserving our national security interests is support for democracy. By ensuring that democratic movements—whether they be labor unions, newspaper associations, political parties, human rights groups, free enterprise advocates, think-tanks, cultural organizations, or student associations, have the know-how to win elections, implement positive political and economic reform, and effectively govern, we are making sure the gains of democracy and freedom are not lost to totalitarianism and communism.

Take Eastern Europe. NED and its associated institutes and grantees have helped transform prodemocratic sentiments of the people into real political parties, legislative coalitions, and democratic movements that could challenge the Communists at the ballot boxes and win. Eastern Europe has been a challenge. Some countries, like Bulgaria, have no real democratic tradition. Others like Hun-

gary and Poland, have suffered under Communist dictatorships for 45 years. Only the senior citizens remember what free elections and free press are. Today, these nations have cast off their Communist oppressors. But, the people have no experience in governing themselves, organizing their thoughts and implementing their aspirations. They are at a real disadvantage and could lose—and in some cases have lost—elections to the Communists because the latter are better organized and able to exploit the democrats' inexperience.

We have spent trillions of dollars over the past 45 years containing communism. That investment has now paid off and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact is allowing us to reduce defense spending and reallocate it to other pressing needs. However, for this positive situation to continue, we need to help make sure the democratic revolutions around the globe do not fail. The failure of such movements exponentially out costs the relatively small price for guaranteeing their success. Relatively small programs like NED help solidify today's democratic victories by providing democratic elements—labor unions like solidarity, small business advocates, political parties, free press, election observers, constitutional reformers, human rights organizations and so many other parts of a fledgling democracy—the real help they need and cry out for.

For example, the National Republican Institute for International Affairs, through working with the democratic opposition in Bulgaria, turned an electoral defeat into a success. By training opposition members of the assembly how to build coalitions, listen to constituencies and so on—skills we take for granted here—the democratic opposition was able to get their leader elected by parliament to serve as Bulgaria's first non-Communist President since World War II.

In Kuwait, the Republican Institute, which I chair, is working with democratic opposition forces to help fully reinstate the Kuwaiti Constitution of 1962 and facilitate new democratic reforms. Greater internal stability and a successful democratic experience can provide a positive model for others in the Middle East.

In Latin America, NED funded programs are ensuring that democracy becomes the dominant tradition and practice, making military coups, Marxist dictatorships and other nondemocratic regimes items for history books. NED's job is particularly important because of the economic crisis facing Latin America today.

Under this authorization, NED funding has increased from previous years. While I am very conscious of the need to reduce Federal spending, not providing NED with adequate resources is a classic example of being penny wise and pound foolish. Today's increase in NED reflects the explosion of democracy around the globe. In 1989 the Berlin Wall still divided Germany and the Iron curtain divided Europe. We did not really need programs in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. Dictators still ran Panama and Nicaragua. The prospects for democratic change in Kuwait, Nepal, Mongolia, Bangladesh, Namibia, Angola and South Africa were slim at best. Today, there are programs and democratic reform movements in every single one

of these countries plus many others I have not mentioned in the interest of time. Clearly, NED is a sound investment for a more peaceful, democratic future around the globe. That, is absolutely, in the best national security interests of the United States.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT

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

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say a few words about the subject of sexual harassment. I know that there has been an accusation made against the Supreme Court nominee. The nominee has every right to clear his good name. It is an allegation at this point.

But I am struck by the trivialization of the issue. Mr. Speaker, some years ago I had the pleasure of serving on the Unemployment Compensation Commission in which we looked at the reasons why people apply for unemployment compensation. Many women throughout the country wrote to me and said, "We can't apply for unemployment compensation if we voluntarily leave a job because we are being sexually harassed, and because our job is the life blood of our mainstay, we in fact stay on the job, even though we are harassed."

□ 1840

So I just hope that in the deliberation of this matter and other matters

throughout our country, people realize that sexual harassment in the workplace is a reality, and that many, many women are affected.

SUPPORT OF JTPA AMENDMENTS

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3033, the job training reform amendments.

Mr. Speaker, convincing evidence shows that the Job Training Partnership Act is a vital link between unemployment and gainful employment. Not only does the JTPA Program address unemployment services, training, and placement for adults, the program also attempts to address youth employment. As I look at the situation of the youth in my district, I am thankful that the Jobs Training Partnership Act exists. Absent JTPA, I believe that the low income and socially disadvantaged youth of this Nation would face many additional barriers to employment with little or no assistance.

There is a crisis in our inner cities as it concerns youth employment. Young African American and Latino youth struggle to obtain gainful employment, but because of many barriers are unsuccessful. Without JTPA, there would be no hope. JTPA begins to address these concerns, but much more must be done. Our ultimate goal must be to improve the quality of life for these young Americans and the bill before us today will help.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of JTPA, participants have obtained their GED's and ultimately gainful employment. More than 300 area businesses in Chicago hire participants of JTPA. These businesses include law firms, construction companies, and international art reference centers.

Nevertheless, a crisis in youth employment continues. Only 1.8 million participants are currently being served out of 33 million who are income eligible. We must find the funds to reach those who need the training and support that would lead to employment. Just to note, Mr. Speaker, Jobs for Youth Chicago, a local nonprofit organization which serves my district, served 400 youth in 1990. With additional funds, that figure could triple.

Although the JTPA has helped some youth with employment, training and placement, problems do exist. Today's amendments will address some of the short comings of JTPA through various reforms. Two reforms, which I believe are critical to JTPA, are amendments to streamline the use of funds and an amendment to reduce the amount of paper required to enroll a participant. Currently, 45,000 pieces of paper are required to serve 400 youth under JTPA. Excessive paper work wastes time, money, and creates a disincentive for many African-Americans and Latinos.

The bill before us today makes needed changes in the JTPA Program, however, to address the real issues of job creation we must go much further. H.R. 3033 has my full support, and I look forward to working with the chairman to address the ongoing employment needs of this Nation.

I ask all of my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

CHICAGO'S 1991 COLUMBUS DAY PARADE

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 14, Chicagoans will commemorate Christopher Columbus' voyage to America with a gigantic parade sponsored by the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans. This parade will honor Columbus' spirit of bravery and innovation, but it also will focus on the contributions Italian-Americans have made during our Nation's wars. The theme of this year's parade, "A Tribute to the Italian-American War Veterans," will encourage us to reflect on the many sacrifices Italian-Americans have made in defense of the United States of America.

We are extremely pleased that the highest ranking Italian-American officers from each branch of our armed services are planning to march in the parade as this year's guests of honor. Other parade participants will include Mayor Richard M. Daley of Chicago, Gov. Jim Edgar of Illinois, Congressman MARTY RUSSO and a number of civic and political dignitaries, including myself.

Mr. Speaker, President George Bush is expected to issue a proclamation shortly commemorating Columbus' voyage to America. Governor Edgar and Mayor Daley have already issued proclamations. Copies of these declarations follow:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Springfield, IL, October 14, 1991.

GREETINGS: As Governor of the State of Illinois, I am pleased to extend personal greetings to everyone attending the Columbus Day Mass and Parade.

Christopher Columbus encountered our land of opportunity and freedom. We are grateful for his vision and perseverance, and the hard work and determination of our citizens to make this the greatest country in the world.

Italian-Americans have kept alive their strong traditions and rich culture while looking toward the future. We Americans of every ethnic background proudly join the Italian community in celebrating Columbus Day.

Best wishes for a joyous celebration.

Sincerely,

JIM EDGAR,
Governor.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans (JCCIA) is sponsoring its annual Columbus Day Parade on October 14; and

Whereas the courage and visionary wisdom displayed by Christopher Columbus in his intrepid voyage to the new world is exemplary of the Italian-American community; and

Whereas those qualities of our Italian-American brothers and sisters are evident in their many contributions to the arts, politics, sports and socio-economic life of Chicago; and

Whereas the Chicago Department of Cultural Affairs is presenting its annual exhibit and program series in honor of Italian Heritage Month in October, and the public is invited to attend; and

Whereas this year's parade will give special recognition to honor the Italian-American War Veterans:

Now, therefore, I, Richard M. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby proclaim October 14, 1991, as Columbus Day Parade in Chicago in honor of the Italian-American War Veterans and urge all Chicagoans to recognize the historical observance in honor of the great navigator, Christopher Columbus.

Mr. Speaker, this year's Columbus Day celebration in Chicago will begin at 9 a.m. with a Mass at Our Lady of Pompeii Church. Rev. Lawrence Cozzi, who chairs the religious committee of the parade, will oversee the services. Rev. Livio Stella will be the main celebrant. Rev. Angelo Moscato, who is pastor at Our Lady of Pompeii Church, will serve as host for the liturgy.

Theresa Petrone will give an introduction before the Mass. She is the theme coordinator for the parade and cochairwoman of the programs and arrangements committee. Norman Boccio, who serves on the parade's finance and souvenir book committee, will serve as commentator. The lectors will include Judy Guzaldo, the president of the JCCIA women's division; and Lilia Juarez, the president of the JCCIA west suburban women's division. Phil Sciacqua, the president of the JCCIA young adult division, will offer the prayer of the faithful. He also is cochairman of the floats committee.

The offertory procession will include: Stephanie Sparacino, who recently was named Queen of the Columbus Day parade; Joe Panzica, who will portray Columbus during the parade; Ann Sorrentino, who chairs the parade's costume committee; and Marie Palelo, who is executive secretary of the JCCIA. Ms. Palelo also chairs the floats committee.

The Italian Cultural Center chorus of Chicago will perform during the Mass under the direction of Leonora Li Puma. Organist Frank Pugno will accompany them. Ushers will include Nick Bianco, John DeBella, Michael Palelo, and Lawrence Spallitta, who chairs the floats personnel committee. The Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus will provide an honor guard including: Mike Gill, master, fourth degree; Ben Daniel, master, fourth degree; and Joseph Nardi, admiral of the LaSalle Assembly. After the Mass, the Mothers' Club of Our Lady of Pompeii Church will serve breakfast to the congregation.

A wreath-laying service will follow at 10:30 a.m. at the statue of Columbus located in Arrigo Park. Congressman RUSSO, the chairman of the Columbus Day Parade Committee, will act as host for this ceremony. The memorial service was organized with courteous support from the Chicago Park District, Sheridan Park Supervisor Joseph Patti and Katherine Mauro, the executive director of the University Village Association.

The sponsors of the wreath-laying ceremony include the Grand Lodge of the State of Illinois, the Order Sons of Italy in America and the JCCIA. Thomas Baratta and Sam Garnello of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America will coordinate the ceremony with help from the color guard of the Italian-American War Veterans of the State of Illinois. Reverend Stella will give an invocation for the service. The posting of the colors will be directed by Rosemary Galluzzo, the president of the ladies auxiliary of the Italian-American War Veterans of Illinois; and Frank Geritano, the Com-

mander of the Italian-American War Veterans of Illinois.

The parade will begin at 1 p.m., at Dearborn Street and Wacker Drive. WGN Channel 9 will telecast live coverage of this event, which will include over 200 floats, marching units, and bands. Several floats will feature members of our community dressed in traditional Italian costumes. One float will feature Mr. Panzica as Columbus and Ms. Petrone as Queen Isabella.

Ben Affetto will serve as grand marshal of the parade. He will follow in the proud footsteps of his grandfather, the late Marco DeStefano, who served as parade marshal for 38 years.

Joseph Ahern, the president of WLS-TV in Chicago, has announced his station will broadcast a tape of the parade on Saturday, October 19. Narrators for this presentation will include Ms. Petrone and Dominic DiFrisco, the president of the JCCIA. Television sponsors for this year's parade include the Ferrara Pan Candy Co., AT&T, Commonwealth Edison, Hilton Hotels Corp., Alitalia Airlines, Joe Gentile Chrysler Plymouth Inc., Waste Management Inc., Dominick's Finer Foods Inc., and Anheuser Busch.

One highlight of Chicago's Columbus Day festivities is the selection of a queen for the parade. Winners in this competition are judged on poise, personality, talent, intelligence, and beauty. Ms. Sparacino of Wilmette was chosen as this year's queen. The members of her court include: Francesca Sparacino of Wilmette, Lisa Amendola of Melrose Park, Monica Trombetta of Chicago, and Rosa Blasi of Mt. Prospect. The queen will receive numerous prizes. These include a free trip to Rome, courtesy of Alitalia Airlines, hotel accommodations donated by the Italian Government Travel Office, a full scholarship provided by the John Robert Powers School of Modeling in Chicago and a \$1,500 award from the JCCIA.

The Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans includes more than 65 Italian-American civic organizations from the Chicago area. Under the able leadership of Mr. DiFrisco and JCCIA Executive Director Fred Randazzo, the JCCIA coordinates the Columbus Day Parade and many other activities. The JCCIA was founded in 1952 to fight bigotry against Italian-Americans through education and public service. Over the years, this organization has developed into a dynamic group that serves the social and cultural needs of more than 500,000 Italian-Americans in the Chicago area. While the Columbus Day Parade is a showcase for Italian-American culture, it also is designed to promote understanding, brotherhood, and equal opportunity for all.

This year's Columbus Day Parade will conclude at 3 p.m. A reception will follow at 3:30 p.m. at the Como Inn to honor the many guests, officers, committee leaders and volunteers who have helped to make the 1991 Columbus Day Parade a monumental triumph.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 21st annual celebration of Columbus Day as a national holiday, I want to take this opportunity to commend all of the members and officers of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans for their tireless efforts to make this year's parade an overwhelming success. As an honor-

any chairman of the parade, I take great pride in participating in this memorable event.

The officers and members of the 1991 Columbus Day Parade Committee are as follows:

THE 1991 COLUMBUS DAY PARADE COMMITTEE
COLUMBUS DAY PARADE COMMITTEE

Congressman Marty Russo, General Chairman.

Congressman Frank Annunzio, Honorary Chairman.

JCCIA OFFICERS

Dominic DiFrisco, President.
Fred Mazzei, 1st Vice President.
Thomas C. Baratta, 2nd Vice President.
John Cioffi, 3rd Vice President.
Pat Naples, 4th Vice President.
Joe Annunzio, 5th Vice President.
Emil Venuti, Treasurer.
Tena Amico, Secretary.
Lawrence Spallitta, Sergeant-At-Arms.
Reverend Lawrence Cozzi, Chaplain.
Fred Randazzo, Executive Director.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Michael Coli, Chairman; Congressman Frank Annunzio, Vice Chairman; Theresa Petrone, Vice Chairman.

YOUNG ADULT DIVISION OFFICERS

Phil Sciacqua, Leo Buttitta, Lisa Misurelli, Andy Rubino, Bill Dal Cerro.

WOMEN'S DIVISION OFFICERS

Judy Guzaldo, President.
Carmella Tolitano, 1st Vice President.
JoAnne Spata, 2nd Vice President.
Frances Passaglia, Recording Secretary.
Marie Paleello, Corresponding Secretary.
Mary Ann Cioffi, Treasurer.
Marion Ortale, Advisor.

WEST SUBURBAN WOMEN'S DIVISION OFFICERS

Lilia Juarez, President.
Leonora LiPuma, 1st Vice President.
Carol Petersen, 2nd Vice President.
Mary Conti, Recording Secretary.
Ann Sorrentino, Corresponding Secretary.
Carol Cerny, Treasurer.
Tena Amico, Advisor.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Richard Caifano, Reverend Lawrence Cozzi, Reverend Gino Dalpiaz, Carl De Moon, Phil Sciacqua, Anthony Fornelli, Sam Garnello, Judy Guzaldo, Lilia Juarez, Pat Pavini, Charles J. Porcelli, John Serpico.

THEME COORDINATOR

Theresa Petrone.

RELIGIOUS PROGRAM AND ORGANIZATIONS

Rev. Lawrence Cozzi, C.S. Chairman, Nick Bianco, John De Bella, Mike Paleello, Lawrence Spallitta.

AUTHENTIC ITALIAN COSTUMES

Ann Sorrentino, Chairman; Elena Frigoletti, Lilia Juarez.

FINANCE AND SOUVENIR BOOK

Marie Paleello, Chairman; Angeline Annunzio, Margaret Porcelli.

BANDS, MARCHERS, TRANSPORTATION AND FLOATS

Marie Paleello, Chairman; Margaret Porcelli.

PROGRAM AND ARRANGEMENTS

Dominic DiFrisco, Co-Chairman; Theresa Petrone, Co-chairman; Fred Randazzo, Coordinator; Alderman William J.P. Banks.

QUEEN CONTEST

Fred Mazzei, Chairman; Josephine Bianco, Co-Chairman; Anita Louise Bianco, Marie Paleello, Mike Paleello, Margaret Porcelli, Fred Randazzo, Nick Bianco, Marilyn Fredricks, Phil Sciacqua, Joanne Spata.

FLOAT PERSONNEL

Lawrence Spallitta, Chairman; Norman Boccio.

PARADE MARSHALS

Ben Affetto, Chairman; John De Bella, Nick Bianco, Pasquale Caputo, Commander Ettore Di Vito, Tom Bellino, Frank A. Lato, Mike Paleello, Ron Onesti, Lewis Affetto, Mark Affetto, Nat Caputo, John Fay, Len Vekkos, Mark Presto, Rich Onesti, Mike Simi, Jeff Garzonetti, Cynthia Cacciatore, Gloria Cacciatore, Anthony Mannella, Richard Morbidoni.

STAFF PHOTOGRAPHER

Sam Bruno.

REVIEWING STAND COMMENTATORS

Alderman William J.P. Banks, Chairman; State Rep. James DeLeo; Mark Farina.

JUDGES FOR THE QUEEN CONTEST

Robert J. Durkin, Adrienne Levatino, Mary Laney, Frank Mazzei, Judge Frank R. Petrone, Ernest T. Rossiello, Laura Spingola, Dr. Carl Tintari, Joseph M. Caliendo, Rose Farina.

RESTORING AMERICA'S FUTURE

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Speaker, the Committee on the Budget today is beginning a review of the budget situation in light of the dramatic changes in the world situation, our compelling social and economic problems at home, and the specter raised by the Congressional Budget Office of deficits rising once again to \$300 billion in the latter part of this decade after the current budget agreement expires.

To guide the review process, I have proposed the outlines of a 10-year budget path which I believe can establish a framework for the decisions that must be made by the Congress and the President. As we begin to debate the budget for fiscal year 1993 and the future of the 1990 budget agreement, we need to have a long-term view of where this Nation should be headed as we approach the 21st century. No decisions can be made, in my view, without that kind of long-term view.

It is my hope that we can work together—Congress and the President, Democrats and Republicans—to get this Nation on the right track not just for 1993 but for the next decade. I urge my colleagues to let me know their thoughts on these critical issues in the weeks and months ahead.

Following is the text of the statement I issued at a press conference yesterday, as well as a brief outline of my 10-year proposal.

PROPOSAL FOR A TEN-YEAR COMMITMENT TO RESTORING AMERICA'S FUTURE

Good morning. Nearly two years ago, Budget Director Richard Darman, writing about the incredible changes in the Communist world that were then only beginning to emerge, said, "this great historical shift has been almost trivialized in its translation into public debate about the budget."

The changes in the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact nations have, if anything, been even more extraordinary since Mr. Darman wrote those words. But his point is still a valid one. Unfortunately, his criticism is ap-

plicable not just to the Congress but to the President as well.

Today, the political debate over the budget seems to be converging on the short-range question of whether the 1990 budget agreement should be breached or revised in Fiscal Year 1992 or 1993 to permit a transfer of funds from defense spending to either domestic spending or foreign aid or tax relief or deficit reduction or some combination thereof. Mr. Darman has suggested that the agreement should be revised after the next election.

But no decisions can or should be made about changing the budget agreement without a careful understanding of the problems in our economy and the steps needed to confront these problems.

The changes of the magnitude we have seen require a nation's leadership to expand its vision and look to the future. We have watched as the economy and ideology of our foremost adversary have been tossed on the scrap heap of history.

But with the 21st century approaching, the fact is our own system is in grave danger of collapsing as well. And neither the President nor the Congress has been talking about how we address these problems over the next decade so that we can approach the 21st century in a position of strength.

We are all familiar with the problems. Our industrial base is no longer competitive internationally. Our educational system, once second to none, is behind in every meaningful category.

Budget deficits and debt continue to grow at record levels despite the budget agreement. Indeed, the Congressional Budget Office now projects that after the current budget agreement expires, budget deficits will begin to rise once again, reaching more than \$300 billion by the year 2001. If that occurs, the national debt will grow to \$5.1 trillion, taking it over the threshold of 50 percent of GNP, 50.2 percent to be exact, nearly double its level just a decade ago.

The nation's financial resources are being drained at an alarming rate. The recovery from this recession is proving to be extraordinarily slow, and the nation's businesses and workers are suffering.

Finally, perhaps most important of all, the American people have lost much of their confidence in government and in the nation's future.

If our national leadership fails to respond in a dramatic way to these challenges, then by the end of this decade we will be a second-rate economic power and our children and grandchildren will be forced into a second-rate standard of living.

This nation has been given a rare opportunity created by the fall of Communism to make the kind of decisions that will restore and strengthen the country for its rendezvous with the 21st century.

Therefore, the Speaker has asked that the Budget Committee undertake a comprehensive review of the budget situation in light of the changes in the world and the growing economic and social needs of the nation. To guide this process, I am proposing for the consideration of my Democratic and Republican colleagues in Congress, as well as the President, the outlines of a ten-year budget path that can guide us to where this nation needs to be not just in the year 1993 but in the year 2001.

Let me make clear that the outline reflects my view of the direction in which this nation must go. My hope is that this approach along with others can be fully debated and considered in the effort to develop a course of action for the President and the Congress.

There are three basic components that should frame the debate:

I. STREAMLINE GOVERNMENT

The first component is to streamline government to make it more efficient and enable it to serve the American people better. The cost of operating Federal departments has grown by 33 percent just since 1981, but few would claim that government has done a better job of coordinating policies or delivering services.

One approach that I believe should be considered is to consolidate the number of departments. There are fourteen today, and they too often work at cross-purposes, frustrating both policy and delivery of services.

One possibility would be to consolidate them down to as few as six—the Departments of State; Defense; Justice; Economic Policy; Human Resources; and Natural Resources. In the 1970's, the Ash Council recommended eight departments, and that is another approach to consider.

Consolidation, combined with desperately needed management reforms, would make government more efficient and less costly. It would result in a streamline of bureaucracy, both executive and legislative, that could produce substantial savings. The goal should be to reduce operating costs in non-priority areas by as much as 20 percent over the next decade. Ultimately, I believe such reforms would not only result in better management and a greater concentration of expertise in key areas but also help attract our best people to public service.

II. TARGET RESOURCES

The second component of this plan is to target the limited resources we will have over the next decade to investments in specific programs—both proven existing programs and new innovative ideas—in three areas critical to our future. First, improving our children's ability to learn and guaranteeing them a quality education; second, securing affordable health care for all Americans; and third, providing incentives and programs that advance economic growth.

A. Education. Regarding education, today's educational system is not preparing our children to work and compete in the next century. Furthermore, too many children are simply not prepared to be educated. Both problems directly threaten our economic future.

By the year 2001, our goal should be to: restore American students to the world's best in science and mathematics; extend the opportunity of literacy to every person; cut the school dropout rate by at least 70 percent; increase opportunity for higher education; provide adequate nutrition to the 5½ million children now estimated to go to bed or school hungry; and guarantee that every school-age child—no matter his or her background—is prepared to be educated.

Words alone are not enough. Our children's schools need resources, not rhetoric. In addition to reforms, an investment over the next decade in the range of \$100-to-\$120 billion will be needed.

B. Health. Regarding the second area, health, our present health care system, with 33 million Americans uninsured, millions of others at risk, and costs climbing through the roof, is intolerable. The challenge, within the next few years, is to establish a self-financing nationwide program that guarantees affordable health coverage for every American.

In addition, the goals of this effort should include, by the year 2001: cutting the rate of infant mortality by 50 percent; ensuring that

every child receives necessary immunizations (six million currently do not); and intensifying the nation's search for the causes and cures of cancer, heart disease, and AIDS. To get this job done will require a ten-year investment of somewhere between \$75 and \$90 billion beyond current plans.

c. Economic growth. The third area for investment is economic growth. American businesses are distressed by the inadequacy of today's work force and the economy's inability to provide the resources, infrastructure, and incentives essential to growth.

By the year 2000, the nation should do the following: (1) implement a comprehensive national energy security plan that promotes conservation and a healthier environment and increases energy efficiency by 15 percent; (2) fund construction and innovation in the nation's infrastructure, including housing, roads, bridges, and mass transit; (3) extend intensive job training to the nearly half million young people most in need of meaningful employment; and (4) enact targeted tax incentives that encourage growth and provide middle-income tax relief without busting the budget or providing a bonanza to the rich. To pay for this will demand an investment over the next decade in the range of \$130-to-\$160 billion.

Clearly, there are other areas, such as anti-crime and anti-drug programs, where the nation needs to maintain a level of spending that keeps up with additional inflation and costs. But the three areas I have identified are where we should target new investments.

III. DEFICIT REDUCTION

The final component of this plan must be to confront a runaway deficit that continues to threaten our resources base for the future. Restoring the nation's savings base is essential both to reduced deficits and to the ability to make necessary investments.

While the budget agreement has provided an important first step in establishing fiscal disciplines and targets, more needs to be done. The combination of reduced revenues from the recession and increased costs from the S&L crisis are causing deficits to balloon in the short run, and CBO expects health care costs to continue to drive deficits higher in the second half of the decade.

If we follow the precedent of last year's budget agreement, in which the President and Congress matched every two dollars in spending of about a trillion dollars in deficit reduction over the decade, bringing the deficit down from 6.1 percent of GNP to less than 1 percent.

In light of the changes in the world, the first step we need to take is a gradual reduction of at least 33-to-40 percent in military spending over the decade, expanding on current plans for a 20-25 percent reduction by 1995, and on the President's recently announced shifts in our defense posture. The goal should be a defense that guards against the threats of the future but does not waste resources on those of the past.

In addition, government streamlining, reductions in non-priority domestic areas, and cost controls in the ever-expanding entitlement programs are needed to produce the required savings.

This approach is practical but tough, it builds on the current budget agreement, but it makes it clear that more needs to be done.

Ultimately, the future of this plan and the future of any changes in the budget agreement will depend on the will of the people, the President, and the Congress to confront these challenges.

In the 1980's, the nation closed its eyes, crossed its fingers, and hoped for the best.

The result is a nation besieged by debt and serious economic and domestic problems that threaten our future. The question for the President and the Congress is whether the 21st century will remember today's leadership for its success or its failure at rebuilding the nation and restoring America's future.

RESTORING AMERICA'S FUTURE: PROPOSAL FOR A TEN-YEAR COMMITMENT

Chairman Panetta has proposed the following outline of a ten-year budget path to restore America's greatness as an economic power, secure productive and healthier lives for our people, and restore the trust of the American people in their government.

1. STREAMLINE GOVERNMENT

We should consider consolidating government to provide greater efficiency and better delivery of services by: reducing cabinet departments from 14 to as few as 6: Human Resources, Defense, Natural Resources, Economic Policy, State, and Justice; spending reduction in non-priority areas: up to 20% over ten years; and separating an Office of Federal Management from OMB to improve governmental performance.

2. TARGET RESOURCES

We must invest resources in those areas most critical to rebuilding America:

Education

Goals: extend literacy to the 30 million currently illiterate Americans; become #1 in the world in math and science; prepare all children to be educated prior to first grade; cut school drop-out rate by at least 70%; increase opportunity for higher education; and provide adequate food to the 5½ million children now hungry.

Investment: \$100 billion to \$120 billion over ten years.

Health care

Goals: enact a self-financed nationwide program that guarantees affordable health care for all Americans, including the 33 million uninsured; achieve 100% immunization of children, including the 6 million currently uncovered, and expand preventive health care efforts; and cut the infant mortality rate by 50%, bringing America from 24th in the world to 1st.

Investment: \$75 billion to \$90 billion over ten years.

Economic growth

Goals: extend job training to the one-half million young people most in need; implement a comprehensive national energy security plan that promotes conservation and increases energy efficiency by 15%; fund infrastructure, including housing, roads, bridges and mass transit; provide targeted tax incentives to encourage growth and provide middle-income tax relief;

Investment: \$130 billion to \$160 billion over ten years.

3. DEFICIT REDUCTION

To achieve lower interest rates, and to increase competitiveness and productivity, the nation's savings base must be restored. This requires a reduction of the Federal deficit: achieve at least a 33% to 40% cut in military spending by the end of the decade, reductions in non-priority domestic areas, including entitlements, and revenue increases; and reduce the deficit to less than 1% of GNP by the year 2001; total net deficit reduction of \$800 billion to \$1 trillion over ten years.

RECOGNIZING MENTAL ILLNESS FOR WHAT IT IS: AN ILLNESS

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult tasks we face in caring for those with mental disorders is to recognize that such illnesses are treatable and should be dealt in the same manner as we treat other diseases—with care and love. Too often those with mental illnesses are made to feel like pariahs. The time for hiding such disorders should be a thing of the past. We must remove the stigma attached to such afflictions. We must no longer react with disdain when a person is suffering with a severe mental disorder. It should not be a shameful thing to be sick because the disorder happens to be mental rather than physical in nature.

I want to call your attention to the fine work which is being done at the National Institute of Mental Health to change the way we view mental illness. I am, of course, referring to the publication issued by the National Advisory Mental Health Council proposal for a national plan of research on mental disorders and services. That report, prepared under the supervision of my wife Norma and Drs. James Jackson of the University of Michigan and Joseph Coyle of Johns Hopkins University has been issued and presented to Congress by Dr. Jack Burke.

The significance of this report entitled: "Caring for People With Severe Mental Disorders: A National Plan of Research to Improve Services," is that it offers hope for a better way of life to those individuals with a mental illness.

The report identifies the major obstacles which must be overcome in order to provide equitable and effective care for the mentally ill. These are: the heterogeneity of mental illness; the emotions stirred by mental illness; the insufficient use of science. These are all addressed by the plan. I find it gratifying to see the culmination of an idea made into such an outstanding reality.

One focus of the report is on ways to improve the quality of care being provided. A general theme of this concern is to find better ways to integrate the goals, and lessons from past experience, of consumers and family members into treatment planning.

A second focus of the report is to improve the organizing and financing of care. As effective services become known, it is essential to ensure that they are available to the full range of people who would benefit from them.

A third focus of the report is on developing the research resources needed to undertake such a challenging scope of work.

Another point which cannot be emphasized too strongly and which should

not be overlooked when discussing mental health is recognizing that early intervention is the key to treating individuals suffering from mental illness. In many cases, if caught in time such illnesses as schizophrenia and manic depression can be treated successfully with medication. As a result, this person is then empowered to lead a more normal and satisfying life. Such treatment would also prevent a whole host of problems for the patient and his/her family. It is heartbreaking and devastating both emotionally and financially for many families who have someone they love suffering from such a disorder.

I cannot stress enough the value of the work being done by organizations such as the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill [NAMI]. The support they give to family members faced with such an ordeal is invaluable. In fact, NAMI recently co-hosted two congressional seminars which brought to light need to revamp our insurance coverage which is totally remiss in this area.

By declaring the week of October 6–12 as Mental Health Awareness Week, we are providing a forum to call attention to the many and varied problems associated with mental illness. We are making strides in research and treatment, but we still have much more work ahead of us. Through patient and understanding and a recognition that anyone can become a potential victim of a mental health disorder such as a depression or anxiety we will bridge the gap which currently exists when dealing ways to treat the mentally ill.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of commemorating the week of October 6–12 as Mental Health Awareness Week. I commend Congressman MIKE KOPETSKI, RON MACHTELY, and BOB WISE for their leadership on this initiative, and thank all the Members of the House of Representatives who have shown their overwhelming support for this important issue.

After many years of interest, 5 years as director of a mental health service for severely disturbed adolescents, and considerable research on this subject, I am convinced that we are making tremendous advances in the area of treatment of mental illness. Luckily, we are far removed from the days when those who suffered from mental illness were scorned by society. It is essential that we as legislators do everything we can to publicize the fact that mental illness is just that, a treatable illness.

Many Americans are mentally unhealthy because of severe chemical, hormonal, or genetic disturbances, which we are making great process in treating. Both Federal and private laboratories and research facilities are occupied full tilt on this problem, which will be

solved with major scientific breakthroughs and advances requiring time, money, and patience. We are on the right track: we will get there.

Thousands of people, who currently live a normal life, previously had crippling diseases, such as manic depression and vegetative depression. Other diseases, like the major chemical-genetic disorder schizophrenia, have proven to be a more formidable foe for scientists and physicians. But even here, remarkable progress in reinstitutionalization and return to normal life has been accomplished for many of those afflicted.

However, in the much larger arena of mental wellness, there is considerable work to be done. The number of Americans struggling with the various problems of everyday life, such as juvenile disorders, midlife crisis, and retirement malaise, is rapidly increasing. Only through greater understanding of these problems can we restore some degree of mental wellness to these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, many of our people have lost a degree of hope, lost faith, lost compassion, and lost vocational satisfaction. These are the people who, while easily treatable, refuse to seek professional help for fear of public ridicule. This is why it is essential that we recognize the ubiquitousness of this problem, and work to help those who suffer from all forms of mental illness.

MENTAL ILLNESS AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in observance of Mental Illness Awareness Week and in support of increased knowledge and understanding of mental disorders.

Although 90 percent of our information about the workings of the human brain was developed during the last 10 years, our attitude toward mental illness has not kept pace. In many respects, we are still operating in the Dark Ages, where ignorance of mental illness bred fear, prejudice, and stigmatization. Yet, our attitudes must keep up with our increased knowledge if we are to pave the way for better treatment for Americans afflicted with mental disorders.

Mental illness takes many forms, including schizophrenia, depression, Alzheimer's disease, manic depressive illness, and anxiety disorders. And every year, between 30 and 40 million of us here in the United States suffer from some form of this affliction; 23 million of us are severely incapacitated. At some point in their lives, one in every five citizens will experience a mental illness.

It is also a known fact that depression is the major risk factor for suicide. But, in spite of the fact that the potential for successful treatment of many mental disorders does exist, only 20 percent of those Americans with diagnosable mental illnesses actually receive help.

Mental illness does not just affect adult Americans. Anywhere from 10 to 20 percent of our children and adolescents suffer from mental disorders. Among our 18- to 20-year-olds, such disorders double the risk of future substance abuse and dependence. These young people go untreated for years.

We fix broken bones. But, when it comes to fixing broken minds, the best we can do is to stigmatize psychological or psychiatric treatment. There is across-the-board discrimination against those with mental disorders. For example, the vast majority of employers limit the annual payout for office visits for behavioral care to about \$2,000. And employees must pay a larger share—up to 50 percent—for behavioral care than they do for other medical services.

However, if we seriously focus on becoming more aware of the nature of mental illnesses, we should soon reach the point where we see mental illness in pretty much the same way we see any other illness. If we are able to kill the stigmatization, we will be able to move toward substantial, sustained funding for increased research that will in turn allow us to provide Americans with the quality and quantity of services they deserve. We can progress to the point where we diagnose early and offer appropriate treatment to end the unnecessary suffering that inadequate treatment causes. We can help those who are afflicted become healthy, productive, functional citizens.

Again, I wholeheartedly support Mental Health Awareness Week and applaud my colleagues, Representatives KOPETSKI, MACHTLEY, and WISE, for their efforts toward contributing to increasing our comprehension and understanding of mental health issues.

RADIO BROADCASTING TO ASIA

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, I have been involved in an effort to establish a much needed surrogate radio service for Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam. The bill that we are considering here today, H.R. 1415, contains a provision to establish an 11-member independent Commission to study the feasibility of instituting a new United States broadcast service to the People's Republic of China and the other Communist countries in Asia.

The Commission's expanded mandate to include the other Communist countries in Asia, came about as the result of an amendment that was offered during the recent House-Senate conference. As the amendment was offered by a cosponsor of my Radio Free Asia legislation, it is clear to me that Cambodia, Laos, North Korea, and Vietnam are synonymous with the phrase "other Communist countries in Asia."

One country that conceivably could slip through the cracks, due to conflicting interpretations of its political status, is Burma. In its annual U.S. and Asia Statistical Handbook, the Heritage Foundation defines the political structure of Burma as a military dictatorship. While this is a technically correct definition, I reject the notion that this closed society, where the democracy movement was ruthlessly hijacked at gunpoint, should be excluded from consideration as we perform a comprehensive evaluation of our broadcasting into Asia. It is my hope that the Commission gives due consideration to the inclusion of Burma in the list of countries to be considered for additional broadcasting.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EWING (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) until 3 p.m. today, on account of congressional business.

Mr. HASTERT (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of congressional business.

Mr. BILIRAKIS (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. POSHARD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and October 9, on account of official business.

Mrs. LLOYD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. CHANDLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes each day, on October 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, and 31, and November 1.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. HAYES of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today and on October 9.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 60 minutes, on October 10.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, for 60 minutes, on October 10.

Mrs. MINK, for 60 minutes, on October 10.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 60 minutes each day, on October 9, 10, 15, 16, and 17.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. PACKARD in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.

Mr. GOSS.

Mr. HYDE.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. RIDGE.

Mr. FIELDS.
Mr. MCEWEN.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. GREEN of New York.
Mr. ARMEY.
Mr. SHAW.
Mr. LIVINGSTON.
Mr. KYL.

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

Mr. CLEMENT.
Mr. LANTOS in two instances.
Mr. SWETT.
Mr. BONIOR in two instances.
Mr. DARDEN in two instances.
Mr. BORSKI.
Mr. SKELTON.
Mr. PEASE.
Mr. WISE.
Mr. LAROCCO in two instances.
Mr. STARK in six instances.
Mr. VENTO.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Mr. MRAZEK.
Mr. MILLER of California.
Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
Mr. RAY in two instances.
Mr. ROYBAL.
Mr. LAFALCE.
Mr. MFUME.
Mr. SOLARZ.
Mr. TOWNS in 10 instances.
Mr. GUARINI.
Mr. REED.
Mr. MATSUI.
Mr. MAVROULES.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2387. An act to authorize appropriations for certain programs for the conservation of striped bass.

H.R. 3259. An act to authorize appropriations for drug abuse education and prevention programs relating to youth gangs and to runaway and homeless youth; and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 189. Joint resolution designating October 8, 1991, as "National Firefighters Day."

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1773. An act to extend until October 18, 1991, the legislative reinstatement of the power of Indian tribes to exercise criminal jurisdiction over Indians.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 9, 1991, at 12 noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose or evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 102d Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ED PASTOR, Second District Arizona.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2185. Under clause 2 of rule XXII, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his notification of his declaration of a national emergency with respect to Haiti, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq., 50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq., and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code (H. Doc. No. 102-147); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

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. GONZALEZ: Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. H.R. 3300. A bill to enhance the financial safety and soundness of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation; with an amendment (Rept. 102-210, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 240. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2369, a bill to establish the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument (Rept. No. 102-245). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FROST: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 241. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1470, a bill to establish evidentiary standards for Federal civil antitrust claims based on resale price fixing

(Rept. 102-246). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2369. A bill to establish the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument; with an amendment (Rept. 102-244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1489, a bill to increase the safety to humans and the environment from the transportation by pipeline of natural gas and hazardous liquids, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-247, 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. BROOMFIELD (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS, AND MR. LENT):

H.R. 3512. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to dispose of certain vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of California: H.R. 3513. A bill to extend most-favored-nation treatment to the products of Armenia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRANE: H.R. 3514. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a maximum long-term capital gains rate of 15 percent and indexing of certain capital assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. BRYANT):

H.R. 3515. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to encourage competition in the provision of electronic information services, to foster the continued diversity of information sources and services, to preserve the universal availability of basic telecommunications services, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. HOLLOWAY):

H.R. 3516. A bill to award grants to States to promote the development of alternative dispute resolution systems for medical malpractice claims, to generate knowledge about such systems through expert data gathering and assessment activities, to promote uniformity and to curb excesses in State liability systems through Federally-mandated liability reforms, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 3517. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to assist the development of small business concerns owned and controlled by

women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SWETT, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 3518. A bill to restrict United States assistance for Serbia or any part of Yugoslavia controlled by Serbia until certain conditions are met, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Ways and Means, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MCDADE (for himself, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. WELDON, Mr. Shuster, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. CLINGER):

H.R. 3519. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Steamtown National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah: H.R. 3520. A bill to improve the management of the public lands by revising the program administered by the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior providing certain payments to units of local governments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3521. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of medical waste except in limited circumstances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PORTER: H.R. 3522. A bill to establish the policy of the United States with respect to Hong Kong after June 30, 1997, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIDGE: H.R. 3523. A bill to provide for the protection and preservation of wetlands property held by the Resolution Trust Corporation; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ROWLAND (for himself and Mr. DARDEN):

H.R. 3524. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the use of forfeited real property as public areas reserved for recreational or historic purposes or for the preservation of natural conditions; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER: H.R. 3525. A bill to apply the expanded definition of disposable retired pay used for computation of the maximum amount of a former spouse's share of military retired pay to divorces that become final before the effective date of amendments made by Public Law 101-510 as well as those after that date; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. HORN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mrs. LLOYD, Mrs. MINK, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OAKAR, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BEILINSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DEFALIZO, Mr.

DELLUMS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. REED, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. WYDEN):

H.R. 3526. A bill to ensure economic equity for American women and their families and to respond to the need to revitalize the American economy by expanding employment opportunities; improving access to funds for women business owners; enhancing economic justice for women through pay equity, improved child support enforcement, and benefits for part-time workers; and providing economic and retirement security for women as workers and as divorced or surviving spouses; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Ways and Means, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Small Business, the Judiciary, House Administration, Post Office and Civil Service, and Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 3527. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to restrict exports of nuclear weapons-usable highly enriched uranium; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SLATTERY (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 3528. A bill to establish a program of marriage and family counseling for certain veterans of the Persian Gulf war and the spouses and families of such veterans; jointly, to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Armed Services.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 3529. A bill to establish a commission to study the research needs of the United States that can be performed by the Department of Energy National Weapons Laboratories; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Armed Services.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 3530. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to eliminate the division of discretionary appropriations into three categories for purposes of a discretionary spending limit for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. PASTOR (for himself, Mr. KOLBE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE):

H.J. Res. 345. Joint resolution to designate October 15, 1991, as "Up With People Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEJDENSON:

H. Con. Res. 216. Concurrent resolution concerning the use of forced labor in Chinese prisons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GINGRICH:

H. Res. 239. Resolution raising a question of the privilege of the House; laid on the table.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H. Res. 242. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1367) to provide a program of Federal supplemental com-

pensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 127: Mr. DURBIN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, and Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 134: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.R. 193: Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 303: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 304: Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 608: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 609: Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.R. 784: Mr. DARDEN, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. KYL.

H.R. 793: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RITTER, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 961: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1067: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. LONG, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1130: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1135: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1239: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. COX of Illinois, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1245: Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 1259: Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 1304: Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 1414: Mr. HOAGLAND and Ms. HORN.

H.R. 1430: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1472: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1473: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 1523: Mr. RHODES and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1527: Mr. WELDON, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1546: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 1547: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 1566: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1707: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1753: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1774: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1860: Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 1992: Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2070: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 2092: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2106: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 2115: Mr. ASPIN.

H.R. 2174: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2215: Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WASHINGTON, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 2248: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 2333: Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 2336: Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 2355: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 2361: Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 2369: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 2440: Mr. FROST and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 2441: Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 2463: Mr. WILSON, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 2534: Mr. SYNAR, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. IRELAND, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. HEFNER.

H.R. 2559: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 2632: Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 2651: Mr. NAGLE and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 2755: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. REED, and Mr. GREEN of New York.

H.R. 2763: Mr. SMITH of Oregon and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2806: Mr. PORTER, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. CONNIT, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 2819: Mr. DAVIS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 2890: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. DE LUOGO, and Mrs. BYRON.

H.R. 2898: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 2906: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2922: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MOODY, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 3070: Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. WEBER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. YATRON, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. INHOPE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. BELENSON, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. CONNIT, Mr. MAVROULES, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MCEWEN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DE LUOGO, Mr. KYL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. EWING, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GRANDY, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 3081: Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 3128: Mr. HORTON and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 3129: Mr. AU COIN.

H.R. 3141: Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 3142: Mr. BEVILL and Mr. BREWSTER.

H.R. 3150: Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 3160: Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KOLTER, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. REED, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VENTO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.R. 3164: Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 3193: Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.R. 3209: Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 3221: Mr. HOLLOWAY Mr. ROTH, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

H.R. 3236: Mr. STUDDS.
 H.R. 3354: Mr. EVANS and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.
 H.R. 3373: Mr. MFUME, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ROE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.
 H.R. 3401: Mr. SIKORSKI.
 H.R. 3402: Mr. SIKORSKI.
 H.R. 3407: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. FISH, and Mr. DONNELLY.
 H.R. 3438: Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 3441: Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 3473: Mr. TORRES, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ROE, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H.R. 3491: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
 H.J. Res. 123: Mr. BROWDER, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. REGULA.
 H.J. Res. 175: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CARR, Mrs. VUCANOVICh, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WISE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. APLEGATE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. GEREN of Texas, and Mr. BROWDER.
 H.J. Res. 198: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BACCHUS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WELDON, Mr. SKAGGS, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. FISH, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. LONG, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARR, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. GEKAS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. IRELAND, Mr.

McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BROWDER, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.J. Res. 261: Mr. BARNARD, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.
 H.J. Res. 299: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MINETA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.J. Res. 324: Mr. PURSELL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. PETRI, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. McDADE, and Mr. SLATTERY.
 H.J. Res. 326: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. SHARP, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. SAXTON.
 H.J. Res. 328: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. RITTER, Mr. APLEGATE, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. TORRES, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Con. Res. 8: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mr. HUBBARD.
 H. Con. Res. 43: Mr. CONYERS.
 H. Con. Res. 156: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEFazio, and Mrs. KENNELLY.
 H. Con. Res. 166: Mr. NAGLE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. KOPETSKI.
 H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H. Con. Res. 192: Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HOAGLAND, and Mr. ROBERTS.
 H. Res. 107: Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.
 H. Res. 116: Mr. PENNY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Ms. NORTON.
 H. Res. 152: Mr. EWING.
 H. Res. 173: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
 H. Res. 205: Mr. PRICE.
 H. Res. 234: Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KYL, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. ENGEL.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 1330: Mr. ANNUNZIO.