

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 15, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

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

As You have made available to us, O God, the wonderful gifts of life, so we pray that we will be receptive to the gifts of tolerance and civility in our relations with each other. We know how we hold to our ideas and beliefs and we cling to our own attitudes and when others do not understand, we do not understand. Whatever our situations, gracious God, whatever our programs, may we hold high the gifts of tolerance and civility toward people from every place. Forgive our rush to judgment, release us from our impatience, and inability to hear clearly other people, and show us Your higher vision of truth that binds us together as one people. Bless us this day and every day. 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 Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JACOBS 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 agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1193) "An Act to make technical amendments to various Indian laws" with an amendment.

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

S. 291. An act to settle certain water rights claims of the San Carlos Apache Tribe.

CONGRESS MUST OVERRIDE VETO OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the Thomas hearings, the President did it, he quietly vetoed the Democratic unemployment bill which would have extended benefits for 9 million out-of-work Americans.

Until these people find new jobs, they need to be able to feed their families and keep a roof over their heads—the money is there in the unemployment compensation fund waiting to help them do so. They paid it in. In fact, the money came out of their paychecks and from their employers.

But the President just vetoed the Democratic unemployment bill.

He says he will only sign Dole's Republican unemployment bill. He says the Republican bill would reach the same number of people as the Democratic bill but with lower benefit levels. That is just not true?

Mr. Speaker, in my home State of Florida, the Republican bill will help 65,346 fewer people than the Democratic bill. That's hardly the same number.

Nationwide, the Democratic unemployment bill will help almost 5 times the number of people as the Republican bill, Americans who need and deserve help.

The battery, Mr. Speaker, must have run out in the President's calculator.

It's well past time to get Americans the help they need—sadly, the President is unable to admit that the recession is still very much with us and he refused to sign the bill.

Well, if the President won't come to the aid of Americans, if the President is too busy doing other things, Mr. Speaker, especially, trying to get one American a job instead of the other 5 million, Congress will just have to do it alone. We must override the veto.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1028

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor from the bill, H.R. 1028.

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

There was no objection.

AGENDA GAP IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we are told repeatedly by the Democrat Party that the President has no domestic agenda. This myth has become such an article of faith among Democrats that many of them have come to believe it.

Since they have so little to believe in these days, we can understand why they desperately cling to this fantasy.

But the fact is President Bush has a clearly delineated domestic agenda. Two of the most important parts of that agenda are the highway bill and the crime package, and neither of these have been passed by the House. In short, Democrats in the House keep the President's agenda from deliberation, and then blame him for not having one, a classic case of blaming the victim.

And speaking of victims, Mr. Speaker, the President's crime bill will help the victim instead of the criminal. What is wrong with that, Mr. Speaker?

Why do we have an agenda gap in the House?

EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, while the Nation's attention was focused on the Thomas hearings last week, the President used that diversion to hide his latest veto of the bill providing help for unemployment.

Clarence Thomas' nomination fight will be over at 6 o'clock this evening, but the problems of working Americans will continue. There are still 9 million Americans who cannot find jobs. They need a middle-class tax cut to help the economy to get moving again, and they need help for the unemployed until the economy does begin to pick up, and they need more than the table scraps that the President is talking about.

Fifty years ago Franklin Roosevelt warned about a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference. It is time for the White House to chip away the ice that surrounds it and to bring American workers back in from the cold.

□ 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.

THE CRIME BILL THAT WAS NOT THERE

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

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following film scenario in the hope some brilliant director might find it of interest:

The plot involves a crime bill that somewhere between the White House and the House of Representatives simply vanishes without a trace.

The President is puzzled.

He asks those who control the House if they have seen his bill.

They become incensed and deny vehemently knowing anything about a crime bill.

Such a claim is quite plausible in their case, so the search for the crime bill continues, but to no avail.

In honor of the lack of serious legislation passed by the House this year, I have titled my scenario, "The Year of Legislating Aimlessly."

Mr. Speaker, we have the lights. We have the camera. Let us see a little action on the crime bill.

RESOLUTION COMMENDING AUNG SAN SUU KYI ON HER RECEIVING THE 1991 NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

(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, yesterday the Nobel Peace Prize Committee announced that the 1991 Peace Prize will be awarded to Aung San Suu Kyi, the leader of the democratic opposition to the repressive, authoritarian military Government of Burma which has dominated that country for decades.

This woman of extraordinary courage, however, will not be able to travel to Stockholm to receive this prestigious award this December. For some 2 years, she has been under house arrest, incommunicado. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is possible that she does not yet know that she has been named for this high honor.

Today with my distinguished Republican colleague from Illinois, Mr. JOHN PORTER, the cochair with me of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, I am introducing a resolution commending Aung San Suu Kyi on receiving the 1991 Nobel Peace Prize and requesting that the Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the Senate invite her to address a joint meeting of the Congress. Her voice in defense of freedom and human rights may not yet be heard in her native land of Burma, but it is heard here in the Congress and it will be heard around the world.

□ 1210

THE OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL ACT

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today to express strong support for several provisions contained in H.R. 3371, the Omnibus Crime Control Act to be considered by this body this week.

H.R. 3371 contains provisions increasing the mandatory minimum penalty for distributing drugs in drug-free zones—such as near a school or playground—from 1 to 3 years for a first offense. For a second offense, the measure increases the mandatory minimum sentence from 3 to 5 years.

Further, the bill triples the penalty for distributing or manufacturing drugs in or near public housing—making public housing a drug free-zone.

The bill combats street gangs by imposing additional penalties of up to 10 years—on top of the sentence for the actual crime—when a gang member commits certain Federal offenses such as a drug felony, if the crime was committed as a member of, on behalf of, or in association with a criminal street gang, and if the gang member has one or more specified Federal or State convictions within the past 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, these measures are laudable and absolutely necessary efforts to protect our youth, make our streets and homes safer, and combat the rising violence of gangs in our cities. This Member strongly supports these provisions and encourages his colleagues to do the same. We in Congress should do our part to make these provisions a matter of law so that they will be enforced across our Nation.

GOOD ADVICE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the whole country knows that one of the two is lying.

Professor Hill has passed a lie detector test given by a former FBI specialist in polygraphs which are given by the FBI regularly.

Our President advises Judge Thomas that it would be "stupid" for him to take a lie detector test. I think that is good advice. It is what I would tell Judge Thomas at this point if I were his lawyer.

INCLUDE GOOD-FAITH EXCEPTION TO EXCLUSIONARY RULE

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I was very disappointed to hear that the House will not be considering the crime bill which was originally scheduled for today, and I certainly hope that we will take it up as soon as possible.

With crime on the streets rampant as it is, we need to move on this issue.

Just one of the measures that should be included in the crime bill is the good-faith exception to the exclusionary rule. When the U.S. Supreme Court imposed the exclusionary rule of evidence on the States, it said that evidence proving guilt could be excluded from the trial in order to deter police agencies from utterly and deliberately ignoring the fourth amendment to the U.S. Constitution, but it makes no sense to exclude evidence which is seized as the result of a good-faith honest mistake about the exclusionary rule.

Mr. Speaker, I was the district attorney of the Albuquerque area for 8 years, from 1981 through 1989, and during that period of time, the Federal court decisions were changing so rapidly as to when an automobile could be searched on a highway that we had trouble advising our police agencies as to what was legal and what was illegal.

Under those circumstances, it makes no sense at all to give a criminal defendant the bonanza of excluding the evidence which might be found to prove their guilt.

TELL IRS THEY HAVE BURDEN OF PROOF

(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, I never heard so many politicians say that Judge Thomas should get the benefit of the doubt, because in America you are innocent until proven guilty.

Now, I agree with that, but the hypocrisy is an American taxpayer is guilty and must prove themselves innocent. Where are all the politicians on this grave and most important constitutional issue? The politicians are hiding.

Are they afraid of the IRS? Taxpayers are going to tax courts being railroaded and must prove their innocence.

I think it is time for the politicians to stand up for the Constitution, tell the IRS they have the burden of proof, and if you accuse an American taxpayer, you have the burden of proof of coming in and proving that case.

I think it is time that everybody is treated the same in this country.

OUR CONSTITUENTS WANT A TOUGH CRIME BILL

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, the President challenged Congress to enact a tough crime bill; 223 days later, the Democratic leadership is finally bringing a crime bill to the floor.

However, the Democrat bill should be called a Criminal Protection Act rather than the Crime Control Act.

I am glad the Democrats finally recognized the need to pass a crime bill, but their version is not strong enough to put a stop to the needless violence that occurs in our country every day. In the United States, someone is murdered every 24 minutes, a woman is raped every 6 minutes, someone is robbed every 55 seconds, and someone is assaulted every 33 seconds. Our citizens are crying out for us in the Congress to help them. Key provisions of the President's crime bill were already passed by considerable margins last Congress such as restoration of the death penalty, habeas corpus revisions, and exclusionary rule reform.

Mr. Speaker, this is the bill we should be considering today, not the Democrat version, which protects criminals rather than victims.

I hope that when we consider some of the amendments to the Democrat bill we will show the citizens of this country that we are concerned about their welfare. We need to pass the amendments that will convert the Democrat bill into a tough and comprehensive crime control bill.

It is time to do something our constituents want, pass a tough crime bill.

IRS AGAIN FIXING SOMETHING NOT BROKEN

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

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, IRS has once again found a way to fix something that is not broken. This time it is imposing ridiculous red tape on family child-care providers, the backbone of this country's child-care system.

The IRS wants detailed time logs, detailing where each child spends his or her time in the house right down to the last minute. Without those records, family child-care providers will not be able to deduct a percentage of their household expenses on their taxes.

No widespread abuse has forced the IRS change. It just seemed like a good idea to those geniuses down at the IRS. In fact, if the IRS has its way, many family child-care providers could be forced out of business.

So in Oregon, 31,000 family child-care providers face a choice today: Do they spend their time with timepieces keep-

ing meaningless records on how often a child has milk and cookies in the kitchen, or do they spend their time taking care of the kids they are supposed to be taking care of?

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to end this nonsense. I think the IRS ought to be cracking down on tax frauds and letting family child-care providers take care of our children and prepare them for their future.

I hope the House will enact this legislation.

DEMOCRATS' CRIMINAL PROTECTION ACT IS A TRAVESTY OF JUSTICE

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, while the President's crime bill lies buried in the bowels of the Capitol, I suppose never to see the light of the day, our Democrat colleagues have crafted a completely unworkable alternative which might better be called a Criminal Protection Act.

Knowing that the American people, exposed daily to an epidemic of violent crime, are demanding a strong response from their elected leaders, the liberal Democratic leadership in this body has instead readied a bill which should be entitled the "Criminal Protection Act."

Twenty-three thousand American lives were snuffed out by criminals last year. How have the Democrats responded? Have they sought deterrents? Have they considered the plight of the long list of victims which grows larger with each passing day? No, they have not.

Mr. Speaker, criminals will love the Democrat bill. The American Civil Liberties Union will probably support it. But I can assure you, the American people, when they listen to the forthcoming debate on this ill-advised legislation, will be mighty upset.

Let us reject this bill. Let us toss it on the trash heap. And let us finally bring the President's crime bill to the floor.

DO NOT LIMIT POLICE AND MILITARY WEAPONS

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to inform my colleagues that I will be offering amendments striking the bans on the so-called assault weapons and magazines with a capacity of more than seven rounds when we debate the crime bill this week. Members should be aware that the language in the crime bill dealing with firearms goes further than any antigun legislation ever has. Members should be aware

that the restriction on magazines to seven or less rounds applies to police and military personnel as well as to all citizens. Can you imagine what affect this will have? The supporters of this language want to limit our police and military to seven rounds or less. It appears if this legislation stands the only people with more firepower than seven rounds will be the criminals, who will not be affected by any gun laws we pass anyway. Members should also be aware that this magazine restriction will have a very dramatic effect on guns that are not on the list of so called assault weapons. The old M-1's used in World War II, most semiautomatic pistols and many more rifles will be affected. My colleagues, you must recognize that most of those in support of the language in this bill want to take all guns away, not just a few, and now they even want to limit our military and police.

□ 1220

REGULATORS ARE STRANGLING SMALL BUSINESS BORROWING

(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, small businesses must have access to credit in order to create the permanent jobs that our Nation's unemployed so badly need. And yet, in many parts of the country today, that credit is simply not available.

The Federal Reserve keeps lowering the discount rate, but money is still not available to smaller firms. Mr. Speaker, interest rates are not the only problem. Federal regulators whose primary concern is their own job security are the problem.

They are intent on taking the risk out of the banking business and any good banker knows that this just can not be done.

Perfectly viable businesses are going under for lack of credit because regulators are making it virtually impossible for banks to lend them money. This is crazy.

Maybe it is time for Congress to make clear to the regulators that we will not sit quietly by while they bring small-business lending to a grinding halt.

As we move toward consideration of banking reform legislation, I would urge my colleagues to remember: It is easy to say that you are all for small business. But it is how you vote that really counts.

THE PROPOSED BAN ON ASSAULT WEAPONS

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, today is Law Enforcement Memorial Day. As I speak the names of more than 12,000 slain police officers are being read at the new Law Officers Memorial at Judiciary Square. President Bush will be there later to pay tribute to fallen officers.

We can do our part to make sure that no other names are added to that memorial by voting for the assault weapons ban in the crime bill. It will save lives and it will help stop crime.

Assault weapons account for one-half of 1 percent of all guns but are used in 10 percent of all crimes. They are 35 times more likely to be used in killings. Why? Because they are weapons of war, made expressly for the efficient killing of human beings. Their accessories such as silencers, large magazines, and mounts for bayonets and grenade launchers are of no use to hunters.

Police officers support this legislation because they know assault weapons are people-killing machines. When the vote on assault weapons comes, stand up and be counted for saving lives.

ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE

(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, we can all recite the Nation's health care statistics in our sleep: 37 million Americans, half of whom are unemployed, now remain uninsured. Almost \$700 billion in annual costs, approaching 13 percent of our GNP. Daily individuals are dropped from coverage they have counted on for their entire lives. Increasing numbers of people need medical safety nets, but insurance risk pools all over the country are going bankrupt. Our goal is equal access to affordable health care for all Americans. But before we demand that businesses pay or play, we should examine the consequences of mandates—we will end up doing more harm than good. Will people lose jobs and be denied employment? I think there is a good chance that is so. Instead, why not focus on developing basic, low-cost health plans, exempt from burdensome State mandates, that can be made available to all small businesses. Why not place more emphasis on managed care and cost sharing that can be utilized to promote responsible treatment decisions? Why not level the playing field for the self-employed. There are alternatives, Mr. Speaker. Let us use them. There can be no sell-out of Americans' health.

WHERE, OH WHERE, DID THE CHILD CARE BILL GO?

(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, where, oh where, did the child care bill go?

Remember that child care bill that the House and the Senate finally passed after 18 years of not having one passed, that we were all so proud of last year, and every single State was crying out for it?

Remember how we decided it would be a joint partnership with the House and the Senate, and then we would have the State and local officials get the money, that basically we were not going to create a whole new bureaucracy in Washington? We wanted it all to go to child care.

Well, check with your States. I bet they have not seen a dime, and that is because the administration is trying to gut it. They are trying to gut it by saying no money goes to any State that has any regulations dealing with child care. If your State tries to get a criminal background check on child care regulators, the Federal Government will not send you the money, because they say that might interfere with parental choice. Parents may want to send their children to criminals for day care.

This is an outrage. I hope everybody who voted for child care and told their States the money was coming gets on the administration and finds out what happened and tell them, yes, we want parental choice, but we want it to be safe and we want it to be wholesome and we want child development to be included in the package.

THE DEFICIT CONTINUES TO SKYROCKET

(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 first anniversary of the 1990 budget summit agreement is just 22 days away. According to the latest projections, this year's deficit will be over \$425 billion.

When fiscal year 1991 closed on September 30, the deficit was \$60 billion higher than last year. American taxpayers should be aware that they have been duped once again. Not only were they stuck with \$165 billion in new taxes, but they also got higher spending, and a higher deficit. Last year's deal has turned sour, especially for the taxpayers.

The latest figures show that the deficit for 1991-95 will be over \$500 billion higher than promised last September. Maybe this is because Government spending continues to outpace both

revenues and inflation. In the last 10 years, our revenues grew 78 percent, but spending levels doubled. Clearly, the deficit cannot be reduced if spending is allowed to out run the growth in revenues and inflation.

It is time to cut spending and reduce the deficit.

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE AWARD TO AUNG SAN SUU KYI OF BURMA

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, today, with the news of the Nobel Peace Prize award to Aung San Suu Kyi, the world's human rights focus turns to Burma.

That nation is ruled by a brutal military dictatorship which rejects the mandate of the democratic elections of 1990.

The winner of that election was Aung San Suu Kyi. She is the rightful leader of her nation.

But Aung San Suu Kyi won more than an election. She won an honored place in the roll of those whose courage and devotion to principle inspire all of us.

In her own words:

It is not power that corrupts, but fear. Fear of losing power corrupts those who wield it, and fear of the scourge of power corrupts those who are subject to it.

These words take on special meaning when we remember that this courageous woman remains imprisoned by one of the world's nastiest surviving dictatorships.

Aung San Suu Kyi's Nobel Prize should—and surely will—focus world attention on concerns for her personal safety, the safety of her followers, and the triumph of democracy in Burma that is sure to come.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 194

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Resolution 194.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MAZZOLI]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL PORNOGRAPHIC VICTIMS AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a joint commemorative resolution which addresses the problem of pornography in our Nation.

Pornography has been found by an overwhelming majority of researchers to be a major element in the countless violent sexual crimes that take place annually. By declaring October 27 through November 2, 1991 "National Pornography Victims Awareness Week," Congress can aid in supporting the victims of such crimes and increase awareness of the pornography's ill effects on society.

The presence of pornography in our society seems to extoll the appearance that violent sexual crime is justifiable. The FBI conducted a study in 1988 which found that 81 percent of violent sexual offenders regularly used violent pornography. The FBI also reported that of 1,400 cases of child molestation, 100 percent of the offenders possessed pornographic videos, magazines, and other such debasing materials.

This is a great opportunity to bring to the attention of all Americans that far-reaching consequences pornography has on society. We must take action to ensure this unneeded violence is brought to an abrupt end. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting "National Pornographic Victims Awareness Week."

□ 1230

REDLINING

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, for years the country's bankers have denied reports that they discriminate against minorities, against the poor, and against women. So a couple of years ago we enacted legislation which I authored to get to the truth.

The results are about to be released, and they are extremely troubling. Data collected from banks themselves now shows that minorities are 2 to 4 times more likely to be rejected for a mortgage loan than whites of the same income. So, for no reason other than the color of their skin, millions of Americans are shut out of our country's system of credit every day.

And where are our Nation's bank regulators in the face of this lending discrimination? Are they voicing their determination to put it to an end? Hardly. Instead of telling bankers to shape up, regulators are giving bankers a heads up on how to put the best spin on this damning data. The Fed told the bankers in an off-the-record briefing they had better get ready for some bad publicity. With a wink and a nod, they are sending a signal to bankers that redlining will not be vigorously opposed by the Bush administration.

Mr. Speaker, if a family cannot get credit, then it has no hope of moving up from poverty. It's time to stop once and for all the evil of redlining. If the

President can spend millions to export the promise of capitalism to the four corners of the world, then surely he can do more to see that it reaches the neglected corners of our own country.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MOTION TO INSTRUCT TO H.R. 2686

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, according to House rule 28, clause 1, as amended on January 3, 1989, in the 101st Congress, I serve notice to the House that tomorrow, October 16, I will offer a privileged motion to instruct conferees to H.R. 2686, the Interior appropriations for fiscal year 1992, that: the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 2686, be instructed to agree to the provisions contained in amendment numbered 212 of the Senate amendments.

This time the House will have an opportunity of voting up or down whether or not we are going to clean up what the NEA can do with taxpayers' money; no deflection by way of a motion to defeat the previous question, so we will have an opportunity to vote up or down.

TRIBUTE TO OLDEST FORMER MEMBER, VICTOR CHRISTGAU

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

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, the oldest former Member of the House of Representatives, Victor Laurence August Christgau, died last Thursday at George Washington Hospital. He was 97 years old.

Mr. Christgau was first elected in 1929 and served two terms before being defeated in 1932. He represented the First District in southeastern Minnesota, the district that I now represent.

Victor was swept from office the same year that Franklin Delano Roosevelt was swept into the White House.

Representative Christgau was a Republican, yet he went on to serve as the Minnesota State administrator of the works progress administration, a New Deal program. Later Victor capped his career as executive director of the Social Security Administration, another New Deal program. In a recent newspaper interview Christgau said, "I was Republican, but I was quite independent." He certainly demonstrated that throughout his career.

Victor was an outstanding public servant. He was a credit to this House, and he was a credit to the State of Minnesota.

MANAGED CARE—PART OF THE SOLUTION

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

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, many have said that managed care is not the answer for reforming the health care system—and I agree. But managed care is part of the solution. It has been at the forefront in developing wellness programs including pre-natal and well-baby care, encouraging annual physical exams and cancer screening, and CPR and smoking cessation programs. It means the delivery of proper care at the proper time in the proper setting at the proper price.

I want to focus on one area very important to me—well-baby care. The Institute of Medicine has indicated that for each \$1 spent on providing prenatal care to low-income, poorly educated women, there is a savings of \$3.38 for their infant medical care in the first year of life. That's just the first year of life. The health care savings throughout childhood and adulthood can be enormous. From a public policy perspective, these savings are imperative if we are to control the cost of healthcare in America.

But I support managed care—not just because it's economically prudent to do so—but because it means better care for the patient. Managed care delivers holistic, continuous, and coordinated care to children and their families. Because a vital relationship between the patient and his/her primary care physician is developed.

By encouraging managed care, we can improve the quality of care, reduce its cost, and I urge you to review my bill, H.R. 1565, and support positive change.

OUR ALLIES SHOULD BE MADE TO PAY THEIR FAIR SHARE OF NATO COSTS

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, once again I come to the well asking that the administration begin to do with our NATO allies what they did in Desert Storm. If it made sense for the Germans and the Japanese and the countries of the gulf region to help finance our military activity during the gulf war, then it makes sense that 50 years after the end of World War II our wealthy German, English, and other European allies pay for the cost of NATO. American taxpayers are kicking in to the tune of \$140 billion to subsidize their defense while we cannot afford an adequate unemployment bill, while we cannot afford universal health care. While we cannot afford to let middle-class kids go to college, we can

afford \$140 billion in subsidies for our wealthiest economic competitors.

If the threat is that serious, then they ought to be willing to pay for it. If this administration cares about the deficit and the needs of the American people, then they would go to the Europeans to either put up the money to finance more of NATO or bring those dollars home to finance the needs we have here.

TWO THOUGHTS ON SOCIAL POLICY AND FISCAL POLICY

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, two thoughts this morning, one on social policy and one on fiscal policy.

Mr. Speaker, in 1915, today, 76 years later, J.P. Morgan and a small group of American bankers put together \$500 million to lend to France and England, who were entering the second year of World War I.

Can you imagine a group of American bankers, in now dollars, that would be somewhere between \$7 billion and \$15 billion, depending upon the economists, in now dollars lending \$15 billion to two former giant European powers, private capital to conduct a war?

We cannot get together on whether to loan small countries \$10 billion, just to insure peace.

On social policy, there is a lot of talk about pornography. Pardon me for being a little impolite, but it is not conservative political or educational or judicial or religious philosophy that has saturated this country in pornography; it is liberal philosophy. Liberal philosophy using the great first amendment of our Bill of Rights that he told young people and old alike in this country, pornography may degrade women but it is protected. It is not, and no Supreme Court has ever ruled so.

IT IS TIME TO GET BACK TO TRYING TO HELP AMERICA'S UNEMPLOYED

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

Mr. APPELATE. Mr. Speaker, last week I brought you the comic strip, "Frank and Earnest." Today I want to give you "Eek and Meek."

Eek says to Meek, "Bush's domestic policy advisers can't understand why a healthy guy like you isn't working." Meek says, "Hold it. A healthy guy like me is unemployed; it is Bush's domestic policy that is not working."

Now that the Thomas fiasco is out of the way, or will be very shortly, I think it is time that the Congress get

back to trying to help America's unemployed, 9 million of them, 3 million of whom have run out of benefits. Now the President has sent back an unemployment compensation bill, he has vetoed it with the description that it is garbage.

Well, if we want to do the right thing, we have got to override this insensitivity and we have to help the 3 million people who have run out of benefits because, if we do not help them, they are going to help you to run out of office next year.

□ 1240

THE SO-CALLED VIOLENT CRIME PREVENTION ACT

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, last year this body overwhelmingly passed strong law enforcement legislation. It included habeas corpus reform, expansion of the Federal death penalty, a good faith exception to the exclusionary rule, and mandatory victims' restitution. The other body approved corresponding provisions; yet somehow, these measures were scuttled in conference committee. Every one of them.

When the President sent his crime proposal to Congress this year, it contained many of the provisions in last year's House-passed crime package. You would think that the Judiciary Committee might take that as a good place to start on this year's crime bill. You would be wrong.

The committee bill, the so-called Violent Crime Prevention Act, would actually increase the sort of judicial technicalities that allow guilty criminals to go free time and again. It even overturns a recent Supreme Court decision allowing convictions involving inadmissible statements to stand, so long as the defendant would have been convicted without them. What is worse, the rule allows no amendment to strike this title, just as my amendment to add mandatory victims' restitution was not ruled in order.

I am disappointed in both the bill and the rule for its consideration. Hopefully, on the House floor and in conference, the Judiciary Committee's impotent crime bill will be transformed into something resembling what the President requested. But don't bet your life on it.

ONE OF OUR MOST CHERISHED RIGHTS—TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

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

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, on December 15, 1791, this country ratified

a copy of this beautiful document, which was known as our bill of rights. This document symbolized many rights that were given to the American people. But probably one of the most cherished rights is a right that we were scheduled to debate today, and that is the right for the people to keep and bear arms.

Mr. Speaker, in that document it says that the people have the right to keep and bear arms and it shall not be infringed.

Now I challenge my colleagues that, before we debate the crime bill, that we stop and look at what that beautiful document represents, and I say that the people of this country should continue to maintain that right to bear arms and to protect their homes and their families.

SAN SUU KYI—THIS YEAR'S NOBEL PEACE PRIZE RECIPIENT

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Nobel Prize Committee for awarding San Suu Kyi this year's Nobel Peace Prize. San Suu Kyi is the leader of the Burmese people.

Mr. Speaker, there is a regime in Burma that claims that they are the legitimate government in Burma, which they now call Myanmar, but in reality it is San Suu Kyi, this brave woman who has stood heroically against the brutality and repression of one of the truly most brutal regimes in the world, most repressive and dictatorial regimes in the world. This woman deserves the Nobel Peace Prize, and I think the Nobel Prize Committee should receive our warm appreciation for selecting her because it will draw the attention of the world to this dictatorship, to this pariah regime which should be isolated from the rest of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, let us know, and let me close today by saying, that the nomination of San Suu Kyi as being a Nobel Prize winner should draw our attention to this country and should give the message to the Burmese people that they are not alone, and that they are remembered, and that we appreciate and applaud the heroic resistance to tyranny going on in Burma by San Suu Kyi and the people of Burma.

DEMOCRATS MORE CONCERNED WITH CHARACTER ASSASSINATION THAN GETTING BILLS PASSED

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a number of speeches from the Democrats today about the unemployment bill that was vetoed the other day by the President, and they made a couple of claims which I think ought to be backed by some facts rather than the kinds of things that we heard on the House floor today.

First of all, they accused the President of vetoing the unemployment bill during the Clarence Thomas hearings because that was an attempt by him to bury the issue. Nothing could be further from the truth. The reason why the President did that was because that is when he got the bill. The Democrats held the bill in the Senate for several days in order to make the political issue that they wanted to make, and then they criticized the President when he almost immediately takes his action when it comes down. A number of us recommended that to the President because we think the promise ought to move forward, hopefully toward a bill that will actually be signable, and we will actually get checks to the unemployed rather than playing politics with the issue.

We also have the claim on the floor today that the President referred to unemployment benefits as garbage. We have pointed out over and over again the speech to which the people refer, that there is no such reference. It seems as though the Democrats are more concerned these days with character assassination than they are with actually getting work done and getting bills passed that help Americans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, 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 at the end of legislative business today.

CLEAN VESSEL ACT OF 1991

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1297) to amend the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act to authorize the use by coastal States of apportionments under that act for construction, renovation, and maintenance of shoreside pumpout stations for marine sanitation devices, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1297

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 "Clean Vessel Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The discharge of untreated sewage by vessels is prohibited under Federal law in all areas within the navigable waters of the United States.

(2) The discharge of treated sewage by vessels is prohibited under either Federal or State law in many of the United States bodies of water where recreational boaters operate.

(3) There is currently an inadequate number of pumpout stations for marine sanitation devices where recreational vessels normally operate.

(4) Sewage discharged by recreational vessels because of an inadequate number of pumpout stations is a substantial contributor to the degradation of water quality in the United States.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to provide funds to coastal States for the construction, renovation, operation, and maintenance of pumpout stations for marine sanitation devices and facilities to receive wastes from portable toilets.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION AND PLAN REGARDING STATE MARINE SANITATION DEVICE PUMPOUT STATION NEEDS.

(a) SURVEY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each coastal state shall conduct a survey to determine, using guidance issued under section 4(b)(4), whether pumpout stations for marine sanitation devices and facilities to receive waste from portable toilets are adequate and reasonably available to meet recreational vessel needs within the State.

(2) FUNDING.—Amounts made available to a coastal State pursuant to the amendments made by section 4 may be used to conduct a survey under this subsection.

(b) PLAN.—Based on the survey conducted under subsection (a), each coastal State shall—

(1) develop and submit to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency a plan for the construction or renovation of marine sanitation device pumpout stations and facilities to receive wastes from portable toilets, that are adequate and reasonably available to meet recreational vessel needs in the State; and

(2) submit to the Administrator with that plan a list of all such stations and facilities in the State which are operational on the date of submittal.

(c) PLAN APPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after a plan is submitted by a State under subsection (b), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall approve or disapprove the plan, based on—

(A) the adequacy of the survey conducted by the State under subsection (a); and

(B) the ability of the plan to meet the construction and renovation needs identified in the survey.

(2) NOTIFICATION OF STATE; MODIFICATION.—The Administrator shall promptly notify the affected Governor of the approval or disapproval of a plan. If a plan is disapproved, the Administrator shall recommend necessary modifications and return the plan to the affected Governor.

(3) RESUBMITTAL.—Not later than 60 days after receiving a plan returned by the Administrator, the Governor shall make the appropriate changes and resubmit the plan.

(d) INDICATION OF STATIONS AND FACILITIES ON NOAA CHARTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere shall indicate, on charts published by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for the use of operators of recreational vessels, the locations of pumpout stations for marine sanitation devices and facilities to receive waste from portable toilets.

(2) NOTIFICATION OF NOAA.—

(A) LISTS OF STATIONS AND FACILITIES.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall transmit to the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere each list of operational stations and facilities submitted by a State under section 3(b)(2), by not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of that list.

(B) COMPLETION OF PROJECT.—The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall notify the Under Secretary of the location of each station or facility at which a construction or renovation project is completed by a State with amounts made available under section 8(d)(1)(B) of the Act of August 9, 1950 (popularly known as the "Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act"; 16 U.S.C. 777g), as amended by this Act, by not later than 30 days after the date of the completion of the project.

SEC. 4. MARINE SANITATION DEVICE PUMPOUT STATION FUNDING.

(a) FUNDING.—Section 8 of the Act of August 9, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 777g), popularly known as the "Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act", is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) PUMPOUT STATIONS.—

"(1) USE OF FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—For each of the fiscal years 1992 through 1996, each coastal State shall use 5 percent of the amounts apportioned to it under section 4 to pay not more than 75 percent of the costs of—

"(A) conducting the survey and preparing the plan required by section 3 of the Clean Vessel Act of 1991; and

"(B) constructing, renovating, operating, or maintaining pumpout stations for marine sanitation devices and facilities to receive wastes from portable toilets, in accordance with a plan approved under section 3 of the Clean Vessel Act of 1991.

"(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary of the Interior shall, if requested by the Governor of a coastal State, waive or reduce the percentage of the State's apportionment under section 4 that is required to be used in a fiscal year in accordance with paragraph (1) by any amount which is not needed to implement the plan of the state approved under section 3 of the Clean Vessel Act of 1991.

"(3) EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a coastal State may use not more than 20 percent of the amounts required to be used in accordance with that paragraph to conduct a program to educate recreational boaters about the problem of sewage discharges from boats and inform them of the location of pumpout stations for marine sanitation devices.

"(4) REALLOCATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall reallocate any amount that is required to be used in accordance with paragraph (1), or is authorized to be used in accordance with paragraph (3), and which is not expended or obligated by a coastal State within 2 years after it is available for expenditure, among the other coastal States for use in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (3).

"(B) MANNER OF REALLOCATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall carry out reallocations under this paragraph in the

manner described in section 4 for apportioning remaining appropriations.

"(5) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this subsection—

"(A) the term 'coastal State'—

"(i) means a State of the United States in, or bordering on, the Atlantic, Pacific, or Arctic Ocean; the Gulf of Mexico; Long Island Sound; or one or more of the Great Lakes;

"(ii) includes Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa; and

"(iii) does not include a State for which—

"(I) the ratio of the number of recreational vessels in the State numbered under chapter 123 of title 46, United States Code, to number of miles of shoreline (as that term is defined in section 926.2(d) of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on January 1, 1991), is less than one; and

"(II) the Governor certifies to the Secretary of the Interior that the water quality of the State is not significantly affected by sewage discharged from recreational vessels;

"(B) the term 'marine sanitation device' includes any equipment for installation on board a vessel which is designed to receive, retain, treat, or discharge sewage, and any process to treat such sewage; and

"(C) the term 'recreational vessel' means a vessel—

"(i) manufactured for operation, or operated, primarily for pleasure; or

"(ii) leased, rented, or chartered to another for the latter's pleasure."

(b) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall notify in writing the fish and game, water pollution control, and coastal zone management authorities of each coastal State of the availability of the amounts under subsection (d) of section 8 of the Act of August 9, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 777g), as amended by this Act, to finance the construction, renovation, operation, and maintenance of pumpout stations for marine sanitation devices and facilities to receive wastes from portable toilets. The notification shall include—

(1) a description of the availability of amounts in the Sport Fish Restoration Account for those purposes;

(2) a projection of the apportionments to the State under that program for each of the succeeding 5 fiscal years;

(3) guidance regarding the types of pumpout facilities that may be appropriate for construction, renovation, operation, or maintenance with those funds and appropriate location of the facilities within a marina or boatyard;

(4) guidance defining what constitutes adequate and reasonably available pumpout facilities in boating areas;

(5) guidance on appropriate methods for disposal of vessel sewage from pumpout facilities;

(6) guidance on appropriate connector fittings to facilitate the sanitary and expeditious discharge of sewage from vessels;

(7) guidance on the coastal waters most likely to be affected by the discharge of sewage from vessels; and

(8) other information that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency considers necessary to promote the establishment of pumpout facilities to reduce sewage discharges from vessels and to protect coastal waters.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "coastal State" has the meaning that term has in section 8(d)(5)(A) of the Act of August 9, 1950, as amended by this Act; and

(2) the term "recreational vessel" means a vessel—

(A) manufactured for operation, or operated, primarily for pleasure; or

(B) leased, rented, or chartered to another for the latter's pleasure.

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

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Clean Vessel Act is to encourage the construction of sewage pumpout facilities at marinas. The need for the bill stems from the fact that although boaters may leave their worries and troubles behind when they set out to sea, they tend to bring their digestive systems along. Sewage, like death and taxes is inevitable; the question is what to do with it. Dumping it directly into the ocean is—for good reason—illegal. Treating it prior to discharge is legal, but expensive. Bringing it back to shore, where it can receive the treatment it really deserves, is often impossible due to the lack of adequate pumpout facilities.

The effectiveness of Federal regulations governing the operation of what bureaucrats call marine sanitation devices has been undermined by low levels of compliance and enforcement, lack of public awareness, and lack of shoreside pumpout facilities capable of receiving waste. The result is marine pollution that is unsightly, unhealthy, and damaging to local economies. A 1988 study by the Cape Cod Planning and Economic Development Commission found that sewage from marine sanitation devices is a significant source of pollution in Cape Cod Bay and a contributing factor to the closure of shellfish beds and declining water quality.

With adequate pumpout facilities, however, strong action against unsightly and unhealthy pollution can be taken. For example, in response to pollution from pleasure boats, the town of Wareham, MA, recently proposed a ban on septic dumping within its maritime boundaries. The effect of this no-discharge zone will be that all boaters will be required to use sewage pumpout facilities which are available in this community. Without adequate pumpout facilities this no-discharge zone would not be possible.

When writing about the innovative actions taken by the town of Wareham, an editor of the Cape Cod Times asked, "Why hasn't the Federal Government actively encouraged coastal towns to qualify for no-discharge zones?" That

is not only a good question, that is the point of H.R. 1297.

H.R. 1297 strongly encourages the construction of pumpout facilities by requiring that a small portion of the money that States receive from the sport fish restoration account be used to construct pumpout facilities. It requires that these facilities only be constructed in States which don't have enough and it provides States with the funds to inform boaters about the location of pumpout stations.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is strongly supported by the boaters of this country. It will contribute, albeit in a modest way, to the fight against pollution and I urge Members to support it.

The text of the article from the Cape Cod Times is as follows:

WAREHAM SCORES A FIRST

Faced with a pollution problem common to a great many coastal communities—septic waste flushed from pleasure boats' holding tanks straight into the water—Wareham has come up with a solution that should be used wherever the problem exists.

The solution: Beginning next summer, Wareham expects to impose a ban on septic dumping within its boundaries.

Sounds simple, so why isn't it being done everywhere along the coast?

Why, indeed, is it not being done anywhere else.

For one thing, such a ban requires the approval of the federal Environmental Protection Agency. And among the EPA's requirements is that a town have pumping facilities available.

Wareham has 57 miles of coastline and seven septic pumping stations, and during the summer season it also harbors an estimated 1,300 boats. And, perversely, because it's legal to empty the boats' tanks directly into a town's harbor—provided the waste is at least macerated and treated with chlorine—that's what many boaters opt to do. In fact, some boat owners don't even bother with this rudimentary treatment.

If Wareham's plan is approved by the EPA, the town will become the first on the East Coast to impose a "no-discharge zone" that could withstand a challenge in court. A couple of other communities have created these zones on their own, but did so without seeking EPA approval and so technically are without the force of law.

That Wareham thus becomes something of a trend-setter is particularly significant because this is a major town involved in the Buzzards Bay Project, the consortium of communities that has undertaken the considerable task of ridding the bay of a serious pollution problem. Boaters aren't major sources of pollution, but they do contribute.

And if Wareham does win permission for its no-discharge zone, that might jump-start the program in other coastal communities. Which leads us to wonder: Why hasn't the federal government actively encouraged coastal towns that qualify for such zones to create them? Removing any source of seawater pollution is progress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1297, the Clean Vessel Act of 1991. This

bill, introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] authorizes coastal States to spend up to 5 percent of their Wallop-Breaux funds that they receive annually for the construction, renovation, operation, and maintenance of pumpout stations for boat toilets.

I commend the gentleman from North Carolina for moving this bill for it addresses a very real problem in some coastal areas. I am especially pleased that certain changes and modifications were made to the bill, in our committee, to exempt those States that do not have such a need. I am aware of several States who have spent considerable money providing these facilities for their boaters. Michigan is one State that comes to my mind. There are other cases where the tidal action and the exchange of water that it produces negates sewage problems along the coast. I am pleased to see that the bill's definition of "coastal State," does not include my home State of Alaska. It is my understanding, then, that the Alaska Game and Fish Department would not be mandated to spend a certain portion of their Wallop-Breaux funds for these facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I support the adoption of this bill, and ask my colleagues to join me in approving this legislation.

□ 1150

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Alaska insists that Alaska is not a coastal State, we cannot argue. Perhaps the map is deceptive.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1297, the Clean Vessel Act of 1991 proposes to earmark a portion of the money coastal States receive from the sport fish restoration account so that they can build, renovate, and maintain pumpout stations for boat toilets along their coasts.

I introduced H.R. 1297 to address problems in North Carolina with sewage illegally discharged from recreational boats because of a lack of pumpout stations where boaters can properly dispose of their wastes. Since then, I've learned that there are also problems in Chesapeake Bay, Puget Sound, Buzzards Bay, Tampa Bay, and Delaware Bay.

I am sure that there are problems in other parts of the country, but since there has never been a comprehensive national survey, we just don't know. H.R. 1297 will help States find out where problems exist, and make money available to address those problems.

H.R. 1297 directs coastal States to survey to determine their pumpout sta-

tion construction and renovation needs. Using this survey, the State must develop a plan to meet these needs. The EPA must approve the plan, and then the State must use 5 percent of its sport fish restoration account moneys to implement the plan.

The 5-percent set-aside may be waived or reduced if the plan identifies no pumpout construction needs or needs which will require less money. This process will ensure that money is spent only where there are identified problems. The bill also directs the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to indicate the location of pumpout stations on navigational charts. Finally, H.R. 1297 allows States to spend a portion of the set-aside to educate the boating public about the costs and consequences of boat sewage discharges.

I believe that this bill will provide important benefits to everyone who swims or fishes in coastal waters, or who eats shellfish harvested from these waters. I urge all Members to support it.

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

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if a vote were gotten on this bill and it were postponed, when would that vote likely take place?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The vote would take place following legislative business today, and the Chair at this point is unaware of how long legislative business will proceed.

Mr. WALKER. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we would complete the Flint Hills Prairie Monument bill before going to that vote, or would the vote take place before the Flint Hills bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair's understanding is that the vote would take place after the legislation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. WALKER. So, Mr. Speaker, this would come at the end of the legislative day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1297, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Din-

gell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act to authorize the use of coastal States apportionments under that act for construction, renovation, operation, and maintenance of pumpout stations for marine sanitation devices."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

MYRTLE FOESTER WHITMIRE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2105) to designate the area in Calhoun County, TX, known as Rancho La Bahia, as the "Myrtle Foester Whitmire National Wildlife Refuge," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2105

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF AREA KNOWN AS RANCHO LA BAHIA AS THE "MYRTLE FOESTER WHITMIRE DIVISION OF THE ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE".

(a) DESIGNATION.—Upon acquisition by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the area in Calhoun County, Texas, commonly known as Rancho La Bahia shall be known and designated as the "Myrtle Foester Whitmire Division of the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge".

(b) LEGAL REFERENCES.—A reference in any law, map, regulation, document, or record of the United States to the area referred to in subsection (a) is deemed to be a reference to the "Myrtle Foester Whitmire Division of the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge".

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2105 which was introduced by Mr. LAUGHLIN. It would designate as the "Myrtle Foester Whitmire Division of the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge" a parcel of land that the Fish and Wildlife Service is seeking to acquire in Texas. It will be a valuable addition to the refuge system, but the sale is contingent on naming the parcel after the owner's wife. This bill would do just that. It will facilitate the transaction and I support it strongly.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2105.

As the chairman of the subcommittee has mentioned, this is legislation sponsored by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN]. It simply designates an addition of land to the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge as the Myrtle Foester Whitmire Division of the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. Speaker, it is rare that I stand on this floor to support the addition of lands to the wildlife refuge system or the Park System because I believe that when the Government owns land, we lose a tax base. But this is a unique situation. Mr. Whitmire, because of his love for his wife and the outdoors, the whooping crane and all those wildlife species that reside on his or her land, dropped his price dramatically, and actually this has been signed over to the Fish and Wildlife Department with the one wish and the one belief that the wife he has cherished, and she has cherished him over the years of their marriage, would be honored, that this refuge would be named in her honor. There is no greater mark or no greater tribute to one's life together than to have a body of land which they cherish and have had in their family for years named for them, and this refuge is named after her.

I want to compliment Mr. Whitmire, I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] for his work, and I compliment the leadership on this issue. There is slight opposition, but not serious opposition, from the administration because they think it goes beyond the customary naming of refuges, but in this case I strongly support it, and I compliment Mr. Whitmire and Mrs. Whitmire for their contribution to Texas and to the United States with the addition of this land in this refuge system.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] for supporting this addition to the National Wildlife System, and for actually defending and naming an endangered species on the floor of the House. This is quite a wonderful day. I am sure the other body is getting the bulk of the publicity today, but it should be focused right here.

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

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today of H.R. 2105. This bill would designate an addition to the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge in Texas as the "Myrtle Foester Whitmire

Division of the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge."

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is currently in the process of acquiring land for the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge with appropriated funds. Included in this refuge is an area known as the Rancho La Bahia addition.

The Rancho La Bahia contains 5,000 acres of vital wetland habitat. It is located 10 miles southeast of Port Lavaca, TX. The area represents some of the finest remaining wetlands on the Texas midcoast. The wetland types identified on this property have been identified in the national wetlands priority conservation plan as being rare in occurrence and in a declining state. Both types of wetlands have also been assigned priority consideration for acquisition in the national wetlands priority conservation plan.

At least 300 species of birds can be found in this area. And federally listed or proposed for listing endangered species, such as the peregrine falcon, brown pelican, whooping crane, and wood stork, are among the many species that have been sighted on the property.

Myrtle and Roy Whitmire own the Rancho La Bahia. The property has been in Myrtle Foester Whitmire's family for over 100 years. The Whitmire's had received offers to develop their land for industry, but they decided about 3 years ago that they wanted to preserve their land because of its ecological value and because so much industrial development already exists in the Calhoun County area.

Knowing that the Rancho La Bahia has for the past several years been the first or second priority for the Fish and Wildlife Service to acquire in that region, Roy Whitmire offered to sell his land to the Fish and Wildlife Service so that it would be preserved as part of the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge.

After his initial asking price, Roy Whitmire came down over \$5 million. Mr. Whitmire agreed that given his lower price, and more importantly, given that the land has been in his wife Myrtle's family for so long, that the addition to the refuge could be named after Myrtle Foester Whitmire.

The reason I introduced this bill is because it is against Fish and Wildlife Service policy to name any refuge or section of a refuge after a living person unless it meets one of several criteria. One of these is that the property is named for a historic occurrence or site and that this occurrence or site is one which "elicits a positive and favorable response among the general public."

Myrtle Foester Whitmire's family has kept and preserved this valuable land for over 100 years. This is certainly of historic significance. Furthermore, the people of Calhoun County know this and have expressed their overwhelming support for naming this area after Myrtle Foester Whitmire. I

have received letters of support and formal resolutions expressing support for the intent of this legislation from the Calhoun County Commissioners Court, the Port Lavaca City Council, the First National Bank of Port Lavaca, and the First State Bank of Port Lavaca. Clearly, this name would elicit a positive and favorable response among the general public.

I must also mention the fact that while the Fish and Wildlife Service does not officially support naming the land after Mrs. Whitmire, the Administrator of the Fish and Wildlife Service, John Turner, recently assured me in a subcommittee hearing that he was not opposed to this legislation.

I am pleased and proud of the Whitmire's admirable decision to sell their property to the Fish and Wildlife Service. I believe Roy Whitmire's request to name this section of the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge after his wife is a noble and perfectly reasonable request. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1300

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise only to say that I compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] on his eloquent statement, and urge passage of this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2105, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate an area as the 'Myrtle Foester Whitmire Division of the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA WILDERNESS PROTECTION ACT OF 1991

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 35) to designate certain lands in the State of North Carolina as wilderness, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 35

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 "Western North Carolina Wilderness Protection Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION AND ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131–1136), the following lands in the State of North Carolina are hereby designated as wilderness and therefore as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System:

(1) Certain lands in the Pisgah National Forest, which comprise approximately 5,710 acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "Lost Cover Wilderness—Proposed" dated July 1990, which shall be known as the Lost Cover Wilderness.

(2) Certain lands in the Pisgah National Forest, which comprise approximately 7,140 acres as generally depicted on a map entitled "Harper Creek Wilderness—Proposed" dated July 1990, which shall be known as the Harper Creek Wilderness.

(b) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the wilderness areas designated under this section shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be reference to the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) **MAP AND DESCRIPTION.**—As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area designated under this section with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and with the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate. Each such map and description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made. Each such map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 35, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 35, the Western North Carolina Wilderness Protection Act of 1991, was introduced by Mr. BALLENGER of North Carolina and would add approximately 12,850 acres of land within the Pisgah National Forest to the 110,000 acres already designated as wilderness in North Carolina. Two areas would be designated, the Lost Cove Wilderness and the Harper Creek

Wilderness. These areas are Appalachian oak forests with rhododendron, mountain laurel, and blueberry and with populations of deer, bear, turkey, and grouse.

This bill has bipartisan support and is noncontroversial. The Forest Service planning process recommends both areas to become wilderness and the administration testified in favor of this bill. It is very similar to the measure that the House passed in the last Congress but that the Senate did not complete action on prior to adjournment. I urge Members to support the bill's passage.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 35, which would designate about 13,000 acres of the North Carolina's Pisgah National Forest as wilderness.

H.R. 35 would designate the Lost Cove and Harper Creek Areas in Western North Carolina as wilderness. The Forest Service has extensively studied these areas and recommends them for wilderness designation.

Although I have not been in these areas myself, Mr. BALLENGER has visited them and assured me of their outstanding qualities. They are presently managed for wilderness by the Forest Service and are popular for hiking, backpacking, hunting, and fishing.

I am also pleased to report that unlike many western wilderness bills that come before this body that are opposed by the Members from the area concerned, this bill was introduced by Mr. BALLENGER and deals exclusively with this district. Hopefully, we can use his bill as a model for future wilderness debates.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. BALLENGER for his efforts on this bill as well as the cooperation of Chairman VENTO. I urge Members to support H.R. 35.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER].

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] for yielding time to me, and also I thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. VENTO for bringing this bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to speak on behalf of legislation I introduced to designate certain lands in North Carolina as wilderness.

Just to give a brief history, the 1984 North Carolina Wilderness Act established five wilderness study in western North Carolina, two of these, Lost Cove and Harper Creek, being located in my district. The Forest Service completed study of the areas in 1987, and recommended Lost Cove and Harper Creek for wilderness designation. In my view, it is time to heed the recommendation of the Forest Service and make the designation official. H.R. 35 would do just that.

Since being designated as study areas in 1984, the 12,850 acres in question have been managed as wilderness, prohibiting the use of motor vehicles and equipment or the use of land for timber harvesting. In fact, the Harper Creek Area has not been logged in over 15 years, and the Lost Cove Area in over 80 years.

Having been born and raised in western North Carolina, I am very familiar with the areas to be designated as wilderness. Within the area there is an abundance of trout, and such wildlife as bear, turkey, and deer. There is also a wide variety of flora, rock formations, and waterfalls. I believe it is essential that these resources be preserved for the enjoyment of generations to come.

Further, the establishment of additional wilderness would relieve the Linville Gorge Wilderness Area that is approaching the point of overuse, and would no doubt benefit the tourism industry in the 10th District. In my view, North Carolina has everything to gain and nothing to lose by passage of this legislation.

Last year, this legislation was passed by the House, and approved by the Senate Committee on Agriculture. Unfortunately, the other body did not consider the bill. I have received wide support for the proposal from constituents living in the area, as well as the local and regional chapters of the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, and the Governor of North Carolina. In addition, the bill has the support of most members of the North Carolina delegation.

I often say that North Carolina is the best kept secret on the east coast. Our coastline and our mountains provide recreation and beauty to residents and tourists alike. Having been born and raised in western North Carolina, I find particular beauty in the mountains. I am glad to have the opportunity as a U.S. Representative to make an effort to preserve part of this beautiful natural resource. I urge Members to support this measure.

□ 1310

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

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

The **SPEAKER pro tempore** (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 35, 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.

FORT NECESSITY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2436) to expand the Fort Necessity National Battlefield, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2436

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

SECTION 1. BOUNDARIES OF FORT NECESSITY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD.

(A) JUMONVILLE GLEN UNIT.—The boundaries of the Fort Necessity National Battlefield, Pennsylvania, are hereby modified to include the area comprising approximately 190 acres as generally depicted on the map entitled "Boundary Expansion, Jumonville Glen Unit, Fort Necessity National Battlefield", numbered DSC-336-20043A, and dated July 1991, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior may modify the boundaries of the Jumonville Glen Unit as depicted on such map to exclude lands (not to exceed 2 acres) on which there are located principal structures actively used by the owner thereof as of July 1, 1991. Following any such modification the Secretary shall prepare and make available for public inspection a revised map of such unit.

(b) DUNBAR'S CAMP AREA.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, shall, within 2 years after the enactment of this Act, conduct such investigations of archaeological sites in the vicinity of the Jumonville Glen Unit of Fort Necessity as may be necessary to more precisely locate and identify Dunbar's Camp and submit a report containing the results of such investigations to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate. If necessary in order to preserve and interpret historic resources associated with Dunbar's Camp, the Secretary may further modify the boundaries of the Fort Necessity National Battlefield, Jumonville Glen Unit, to include such additional lands as are needed to preserve the resources within the battlefield, but not to exceed 30 acres.

SEC. 2. ACQUISITION OF LANDS.

The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") may acquire land or interests in land within the boundaries of the Fort Necessity National Battlefield by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange.

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATION.

The Secretary shall administer the Fort Necessity National Battlefield in accordance with the provisions of law generally applicable to units of the national park system, including the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, 2, 3, and 4) and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461-467). In administering the battlefield, the Secretary shall take such action as is necessary to preserve and interpret the historic resources associated with—

(1) the social and military history of the European and Native American contests for North America;

(2) the social, political, and economic history of the westward expansion of American frontier; and

(3) the social, political, and economic history of the early National Period of the United States of America.

SEC. 4. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

The Secretary is authorized and directed to enter into cooperative agreements with those landowners in Fayette County whose activities on their properties could have a harmful effect on the Fort Necessity National Battlefield, its resources and the enjoyment of its visitors in order to prevent such effects through technical assistance, land use agreements, or such other means as mutually agreed upon. The Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, is authorized to expend Federal funds to carry out such agreements.

SEC. 5. TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

The Act of March 4, 1931, entitled "An Act to provide for the commemoration of the Battle of Fort Necessity, Pennsylvania" (46 Stat. 1522) is amended by striking "1757" and inserting "1754".

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill presently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Fort Necessity played a key role in the French and Indian War, part of the much larger European struggle for supremacy on this continent. One of the first engagements in that war occurred at Jumonville Glen, 7 miles from Fort Necessity itself. Today that glen appears much as it did two centuries ago. But suburban development, timbering and gas drilling all threaten to change that historic scene. Today, the National Park Service owns only a small sliver of land at Jumonville Glen, making protection of the site quite problematic. Congressman AUSTIN MURPHY in response to this problem introduced H.R. 2436. Congressman MURPHY should be commended for his efforts to protect this park, for the personal attention he has given this, and for his efforts with the landowners involved to enlarge this portion of Fort Necessity National Battlefield to ensure its preservation. H.R. 2436 also directs that further archeological investigations be undertaken, provides for the park and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with landowners to jointly coordinate protection of the park. The National Park Service supports this legislation.

After careful review of the land in question, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs amended H.R. 2436 to exclude from the boundary a house, barn, and radio antenna on substantially disturbed land whose archeological value is questionable. It sought additional information from the National Park Service and the landowners to ensure that the resulting boundary would both protect key park resources and be equitable toward the landowners. I believe this bill as amended achieves this goal. Mr. Speaker, I endorse this bill and the principles in it and look forward to its passage.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2436, a bill to expand Fort Necessity National Battlefield. This bill would make an approximately 200-acre addition to the existing historic site in southwestern Pennsylvania. As subcommittee Chairman VENTO has described, this battlefield protects a site which was very important in the French and Indian War.

The bill before Members today is based on the park's general management plan which called for limited park expansion. Unfortunately, that plan was seriously flawed in several respects. First, it contained almost no mention of Dunbar's Camp which the subcommittee heard likely contains valuable archeological resources. Due to this lack of information, the bill before us is undesirably vague as to proposed park boundaries needed to protect these resources. Second, the park plan proposed a new boundary based on a viewshed analysis which unrealistically assumed clearcutting of all lands in the vicinity, including existing National Park Service lands. For that reason, the bill before us includes more lands than are necessary to protect this site.

I do not object to the bill because I know that the bill's author, Mr. MURPHY, has worked very closely with the affected private landowners to ensure that developed portions of their lands were excluded and that their interests were protected to the maximum extent possible. Similarly, I want to thank the subcommittee chairman for modifications to this bill which place appropriate limitations on potential acquisition of interests in lands outside the park boundary.

While the administration initially recommended deferral on this measure until after a land acquisition cost estimate had been developed, it is my understanding that such information has now been forwarded to the committee. For these reasons, I recommend other Members join me in supporting this measure.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], the sponsor of this measure

and a member of the committee, who has worked very diligently on this matter, and I commend him for that.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman VENTO and the ranking Member, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] for the support and consideration and expediting of this matter that they have given in both subcommittee and in full committee. As both the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Minnesota have pointed out, we believe that the events that occurred at Jumonville Glen, or Washington Rocks as we often call them back in Fayette County, PA, were events that set the stage for our American Revolution, and certainly set the accomplishment of who would occupy North America, the English or the French.

We often hear of the first shot at Sarajevo that started World War I, but very seldom do the people of our country hear of the first shot that started what was to be known as the French and Indian War. George Washington was not even a colonel at that time, but he was representing the Governor of Virginia and led the Virginia militia, accompanied by some Pennsylvanians, to inform the French that the Ohio country, then everything west of the Appalachian Mountains, was to be in English control by the colonies. When he delivered that message, the French rebuked it.

Washington went back and raised some additional militia, and they then commenced to march on Fort Duquesne. The very small force Washington had for such a major mission, when he arrived at the Great Meadows Glen, which is now the site of Fort Necessity and was then, he was informed that the French and their Indian allies were on their way to meet him. He walked 7 miles through the dreary rain in May 1754 and surprised the French and the Indians at Washington Rocks, and therefore opened the first volley of fire that started a 7-year war around the world. It almost could have been called World War I because it involved all of the nations in Europe, and of course many of the battles were fought here on the North American Continent.

Following the culmination of that war, it laid really the foundation for the American Revolution, because the English then thought that the colonies should have to pay for the total cost of the French and Indian wars, and they levied and imposed very heavy taxes, and consequently our Virginia militia and Pennsylvania militia then said we are going to revolt against the crown, and that laid the groundwork for our own revolutionary war.

The reason we believe that the additional ground is required for this national park is that when it was first laid out in 1933 the area was really almost in the same shape that it had been 150 years before that. However, in

recent years oil and gas development, strip mining for coal, housing developments, mountain cabins, and lodges are being constructed around this entire area, thus disturbing the trail we know as the Braddock Trail leading down to where Braddock suffered his defeat a year following Fort Necessity, and traveled on to Dunbar's camp where Colonel Dunbar buried many artifacts and where he spiked his cannon in the general area we are studying for take-offs, and we would like to explore this for the historical concept and avoid any further development.

I wish every Member here could walk down to the Jumonville Glen today and see it actually as it was 200 years ago. But there is such a small area of ground about that that we believe by acquiring this additional 180 acres surrounding it, we will have truly a fine national park.

What we have crafted is a bill that does not require the taking of 180 acres.

□ 1320

We already have negotiations pending with the Methodist Training Center which occupies about half of this land, and they are going to allow the Park Service to have it under what we call a limited-use basis. It will be very low-cost rental for the National Park System, but we will have full utilization to merge it into the national park site.

We are attempting to acquire the same thing with the landowners of the other one-half, and in order to accommodate the other landowners, we fully exempted a place where there is an old farmhouse, an old barn, old out-buildings, and an existing gas well from the site that we propose to take. They can do with it as they want. We will try to negotiate with the landowners, again, a limited usage so that what we can do is preserve the true identity of Washington Rocks with limited cost to the Federal Government.

I hope the Members will see fit to support this.

I, again, thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] for their consideration in expediting the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairman VENTO and his staff for all their hard work and special efforts to see this bill through the Interior Committee and to the floor today.

Since the committee reported out the bill in September, my office has been examining the boundaries of the proposed expansion of the national battlefield.

The area surrounding Jumonville Glen is rich with the early history of our Nation. Few people realize that not many years before the Revolutionary War, the British fought with the colonists to drive the French from the area west of the Appalachian Mountains. Fort Duquesne, located in what is now downtown

Pittsburgh, was one of the most famous of the many fortification which were constructed to maintain the French claims.

In the area surrounding Jumonville Glen, we have evidence of several important military battles from the French and Indian Wars, Braddock's Road, Dunbar's Camp, and George Washington's first recorded military victory on May 27, 1754.

While Pennsylvania is dotted with many important sites from the Revolutionary War and the Civil War, we have neglected to document and preserve some of the more important sites which predate the Revolution.

Fort Necessity and its related sites, which include Jumonville Glen, is the one bright exception. Unfortunately, as the population surrounding the glen continues to grow and as development in the general area increases, we are in danger of losing much of this history.

My legislation expands the boundaries of the Jumonville Glen portion of the battlefield, protecting what we believe to be the most important areas still available from encroachment. While there is still much to be discovered about the events of 1754 and 1755, I am confident that revised battlefield boundaries will reveal many of the untold secrets of that period.

I would like to say to the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service that whenever they begin to carry out the purposes of this legislation, they use the least restrictive means possible to provide adequate protection for the historical resources of the area. The participation of the property owners in and around Jumonville Glen is essential to preserve the integrity of the area. Their cooperation should be encouraged and their rights respected at all times.

I would like to conclude by thanking everyone who has helped with H.R. 2436. I would like to invite my colleagues to join me sometime for a visit to the Fort Necessity Battlefield so that they might get a better understanding of the importance of this unique portion of our early history.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2436, 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.

FLINT HILLS PRAIRIE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 240 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 240

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2369) to establish the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule and each section shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 240 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2369, the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The rule waives clause 2(1)(6) of rule 11 against consideration of the bill. This clause requires that the report on any measure reported by a committee must be available to Members for 3 calendar days prior to consideration in the House. The waiver is included in the rule because the bill was scheduled for floor consideration last Thursday and the report became available last Wednesday. Since the report has now been available for 3 days, the waiver is no longer necessary.

The rule makes in order the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now

printed in the bill as an original bill for purposes of amendment.

Finally, House Resolution 240 provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2369 authorizes the National Park Service to acquire and designate as a national monument an 11,000-acre-ranch of tallgrass prairie land in the Flint Hills of Kansas. Situated among acres of unaltered prairie land are a three-story ranch house and a one-room schoolhouse constructed in 1881 and 1882 respectively. Both structures are presently listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The ranch also contains a barn constructed of native limestone which is approximately 6,500 square feet.

The National Park Service has considered the establishment of a tallgrass prairie preserve as one of its top priorities for over 30 years. The current National Park System only contains a combined total of 3,100 acres of protected tallgrass prairie land. The Flint Hills region of Kansas is the most extensive, minimally impacted tallgrass preserve in North America.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2369 is the result of hard work by Chairmen MILLER and VENTO along with the bill's sponsor, Congressman DAN GLICKMAN.

House Resolution 240 is an open rule and I urge my colleagues to adopt the resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] has stated, this is a completely open rule, and I support it.

H.R. 2369 would establish a ranch site in Kansas which consists of tallgrass prairie and several historic buildings as a unit of the National Park System.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of controversy surrounding the legislation. It is opposed by Mr. NICHOLS, the Member who represents the district where the monument would be located. A survey in his district revealed that his constituents oppose this action by more than a 2-to-1 margin.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the administration is also strongly against enactment of the bill. A 1990 National Park Service study has concluded that this site does not meet its longstanding criteria for a manageable, cost-effective prairie ecosystem unit.

The administration objects to the potential costs of the bill. The National Park Service study identifies an absence of visitor services infrastructure in the surrounding area. The Park Service finds that the costs of land acquisition and development of adequate public access and visitor facilities at this site would further impact already stretched budgetary resources for the existing units of the National Park System.

The National Park Service study does indicate that the site may contain cultural resources that could be eligible for designation as a national landmark that would not be part of the National Park System. The administration would prefer that the National Park Service be allowed to complete its study process to determine if cultural resources of national significance eligible for landmark status are present.

Mr. Speaker, under this open rule, the concerns of the administration and those Members opposed to the bill can be addressed. I urge its adoption.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 240 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2369.

□ 1330

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2369) to establish the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument, with Mr. COLEMAN of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2369, legislation to establish the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument in the State of Kansas.

The monument would consist of the 10,894-acre Spring Hill Ranch and its extensive tallgrass prairie resources and historic ranch buildings. This bill was introduced by Representative DAN GLICKMAN and has the bipartisan support of two other Members from the State of Kansas, Representatives JAN MEYERS and JIM SLATTERY.

Tallgrass prairie once covered nearly 400,000 square miles of the North American continent. Today less than 1 percent of this vast prairie ecosystem remains. Although tallgrass prairie played a very significant role in the

natural and social history of our Nation, this ecosystem is greatly underrepresented in the National Park System. The current National Park System only has about 3,500 acres of scattered tallgrass prairie in all national park units combined.

The legislation before us provides an excellent opportunity to preserve and interpret for present and future generations one of the few remaining expanses of the once vast tallgrass prairie. The Flint Hills region of Kansas is the most extensive remnant of tallgrass prairie remaining in North America, and the grasslands of this particular ranch are in good to excellent condition. In addition to the nationally significant natural resources of the area, the ranch contains several well-preserved historic structures including the ranch house and a one-room schoolhouse listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The National Park Service studies the ranch for 18 months at the request of the entire Kansas delegation. Professionals at the Park Service concluded after this exhaustive study that, and I quote, "The Z-Bar contains significant natural and cultural resources and is both suitable and feasible as a potential addition to the National Park System."

Members will hear that the administration is opposed to this legislation. I would tell Members to be wary of the metamorphosis of the administration's position between the time when the field professionals found the ranch to be a nationally significant and suitable addition to the System and when politics entered into the process and that position changed. While political appointees in the Department of Interior do have a perspective to lend on this issue, I hope Members will give appropriate consideration to the recommendations of the Park Service professionals in the field.

H.R. 2369 represents a unique opportunity to preserve tallgrass prairie not only because of the significance of the natural and cultural resources present but also because of the circumstances surrounding its ownership and availability. The property is wholly owned by one owner who is a willing seller. Furthermore, the property is of sufficient size necessary to carry out the purposes of the park, whether that includes the introduction of native herbivores such as bison and elk or not. The bill has a clearly defined boundary which is limited to one landowner and the bill specifically prohibits condemnation as a means of land acquisition. As Members who were involved in previous debates about prairie parks will recall, the proposals of the 1970's consisted of much higher acreages and permitted condemnation to achieve that goal.

The statement of administration policy on this bill repeats a misleading

statement concerning the size of the ranch being too small to support the restoration of large populations of free-ranging herbivores such as bison and elk. I am not sure the House wants to get into an extensive discussion of the foraging behavior of large ungulates at this time so I will simply refer interested Members to the testimony given by the scientific panel at the subcommittee's field hearing in Kansas. Suffice it to say that there are plenty of examples of parks and preserves with smaller acreages which have healthy populations of bison and that if called for the park's general management plan, the reintroduction of bison would be viable operation on the site.

The administration's statement is also misleading with regards to oil and gas drilling. There are no producing oil and gas wells on the Z-Bar property and the mineral rights are held by the landowner, who is willing to negotiate their sale. This is a far cry from the last prairie park proposal in Oklahoma where oil and gas issues were very contentious.

The Interior Committee has heard extensive testimony on H.R. 2369. This measure has generated considerable public interest with many statements in strong support and opposition submitted to the committee during its two hearings held in Washington, DC, and in Kansas. The member in whose district this ranch lies is opposed to this measure, and we will hear from him and other opponents. As I mention earlier, three of the five members of the Kansas House delegation support this bill, as do the mayors, city councils, and chambers of commerce of the two largest cities in Chase County and numerous other Kansas citizen and environmental organizations including the Kansas Audubon Council, the Kansas chapter of the Wildlife Society, the Kansas Wildlife Federation, and the Travel Industry Association of Kansas. Opposition to this measure has come from individuals and organizations who do not question the natural and cultural resources values of the ranch but who oppose Government spending or fear condemnation of private lands or who prefer the ranch to be privately acquired and managed.

As I have explained, there is no condemnation allowed by this bill. As for private ownership, the Interior Committee was never presented with a viable plan for private acquisition or operation of the Spring Hill Ranch. Even if a private organization could acquire the ranch, there was concern that a private organization may not have a similar mission or purpose for the ranch nor the expertise in interpretation and preservation that the National Park Service has. Furthermore, private ownership would not guarantee that nationally significant prairie resources would be preserved and inter-

preted for present and future generations.

Mr. Chairman, I commend Mr. GLICKMAN and his colleagues from Kansas for putting together a nationally significant natural resource initiative which is sensitive to the concerns of the local citizens of Kansas. I urge my colleagues to support this meritorious legislation and oppose any weakening amendments.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, representing the State of Wyoming, I have a real appreciation for the preservation of important and unique lands in our national parks and monuments system. Yellowstone, Devil's Tower, and the Tetons are part of my State's legacy in parks and monuments.

And as a member of the National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee, I have participated as we add parcel after parcel to the Parks System. But the Flint Hills Monument proposal in H.R. 2369 raises many serious questions that must be addressed.

The Interior Committee and the Congress are getting into the disturbing practice of setting aside large parcels of land completely against the wishes of the local population, and against the concerns of the Members representing the affected districts.

Do not misunderstand, Mr. Chairman. I support the designation of lands as parks and monuments when appropriate. But it's time for Congress to examine just what is going on here.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NICHOLS] was elected less than a year ago to represent the voters of the Fifth District of Kansas. When 15,000 of his constituents responded to his survey about the Z-Bar Ranch, two-thirds indicated they opposed Federal acquisition of this property.

As a result, it is disappointing to me that we are seeking to move this bill through the House over the objections of Mr. NICHOLS and his neighbor, Congressman PAT ROBERTS.

Five months ago this body ran over Mr. BARRETT whose district contains a large segment of the Niobrara River. In spite of overwhelming opposition by his constituents, who are the only ones directly affected, we designated that river wild and scenic.

In July, the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands marked up a bill to have the Federal Government confiscate 200,000 acres of productive timberlands in the district of another freshman, Mr. RIGGS.

Despite the strong opposition of Mr. RIGGS, who was representing the people who would be displaced by the bill, the subcommittee opposed him on a straight party line vote.

The full committee is expected to act in a similar fashion soon.

And in this case, when Congressman NICHOLS polled his constituents on this

proposal, they opposed it by 2-to-1 margin. And yet this bill is still moving forward.

We are witnessing a disregard and carelessness about private property rights and taxpayers, and ignoring legitimate concerns of Members and their constituents.

It is important to remember that we already have vast acreages of tallgrass prairie in the Flint Hills of Kansas and in the Osage Hills of Oklahoma.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, over 600,000 acres of croplands have been reseeded to native tallgrasses in the eastern third of Kansas under the Conservation Reserve Program since 1986.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] advises me that Federal rules require that producers reseed these lands only to native grasses. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers owns 150,000 acres of land in the Flint Hills which are virtually all in native tallgrasses and other native species.

Finally, the Nature Conservancy has a 30,000-acre tract of spectacular native tallgrass prairie in the Osage Hills of Oklahoma that is open to the public. That tract is three times larger than the Z-Bar Ranch.

Because of this vast existing acreage of tallgrass prairie, it defies the imagination why we are spending the scarce funds of the National Park Service for this parcel. Where is our sense of priorities?

Mr. Chairman, our national parks are already in a state of disrepair. The National Park Service has a land acquisition backlog of \$3 to \$4 billion and a backlog of about \$5 billion for its national construction priorities.

This includes items such as resurfacing roads that are in disrepair as well as upgrading campgrounds, visitor centers, and sanitation facilities.

Under this bill we will only worsen this problem. According to the Congressional Budget Office, we will spend \$5 or \$6 million to buy this ranch, another \$5 million for basic visitor services, and possibly much more for road construction and restoration of ranch buildings.

After the ranch is bought, we will spend between \$500,000 and \$1 million per year just to maintain and operate it.

And the Park Service says that a 10,000-acre parcel is not large enough to properly manage for the purpose of preservation, so expect proposals to expand the monument almost immediately.

This bill does not have the type of local public support needed for creating a new park, it is opposed by the Member representing the affected district, and it is a budget buster.

I urge my colleagues to defeat it. However, I ask them to support the Nichols amendment which delays the effective date of this bill until Congress enacts a balanced budget.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], who has been a diligent worker in terms of this matter and has pursued it, and I commend the gentleman for it.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] for his yeoman work in helping us move this bill along, and I also want to thank his staff for being so cooperative as well.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to come before the House today in support of legislation that three of us in the Kansas delegation have introduced, myself, my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] and my colleague, the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], to create the First National Park in the State of Kansas, the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument.

I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NICHOLS], and to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], particularly, that even though we have disagreed on this issue, that I have felt we have done so in a nondisagreeable fashion and that we have been open and candid with each other in our problems, and should this bill move forward, which I think it will, we look forward to working with the gentlemen in trying to make this a reality in the best way possible.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2369 has bipartisan support in Congress, in Kansas, and in Chase County, where the ranch is located. The bill is supported by the National Parks and Conservation Association, the National Audubon Society, Defenders of Wildlife, the Wilderness Society, the National Wildlife Federation, Izaak Walton League of America, Friends of the Earth, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and the League of Conservation Voters.

There are over 40 organizations in Kansas supporting the bill, ranging from the Kansas Sierra Club to the chambers of commerce of the four neighboring communities of Council Grove, Cottonwood Falls, Emporia, and Strong City.

A tallgrass prairie is one of the only ecosystems missing in the entire National Park System. Today we have the opportunity to create a prairie national monument in Kansas consisting of 11,000 acres of rolling hills, bluestem grasses which grow up to 6 feet high, and historic buildings over 100 years old. The occasion does not often occur in which there is a willing seller of a single property so suitable for national recognition. The National Park Service itself has described Chase County, KS, as having some of the most dramatic landscapes of tallgrass prairie that exist anywhere. Endless miles of rolling grasslands stretch out to surround the visitor from horizon to horizon.

Mr. Chairman, I have with me some photographs of the grasslands on the

site we are talking about. When standing in the middle of these hills, you can literally see forever. The land absolutely overwhelms you.

The buildings on this property are on the National Register of Historic Places. The main ranch house I like to envision as a historic museum on the prairie. The house would be restored to the decor of the late 19th century, in the grand style in which it was built.

The stone barn, which is also over 100 years old, is so large that you can drive a team of horses up this ramp, into the barn, and turn the entire team around inside the barn. We have envisioned having a working ranch, where kids and families can learn what cattle ranching was all about.

There is also a one-room schoolhouse on the ranch. You don't see too many of these anymore, especially one like this, sitting alone on a ridge in the middle of miles and miles of prairie.

It is vitally important that we bring the tallgrass prairie ecosystem into the National Park System. In the 1820's, there were 140 million acres of tallgrass prairie stretching from Ohio to Kansas and from Oklahoma to North Dakota. Today less than 1 percent of it remains. In fact, there are only 3,100 acres of prairie land preserved anywhere in the National Park System. These acres are made up of bits and pieces of land scattered among Park Service sites around the Midwest.

Every other ecosystem has been honored with inclusion in the National Park System: mountains, seashores, deserts, marshlands, ancient forests, but no tallgrass prairie. While there are over 900,000 acres of prairie in private ownership in the Kansas Flint Hills, there is no tract of prairie land where average people, not wealthy landowners, just average folks can go for hiking, horseback riding, camping, fishing, and learning about cattle ranching.

Keeping in mind controversial proposals in the past, this legislation protects adjacent landowners by prohibiting condemnation of property or forced sales of any kind. Under my bill, the land in question would be purchased from a willing seller, at fair market value determined by an independent appraisal.

The cost estimates we have received from the Park Service and the Congressional Budget Office run around \$4 to \$5 million for the purchase of the land itself, and \$5 million for development of the park and the building of a visitors center, roads, and bringing the buildings back to their 19th century decor.

This is not an inappropriate use of tax money. It is the perfect use of public funds. In fact, the money to purchase the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument comes from the land and water conservation fund, which is the main source of Federal money to pay for new park and recreational lands.

Over 80 percent of the LWCF money has come from oil and gas leasing revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf. The rest comes from park entrance fees.

Each year, \$900 million is authorized for the LWCF so we can acquire new parks. This is money that cannot be used for education, for defense, for drug programs. This is money set aside, so that while we are depleting one resource through offshore oil drilling, at least we are giving something back to the environment, with the creation of new areas to preserve for the public.

Kansas wasn't blessed with beaches or mountains, but we do have something extraordinary to offer the rest of the Nation and the rest of the world: the broad expanses of tallgrass prairie.

William Least Heat-Moon, the best-selling author of "Blue Highways," has written a new book, "PrairieErth," which relates the story of Chase County's towns and houses, its geology and floods and tornadoes, its history and heroes and legends, and its extraordinary people. "PrairieErth" is a book that captures in the tallgrass prairie the heart of what it has meant, from the beginning, to be an American.

To quote the author:

It was tall grass that made man stand up: to be on all fours, to crouch behind a six-foot-high world of thick cellulose, is to blind and vulnerable. People may prefer the obvious beauty of the mountains and the seacoast, but we are bipedal because of savanna; man is man because of tall grass.

Mr. Chairman, not all of us has had the opportunity to see a tallgrass prairie in real life. But if any of my colleagues saw last winter's Academy Award-winning film, "Dances With Wolves," you have a good idea of what I am talking about. I am talking about vast expanses of bluestem grassland which grow so high you can tie the grasses around a horse's neck.

The movie featured stunning vistas of the South Dakota Badlands and other wide-open landscapes. Not surprisingly, tourism in the Badlands National Park increased 17 percent this past summer. Apparently, "Dances With Wolves" touched on a nerve to see our open spaces and experience some of the culture of native Americans.

Mr. Chairman, the tallgrass prairie is the most distinctively American landform, and this monument could be one of the most important preservation projects in this country. The Z-Bar Ranch is a national treasure and we should treat it as such. It has the potential to become a ranch available to every American family, 365 days a year if it becomes part of the National Park System. We must act now to save it for our children and grandchildren and for generations to follow.

Let us stand up and do what is right for Kansas and for the Nation. As the Wichita Eagle noted, the Kansas Flint Hills may soon offer refuge not just to

hawks and coyotes, and eventually bison and elk, but to all Americans who are drawn back to their prairie roots.

BACKGROUND

The Z-Bar Ranch was sold by the Z-Bar Cattle Company to Boatmen's First National Bank of Kansas City in 1986. In July 1988, the National Audubon Society acquired an option to purchase the Z-Bar Ranch. The Audubon Society suggested the property be purchased and designated a unit of the National Park System. Substantial local interest was generated and in 1989 a group of Chase County citizens formed the Flint Hills National Monument Committee, which proposed the ranch be designated a national monument, and forwarded this suggestion to the Kansas Congressional delegation.

In August 1989, at the request of the entire delegation, National Park Service Director James Ridenour agreed to conduct an area feasibility study using existing NPS funding. The purpose of the Park Service study was to determine the national significance of the ranch.

When the study was finally finished in April of this year, I held a press conference, with the leader of the study team, to announce the results of the study. For 15 months, the Park Service studied the historic and natural significance of the Z-Bar Ranch, the suitability and feasibility of adding the site to the National Park System, and presented the alternatives available to the Kansas Delegation. In that report, the National Park Service has concluded the Z-Bar Ranch exhibits a high degree of national significance.

To quote that study, "While the tallgrass prairie is considered of prime significance, this ecosystem is very under represented in the National Park System." Based on the very positive review by the National Park Service, I, along with Representatives Slatery and Meyers, and other members, introduced legislation to establish the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument.

Three months after its extremely positive feasibility study, the National Park Service opposed our legislation establishing the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument. The reason for their opposition? They say the site is suddenly not large enough and there has not been a determination of its natural or cultural significance.

Mr. Chairman, this action was one of the most unusual incidents to ever come out of the National Park Service. When the feasibility study was being completed earlier this spring, I was told that all levels of the Park Service bureaucracy had signed off on it, and the reason it was taking so long to release the draft, was that it had to go to the top of the Park Service for final approval. Why the change of heart?

The Park Service, and the Administration now states that the proposed unit is not large enough to ensure successful management as a tallgrass prairie. Page 26 of the feasibility study states, "The existing boundary is of sufficient size and configuration to afford adequate resource protection and provide sites for visitor facilities with minimal intrusion on the landscape."

The Park Service also states that there has not been a determination of its degree of natural or cultural significance. Page one of the study states that, "The conclusion of this study is that the Z-Bar contains significant natural and cultural resources."

BILL DESCRIPTION

I have included provisions prohibiting the condemnation of property or eminent do-

main authority. I have included federal payments in lieu of taxes to make up for the loss of tax base for the county. I have included a provision establishing a local advisory commission whose purpose will be to advise the Secretary of the Interior on the management and operation of the monument. There have been some concerns voiced that the government will pay more than fair market value for the land. It is against the law for the government to pay one penny more than fair market value for land it is acquiring.

WHY WE NEED PRAIRIE IN THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

In the 1820's, there were 140 million acres of tallgrass prairie stretching from Ohio to Kansas and from Oklahoma to North Dakota. Today less than one percent of it remains. No other grassland system anywhere supports the biological diversity of tallgrass prairie.

Every other ecosystem has been honored with inclusion in the National Park System: mountains, seashores, desert, marshland, ancient forests: but no tallgrass prairie. While there are over 900,000 acres of prairie in private ownership in the Kansas Flint Hills, there is no large tract of prairie land where people can go for hiking, horseback riding, camping, fishing, wildlife observation, touring of historic facilities, and viewing of farming practices or ranching operations.

The Park Service, Congress, and environmental organizations across the country have shown significant interest in creating a Prairie National Monument in our state. The establishment of a Monument would bring considerable benefits to Kansas and it is important for Kansas to become part of the National Park System.

LOCAL OPPOSITION

This proposal has been controversial in Chase County, as many landowners and ranchers remember a proposal in the late 1970's by Congressman Larry Winn to create a 63,000-acre prairie park, spanning several counties, state lines, and involving the condemnation of property and forced sales of land.

These folks have every right to be concerned. I, too, remember that proposed legislation—legislation I did not support, nor did the rest of the Kansas delegation. The opponents of the park at that time urged that we find a much smaller piece of land, purchased on a willing-seller basis. I don't believe that anyone in the Kansas delegation would ever support such a massive proposal. But today we have a contained ranch, owned by a willing seller, which has been studied and deemed nationally significant by the National Park Service. I cannot imagine a more positive scenario. I believe the Z-Bar Ranch has the extraordinary virtue of being large enough to singularly be adequate for a national monument, without the necessity for additional acquisition.

Many people are opposed to federal ownership of land on principal, and distrust any action by the federal government. There is nothing I can do to diminish the kind of opposition. Fortunately, the National Park Service is one of the best-run components of the federal government. The Park Service has a proven track record in being a good trustee of the land and making it available to the public.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS

The \$10 million or so this monument will cost initially will return many times that amount in positive dividends, both economically and culturally, to our state.

Kansas is rural. Perhaps more than any other state, Kansas has the collection of

small towns, self-reliant people, and agrarian heritage which people have come to associate with "rural".

The nation's population and economic power continue to concentrate in urban areas. Alarming demographic trends can be seen in our most remote rural regions. In 1990, Chase County, in which the Z-Bar Ranch is located, ranked 51 out of 105 Kansas counties in terms of a combination of wealth indicators, growth indicators and dependent population indicators. The country dropped 5 spots from the previous year.

Between 1980 and 1990, the population in Chase County has declined nine percent to 3,021 residents. In fact, the population in Chase County has declined every census period since 1950.

Rural Kansas communities like Chase County need diversified economic opportunities. The monument would enhance the local economies of Council Grove, Cottonwood Falls, Strong City and Emporia, along with areas all over the state with their own tourist attractions which would benefit from having a national park in the state.

If the Z-Bar Ranch does not become a prairie monument, it will very likely become absentee or corporate-owned and operated if it is sold on the open market. That seems to be the trend in the Kansas Flint Hills. In fact, 88% of the large ranches in Chase County now have absentee ownership, substantially limiting the local economic benefit. The problem with absentee ownership lies in that fewer people live in the rural areas of the Flint Hills and that makes it more difficult for rural communities to survive.

The Z-Bar Ranch has the potential to become a ranch available to every Kansas family and every American family, 365 days a year if it becomes part of the National Park System.

CONCLUSION

Kansas wasn't blessed with beaches or mountains, but we do have something extraordinary to offer the rest of the nation and the rest of the world: the broad expanse of tallgrass prairie. The Park Service feasibility study noted, "When traveling to the Z-Bar Ranch in Chase County, Kansas, a visitor is exposed to some of the most dramatic landscape of tallgrass prairie that exist anywhere. Seemingly endless miles of rolling grasslands stretch out to surround the visitor from horizon to horizon."

The beauty of a national park facility is that it can be utilized, but we in the state still have to call our own. The beauty and culture of the Flint Hills is a truly sustainable resource and we should take this opportunity to preserve it for generations to come. As The Wichita Eagle noted in one of its many editorials in support of the Prairie Monument, the Kansas Flint Hills may soon offer refuge not just to hawks and coyotes, and eventually bison and elk, but to all Americans who are drawn back to their prairie roots.

□ 1340

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NICHOLS], who represents this district.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to discuss my opposition to H.R. 2369—the creation of the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument. Revelations of apparent inappropriate congressional

banking practices and unpaid cafeteria bills have many of my constituents thinking some Members of Congress feel they are above accountability. How this House votes on the bill we have before us now, will either confirm that feeling or help restore some respect to our institution.

As I stand before you today I have no graphs, or complicated theorems to show why the Federal Government should not get involved in this endeavor. What I do have is a number of undeniable, commonsense reasons why this bill should be defeated.

Throughout my congressional campaign, I ran on a platform of bringing common sense and simple business principals to Congress. These principles, which by the way have kept me from bouncing checks at the House bank and running up unpaid cafeteria tabs, have shown me this is a project which should not involve the Federal Government.

Let us look at a few of the arguments. Common sense argument No. 1: The National Park Service does not want it. That is right, the very people who would be charged with caring for this park, conclude in their study that this site does not meet its longstanding criteria for a manageable, cost-effective, prairie ecosystem unit.

The study also states the park would not ensure the preservation and sustainability of an intact tallgrass prairie ecosystem because it's not big enough, it lacks a complete watershed system, it's bisected by a State highway, and it's adjacent to oil and natural gas fields with operations and pipelines.

Commonsense argument No. 2: The Federal Government can't afford it. As a banker, I have been involved in decisions like this at every level. Families, small businesses, and even Fortune 500 companies must hold the line on expenses. Why should the Federal Government not abide by the same commonsense guidelines? If you cannot afford it, you should not buy it.

Yes, I know there is a trust fund set up for the purchase of public lands. However, the cost of developing this park and caring for it will come out of our tax dollars. National Park Service Director James Ridenour also estimates that the service now faces a \$2 billion backlog in maintenance related repairs, a \$3 to \$4 billion backlog in land acquisitions and a \$5 billion backlog in major repairs. Yet, there is an effort to ram this park down the throats of the Park Service and the public.

Commonsense argument No. 3: The people of the Fifth District don't want it. Regardless of what some will tell you, the people of the Fifth District stand firmly behind me. Over 15,500 constituents answered a recent questionnaire mailed to every postal patron in the district. By a margin of 2 to 1,

they opposed the creation of a Prairie National Monument.

In another question, these same people, by a 3 to 1 margin, named the Federal deficit as the No. 1 problem facing this country. One only needs to read the handwritten notes in the margins of the questionnaire to know my constituents believe the two matters are related.

Commonsense argument No. 4: There is no reason for the Federal Government to buy and preserve something that is not in danger. This property is in no way in danger of tillage, urban development, or neglect. There are no better stewards of the land than the farmers and ranchers of Kansas. A recent study conducted by the Park Service acknowledges that the rangeland has improved over the last 30 years, and that 80 percent of the rangeland is rated in excellent or good condition.

The Federal Government does not need to purchase this land, to preserve the tall grass prairie. There are currently 32 publicly accessible units in the National Park System that contain prairie resources. Finding tall grass prairie in the Midwest is about as difficult as finding a traffic jam here in Washington.

As you will note on the chart behind me, nearly 800,000 acres of land in Kansas exhibits characteristics of tallgrass prairie, the majority of which already falls under either the direct or indirect supervision of the Federal Government. For instance, farmers in Kansas have contracted with the Government to reseed prairie grasses in more than 600,000 acres of Kansas land.

The Konza Prairie Research Natural Area, immediately south of Manhattan, KS and administered by Kansas State University, is owned by the Nature Conservancy. They purchased it to preserve the natural diversity of the area. The Konza consists of 8,616 acres of native tallgrass prairie. It is available for research, educational outings, flora and fauna study, or simply hiking along nature trails. It is only 40 miles from the Z-Bar Ranch.

The Nature Conservancy also purchased the 30,000 acre Barnard Ranch in Oklahoma in 1989, in order to recreate a functioning tallgrass prairie ecosystem. Exactly the same goals of this legislation.

Before I conclude, let me touch on a couple of other matters. While this bill does include a provision which would prohibit future government expansion, you should know—just as surely as those who propose this legislation know—such a provision will not prevent future Congresses from expanding the park.

I say this because the National Park Service study states this is not a large enough area to meet the goals of this legislation and that future land acquisition may be desirable. In other words

the very goals of this bill contradict the provision to protect area landowners from future land grabs.

Voting against this legislation is not a vote against development of the Z-Bar Ranch. I am excited about the potential opportunities that private development of this property can have for my district and the State—without Federal intervention. I am confident Kansans can and will find a way to preserve the vast expanse of the prairie without making it a vast expense to the taxpayers.

Throughout my campaign and since my election, the people of the Fifth District have sent me one message, "Cut spending, and reduce the Federal deficit." It is with that message in mind that I fundamentally oppose this legislation.

As you prepare to vote on this matter I ask you simply to use some common sense. The Park Service doesn't want it, the administration doesn't want it, the people don't even want it. Why do we want to steamroll this thing through Congress?

This vote has little to do with the environmental, and everything to do with needless porkbarrel spending. The people of the Fifth District do not want to be a part of the problem of bloated Government spending. They want to be part of the solution. I urge you to vote no on this bill.

□ 1350

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], a cosponsor of the measure.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2369 and urge my colleagues to support this bill, which has strong bipartisan support in the State of Kansas.

For those of you who have never been to Kansas to witness the beauty of the Flint Hills, I will try to describe as best I can. The Flint Hills cover 3.7 million acres in Kansas and are unique to the United States, specifically to the Midwest. Just below and on the prairie surface is a layer of limestone and flint. This rock formation of endless plateaus and deep ravines cannot be cultivated for wheat or other feed grains. For this reason, the Flint Hills remain the most extensive remnant of virgin tallgrass prairie in North America, growing to a dramatic 6 feet in height. In his testimony before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Republican mayor of Cottonwood Falls, KS, described the Flint Hills as follows:

One need only stand amid the tallgrasses to imagine what it must have been like 100 years ago as our pioneer fathers traveled westward on foot, on horseback, and in covered wagons.

Mr. Chairman, I think the key word here is "preservation."

In addition to its natural beauty, the Flint Hills are home to 31 different

mammals and 199 species of birds, including the Meadowlark, the State bird of Kansas. There are more than 400 species of plants, including 14 species of grasses.

Mr. Chairman, I want my colleagues to know why I am supporting H.R. 2369, and why I think they should also be supporting it. H.R. 2369 is different from, and much more reasonable than, past prairie park proposals. In the 1970's, a tallgrass prairie park was proposed. It comprised over 150,000 acres, allowed condemnation, and had virtually no support in southeast Kansas. The bill before the House today is for less than 11,000 acres, prohibits condemnation, involves a willing seller, and has substantial support in southeast Kansas and throughout the State.

Second, the bill has strong bipartisan support in Chase County and throughout the State of Kansas. This legislation is not a partisan issue. In Chase County, both the chairmen of the Republican and Democratic parties strongly support H.R. 2369. The former chairman of the Chase County Republican Party, who currently serves as the chairman of the Chase County Board of Commissioners, also strongly supports the prairie park monument.

Third, the bill includes safeguards to ensure that the concerns of local ranch and farm owners will be taken into account in managing and operating the prairie park monument. H.R. 2369 establishes an advisory commission of ranch and farm owners from Chase County, local government officials, and representatives of conservation organizations that will advise the Interior Department on management and operation of the monument. The contribution of these Kansans is the best method to protect and preserve the true nature of the Kansas prairie.

□ 1400

Fourth, there is a national need to preserve some of the tallgrass prairie. The tallgrass prairie once covered nearly 400,000 square miles of the North American continent. Because not much of it is left today, it is imperative that a portion of it be preserved. Even the National Park Service, in its study of this proposal, recognized that the Flint Hills are "one of the few unaltered expanses of the once vast tallgrass prairie."

In addition to preserving 11,000 acres of tallgrass prairie, this bill preserves the Z-Bar Ranch. On the ranch, there is a magnificent old stone house and barn, as well as a one-room stone schoolhouse. All of these buildings date back to the 1880's, and the ranch and schoolhouse are already on the National Register of Historic Places.

As a supporter of this legislation, I am not inferring that the ranchers and farmers of Chase County have not been good stewards of the Flint Hills—indeed, they have been. However, it is

important that a small piece of the tallgrass prairie be preserved for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to recognize the widespread bipartisan support in Kansas, the support from environmental, professional, and governmental groups, and I would ask that I be allowed to place on each of the desks copies of lists of committee groups in Kansas that support the tallgrass prairie. I would supply a letter from all the environmental groups that support it, and finally, I have excerpts from several newspaper editorials from the State of Kansas. I would make this available so that when our colleagues come to the floor, they can see them.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, my family roots go back to this area, to this part of the country. Following the Civil War, my great-grandfather, along with my grandfather and his brothers and sisters, came by wagon and horseback from Illinois to this part of southern Kansas, and when I was a boy, my father wrote a book about the experience that his father had had with this. I came to appreciate in reading that book and in going to visit my family at family reunions back in this part of the country, what this tallgrass prairie country really meant to America. It is a place that ought to be preserved, and Americans ought to experience it.

But let me say, after sitting on the committee and hearing the testimony, I came to several conclusions about this particular project. First of all, it is not imperative that we reach out and spend this kind of money, at a time like this when we are in such terrible deficit straits, for this piece of property. It is not like Fort Necessity, which we just had on the floor just a few moments ago, where it became evident that if we do not take this additional land here, if we do not purchase this additional land, there is going to be encroachment by development and all kinds of things and we will lose it forever. There is not likely to be a change in the composition of this area regardless of whether Congress does anything or not. If it was good for wheat, they would be growing wheat on it, but it is not good for wheat. It was good for development, they would already be developing it. It is not good for development; it is good for ranching. It is good for exactly what it is being used for, and it will continue to be used for that purpose whether Congress acts or not.

This chairman of the committee mentioned a while ago that this is a unique opportunity. I would challenge that statement that it is a unique opportunity. Just a few miles away, across the border in Oklahoma, the Na-

ture Conservancy has purchased, I believe, 30,000 acres for this very same exact purpose. When I placed this issue in committee, the chairman said, "Oh, but that is not the Federal Government."

Well, I would hope to goodness that we are not going to assume that only the Federal Government can do these kinds of projects. This ought to be a government-private cooperative effort to protect the unique heritage that we need to protect in America.

Third, there is not enough land here; 10,000 acres simply is not going to do it. So in spite of the fact that in the bill it says there is no condemnation, this particular committee that we serve on has as little respect for private property rights as any committee I have ever seen in the U.S. Congress, and the next year, when the Park Service comes in and says, "You know something? This isn't enough land," we know what our committee is going to do. It will say, "Well, we had better go out and get more land," and we will be condemning land out there to add to it.

We know that it is not enough land, so we should not take that step. I would urge my colleagues to wait on this. It is not necessary. We do not have to do it today. It does not make a lot of sense. Most of the local people do not want it, and I would encourage the Members to vote against this legislation on this particular day.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY], one of the major sponsors of this measure.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2369 would provide for the acquisition of a tiny piece of tallgrass prairie, and make it publicly available for the benefit and inspiration of this and future generations.

All Kansans want to ensure that our property tax base is protected and that our property does not fall victim to so-called Federal Government land grabs. But we also want to memorialize the role of the tallgrass prairie in Kansas' history, and ensure that Kansans and all Americans will have access to it for years to come.

As has been said, the Z-Bar Ranch is a 10,894 acre cattle ranch in Chase County, KS. The ranch, owned by the trust department of Boatmen's First National Bank of Kansas City, MI, contains one of the Nation's largest expanses of tallgrass prairie as well as several buildings that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

As it is envisioned, the working ranch would be a tourist attraction for visitors from Kansas and around the country. The preserved prairie land could serve as a home to such native wildlife as bison, elk, and antelope. It also could be used for hiking, camping, and horseback riding.

According to the National Park Service study, a Flint Hills Prairie Na-

tional Monument could attract more than \$500,000 locally and \$1.25 million to the region—boosting the local economy and more than offsetting any tax base loss.

I regret that the Kansas congressional delegation is split on this issue.

I believe we are all trying to do what we believe is in the best interest of our State and of our country.

We all agree that eminent domain should not be used to acquire one acre of Kansas ranch land to expand this prairie monument.

That is why we included language in this legislation which sets strict limits on government land acquisition. It specifies that, "no lands, or interests therein, may be acquired for purposes of the monument without the consent of the owner thereof."

No condemnation or eminent domain authority is granted to the Secretary under this bill.

Any future expansion of this ranch would have to be approved by the Congress of the United States.

This language provides assurances that area landowners will continue to have complete control over their own property. H.R. 2369 would prohibit the Federal Government from purchasing any additional land without the permission of landowners and without providing adequate compensation.

I know there are some area ranchers who are opposed to the Federal Government acquiring any land in their neighborhood. They are worried that the Federal Government will someday want to take more land.

I understand their concerns.

However, I think it is important to recall that in the past, affected area landowners in Kansas and landowners across this country have typically opposed land acquisition for parks, historical monuments, highways, flood control dams, schools, and other public purposes.

Thank goodness our forefathers had some vision and foresight and, yes, the willingness to take political heat to invest in our Nation's future and advance the public interest.

□ 1410

This legislation has bipartisan support in Congress and throughout Kansas. Some 42 organizations in the State support H.R. 2369, including the city councils and chambers of commerce of the four associated communities of Cottonwood Falls, Strong City, Council Grove, and Emporia.

As a father with two young sons, I am especially interested in ensuring that our children and grandchildren will have opportunities to experience Kansas' history and unique beauty. I want the young people of Kansas and this country to have a place where they can go to experience life on the prairie at the turn of the century and to learn about the enormous hardships

that those settling that vast expanse of prairie encountered 100 years ago. Then they will hopefully have a greater appreciation for the unique quality and value of life in rural America that I think must be preserved.

Is this worth \$4 million? I believe it is. I believe it is important for us to be willing to make the kind of investment that this bill calls for in the future of our country.

For those who want to talk about the deficit, I would say to them, join me in killing the B-2 bomber and we will save the taxpayers \$50 billion, not \$4 million; join me in killing the super collider, and we will save the taxpayers \$10 billion—not \$4 million; and join me in reforming entitlements, and we will save the taxpayers billions more.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2369 for many reasons. I cannot help but feel compelled to respond to my good friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY], that his two sons should enjoy the prairie. Perhaps my family and his family can go knock on the door of the ranch house and talk to Arlan Dittmer, who actually runs the Z-Bar Ranch, and he can have us over for some fried chicken, or more especially beef in that country, and both families can enjoy the prairie, except it can remain in private hands.

Mr. Chairman, I understand and share the desire of Members, most especially the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], who is a good friend, who wish to preserve Kansas' tallgrass prairie and want to increase economic and recreational opportunities in the State. However, I would plead with Members that this legislation is not the way to achieve these goals.

Early in this debate, I think it is important to address some misconceptions that have been stated publicly on various occasions that there is an eminent need for this legislation for two reasons: One, that the historic buildings and property are not being maintained adequately, which is not correct; and, second, that the Z-Bar property and the entire Flint Hills tallgrass prairie are now suddenly facing the danger of being broken out and that some crops would be planted on these virgin plains. They are not suited to crops. This is not going to happen.

Now, some facts: First and foremost, the National Park Service study has continually recognized the excellent management and care that has and continues to be given this property. This includes the historic buildings as well as the surrounding prairie lands.

It is a working ranch. Mr. Arlan Dittmer, an old fraternity brother of mine from Kansas State, lives in the building. It is in fact and practice a

working ranch. Mr. Kenny Knight leases the ground and runs cattle on the ranch. Again, it is a working ranch.

The folks who went out there and conducted the hearing went to Emporia. They did not go down on the site and knock on the door and see Arlan. They may have perhaps tipped their wings as they went over it to see the beauty of the Flint Hills, which is certainly true.

Nowhere in the report has the Park Service or others found an imminent danger to the future of the Z-Bar or surrounding prairie. In fact, the National Park Service data shows a continuing positive trend over the last 30 years on the range conditions of the land.

As well, no one should make the mistake in thinking that this is an effort to protect various plant or animal species. The national directory states that "The Z-Bar property does not provide a quality habitat for any rare, threatened or endangered species." Preservationists should be aware that nearly 800,000 acres are already held by the Federal Government, 600,000 in the Conservation Reserve Program, 150,000 in regard to the Corps of Engineers, and private owners, the Nature Conservancy, 38,600 acres.

Mr. Chairman, Members should be aware that as written, this legislation has several goals and shortcomings that are conflicting. It does not achieve the objectives as described by its proponents. If enacted, it would waste millions of dollars as explained throughout the Park Service's testimony before the Committee on the Interior. Even in the earlier report, it was recognized that the Z-Bar property is far smaller than the size needed to meet the preservationist objectives of the Park Service. As well, it noted that the additional pressures the property would face should it be opened to such recreational activities as camping, hiking, biking, and others would result in a need for even more land. That has already been pointed out by Members.

Mr. Chairman, the Park Service noted the park would need to be two or three times the size proposed in this bill to fulfill all objectives. So you cannot have it both ways. It should be clear that what we are debating today is the beginning of a park that is not 11,000 acres if you meet the objectives of the proponents of the legislation, but the beginning of a project that would not be complete until the surrounding lands are absorbed, 30,000 to 40,000 acres, again if you want to follow the objectives of the people who are sponsoring the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to prevent the creation of a prairie park in Kansas. But I want a workable proposal that all the people of Kansas can support. As stated earlier by my friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NICHOLS], this issue has divided his con-

stituents. Most are opposed to it, by a 2-to-1 margin.

Mr. Chairman, I know the chambers of commerce from the surrounding communities that are not affected in terms of their land are for it for the proposed economic development. But not the people who live adjacent to this proposed park.

Mr. Chairman, this land has been fostered in such a way that it and the surrounding lands continue to radiate natural beauty. It is true, all of the remarks by the gentlemen from Kansas, Mr. GLICKMAN and Mr. SLATTERY, and my good friend, the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], are true about the prairie. They are a resource, and they have been treated as such. They are not in jeopardy. They will continue to be preserved if we can avoid both Federal involvement and the masses of visitors that could come.

Mr. Chairman, this land has been fostered in such a way that it and the surrounding lands will continue to radiate natural beauty and provide the habitat for various wildlife, while continuing to be a productive cattle operation.

Mr. Chairman, the caring of the Z-Bar and surrounding lands has been a way of life for local residents, farmers, and ranchers. I would say to Members that if you are going to "dance with the wolves," as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] has indicated, that I too saw the movie. I am for the prairie, I am for preserving our heritage and all of our history.

But I would say to Members that if you dance with wolves, it is going to be the Kansas one-step, because with 10,000 acres you do not have enough ground to get the job done. The bison and the elk will not roam this area in conjunction with the economic development objectives that you have listed.

Finally, by creating this park, let me stress again the facts are this: the Z-Bar property is not threatened. The National Park Service has found it not to be significant or appropriate to add to the Park System. It will cost the American taxpayer nearly \$10 million to purchase, and nearly \$1 million annually to operate.

Nearly 800,000 acres of tallgrass prairie are already being preserved in the Flint Hills of Kansas and Oklahoma.

The creation of this park will threaten the future of surrounding private lands. This fails to achieve all of the objectives the proponents have promised, recreational, for land and wildlife preservation, or rural economic development. The prairie park as envisioned cannot and will not be all things to all people.

Mr. Chairman, finally, I think that private options to purchase and preserve the land were not pursued or investigated as a reasonable alternative to the extent they should have been.

Mr. Chairman, with these points in mind, I continue to oppose this legisla-

tion. I am convinced that H.R. 2639 is the wrong legislation at the wrong time. I urge Members to vote "no".

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JONTZ], a member of the committee and a sponsor of this measure.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. It seems to me that any time a proposal comes before this body with regard to creation of a national park or similar lands, we need to ask ourselves what is the compelling national interest that leads us to consider this proposal?

We have lots of parks. We have wilderness. Why do we need an additional park?

Well, I believe that one of the reasons that we have a National Park System is to set aside representative samples of a portion of our landscape in this country, to address that in a word that is now current in the scientific community, to preserve by logical diversity.

By logical diversity we mean the variety of life. Certainly what we have in this proposal is to set aside a portion of the landscape as the tall-grass prairie which is not now well represented in our Park System.

□ 1420

The history of the parks of our country is certainly a fascinating story. Many of them were set aside for their great scenic beauty, for their attraction to us as places of recreation. But had we designed our Park System from the beginning from an ecosystem standpoint to make sure that we were protecting the various types of biological diversity which exists in our country, we probably would have designed it differently by including a prairie park from the beginning.

We do have a sliver of prairie here and there in our Park System. There are some means by which prairie is protected otherwise, but the suggestion from the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] that by putting lands in conservation reserve, that we are preserving those for future generations is just a mistake.

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

Mr. JONTZ. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out, that is the European system of reserves for private use. That is the real point here. I commend the Nature Conservancy for setting aside 30,000 acres. That is why we have a Park System. It is not that the Federal Government has to own it; we want it for public purposes.

Mr. JONTZ. I appreciate the point the chairman makes. We need a tallgrass prairie as part of our National Park System.

I believe that part of our responsibilities in this body is the responsibility

of stewardship, to leave to future generations as part of our public Park System samples of the different types of the American landscape which are important from a scientific, from an ecological standpoint, as well as the standpoint of educating the people about the resources of this Nation.

As magnificent as our Park System is, we need the addition of this Flint Hills property. Maybe it is not as big as it should be. Maybe there are not any immediate threats. Maybe there are not any endangered species there right now, but we will be doing the right thing for future generations if we establish this park and provide for the protection of the biological diversity which it contains and ensure that our children and their children will be able to use this very valuable resource.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2369, legislation that is both contrary to the wishes of the people that it would most affect, and would further strain the resources of an already overburdened National Park Service.

The able representative from the Fifth District of Kansas and I have a lot in common. We not only come from neighboring States, but we find ourselves neighbors on Longworth's sixth floor as well. We came to Congress together in a year that has seen more than its share of controversial issues, and certainly has had more of its share of painful surprises. We represent a similar constituency, and we both face unwanted and unwarranted intrusions by the Federal Government into the interests of those constituencies. And we're getting steamrolled by the majority flexing its muscles to implement an agenda that takes little, if any, heed of the people back home.

It's not too far to the north of the Flint Hills site that we are discussing today that you'll find the Niobrara River Valley, located in my district. And it has been 154 days since this body instructed the National Park Service to begin administering this river as a component of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Just 10 days ago, I visited the Niobrara with the Assistant Secretary for Wildlife and Parks, and you should know that as of yet there is no Park Service office in the area, no set boundaries, no management plan, no advisory commission nominations, not even identifying signs.

Perhaps 154 days is too soon to expect more than that. But consider that to the southwest of the Niobrara Valley, you find the Scotts Bluff and Agate Fossil Beds National Monuments, both authorized by Congress and administered by the National Park Service—Scotts Bluff National Monument since 1919, and Agate Fossil Beds since 1965.

After all these years, these sites remain underfunded, understaffed, and underequipped.

So before we assign these sites to past accomplishments, and go out looking for more additions to the System, perhaps we should see that existing parks are receiving the support that was originally envisioned.

But today we're going to tell the Park Service that we've got another one for them? Another one that can't wait? Another site that won't be safe in the hands of those who have taken such good care of it in the first place? Where are we going to get the ranger for this one?

I won't ask, where will it end? I don't think it ever will end—not until this country is coast-to-coast parkland and only Canada and Mexico stand in the way of our fencing off the entire continent. But I must ask, when will this body start allowing its Members to do the job they were sent here to do—to represent their constituents? When will this body stop spending money we don't have, and start spending wisely the money we do have? When will we start finishing one job, before starting another?

Mr. Chairman, we can start doing these things today. We can give the Park Service a break, and let it attend to the many, many tasks already assigned to it. We can save the taxpayers some of the million-dollars-here and the million-dollars-there that seems to be adding up to real money. And most importantly, we can give the people of Kansas' Fifth District, along with their Representative the respect they deserve.

We can do all of these things by voting against H.R. 2369.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOAGLAND], a member of the committee.

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Chairman, perhaps it is appropriate that I should follow the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], my colleague, inasmuch as he and I disagreed on the Niobrara legislation as well.

Let me say, in strong support of this legislation, that my family and I visited a small tract of land in northwestern Iowa this summer called Caylor Prairie, a 160-acre tract of land owned by the Iowa Department of Natural Resources which has been preserved by the State of Iowa since the mid-1950's, when title was given to the State.

Caylor Prairie has never been plowed before and has a remarkable variety of native prairie grasses. Northeastern Iowans are really proud of this little plot of land that is preserved the way it was back before even the white man settled the Midwest. Let me tell my colleagues some of the things that are in that 160-acre plot of land.

There are natural onions and potatoes that the Indians used to eat as

they lived off the land. There are various plant species they used for seasoning. There are plants used for medicinal purposes. There was even a plant called snake grass that provided fruit for the dinosaurs. It is so ancient that it dates back to the dinosaur times.

When we have an opportunity elsewhere in the Midwest to set aside, in this case, 10,900 acres that are held by a bank in conservatorship that is more than willing to sell this land to the Government, there is no question we should take advantage of it.

Let us look at what we know about the property in Kansas that we are talking about here, the Z-Bar Ranch property. In the uplands, the Z-Bar Ranch is dominated by tallgrass or true prairie species, including big bluestem, little bluestem, and Indian grass. In the lowlands there is smooth brome. The forests along the stream beds have native burr oak and hackberry. Over 400 species altogether of vascular plants are estimated to occur within the Z-Bar Ranch.

It is important to preserve this, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill before Members today and urge my colleagues to defeat it. My position reflects not only careful consideration of the testimony before the Parks and Public Lands Committee in July, the strong opposition which has been expressed by the local people and their elected congressional Representative, Mr. NICHOLS, the strong opposition expressed by the administration, but most importantly the overall lack of merit for this designation.

Since I began my tenure on the Parks Subcommittee some 17 years ago, I have been aware that NPS has been looking to designate a tallgrass prairie park. In fact, major studies have been conducted by the agency since at least the 1950's in an attempt to find such a site. In the mid-1980's, this goal was almost realized when a compromise bill was developed for lands in the Osage Hills region of Oklahoma. That compromise was derailed at the last minute when environmentalists attempted to expand the 80,000-acre proposal by another 25,000 acres. When that happened, other parties to the deal realized that for environmentalists the deal that was being struck was only valid until the ink was dry. In reality, there was no end in sight for how many additional concessions environmentalists would seek over time.

Indeed this has been the past history with respect to expansion of the National Park System. Of the 50 national parks in the Park System, 68 percent have expanded one or more times in

their history and 32 percent have been expanded five or more times. Every Congress passes 10 to 15 park expansion bills. Bills pass without benefit of thorough study, but because of some perceived threat, because some adjacent landowner desires to sell or because of the environmentalists eternal zeal to reach their original vision of the park.

Should the adjacent landowners to this park feel threatened? Absolutely. Should those who oppose this measure feel that their concerns have been addressed in any substantive way by the cosmetic changes to this bill? Hardly.

This particular ranch meets no one's idea of the tallgrass prairie site for the National Park Service. As the NPS has stated in writing and recently at our hearing on this bill, NPS is seeking a large area to be set aside consisting of a minimum of 30,000 to 50,000 acres. The position of the environmentalists with respect to a tallgrass prairie park is also no secret, while they support this measure, they do not see it as a substitute for the larger park. Therefore, even if Congress were to pass this measure, acquire and develop this land at a cost of millions of dollars; pressure would remain to designate a large tallgrass prairie park. That pressure will manifest itself as future expansion proposals to expand this park, create a new area just down the road, or create a new area in the next county.

I guess the bottom line here is that there is no good rationale for adding this site to the National Park System. It fulfills no one's idea of a tallgrass prairie preserve, but just happens to be a nice ranch with a couple of historic buildings which is on the market. Adding this site to the Park System is like forcing someone who wants a luxury five-passenger vehicle to transport his family to buy a two-seater economy model. As soon as the luxury model is available, he will trade in his economy model, because it is unsuitable to the task. Unfortunately, there is no trading in national parks. It amazes me to see the environmentalists who express so much outrage about the lack of funding for existing parks, go out and support every park proposal which comes along regardless of how it meets their vision.

Indeed, with the Nature Conservancy ownership of a 30,000-acre tallgrass prairie preserve just down the road in northern Oklahoma, there is a very legitimate question as to whether there is still any need for such an area in the Park System. It is unrealistic to say that we should add to the National Park System every site which is feasible or suitable. There are currently almost 3,000 natural and cultural landmarks which have been determined to be nationally significant. Because of the nature of the budget within the National Park System and within this country in general we must look for every opportunity to avoid adding sites

to the Park System and look toward non-Federal avenues for protection.

I hope my colleagues will consider this issue on its merit not on the rhetoric or which special interest group sends them a letter on it. If they do they will vote with me in opposition to this measure.

□1430

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] chairman of the full committee and a proponent of this measure.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of legislation to establish the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument. For decades, the acquisition and protection of some significant remnant of the tallgrass prairie ecosystem has been a dream of conversationists, scientists, and historians.

When our forefathers began the great westward expansion of America, the tallgrass prairie dominated their travels. It once covered more than 400,000 square miles of North America. Today, less than 1 percent of it remains. No park system that aspires to preserve and interpret America's natural and cultural history could be considered complete without a legitimate representation of the tallgrass prairie, but sadly, that is the case today.

The nearly 11,000 acres of the Spring Hill or Z-Bar Ranch provides us with perhaps our last chance to do so. The tallgrass ecosystem there remains in excellent condition. Several buildings of undisputed integrity and value, including the ranch house, limestone barn, and one-room schoolhouse will make great places to present the history and culture of 19th century prairie society. The private owner of the property is willing to sell, and more than three dozen Kansas organizations, including chambers of commerce, cities, and civic groups, strongly support this bill.

Critics of the bill have pointed to local opposition to the acquisition and designation. Mr. Chairman, I would make one observation in addition to the widespread local support for the bill. And that is that in the past century, this country has embarked on a mission to create national parks, wildlife refuges, wilderness areas, national forests, and other conservation areas that is the envy of the world. Each and every one of them was a fight and the victories were hard won. The national forests we now take for granted had to be created by President Teddy Roosevelt by executive order over the virulent objections of an outraged Congress. Innumerable parks and wilderness areas everyone today supports were at the time of their creation opposed by people who will always think of some reason why preserving and interpreting our natural and cultural heritage is just not important enough.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the Interior Committee has brought this bill before the House today. I want to commend our colleague, Representative GLICKMAN, for his leadership in breaking a decades-old impasse on tallgrass prairie preservation and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] has 1 minute remaining and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my remaining 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, as has been said properly in the course of this debate, what we need to do each time one of these comes before us is to look at it in terms of public interest and the value that it has. The proposal here is to acquire 10,000 acres in the Flint Hills of Kansas.

We say what is wrong with that. Let me summarize some of the things that are wrong with that.

First of all, there is no imperative, and that needs to be one of the characteristics of land we acquire, that something is going to change it. This is not an imperative to acquire.

Two, it is not favored by the local people nor the Congressman who represents that area. Increasingly we are rolling over the local Congressman and putting it in despite his protestations.

No. 3, there is substantial land in ownership and available in the proximity. By the way, here is a brochure from the conservation group that has the 30,000 acres welcoming people on to enjoy that particular land.

No. 4, it is opposed by the administration.

Finally, we are not able or willing to fund the parks that we now have in terms of keeping up the facilities.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this proposition.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my remaining 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, in prior Congresses all members of the Kansas delegation asked for the study that I have in my hand, and I will read from the summary conclusion. It says that the Z-Bar contains significant natural and cultural resources; may be eligible for either National Landmark or National Historic Landmark designation; and is suitable and feasible as a potential addition to the National Park System.

I read further from that report, Mr. Chairman, that the study land is currently in private ownership and available for purchase. The existing boundary is of significant size and configuration to afford adequate resource protection and provides a site for visitor facilities and minimal intrusion on the landscape.

Mr. Chairman, that is what the Kansas delegation requested. They received in the study the answers, and obviously today we have a different member of the delegation, but I think that the position exhibited on the floor really is a reneging on the basic effort the purpose of the study as well as being politicized by Washington, DC Park Service staff.

The professional report stands before Members. I submit that the Nature Conservancy has purchased 30,000 acres of natural grass prairie, but they are in no way opposed to this particular designation. In fact, they have given me a letter that states that they support the purchase of public lands such as the grass prairie resources, and I include that letter at this point in the RECORD.

NATURE CONSERVANCY,

October 7, 1991.

Hon. BRUCE F. VENTO,
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VENTO: I recently learned that The Nature Conservancy's Tallgrass Prairie Preserve in Oklahoma was a topic of discussion during the Subcommittee's markup of H.R. 2369. I am writing to address the concerns which I understand were raised, and to give you some background with regard to the Tallgrass Prairie Preserve in Oklahoma and the Conservancy's activities in Kansas.

First, we trust that our acquisition of the Tallgrass Prairie Preserve in Oklahoma is not being interpreted as either a sign of support or opposition to federal acquisition of the Z-Bar Ranch. The fact that the Conservancy acquires property using private funds should not be construed to mean that the government should not be acquiring land for conservation purposes—quite the opposite is true.

Second, I understand that it has been intimated that the Nature Conservancy could become involved—perhaps even acquire—the Z-Bar Ranch as we did with the Barnard Ranch in Oklahoma. This is to clarify that the Nature Conservancy is not contemplating acquisition of the Z-Bar Ranch.

I hope this clarifies the questions raised at the markup. If the Conservancy can be of further help to you or members of the Subcommittee, please let us know.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to legislation to establish the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument in Chase County, KS.

First of all, let me tell you about my experience in establishing a national monument. Last year, I worked with members of the Interior Committee to establish the Newberry National Volcanic Monument in central Oregon. We spent months working to craft a proposal that had broad-based support from a wide range of interests. When this bill finally passed the Congress, it had support not only locally, but throughout the State of Oregon.

I can tell you with all honesty, if my bill had the level of support this bill has, or lack of it, it would have never received a hearing, much less pass the Congress, and that's the way it should be. If the people of my district hadn't supported the proposal, I would have never introduced it in the first place.

So it is beyond my comprehension why we are here today establishing a national monument in Chase County, KS, that is opposed by the people of Chase County, KS. It is opposed by a majority of Chase County Commissioners, the National Park Service, and Congressman DICK NICHOLS, who represents this area. They oppose it because it is unnecessary and because invariably, the environmental organizations will push for expansion of the monument.

Then there is the issue of funding. Over the decade of the 1980's, over 100 existing National Park Service units lost ground to inflation. To a large measure, this was due to reallocation of funds to cover the costs at the newly established park area. Therefore, we shouldn't create new national monuments that will cost \$6 to \$8 million when the people of the area are opposed to the designation.

Like many of this side of the aisle, I have had other Members of Congress try to legislate in my district against the wishes of my constituents. So I can identify with Representative NICHOLS in that respect. We talk about deferring to the wishes of the Congressman who represents the area in question, but when dealing with land management issues, we rarely do.

But in this case, let's defer to Representative NICHOLS, the Park Service, and the people of Chase County, KS. They believe we shouldn't establish a Flint Hills National Monument.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the reported bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section is considered as read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The test of section 1 is as follows:

H.R. 2369

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

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT.

IN GENERAL.—In order to preserve a part of the tallgrass prairie in the Flint Hills of Kansas, to protect the area's unique environmental features, and to interpret the historic, natural, and cultural characteristics of that area; including rural farming and ranching activities, there is hereby established in the State of Kansas, the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "monument").

(b) AREA INCLUDED.—The monument shall consist of the lands, waters, and interests therein comprising approximately 10,894 acres lying along Highway 177 between Interstate 70 and the Kansas Turnpike immediately north of Strong City, Kansas, known as the Spring Hill Ranch as generally depicted on the map entitled "Boundary map, Flint Hills Prairie National Monument", numbered NM-FHP-80,000, and dated September 1991. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the monument in accordance with this Act and with the provisions of law generally applicable to units of the national park system, including the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes". Approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1-4) and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461-467). In the administration of such monument, the Secretary may utilize such statutory authority as may be available to him for the conservation of wildlife and natural resources as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—(1) After notice and opportunity for public comment, but not later than 3 years after the acquisition of the property referred to in section 1, the Secretary shall publish a general management plan for the monument. Such plan shall include (but not limited to) provisions for—

(A) the preservation of tallgrass prairie in the monument, and

(B) the interpretation of historic, natural, and cultural characteristics, including rural farming and cattle ranching in the Flint Hills.

(2) Such plan shall be developed in accordance with section 12(b) of the Act of August 18, 1970 (16 U.S.C. 1a-7(b)), and shall be submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(c) DONATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may accept and expend donations of funds, property, or services from individuals, foundations, corporations, or public entities for the purpose of providing services and facilities which he deems consistent with the purposes of this Act.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

SEC. 3. ACQUISITION OF LAND

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may acquire lands, or interests therein, within the boundaries of the monument by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange, except that no lands, or interests therein, may be acquired for purposes of the monument without the consent of the owner thereof. No condemnation or eminent domain authority is granted to the Secretary under this bill.

(b) PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES.—Units of local government in which lands acquired for purposes of the monument are located shall be eligible for payments in lieu of taxes in accordance with chapter 69 of title 31 of the United States Code.

SEC. 4. ADVISORY COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established the Flint Hills National Monument

Advisory Commission (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall advise the Secretary of Interior on matters pertaining to the development of a management plan, and the management and operation of the monument.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission shall consist of 11 members appointed by the Secretary—

(1) 5 of whom shall be residents of Chase County, Kansas, of whom 3 shall be owners or operators of farm or ranch property within the immediate vicinity of the monument;

(2) 1 of whom shall be chosen from a list submitted by the Governor of Kansas;

(3) 3 of whom shall be elected officials of affected local governments; and

(4) 2 of whom shall be representatives of conservation organizations.

The Secretary shall make the initial appointments to the commission not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, except that the appointment made pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be made not later than 6 months after the date on which the Governor of Kansas submits the list to the Secretary.

(c) TERMS.—Members shall be appointed to the Commission for a term of 3 years. A member may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has taken office.

(d) CHAIRPERSON; VACANCIES.—The Secretary shall designate 1 of the members of the Commission who is a permanent resident of Chase County, to serve as Chairperson. Vacancies on the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation, but the Secretary is authorized to pay expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairperson.

(e) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App) shall not apply to the Commission.

(f) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall terminate on the date which is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NICHOLS

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NICHOLS: Page 6, after line 15, insert the following:

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect in the fiscal year following the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act in which Federal revenues are equal to or greater than Federal expenditures.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, let me briefly explain the nature of my amendment which was printed in the October 9, 1991, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and my staff has distributed.

It merely places a condition on the expenditures of funds for the enactment of this act until Congress is able to balance the budget. This is not an unrelated condition because it merely addresses the issue of spending priorities, and the establishment of this National Park should be a low priority when the National Park Service has

stated its opposition to the Flint Hill Prairie Monument, is working in a deficit, and cannot maintain our current National Park System.

It does not make enactment of this bill contingent upon the passage of any other piece of legislation. It does not call for a balanced budget amendment.

Under the rules of the House, rule XVI (16), section 800 states:

*** an amendment to an authorization bill which conditions the expenditure of funds covered by the bill by restricting their availability during months in which there is an increase in the public debt may be germane as long as the amendment does not directly affect other provisions of law or impose contingencies predicated upon unrelated actions of Congress.

Without question the authorization of funds—Congress spending tax payers money—does have a direct effect on the Federal budget.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, the Congress must use good judgment when we consider the use of taxpayers money, and prioritize where we spend their money. This amendment has been endorsed by Citizens Against Government Waste and the National Tax Payer's Union. Therefore, I urge my distinguished colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, but for the fact that this amendment would deal with the effective date, it would really have little or no relevance to this bill.

What it effectively does is say we will make a decision on this legislation to designate or set aside these 11,000 acres of tallgrass prairie, but then we will postpone almost indefinitely, nearly without conclusion until such time as the first year in which there would be a balanced budget with respect to our national budget.

□ 1440

All of us would like to see, of course, the national budget balanced. The question is whether or not this priority, the designation of this park, deserves to be the last priority that we deal with on a national basis.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this type of discussion would better take place within the context of the Budget Act and the budget resolutions that we deal with in the Congress.

The appropriateness of the discussion because it is germane does not mean it makes sense to add to this particular bill. It does not make sense. It is another way, a circuitous way, to defeat the bill without, in essence, dealing with the substance of the dark issue.

In dealing with the substance of the issues before us, we have heard a lot of misstatements in the general debate about what is being accomplished or intended.

I think the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], though, touched on the most relevant point in discussion

the dollars available to the National Park Service under the LWCF, the land, water, conservation fund. Under that particular program, there are over \$7 billion that have been set aside from offshore oil and gas. That \$7 billion is available until appropriated, as stated in the law. Those dollars are meant to provide the opportunity to preserve resources, cultural and historic and natural resources such as this Tallgrass Prairie Monument that is being proposed before us today.

At the same time we are depleting our natural resources, the Outer Continental Shelf, oil and gas, the intent of the law is that we preserve other resources such as this proposed park, that Congress has been continually borrowing from the future, borrowing from the resources that we are supposed to set aside for this purpose, taking away from our national heritage, the heritage of all Americans, such resources, gradually even losing parts of our natural heritage.

There has been a number of suggestions that this issue can wait; there is no damage occurring to it, nor threat to damage. As a matter of fact, some portions of the tallgrass prairie, the Flint Hills area, have been cultivated, not extensively, but some have, and I think it points out that that is a possibility that such activities may irreparably damage such tallgrass prairie resource.

Here, in this case, I think really that the sponsors of this amendment and the opponents of this measure are really stretching trying to find arguments against this measure, and so if they cannot beat this issue on the merits of the resource, they are trying to conjure up problems with the budget.

In other words, the park designation is portrayed as being antagonistic toward the total national effort to balance the budget. But you are not really against the issue, and they all want to save it and preserve it, but the fact is the proponents of this amendment concerns are transparent to undercut to kill the designation and preservation of our national tallgrass prairie heritage.

We are all concerned about the budget. But the fact of the matter is that this resource deserves the opportunity to compete for funds just like all the other programs that we have within the Park Service or with our national budget.

This would defeat the purpose of the bill. It is a circuitous way to do it without addressing the major issues.

I think that if we were to add this type of amendment to every measure around here, it would be a different matter, but to select this one, this particular issue, which I think is of some import and of some significance nationally, and certainly has broad support in the body and in Kansas, and I think it is unfair and inappropriate.

I would ask the membership of the committee to defeat it.

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

Mr. VENTO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear that the money comes from the land and water conservation fund that is earmarked from revenues from oil and gas drilling offshore to these kinds of projects. So if the money is not spent here, it will be spent on some other land and domestic resource projects.

But I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NICHOLS], that while I respect his amendment, I noticed that last week in vote No. 300, the Lehman motion to recede and concur to a Senate amendment with an amendment to provide \$249.1 million for 89 highway demonstration projects throughout the country, I believe unauthorized, he as well as I vote for that amendment. Now, I did not see him arguing that we should not fund those 89 highway demonstration projects, none of which were in Kansas, by the way, because the balanced-budget amendment was in effect or because the budget was not in balance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, my point is that we all use these selectively. None of us are pure on the issue of Federal spending. Some are more pure than others, as the old expression would go.

But my gracious colleague and friend from McPherson, KS, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NICHOLS], did not, when he voted for nearly \$250 million for 89 highway demonstration projects throughout the country, unauthorized, which I did, too, because I think the country needs those kinds of things, at that point argue that we should not fund them because the budget was not in balance, and in that case, the money comes from the General Treasury.

In this case, the money comes from the allocated funds, from the land and water conservation fund, and we are authorizing the project here. We are actually spending no money here. We have to go through the appropriations process later on. We are going through the legitimate work of the House as Members have asked us for years and years, "Do not just appropriate these moneys. Come down and talk about the projects, authorize the projects."

The other body sometimes puts projects like this in without ever authorizing them. We are authorizing the project the normal way, the effective way, and so I would urge you, if you want to vote for this kind of bill, let us look back at some of our own records and histories in voting for projects around the country that were not authorized. This is an authorized project.

The money comes out of the water and land conservation fund, and I urge the amendment to be rejected.

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is exactly correct in terms of the assumptions. This only gives the Tallgrass Prairie Monument if there is authorization of the Flint Hills National Monument, it would only permit it to compete for dollars before the Committee on Appropriations with other measures, and it would be part of the budget process. There is no reason to exclude it. This amendment is certainly not a solution to our budget problems.

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. WALKER and by unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, how much money is typically authorized out of the fund? I know the gentleman said there is \$7 billion in the fund. But my understanding is that the Committee on Appropriations is somewhat less generous than that.

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, I am happy to respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The fund has, during the early part of the 1980's, under the previous administration, no dollars were sought or few dollars were sought in the Committee on Appropriations between the House and the Senate, and our body decided to provide a couple hundred million dollars a year.

Previous to that in the 1970's, much more was appropriated, nearly \$600 million or \$700 million, and in recent years, it has been about \$400 to \$500 million, as President Bush, of course, has sought to appropriate money from the LWCF.

Mr. WALKER. Are there more than 300 projects that draw from this fund?

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, there are a large number of projects that are authorized that are inholdings within the Park Service system, a significant number.

Mr. WALKER. Can the gentleman give me an approximate number?

Mr. VENTO. About 2 billion dollars' worth of backlog inholdings within the Park Service, not all of which are sought to be purchased, but many of these are inholdings which may not be purchased out, there is a backlog of dollars that could be or should be expended in some of these areas.

These dollars, also I would advise the gentleman, cover programs within the National Forest Service, and BLM, the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, my point is this, that this one project would total, according to CBO, about 1 percent of all the moneys that the committee, that the appropriating committee, is likely to come up with, so, in other words, if there are more than 300, 400, 500 projects around the country, here is one project that would usurp all of the money that would go to some of those other projects.

So we really are making a decision not about the merits of this particular project but whether this particular project is more meritorious than virtually everything else we have passed before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. VENTO. In commenting to the gentleman, I would point out that what generally happens is we go down the road, and it is important that we appropriate the dollars in a timely fashion, because the price of many of these things goes up. As a matter of fact, of course one of the crises that developed was with Manassas National Park in Virginia.

If we wait for Flint Hills Prairie National Monument to become a crisis, as an example, we would have a significant problem.

The intent here, of course, and I think that this price is very reasonable, a willing seller and a willing buyer; and nonacrimonious acquisition would be a very prudent thing to do, and, in fact, the gentleman's amendment before us would force us to wait so that we would authorize something, and the NPS at that point may not even have a willing seller, and we may very well expend tens of millions of dollars more additional dollars under the amendment of Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, for example, how much have we added to the backlog so far this year?

Mr. VENTO. I could find out for the gentleman. I do not have that at my fingertips.

Mr. WALKER. Is it 100 million dollars' worth?

Mr. VENTO. I do not believe so.

Mr. WALKER. Is it 50 million dollars' worth?

Mr. VENTO. I think it would be less, and I think it would be less than the \$50 million level that we have authorized, in law by the House.

□ 1450

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(At the request of the Mr. WALKER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. VENTO was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. WALKER. The only place, Mr. Chairman, where the gentleman's amendment is extremely relevant to this bill is if we are continuing to add to the backlog and if we are continuing to build up all these obligations of the Federal Government, it seems to me all the gentleman is saying in this amendment is that somewhere along the line we ought to insure that no money is going to be spent until we get the budget in balance.

In this particular case, what the gentleman is saying is that since we have this huge backlog and since we have all these commitments, that maybe we ought to look at the future obligations of the country in terms of a balanced budget. It seems to me that it is extremely relevant to the issue before us.

Mr. VENTO. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I just think it would be better to deal with the issue directly. If the gentleman is against the bill, I would suggest that the gentleman vote against it, rather than trying to suggest ways to complicate the issue and to mislead in a sense the Members as to what the issue is.

The issue here is whether you want to postpone indefinitely the purchase of this tall grass prairie. If this amendment taken on its face were to be followed, we would by virtue of this amendment be multiplying the cost of the particular area tens, maybe a hundred times, based on what happens, because the price of this land would go up. You would not have a willing seller. So I just think the amendment is on its face, unworkable.

I think the goal of a balanced budget, the objective, is a noble one. Unfortunately, the effect of this amendment does not help either the establishment of this proposed park unit or the National budget. It simply I think is unworkable and unreasonable and should be rejected for that reason.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It makes sense to me. It dismays me a little bit to hear the chairman of the subcommittee predict that this would put off acquisition of this property "indefinitely". That does not give me much good feeling about the gentleman's optimism of some day balancing the budget, but I guess that is the subject for another place.

Having served on the National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee and having seen the voracious appetite that subcommittee has for acquisitions and expansions, perhaps the gentleman's pessimism about the ability to balance the budget in the near future is well placed.

Let me speak for a moment, Mr. Chairman, to the underlying bill. Let

us look at the forces that are arrayed against this bill. The people at home do not want this bill. The Member of the House who represents the people at home does not want this bill. The National Park Service does not want this bill. The National Park Service cannot afford this bill.

At least one of the local governmental units does not want this bill.

Now, with all of that arrayed against an ordinary bill in this House of Representatives, you would not give it much chance of passage at all; but for the National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee, no task is too hard, no hurdle is too high. So here we are today and this bill is probably going to pass and proceed to an uncertain future in the Senate and an uncertain future at the White House.

One has to ask why we do this to ourselves. Why we do this to ourselves as an institution and why we do it to an individual Member and why we do it to the people whom he represents. I really do not know what the answer to that is.

Mr. Chairman, it has been mentioned many times that the National Park Service cannot handle these piecemeal additions to its holdings, cannot handle the operation and maintenance cost. It has a \$2 billion backlog on deferred maintenance and rehabilitation on the units it already owns and operates; but here we are proposing to add another burden to the budget of the National Park Service.

Now, I just want to take one moment and talk about something real small. When we get down to the point where we are dealing in a six-figure dollar amount, amounts less than \$1 million, many of us cannot compute. But I want to mention a real small number, \$6,000; \$6,000 is the amount of money that will be lost to the Chase County School Board in property taxes if this bill passes and this land is ultimately acquired.

Now, \$6,000 is not much to the Congress of the United States, but to the Chase County School Board \$6,000 is a lot. \$6,000 is enough money to supply the gas, oil and tires for the single school bus that this school board has for carrying children with physical and learning disabilities to a special education facility in Emporia, Kansas, near this location, every day, each school year.

Now, those Members of this House who represent rural communities perhaps with declining economies which have school boards that have to scrape for every dollar they get, you know \$6,000 is a lot, and by our imperious action here today we will be taking \$6,000 out of the revenue stream of this school board which they will have to replace, because by another Federal law they have to provide that transportation.

So I think that we need to think beyond what we are doing in terms of im-

pacting the National Park Service and ask ourselves, is the impact we are having on people at home really warranted, is it something we really feel we have the right to do?

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

Mr. RHODES. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague who has roots in the State of Kansas for yielding to me.

Mr. RHODES. I certainly do, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GLICKMAN. His distinguished father who was here was from Council Grove, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. RHODES. Both my mother and my father were born and grew up in Council Grove.

Mr. GLICKMAN. And we have great affection for the gentleman's father. I want the gentleman to know that.

I want to say a couple things.

Mr. RHODES. Here it comes, right?

Mr. GLICKMAN. One is that any loss of taxes, the local governments are held harmless for 5 years. In our judgment, it means that for 5 years there would be no loss of taxes, and in our judgment after that time period the economic development that would take place would more than offset the loss of taxes.

For that reason, most of the county-elected folks and Chamber of Commerce people support this.

Second of all, the gentleman mentioned that the Park Service is overstrapped as it was, but I recall the gentleman, if I am not mistaken, strongly supported the Saguaro National Monument near Tucson, AZ, also viewed with affection by me because my daughter goes to school at the University of Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. I hope she is paying out of State tuition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

(At the request of Mr. GLICKMAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RHODES was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RHODES. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe that Saguaro National Monument, supported I believe by the gentleman and I think it was the bill of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] cost four times the cost of this particular national monument, signed by the President this last summer.

I guess what I am saying is that it is all relative. You can reach agreements and people are supportive and they do not mind burdening the Park Service, but if there is some degree of controversy people then use the Park Service and burdening them as a shield to hide behind.

Mr. RHODES. Well, Mr. Chairman, if I could reclaim my time, Saguaro is in

a genuine urban area. The threat to the expansion of Saguaro from urban development is real.

Pinal County in which it is located is in fact an expanding county, is in fact an expanding urban area, so that degradation of the tax base is not nearly so serious as it is in Chase County.

I believe that the economic development that the gentleman foresees for Chase County as a result of this action is ephemeral at best.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RHODES was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RHODES. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the economic development that the gentleman forecasts for Chase County as a result of this acquisition is ephemeral at best. As we all know, Chase County has been steadily declining in population over the last two or three decades.

And finally, 5 minutes in the eyes of a rural school district with a declining population based on a declining tax base is a mere wink in time.

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

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the gentleman, Does that part that was supported in Arizona fall in the gentleman's district or the other gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE]?

Mr. RHODES. It is in the district of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. DELAY. Another big difference is that these two gentlemen supported that.

Mr. RHODES. That is correct.

Mr. DELAY. And in this case, we are forcing this on a Congressman in which this whole project lies within his district and we are forcing it down his throat.

In the other case, the gentleman, supported that project.

Mr. RHODES. I thank the gentleman for his observation. It is absolutely true. The Pinal County community did support this Saguaro expansion, as did all the urban delegations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RHODES was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. RHODES. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Well, No. 1, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the grazing fees or the revenue from the grazing fees in the original bill of the gentleman from Kansas would have gone to the local commu-

nities, but that has been changed now. In the bill we have before us, that revenue will be denied to the local communities, so his school district example is most appropriate. Now those revenues will go to the Federal Government.

Now, I am not going to get in the business that my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, mentioned in regard to who votes for spending and who does not, except to say that if I am not Ivory Soap pure, perhaps, maybe lye soap pure in regards to these appropriation bills, and no, I did not support the demonstration projects, and I still support the Gramm-Rudman-Nichols, spending plan here. I guess I can call it that.

□ 1500

Is it not true, I would ask the gentleman, that the National Park Service went out to Colorado just this past week and had a summit meeting with numerous participants there and stated generally that they do not have the revenues to operate all of the parks under their jurisdiction, that they need more personnel, that the management of the parks is in question, and really we are entering into a debate as to what we want our National Park System to be; accessible to everybody, can we afford all this, are we going to focus on preservation or what?

There was a big summit meeting out there, and yet we are now asking to authorize yet another park. Would the gentleman care to respond to that with regard to the summit?

Mr. RHODES. Yes, the gentleman is absolutely correct in the conclusions that he just stated.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for his brief but sterling statement of support.

Mr. Chairman, I would say only one other thing if the gentleman would continue to yield: My predecessor, Keith Sebelius, was the ranking Republican on the National Parks Subcommittee. He worked very hard in behalf of the Indiana dunes, worked very hard in behalf of some ground out by Death Valley, and worked very hard with the Redwood preservation, and he worked with Mr. BURTON, who never met a national park he did not like. He was like Will Rogers.

I would say from this standpoint we are in a new era here. And if the Park Service does not even know where we are headed and in fact we cannot afford this within the Park Service budget, it only makes sense to support the amendment of the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a large portion of the Hudson River Valley, which is the site of many of the most famous historical sites in America. In

the 24th Congressional District in New York, such monuments include the Saratoga Battlefield, and I invite all of you to come up there. It really is a historical site of which we can be proud.

My district includes the home of President Martin Van Buren in Kinderhook, NY, the Hyde Park home of Franklin Roosevelt and his wife, Eleanor, and the Hyde Park mansion of the Vanderbilt family. The home of Ulysses S. Grant, which is not even a part of the National Park Service yet, is also in the district I represent.

I mention all these historical sites to point out that there is a serious shortfall of funds available for such important monuments, not just for the new initiatives but for personnel, basic maintenance, and renovation for existing sites.

I would like to invite all of you to come up there and take a look at what is happening to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt home and what is happening to the Vanderbilt mansion; they are in a state of disrepair.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, enactment of this particular bill, H.R. 2369, will cost at least \$11 million over the next few years, up to \$6 million of those outlays occurring in fiscal year 1992. And as the National Park Service has stated in opposing this bill, they cannot even make allocations for renovations in the areas I have just mentioned.

This additional \$11 million will further impact already-stretched budgetary resources at the expense of the 358 units of the National Park Service already in existence.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that when it comes to National Monuments in my district, we are not even asking to have the money put in, because the money is not there. Yet I see bills like this one come on the floor day after day after day.

You know, we have an annual deficit this year of \$350 billion that will be tacked on to \$3.5 trillion of debt.

Do you know how much \$350 billion is? That is bigger than the entire defense budget. Yet people here yell we are spending too much money for defense. The deficit this year is greater than the defense budget.

The annual debt service on \$3.5 trillion is over \$200 billion.

Where is the money coming from? I do not stand up here to grandstand this, but I am going to tell you one thing: I go back home and I take flak because I have not asked for money, additional money to be added to the Federal deficit, because the money is not there.

At the right time, in a different place, it might be the time that I could support the bill, H.R. 2369.

But we have got to get off this drunken spending spree we are on. And no wonder the American people are losing faith in this institution. Please de-

feat this bill and support the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, after listening very carefully to his arguments in rebuttal to Mr. NICHOLS' amendment, that I suppose if we had a line item veto authority for the executive branch of the Government, be it a Republican or a Democratic administration, perhaps his amendment would not be germane.

I find it to be particularly germane. But I rise now because, as the distinguished subcommittee chairman knows, I am next in line of target, unfortunately all of us being Republican freshman Members along with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NICHOLS] for these encroachments or intrusions into our districts.

In my case, my district already includes the Redwoods National Park, the most underutilized national park in our entire National Parks System. But now the subcommittee has marked up a bill that is nothing more than a naked land grab, a congressional taking to the tune of \$900 million in terms of its budget authority, of 210,000 productive acres of timberland in my district.

Unlike the bill before us, the legislation before us, it does not include a willing seller provision.

What I am really concerned about is the precedent being created in the subcommittee—let me just focus on that for a moment. One, this subcommittee seems to be embarked on an aggressive campaign to take productive land off the tax rolls of local and State government throughout our country. This increases the pressure, the already-existing pressures which are manifold on State and local government in their delivery of services.

That is No. 1. No. 2, running through this whole debate, and I saw it in the subcommittee markup, as I think the subcommittee chairman would acknowledge, is the very dangerous presumption that the Federal Government, rather than private industry or private ownership, can do a better job of managing private property for multiple uses and multiple values, including recreation and environmental values such as biological diversity.

So the irony is not lost on me. In fact, I dare say the irony is very rich in this Chamber today that when the rest of the world, including the emerging democracies of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, are rushing to embrace the very freedoms that we cherish, including the right of private property ownership, our country seems to be going in just the opposite direction, two ships passing in the night.

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

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman mentioned something concerning the fact that a number of Members new to the body had had issues brought before the committee that affected them that they disagreed with. Did I understand the gentleman's statement correctly?

Mr. RIGGS. That is a concern, yes.

Mr. VENTO. Of course, there are many issues which are in disagreement, but I would hasten to point out for the gentleman that, of course, the initial instance in the matter with regard to Nebraska was brought before the subcommittee in the last Congress, in which a very senior Member was opposed to it. So the very same proposal was again considered and, I think, was expected to be considered in this Congress.

So there is no agenda, as the gentleman's remarks spoke to or as much as suggested there was.

Second, I would say this proposal before us today, there was no knowledge of the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. NICHOLS' position on the matter until the day the hearing was held with respect to it, at which time he announced his position in opposition to it.

So this gentleman from Minnesota and others had no way of knowing what the gentleman from Kansas' position would ultimately be. He was not a sponsor of the measure, but this gentleman and no one else, as far as I know, knew of what the gentleman from Kansas' position was.

So I want to assure the gentleman that whatever his theories and hypotheses are with regard to this, that there is no such agenda before the committee.

Mr. RIGGS. Well, reclaiming my time from the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, let me point out right now that we are in the process of soliciting the views of my constituents regarding the proposed legislation which, as I mentioned earlier, was marked up in his subcommittee. We are getting, as you might imagine, an overwhelming response from our constituents indicating that they are fiercely opposed to any more congressional taking, any more Federal land grabs in the First Congressional District of California, as a response almost identical to the response, the outpouring of sentiment that Mr. NICHOLS received from his constituents.

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

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the inquiry about how the gentleman from

Kansas stood, not known until the day of the hearing, I had a press conference the day before the hearing. My opposition to this was announced even before that time. So it was a matter of public record at that time. I have not taken a survey, a concentrated survey, as I had mentioned; but prior to that time, even before the release and recapture of all the results of the survey, I had come out publicly in opposition primarily because the people in our district are not for taking the land off the tax rolls. They are suspicious of the role of the Federal Government. They just do not feel they want this, with the law of eminent domain working, for future land acquisition.

□ 1510

Mr. RIGGS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to point out to my colleagues that I have been before the subcommittee of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RIGGS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that I have been before his subcommittee, and he has been gracious to empanel me as a member of the committee to participate in those proceedings, and I did hear local opposition characterized as parochial or provincial concerns, and I just want to say that, as far as I am concerned, the response that we get from our constituents at the grassroots level is a very real gut level response, and it is a response regarding concerns of jobs and the effects that our actions are having on their immediate economic future, and their families, and their stores and communities.

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

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that the hearing was announced long before the position of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NICHOLS] was known. I became aware of it the morning of the hearing, but it was not. So, I just want to lay to rest the hypotheses and theories that were being speculated here as to what the gentleman from Minnesota's agenda was, because they are incorrect.

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

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I would want to mention in deference also to the arguments about the congressional budget situation that the CBO, Congressional Budget Office, estimates that enactment of this bill will result in outlays of between \$4½ million and \$6 million in each of fiscal years 1992

and 1993, and we do not talk about cost, but there is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RIGGS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. NICHOLS. And then, after these 2 fiscal years, 1992 and 1993, when \$4½ and \$6 million would go out, another \$5.3 million would go out the following several years. So, it is a costly budgetary item, and that again is where the people are concerned, in addition to this Federal land grab. We must prioritize our spending.

Mr. Chairman, I held 31 town hall meetings in Kansas in August throughout my district when I was back there during the recess work period, and over and over again I heard, again from the little people on the streets, in the farms, and remarks on the main streets, "When are we going to cut spending?"

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to take up more of the Committee's time, but I think something needs to be said. Like the gentleman who is sitting in the chair, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], I first started in the Texas Legislature and learned something very meaningful in the Texas Legislature, and it kept a comity, and a courteousness, and an esprit de corps in the legislature that anticipated any problems that we may have. That thing that I learned was: "You don't mess in another member's district. You don't mess in another member's district."

Now this institution has been coming under fire for the last few weeks, tremendous fire that has denigrated the integrity of this institution, and I think that is very unfortunate, and I have not participated in that kind of denigration. In fact, I was one of those few Members that voted against the resolution shutting down the bank because I felt like it denigrated the integrity of this institution.

I think what is important here is that we are developing an elitism in this House that is very, very dangerous, and that elitism is: we know better what is good for a Member's district than the Member himself knows.

Now the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], the chairman of the subcommittee, mentioned that they did not even know what the position of the gentleman from Kansas was on this particular project. I ask, "Isn't that interesting? Why didn't they ask?" I mean it was totally within his district, it was totally within his district, so

why did they not have the courtesy to call him on the phone and say that they tried this against the gentleman from Kansas last year, knowing that she was retiring, and they thought they could get away with it?

And now they are going to do it to the gentleman, now that he is a freshman Member just coming into the House. I ask, "Why didn't they even notify him or ask him what his position would be on this project?"

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

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] want to cite a point in which somebody said that they proposed the Niobrara legislation in the district of Virginia Smith because they thought they could get away with it? What is the gentleman's source of information for that?

Mr. DELAY. I was here.

Mr. VENTO. Is the gentleman ascribing motives to Members? If so, I would like the gentleman to specifically point out—

Mr. DELAY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I was here. I remember the debate and remember very graphically the debate, and I am reporting on the debate as it was presented.

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

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, it was the gentlewoman from Nebraska, Mrs. Virginia Smith, who was in question here, not Virginia Smith of Kansas.

That was the last vote we had in that session of last year where everybody was struggling with the budget agreement, to get out of town at 2:30 in the morning. This thing came back again after we had already defeated the bill because it was on suspension. That was the very last vote of the last Congress, and we not only did it once, but we did it twice.

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, let me make my point, and then the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] may make his.

My point is that sometime, in some way, the two parties of this House are going to have to show a little courteousness in this House and a little bit of comity in dealing with Members, and what is happening in a Member's district. Now the gentleman's voting record has been questioned because he voted for whatever reason last week against a bill to pull out some projects of the transportation appropriation bill, and the Committee on Appropriations is a committee on which I sit, and inferring the fact that he was for that pork, but he is against this pork. Well, I think that is a really sad moment.

Now, if my colleagues believe that something ought to be put into the wilderness system, if they believe that and believe, as has been touted here today, that the LWCF, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, is a very important thing and it is going to take care of all this, then they also ought to believe that they ought to be supporting ways that this fund—we have news that this fund receives, and that is revenues from development of the Outer Continental Shelf, development of ANWR. That is where we get these funds. Yet this committee has consistently on the one hand said the LWCF is just wonderful, yet, on the other hand, we do not want any revenues for it because we are not going to allow development on the OCS, in ANWR and in other places, leading one to conclude that the way we are going to get this money, if it is appropriated—and I am going to work very hard as a member of the Committee on Appropriations to stop it from being appropriated—but if it is appropriated, it will be appropriated much in the way we appropriate highways.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELAY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to fund it this way, then the way we are going to fund it is the way we fund highway funds, and that is through the general fund, which leads to the gentleman's amendment. The gentleman is saying, "You're messing in my district, and you ought to leave me alone because my folks don't want this. I've had a survey. My people don't want this."

The gentlelady from Kansas, Virginia Smith, also reiterated that in this debate last year. "We don't want it, but, if you're going to do it to us, don't add insult to injury and do it to us on borrowed funds. At least do it when the budget is balanced."

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

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] yielding because I think, first of all, the gentleman's suggestion that the land water conservation is running on empty, I think, is not precise. The fact is that the fund has a backlog of over \$7 billion that are owed to these types of projects.

Mr. DELAY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I never said that it was running on empty. I am saying this committee discouraged bringing in new revenues to the LWCF because they discouraged development of OCS and ANWR.

Mr. VENTO. Does the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DELAY Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman: Does the gentleman support development of OCS, and ANWR, and other areas to oil and gas development?

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

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Yes; I do not favor opening up ANWR. I do favor using the dollars that are coming right now today in our \$7 billion backlog for the purposes that they were intended.

□ 1520

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will join me in support of the use of those dollars for what they were intended.

Mr. DELAY Mr. Speaker, I might support the gentleman on that, but I certainly will not support him to do it in another Member's district if the gentleman does not support such a project.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NICHOLS].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 153, noes 249, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 305]

AYES—153

Allard	Franks (CT)	McDade
Archer	Gallegly	McEwen
Armey	Gallo	McMillan (NC)
Baker	Gekas	Michel
Ballenger	Gillmor	Miller (OH)
Barrett	Gingrich	Miller (WA)
Bateman	Goodling	Molinari
Bentley	Goss	Montgomery
Bilirakis	Gradison	Moorhead
Bitley	Grandy	Morrison
Boehner	Gunderson	Myers
Brewster	Hall (TX)	Nichols
Broomfield	Hammerschmidt	Nussle
Bunning	Hancock	Olin
Burton	Hansen	Orton
Camp	Hastert	Oxley
Campbell (CA)	Hayes (LA)	Packard
Campbell (CO)	Hefley	Parker
Chandler	Henry	Patterson
Clinger	Hobson	Paxon
Coble	Hunter	Petri
Coleman (MO)	Hyde	Pursell
Combust	Inhofe	Quillen
Condit	Ireland	Ramstad
Coughlin	James	Regula
Cox (CA)	Johnson (CT)	Rhodes
Cunningham	Johnson (TX)	Riggs
Dannemeyer	Kasich	Roberts
Davis	Klug	Rogers
de la Garza	Kolbe	Rohrabacher
DeLay	Kyl	Ros-Lehtinen
Dickinson	Lagomarsino	Roth
Doolittle	Leach	Roukema
Dorgan (ND)	Lent	Santorum
Dorman (CA)	Lewis (FL)	Sarpalius
Dreier	Lightfoot	Schaefer
Duncan	Livingston	Schiff
Edwards (OK)	Lloyd	Schulze
Emerson	Lowery (CA)	Sensenbrenner
English	Machtley	Shaw
Ewing	Martin	Shays
Fields	McCollum	Shuster
Fish	McCreery	Skeen

Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Barnard
Bellenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Billbray
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Clay
Clement
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
DeFazio
DeLauro
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Downey
Durbun
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hamilton

Sundquist
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Vander Jagt

NOES—249

Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hefner
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Jacobs
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kiecicka
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman (MI)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Manton
Markay
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McGrath
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Panetta
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)

Walker
Weber
Weldon
Wolf
Wyllie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Horn
Poshard
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schauer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Trafigant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Viscosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—31

Barton	Flake	Mrazek
Berman	Ford (MI)	Nagle
Bevill	Ford (TN)	Owens (NY)
Boxer	Herger	Owens (UT)
Brown	Holloway	Porter
Callahan	Hopkins	Roe
Chapman	Lehman (FL)	Slaughter (VA)
Crane	Levine (CA)	Thornton
Dellums	Lewis (CA)	Vucanovich
Dymally	Marlenee	
Feighan	Mineta	

□ 1543

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herger for, with Mr. Ford of Tennessee against.

Mrs. Vucanovich for, with Mr. Dellums against.

Messrs. SMITH of Texas, MONTGOMERY, PARKER, CONDIT, and WEBER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McNULTY] having assumed the chair, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2369) to establish the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument, pursuant to House Resolution 240, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. McNULTY). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 284, nays 121, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

YEAS—284

Abercrombie	Andrews (ME)	Anthony
Ackerman	Andrews (NJ)	Applegate
Alexander	Andrews (TX)	Archer
Anderson	Annunzio	Aspin

Atkins Henry
 AuCoin Hertel
 Baucus Hoagland
 Barnard Hochbruckner
 Bellenson Horn
 Bennett Horton
 Bereuter Hoyer
 Bilbray Hubbard
 Boehlert Huckaby
 Bonior Hughes
 Borski Hutto
 Boucher Jacobs
 Brooks James
 Broomfield Jefferson
 Browder Jenkins
 Bruce Johnson (SD)
 Bryant Johnston
 Bustamante Jones (GA)
 Byron Jones (NC)
 Campbell (CA) Jontz
 Campbell (CO) Kanjoraki
 Cardin Kaptur
 Carper Kennedy
 Carr Kennelly
 Clay Kildee
 Clement Kleczka
 Clinger Kolter
 Coleman (TX) Kopetski
 Collins (IL) Kostmayer
 Collins (MI) LaFalce
 Condit Lancaster
 Conyers Lantos
 Cooper LaRocco
 Coughlin Laughlin
 Cox (CA) Leach
 Cox (IL) Lehman (CA)
 Coyne Levin (MI)
 Cramer Lewis (GA)
 Darden Lipinski
 Davis Long
 de la Garza Lowey (NY)
 DeFazio Luken
 DeLauro Machtley
 Derrick Manton
 Dicks Markey
 Dingell Martinez
 Dixon Matsui
 Donnelly Mavroules
 Dooley Mazzoli
 Dornan (CA) McCloskey
 Downey McCurdy
 Dreier McDade
 Durbin McDermott
 Dwyer McGrath
 Early McHugh
 Eckart McMillen (MD)
 Edwards (CA) McNulty
 Edwards (TX) Meyers
 Engel Mfume
 English Miller (CA)
 Erdreich Mink
 Espy Moakley
 Evans Mollohan
 Fascell Montgomery
 Fawell Moody
 Fazio Morella
 Fish Morrison
 Foglietta Murphy
 Frank (MA) Murtha
 Frost Nagle
 Gaydos Natcher
 Gejdenson Neal (MA)
 Gephardt Neal (NC)
 Geren Nowak
 Gibbons Oaker
 Gilchrist Oberstar
 Gillmor Obey
 Gingrich Oliver
 Glickman Ortiz
 Gonzalez Pallone
 Gordon Panetta
 Green Parker
 Guarini Pastor
 Gunderson Patterson
 Hall (OH) Payne (NJ)
 Hamilton Payne (VA)
 Harris Pease
 Hatcher Pelosi
 Hayes (IL) Penny
 Hayes (LA) Perkins
 Hefner Peterson (FL)

Peterson (MN)
 Bentley
 Bilirakis
 Billey
 Boehner
 Brewster
 Bunning
 Burton
 Camp
 Chandler
 Coble
 Coleman (MO)
 Combest
 Costello
 Cunningham
 Dannemeyer
 DeLay
 Dickinson
 Doolittle
 Dorgan (ND)
 Duncan
 Edwards (OK)
 Emerson
 Ewing
 Fields
 Franks (CT)
 Gallegly
 Gallo
 Gekas
 Gilman
 Goodling
 Goss
 Gradison
 Grandy
 Hall (TX)
 Hammerschmidt
 Hancock
 Hansen
 Hastert
 Hefley

Herger
 Hobson
 Houghton
 Hunter
 Hyde
 Inhofe
 Ireland
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson (TX)
 Kasich
 Klug
 Kolbe
 Kyl
 Lagomarsino
 Lent
 Lewis (FL)
 Lightfoot
 Livingston
 Lloyd
 Lowery (CA)
 Martin
 McCandless
 McColium
 McCrery
 McEwen
 McMillan (NC)
 Michel
 Miller (OH)
 Miller (WA)
 Molinari
 Moorhead
 Moran
 Myers
 Nichols
 Nussle
 Ohn
 Orton
 Oxley
 Packard

Paxon
 Quillen
 Regula
 Rhodes
 Riggs
 Roberts
 Roe
 Rogers
 Rohrabacher
 Roth
 Santorum
 Schaefer
 Schiff
 Schulze
 Sensenbrenner
 Shuster
 Skeen
 Smith (OR)
 Smith (TX)
 Solomon
 Spence
 Stearns
 Stump
 Sundquist
 Tanner
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Thomas (CA)
 Thomas (WY)
 Vander Jagt
 Walker
 Weber
 Wolf
 Wylie
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)
 Zelliff

establish the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was ill and I was unable to come to the House floor to cast votes on rollcall Nos. 305 and 306. I regret that I was absent for these important environmental votes. Had I not been ill I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 305 and "yes" on rollcall No. 306.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3070

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, about a week ago my name was inadvertently, mistakenly added as a cosponsor to H.R. 3070.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 3070.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION CORRECTING ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 2608, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 221) making corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 2608, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. —

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2608) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes", the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the said bill, to make the following corrections, namely:

(a) In title I, under the heading "Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Justice Assistance", at the end of the third paragraph, after the phrase "authorized by section 281 of Part D of title II of said Act", insert the following: "Provided, That of the \$76,000,000 appropriated herein, \$4,000,000 shall be derived from deobligated funds previously awarded under part B and subparts I and II of part C of title II of said Act".

(b) In title I, under the heading "Federal Communications Commission, Salaries and Expenses", strike the words "total obligations", and insert "necessary expenses".

(c) In title IV, under the heading "Legal Services Corporation, Payment to the Legal

NOT VOTING—28

Barton Feighan
 Berman Flake
 Bevill Ford (MI)
 Boxer Ford (TN)
 Brown Holloway
 Callahan Hopkins
 Chapman Lehman (FL)
 Crane Levine (CA)
 Dellums Lewis (CA)
 Dymally Marlenee

□ 1603

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. FORD of Tennessee for, with Mr. LEWIS of California against.

Mr. DELLUMS for, with Mrs. VUCANOVICH against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2369, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained due to business relating to the surface transportation reauthorization, and was therefore unable to record my vote on rollcall No. 306, final passage of the bill to es-

NAYS—121

Allard Baker
 Arney Ballenger
 Barrett
 Bateman

Services Corporation", after the phrase "at which such Institutes", insert ", primarily for the Corporation's grantee employees."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if we dispense with the reading, are we going to get an explanation of what this concurrent resolution does?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, we will provide an explanation; whatever the gentleman wants.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, just for a question, I understand there are going to be three concurrent resolutions? Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield further, no. The technical changes are all in one resolution. There are three items in one resolution.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but under this reservation, I would yield to the gentleman from Iowa for the purposes of explaining the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, there are three technical changes here. I might say, all are consistent with the explanations in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on the bill.

One of these changes concerns inserting a provision which would take money out of unobligated balances in the Justice Department instead of providing new budget—obligational—authority. This is what was clearly intended by the conferees and the outlays were scored that way. But when the conference report was written, this provision was inadvertently omitted.

The second provision concerns the FCC. When the President's budget was sent to Congress for the FCC, a portion of it was to come from fees, but in the conference report, the conferees funded the FCC entirely from new budget authority and not from fees. Therefore,

the conference report should have included the words, "necessary expenses" instead of "total obligations." This change does not increase budget authority or outlays.

The third change clarifies that when we referred in the conference report to a certain grant under the Legal Services Corporation, to whether or not a university had conducted National Trial Advocacy Institutes in 4 out of 5 years, it did not mean mere training sessions. This change does not increase either budget authority or outlays.

Mr. ROGERS. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman, on the three changes, one of the juvenile justice portion of the Justice Department appropriations bill, as I understand it, the conferees assumed in the conference report that of the \$76 million for fiscal 1992 that \$4 million of that would be available from current balances, from last year?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Right.

Mr. ROGERS. But the bill language was inadvertently omitted that allowed that to be done? Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that is correct. We intended to take these funds out of unobligated balances, not out of new budget authority.

Mr. ROGERS. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, on the second one, the FCC change, your resolution substitutes the words "necessary expenses" in place of the bill language "total obligations"?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS. Further reserving the right to object, without that change, the FCC could not expend the \$1.2 million from carryover funds in order to make them whole in the next-year budget?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS. Further reserving the right to object, the third one, the Legal Services change, is intended to reflect in the bill language the conferees' intent, as expressed in the conference report, in order for the Legal Services Corporation to be able to give preference to an experienced university when they give the money out for the training sessions for Legal Services advocates? Is that correct essentially?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is true; making sure that it is clear we are talking about institutes, not mere training sessions.

Mr. ROGERS. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the subcommittee, has stated, these changes are corrections which are necessary for the proper enrollment of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the initial requests of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to explain that the first two changes appear to me to be technical changes in reviewing it, and I do not have a problem with those two changes.

The third change, however, does appear to be more than a technical change. It is a substantive change that would have the effect of changing rules, procedures, and ultimately would direct the moneys toward one particular university under the formula.

□ 1610

That it seems to me goes beyond what would typically be considered a technical change, and so I would have some problems with that. If we could limit the concurrent resolution to the two subject matters that are really technical changes, then I would have no problem with the resolution. I would have a problem with it if it includes that third item.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I hear the gentleman's explanation; however, in the case of the third item pertaining to the Legal Services Corporation, I do not think it makes any legal difference whatever. Somebody says the change is necessary to make it clear that training sessions are not included. The conferees intended a university that has held institutes; we are not including universities that have held training sessions. The proposed language just clarifies for the Legal Services Corporation that they will proceed the way we intended them to proceed.

Mr. WALKER. Well, as I understand, it substantially narrows the scope of universities that would be eligible for the moneys, and therefore basically would make the moneys available only to one university under this amendment. That in fact is something which would have the effect of being a substantive change in the program, and in my opinion goes well beyond the nature of what is typically a technical change.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. Surely, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It is clear in the report, Mr. Speaker, as I know the gentleman always reads the reports, that we did not intend to include mere training sessions, but somebody thinks it would make it clear if we just included these two or three words.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I understand what the gentleman is saying to me. On the other hand, there is language that we are dealing with that needs to be amended. There needs to be some things done in the regular methodol-

ogy, rather than referring to those things as a technical change. In my view, this particular matter goes well beyond what one would regard as a mere technical change to the bill.

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

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

These changes have, by the way, been approved by the OMB downtown. They have been OK'ed by our leadership, both on the House level on the minority side as well as by the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, and certainly by me.

I think the language would be very, very useful, because with the few dollars we have in our bill for legal services and the few dollars that are available for training purposes, those dollars ought to be used by the most efficient method that we have, and that is by the most experienced in training grantee employees, and that is what this language essentially does.

Mr. WALKER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand that, but it also means that there is no competition for the money. No one is going to take a look to figure out whether or not they can offer a better program. The money is going to be singularly devoted to one university as a result of this language. That goes beyond the scope of what my understanding is of what good procedure probably should be.

As I say, in this particular case, since we are calling it a technical change, it goes beyond the scope of what we ought to be doing in a resolution designed for technical changes only.

If the committee wants to modify this at some point, that is another matter, but in this particular case it does go well beyond what this gentleman would regard as a mere technical change.

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

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, this language would not necessarily dictate one particular school.

Mr. WALKER. It effectively would.

Mr. ROGERS. The language as I read it does not dictate any particular school.

Mr. WALKER. No, the gentleman is right. There is no university named in this section. My understanding is, though, it has been very carefully drawn to ensure that only one university would be eligible, so the effective nature of the language is that it would do that.

As I say, I do not have a problem with the first two portions of the request of the two gentlemen, and I would like to have them go ahead with those maybe in another form, but I would object to this third item being in it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman objects, he is within his rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Objection is heard.

WHAT DOES THE CRIME BILL ACCOMPLISH?

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, very soon now this body will be faced again for the fourth or fifth consecutive term, I believe, with the debate on the comprehensive crime bill that has been offered in four different terms of Congress and by two Presidents of the United States.

Now, what does this crime bill, which we again will debate and which will bring out the emotions of the Members, contain that is so difficult to contemplate and becomes so difficult for the Congress to pass and which can do a great deal to curb the rise of crime in our country.

First of all, what does the bill do and what does the opposition to it really want to accomplish?

The bill if it will be passed, as we who are on the Judiciary Committee on the minority, as it were, if it were passed we would like to see it passed, it would call for reform of the exclusionary rule.

Now, when we tell the American public that we would like to reform the exclusionary rule, it may not be very clear, but what we are after is the following scene. We see time and again, and so do the American people, examples of criminals caught red-handed in the perpetration of a robbery or a burglary or a drug transaction of one sort or another enter the court and then in front of the judge his lawyer makes a motion having to do with the exclusionary rule to throw out the evidence because something went wrong with the search and seizure, that the warrant did not have the proper comma in the proper place or some other technicality.

And what is the result? The judge too often for our own good throws out the case on that technicality, saying that under the law on that technicality, saying that under the law the exclusionary rule says that evidence must be thrown out if the police did not have the authority in a search warrant, for instance, to look for certain articles that they found in the course of their investigation.

Now, is that not silly? The American people know it is silly to have a search warrant that says we are going to go in and bust and find drugs, we believe, say the police, and then all of a sudden when they enter the premises where they find no drugs or they find drugs, but at the same time they find a cache

of weapons, let us say machine guns and other kinds of deadly weapons, swooping those up in the evidence and bringing them into court the judge would have to throw that case out in some cases because of a technicality that the search warrant did not contemplate finding those machine guns or the police did not know, did not have an inkling that they might find these illegal weapons.

What we are seeking is to codify, to put into the law a good-faith exception to that exclusionary rule, meaning that if the police, the law enforcement agents whom we trust to keep the domestic security of our country, if they in good faith burst into a place armed with a search warrant for a certain type of criminal enterprise, that if they find evidence of another criminal enterprise, in good faith they stumbled on it, shall we say, they ought to be permitted to present that evidence and not have it excluded under the exclusionary rule when they finally bring that culprit to justice.

□ 1620

We want to reform the exclusionary rule. Is that so tough to take?

Yet term after term the opposition, the liberal-bent side of the Committee on the Judiciary and on the floor of the House fight the reforms, the modest reforms we seek, which by the way, Mr. Speaker, reforms which have been adjudicated and adopted by two circuits of the judicial system, the Federal judicial system in our country.

So it is not as if some courts have not already looked at it and have seen that when law enforcement officers, in good faith, obtain evidence of a crime, that they ought to be able to use it even if they did not have the authority originally to seek out and to obtain such evidence.

On the death penalty, Mr. Speaker, which gives me a great deal of chagrin, over the years, to observe the following: The President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, during his time pressed for and we accommodated his protection of a comprehensive death penalty bill that would restore of the Federal jurisdictions that type of penalty which is appropriate for treason, for espionage, and for murder committed in the first degree. We want to restore that kind of comprehensive death penalty.

What has happened is that many on the other side swoop to the defense of the criminal to try to keep him from receiving the death penalty.

Here is a man who has murdered in cold blood, who has bodies strewn all over the street because of his acts, and they want to defend him by saying that the jury should not have the opportunity, the option to inflict the death penalty.

We are going to redebate these in the next few days. I want the American

people to know in advance that we are serious about adopting, at least, a comprehensive crime package.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3371, OMNIBUS CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1991

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-253) on the resolution (H. Res. 247) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3371) to control and prevent crime, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CHANGED CRITERIA FOR USE OF THE MEMBERS' AMBULANCE

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. I thank the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, even as we speak, the following letter is being delivered to the Speaker of the House, the Honorable THOMAS FOLEY, the gentleman from Washington; to the House minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]; the House majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]; and the House minority whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH]. Mr. Speaker, this letter is on the subject of ambulances and perks. It says this:

OCTOBER 15, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, one of the most criticized instances of special privilege reported by the media has been the "stand-by ambulance" for members only. In its "inhumanity," i.e., "Staffer Dies of Heart Attack as Members' Ambulance Stands Unused Across Street," Roll Call, Oct. 14, 1991. This is the 2nd news report within as many weeks of an injured person being ignored by the ambulance and this instance, a fall down the Capitol steps, literally was in view of the ambulance. There can be no defense for this perk.

We must not ever turn away the humanitarian use of the ambulance whether for a staffer or a visitor. However, I suggest that a system of mutual assistance be worked out, in conjunction with the District of Columbia, that when the Congressional ambulance is in use, D.C. immediately dispatch one of theirs to stand by until the Congressional ambulance returns. Many volunteer fire departments in Maryland operate all of their services (fire and ambulance) in this manner, and it works well. (In fact such back up of the volunteer fire departments recently prevented my husband's store from being totally destroyed.)

This demand certainly can be justified because the Capitol is one of the busiest areas in the city of Washington—many days tantamount to a major parade because of the numbers of groups which target the Congress lobbying special interest legislation. The District of Columbia not only has received increased funding this year, but the fact that the Capitol is the major attraction in the

city—that our visitors also are staying at local hotels and contributing mightily to the tax base of the city—that they deserve good emergency services—should be able to be defended.

Having read the Roll Call story, it seems also that a better system for emergency calls should be set up rather than just depending upon the Attending Physician's Office for referral either to the use of the ambulance or for treatment of the injured or ailing person. Surely that is a job for the Capitol police and I would hope they would have the authority to summon the ambulance and/or the physician as needed. In the same vein, I hope that all Capitol police have received emergency medical training—and if not—this training be considered in the near future.

I appreciate your attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,

HELEN DELICH BENTLEY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked our leadership to give this critical matter their prompt attention.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA SEEKS PEACE AND PROGRESS

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, I rise to commend President Vaclav Havel and the people of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic for their efforts over the past 2 years to establish democracy and to work toward economic renewal.

Although this nation still faces tremendous challenges, at least the legacy of the Soviet invasion of 1968 may now pass into history. Twenty-three years have gone by since the "Day of Shame,"—August 21, 1968—when 500,000 Soviet troops overran Czechoslovakia to snuff out the "Prague Spring" reform movement.

Under the leadership of Mr. Havel, who was reelected to the Presidency in June 1990, Czechoslovakia is continuing to move toward a market economy. Last spring his nation's Federal Assembly approved two key privatization bills as well as new rules for foreign investors.

I applaud these moves, and I also want to praise last week's decision by the Czech leadership to cancel its proposed sale of tanks to Syria. The Government acted in a gesture of support for international efforts to end the violence in the Middle East. This decision will help the people of Czechoslovakia advance the cause of world peace.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND OUR ECONOMY IN GENERAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to talk about the issue of unemployment compensation and also about our economy in general, because as someone pointed out to me today, we hear a lot about the budget

deficit and whether or not the Bush administration is responsible for a budget deficit, a budget deficit which, I might add, is just about tripled in the last 12 years since President Reagan was first inaugurated. But there is a budget deficit. But there is another deficit they do not want you to know about, Mr. Speaker, and that is the jobs deficit. Because there is a budget deficit and, yes, there is a jobs deficit. Indeed, there are less jobs today than there were when President Bush took office; 300,000 jobs less.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, workers are being laid off each business day. USA Today reported, for instance, that 2,200 workers are being laid off each business day, and that 8.4 million Americans are unemployed.

How many other many millions are out there and have given up the search for work?

Two million Americans have exhausted their unemployment benefits during the first 7 months of this year. I think it is significant to note, because there is an assumption that all Americans, if they are unemployed, receive that pink slip, that all Americans will receive unemployment benefits. That is incorrect. Indeed, we are at the lowest point in this Nation in anyone's memory, a historic low of only 38 percent of the unemployed actually receiving benefits.

I think we need to look at the job-creation record or, perhaps better said, the job-deficit record of the Bush administration.

In 1988, President Bush promised to create 30 million jobs in 8 years, and he derided the Democratic Party's platform in concerns about the record of Mr. Bush and his party. He derided Governor Dukakis' statement when President Bush said, and I quote, "Dukakis claims that we are turning into a Nation of hamburger-flippers. I see a different America." I close the quote. But because of the President and his party's policies, it is the same America, but with more hamburger-flippers. Since, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the total service jobs increased 5.8 percent while President Bush has been President, while the number of quality manufacturing jobs decreased by 1.5 percent.

There are 300,000 fewer jobs today than when George Bush became President of the United States; 300,000, not 30 million more, not even on the road to 30 million; 300,000 less.

This is the worst economic growth of any President since World War II; 0.6 percent, six-tenths of 1 percent growth. The only President, I might add, with an average annual growth national product of below 1 percent.

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, I fear that the Bush record is going to look even worse in a few months when the gross national

product, GNP, data revision, which has been made public, is adopted because then the President's economic growth record will fall from six-tenths of 1 percent to four-tenths of 1 percent, and since President Bush's first quarter in office the economy for any quarter has not grown at more than 2 percent annual rate, and yet the administration is assuming that the economy will grow at least at a 3½ percent rate in every quarter of 1992. That flies in the face of the reality we have seen.

My colleagues, this is not partisan rhetoric. Mr. Speaker, these are facts. These are facts about the economy of our Nation. It is a dull, listless economy and stagnant. The people know, the public knows, the business person knows, that this economy is not what it should be. It is not growing, and it is not vibrant.

Happily though we will be out on the floor of this House in just a few days with the highway bill, which is one area that we can be making a public investment, for the first time investing in our economy, investing in growth, doing something that will put up jobs, will put up to two million people to work, that will produce new tax revenues and will help the economy to spend. Mr. Speaker, anybody can tell you, a business person can tell you, a homeowner can tell you, that the way you build is that you invest, and you have to lay money out to get money back, and that is what this highway bill will do.

There are other infrastructure bills that need to be done, but that is a subject for another day. The fact of the matter is that this economy is not growing, and it is bumping along. The recovery that we were promised in the spring, the recovery that we were promised in the summer, the recovery that we heard about in as recently as August, when the President said that the recession is over; that recovery is simply not here, and indeed most economists are projecting the same kind of listless progress that we have seen in the past months, and they see that for a long time to come.

Once again the job deficit: Where are the 30 million new jobs? I will tell my colleagues where a bunch of them are. They are standing in the unemployment lines. They are wondering where those new jobs were. They would be happy to have their old job. That is right, just a job they had. But unfortunately that is not the case.

And so what is the response? Well, the response is to talk about capital gains for the rich, and the response is to talk about all the other proven, the proven, incentives that probably only helped get us to the situation we are in.

I think that it is also important to note the administration's response to the unemployment compensation bill, which the President vetoed for the sec-

ond time last week. My colleagues probably may have missed that in all the uproar over the confirmation proceedings. But, yes, that bill was vetoed by the President, and, when he vetoed that bill, he vetoed extending unemployment benefits for millions of Americans, up to 20 weeks, as long as 20 weeks. He did say that he supported another bill, a Republican alternative, one that has been proposed in the other body, and in that bill he said that is kind of bill that we need.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at exactly what that bill would do for America's workers because in reality it does not do very, very much. First of all I think, for instance, in the case of my State of West Virginia, which unfortunately is right now bumping along with fairly high unemployment, the Democratic bill that the President vetoed would have provided up to 20 weeks of benefits for individuals who had exhausted their benefits. That is they had already run through the first 26 weeks, and in the case of West Virginia what the Democratic bill would have; for this column, individuals who have exhausted benefits. The Democratic bill would have provided up to 20 weeks of additional benefits. The Republican bill, no weeks. That is right; no weeks. I am saying, "You exhausted your benefits, you're a working family, you're out there every day busting, trying to find work, going out and doing those interviews. You going to get any help? No, no, not at all. But support capital gains for the rich. That will help you."

Then for those individuals who are going to exhaust their benefits in the upcoming months: The Democratic bill would have provided 20 weeks of extended unemployment benefits. That is beyond the 26 weeks that they are presently receiving. The Republican bill would have provided 6 weeks of benefits. In the case of my State, once again a good example, the Democratic bill provided 20 additional weeks of benefits for the 7,442 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and would have provided an additional 14 weeks of benefits for the 13,715 individuals that are estimated to lose their benefits in the next 10 months.

So, Mr. Speaker, you can see, I think, a clear difference, and, if you go through State, after State, after State, you will find the same type results. In almost every instance, with only just a few exceptions, every State significantly lost because of the bill that the President said that he preferred.

Now I think it is important to talk for just a second about what these benefits are. Are we talking about welfare? Are we talking about a handout? Are we talking about aiding those who do not work? Are we talking about in some way discouraging people from working? We are talking about preserving working American families, fami-

lies that have been working, families that want to work, families that are trying to work, and families that are going to work again. But they are in their rough time now. They have received their pink slip, and they are out of work for the time being. The present law provides for 26 weeks of unemployment benefits, and then up until July many of these families were receiving an additional 13 weeks of benefits in areas of high unemployment.

Now so that we understand what these benefits are once again, these benefits are the kind of benefits that help a working family stay a working family. Because they help them to make that mortgage payment. They help them to make that car payment or that truck payment. They help them to make out that tuition payment in August so that someone's child can stay in college, can go to the university, or to the college, or the State school, or the private school, private university or college, and so these are the benefits that helps them, keeps them where they are so that they can continue to be a taxpayer and so that they can continue to search for work.

Mr. Speaker, I resent those who would somehow suggest that these are welfare, and that remark has been made on this floor, or that there is somehow a giveaway program. These are benefits going to millions of Americans who paid taxes all their working lives and have been the backbone of this Government, who have paid taxes all their lives and who are going to pay taxes for a lot more of their lives, and right now they have reached a low point, a low point in their employment career.

Now it is interesting, the Soviet Union. We hear that we must preserve the Soviet Union's infrastructure, and the President is going to be asking, I believe, for resources to do that, to help the Soviet Union make it through the winter because it is going from one tough time in coming out of the many years of communism, and through a tough winter, and hopefully to emerge over here to another type of system, a system closer to what we know. So, help the Soviet Union.

I happen to think that it is probably a worthwhile investment for this country, given the billions of dollars that we spend on arms to protect ourselves against the Soviet Union.

Then we heard that the Kurds must be helped, and I do not think there are too many people that looked into the faces of those families and would have denied that help.

And so we heard that the Bangladesh flood victims must be helped, and so we hear that others must be helped. But all of them must be helped to make a transition from a shock that has hit them, that has rocked them body and soul, until they get back on their feet again. Fine. Let them be helped.

What happened to the American worker? What happened to one of those families, the millions of families, that have lost their jobs? Where are they in all of this? Why is it they cannot be helped?

They get 26 weeks. Is it too much to ask that they get an additional 13 to 20 weeks of extended unemployment benefits while they are going through the roughest time that they have ever had?

The greatest fear I have in my personal life, now that I have been blessed with a family, is unemployment such that I cannot pay my bills, and particularly such that I cannot have health insurance and some of the other things that are so important. What is it like to go home every night, to look at your family in the face and to know that there is nothing coming in while you are doing everything you can that society asks you to do, and so I think it is just crucial that these points be made.

□ 1640

So this is not incidental. The unemployment compensation bill is not a growth factor in the sense of what gets this society moving. The highway bill that will be up in just a few days is part of a growth package. But this is part of a package that is necessary to keep American working families together, to keep them viable, to permit them to go out and find work, to permit them to meet those kinds of what I call vital family investments that are necessary, particularly paying for the higher education of their children. Those are the types of investments I am talking about.

So while we talk about a lot of different things and we hear a lot of talk about the budget deficit, it is important to remember the Bush jobs deficit—300,000 jobs less today than when President George Bush raised his hand out here on the steps just a couple of years ago. Where are those jobs, those 300,000 less jobs? Where have they gone? At least if we do not have a policy that helps people keep their jobs, then at least we should give them the benefits necessary so they can keep struggling and go on and get another job, incidentally a job that is very likely, regrettably, to be paying less, because that is another part of these economic policies we have heard so much about, because for the first time we are seeing a decline of income, and indeed we are seeing, both in the manufacturing wage and other areas, that the average American working family today is making less in real dollars, adjusted for inflation, than it was in 1980.

So that is another part of this equation, the jobs deficit. It is something that we are seeing, and I am afraid we are going to see more of it. So that is why all this hocus pocus I have heard out here from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, all of this, with

people saying that they want a growth package inserted, a growth package which gives capital gains to the rich, that is great. That is all we need to do, give one more untargeted tax incentive to them. We have seen the upper income ranks grow in leaps and bounds. We have seen that percentage as part of total income shoot up. Yes, they are paying more taxes than they did before, but that is because their income went up so much higher. Yet at the same time we are seeing the average working family's income actually decline.

So when we talk about the economy, there is a budget deficit that has to be dealt with. President Bush needs to be held accountable on the jobs deficit as well.

Mr. Speaker, I see my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee and vice chairman of the caucus, has come in, and I would be happy to yield to him for any remarks he might wish to make. I might say also that this is the gentleman who was the instigator of this special order, and I appreciate all he has done to make it possible.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] for beginning this special order, and I wish to associate myself with the remarks he has made up to this point.

I want to address the American people tonight on a very important issue, one that the President and our friends on the other side of the aisle seem not to want to talk about, and that is the President's veto of the unemployment insurance bill. At a time when 2,000 workers a day are being laid off by American businesses, when almost 9 million people are out of work, and with an economy that has 300,000 fewer jobs today than it did when President Bush took office, the President last Friday vetoed a measure to provide relief to the worst victims of this recession.

I want to take this time to give the American people the facts on the Democratic bill that the President vetoed, and I also want to provide some facts on the inadequate alternative that has been offered as some part of a solution in lieu of his signing the bill that he just vetoed. The issue goes to the core of the President's inability to provide a real economic program for this country.

How have we gotten to this point? Last July the Democrats in Congress passed an extension of the unemployment benefits bill and sent it to the President. The President cynically signed the bill, but then he blocked the benefits from going into effect. So the Democrats in Congress sent him another bill, and just last Friday, as Clar-

ence Thomas took the stand and the headlines, the President chose to veto the unemployment bill in the media equivalent of the dead of the night. Now Congress is faced with the necessity of trying to enact these crisis benefits over the President's veto.

The Republicans, having heard the American people's overwhelming support for this measure, have recognized that they have to offer an alternative proposal if they are to sustain the President's position.

My remarks are an effort to document the shortcomings of the legislation being offered by my friends across the aisle. I would like to begin with my own State of California. California is the largest State in the Nation, and it has been badly hurt by unemployment. Our unemployment rate has been running higher than the national average for many months now, and yet 17 of my 19 Republican colleagues from California have voted against S. 1722, which is the bill I am here to advocate today. And our junior Republican Senator has joined them in that context.

Let us look at what distinguishes these two bills. The Republican bill which is currently being advocated by the minority leadership in this body, as well as in the other body, would provide zero benefits, no benefits to individuals who have already exhausted their benefits at this point, and only 6 weeks' benefits to those individuals who are expected to exhaust their benefits in the next couple of weeks. Our bill, on the other hand, not only provides 13 weeks, more than double the amount offered by the Republican alternative, for those who will lose their jobs and will become eligible for unemployment insurance benefits, but also retroactively reaches back with up to 13 weeks for people who have already exhausted their benefits, who have been victims of this recession over an extended period of time.

We are not talking about a few people, of course, in this State, which has over 10 percent of the population of this country; we are talking about a sizable number of people. Two hundred fifteen thousand, eight hundred sixty-nine individuals who have already exhausted their benefits would become eligible for these 13 additional weeks. Seven additional weeks of benefits would be available to 408,018 individuals who are likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

These are not political games that we are playing here. This is not some effort, as has been indicated by our Republican colleagues, to somehow embarrass the President. This is not a debate over simply how we are going to pay for these extended benefits. This is really a benefit package that we offer that meets the need. It is not an effort to somehow squeeze under available revenues that the Republicans have identified and on which, I might add,

they in my view are taking a totally inadequate approach in the funding of their bill. For example, they offer the auctioning of broadcast spectra at a point when the country is in recession, when we will get little, I am sure, from a very slack market of people who might be interested in bidding in this auction of broadcast spectra. It is a penny-wise and pound-foolish way to fund part of their inadequate package.

But beyond that, we are talking about people, the lives of individuals, as my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE], has mentioned, who are directly affected by this legislation—many more people, thousands more, hundreds of thousands more who need this legislation that we hope we can enact into law when the Senate takes up this matter.

Let me go on to another major State in our Nation which has also been ravaged by this recession, the State of Florida. Florida, of course, one of the fastest-growing States if not the fastest-growing major State in the 50 States, has also been badly affected by this recession.

□ 1650

Under the Republican bill, very similar to California, no individual who has exhausted his or her benefits would be in a position to retroactively become eligible.

In the case of those who will exhaust their benefits, who will run out because they are currently unemployed and are using their available benefits, 6 weeks. That is all the Republicans can offer. Our bill provides 13 weeks for those who have already exhausted their benefits, and 15 weeks for those who are about to and will over the next 10 months.

Let us look at the numbers again. For those 13 weeks of retroactive coverage, 65,000 people in the State of Florida who have already exhausted their would get benefits. An additional 8½ weeks of benefits would go to people who have already qualified for unemployment and will be running out of their existing benefit package; 133,651 people who will likely exhaust those benefits will be receiving them under this particular legislation, an additional increment of 8½ weeks over what the Republicans are willing to offer.

Let us take a look at another of the major States in this country who have obviously been suffering greatly. Michigan, of course, with the tremendous problem of unemployment, a long and hard to reverse economic decline, has the benefit of 20 weeks from the Democratic bill, both in retroactive coverage and prospective coverage. The Republicans offer no weeks of retroactive coverage, and only 6 weeks of new coverage.

For so many individuals who are having a very difficult time maintaining

their homes, paying the bills that they have to pay for their children's education, continuing to provide for additional health care costs, all the things that we can normally handle out of our monthly paycheck but which are denied us when we are forced to undergo an extensive period of unemployment.

There are 75,000 Michigan residents who have already exhausted benefits, will get nothing under the Republican bill, but will get 20 weeks of coverage under the Democratic alternative. We are talking about 134,000 people who will qualify for not 6 weeks, but 20 weeks, an additional 14 weeks under this legislation.

Yet there are still Members of the Republican delegation in the House of Representatives who have chosen not to support this bill but have chosen to support the unfortunate alternative that the Republicans have put together. Just as in the case of Florida, where a number of our Republican colleagues have been unable to see the benefits to their State, we have even in Michigan, a State as badly hit as any, colleagues who have been unwilling to see the reality, the needs of their constituents.

In Pennsylvania, where we again have a very serious unemployment problem, we have 144,000 individuals who are likely to exhaust their unemployment benefits, who will be given only 6 weeks by the Republicans, an additional 8 weeks by the Democrats. But, most importantly, in Pennsylvania, where we have some basic industries that have been suffering for many, many months, there is absolutely no retroactive coverage for the people of Pennsylvania who have lost their benefits. There is 13 weeks of retroactive coverage for those who have exhausted their benefits in Pennsylvania under the Democratic alternative, which three Members of the Republican delegation from Pennsylvania have still been unwilling to support.

They talk about their concern. We heard a lot about the word "concern" for the unemployed. We are not getting the kind of attention that we think these people deserve in real terms, in real dollars in their pockets, in a way that will help the recovery in the hometowns of these individuals who are unemployed.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] has spoken to us about West Virginia. I am not going to take any further time to talk about that. It is a pretty clear distinction in that State as well.

In fact, what is very hard to explain to the American people is that under the legislation offered by the Democratic Members in this body and supported by Members of the other body who are in the majority, there are only three States that benefit more under the Republican plan than under the Democratic plan. Even when there are

States with relatively low levels of unemployment, the Democratic bill reaches back and is of more assistance to the people in those States who have been long-term victims of unemployment.

So I would at this point be inclined to include in the RECORD all of the States, this kind of data which has been made available in detail, so that all Members of this body can take a closer look at how these two bills impact the unemployed, both the long-term unemployed and those who are about to run out of benefits over the next 10 months.

ALABAMA

(In weeks)

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	13	13

The Democratic bill provides:

Thirteen additional weeks for the 15,815 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 7 additional weeks of benefits for the 31,092 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

ARKANSAS

(In weeks)

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	13	13

The Democratic bill provides:

Thirteen additional weeks for the 11,496 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 7 additional weeks of benefits for the 21,218 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

DELAWARE

(In weeks)

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 27,100 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1 additional week of benefits for the 4,613 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

GEORGIA

(In weeks)

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 44,466 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1 additional week of benefits for the 88,597 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

IDAHO
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 5,626 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1 additional week of benefits for the 8,527 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

ILLINOIS
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 64,289 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1 additional week of benefits for the 128,363 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

INDIANA
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 20,319 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1 additional week of benefits for the 34,800 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

IOWA
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

One additional week for the 15,027 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

KENTUCKY
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	13	13

The Democratic bill provides:

Thirteen additional weeks for the 14,393 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 7 additional weeks of benefits for the 28,249 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

LOUISIANA
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	12

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 10,866 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 6.3 additional weeks of benefits for the 21,560 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

MAINE
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	10
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	20	12

The Democratic bill provides:

Ten additional weeks for the 13,889 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 2.5 additional weeks of benefits for the 24,350 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

MARYLAND
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 25,627 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1 additional week of benefits for the 54,679 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

MASSACHUSETTS
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	10	10
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	20	20

The Democratic bill provides:

Ten additional weeks for the 60,041 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 10 additional weeks of benefits for the 115,825 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

MISSISSIPPI
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	16
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	20	20

The Democratic bill provides:

Twenty additional weeks for the 10,756 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 14 additional weeks of benefits for the 20,050 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

MISSOURI
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 27,580 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1 additional week of benefits for the 51,588 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

MONTANA
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	13	8

The Democratic bill provides:

Thirteen additional weeks for the 3,535 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1.7 additional weeks of benefits for the 5,123 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

NEW HAMPSHIRE
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	13	10

The Democratic bill provides:

Thirteen additional weeks for the 705 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 3.7 additional weeks of benefits for the 44 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

NEW MEXICO
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	13	13

The Democratic bill provides:

Thirteen additional weeks for the 4,569 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 7 additional weeks of benefits for the 9,176 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

NEW YORK
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	13	10

The Democratic bill provides:

Thirteen additional weeks for the 137,938 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 4.4 additional weeks of benefits for the 275,128 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

OHIO

OHIO
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 48,275 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1 additional week of benefits for the 96,047 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

OKLAHOMA
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 12,287 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1 additional week of benefits for the 16,348 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

OREGON
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 17,871 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1 additional week of benefits for the 34,095 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

RHODE ISLAND
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	10	10
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	20	20

The Democratic bill provides:

Ten additional weeks for the 13,953 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 9.2 additional weeks of benefits for the 26,300 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

SOUTH CAROLINA
[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 15,414 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1 additional week of benefits for the 29,777 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

TENNESSEE

[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 31,801 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1 additional week of benefits for the 59,026 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

TEXAS

[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 68,755 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1 additional week of benefits for the 131,401 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

VERMONT

[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	13	8

The Democratic bill provides:

Thirteen additional weeks for the 2,671 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1.7 additional weeks of benefits for the 6,518 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

WASHINGTON

[In weeks]

	Individuals who have exhausted benefits	Individuals who will exhaust benefits
Republican bill	0	6
Democratic bill (S. 1722)	7	7

The Democratic bill provides:

Seven additional weeks for the 25,804 individuals who have already exhausted benefits and, 1 additional week of benefits for the 48,045 individuals likely to exhaust their benefits in the next 10 months.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I would just think those statistics are very, very important, and would ask unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has made a very important point also as he went through this State by State. There are only three States that will actually be better off under the Republican alternative. So it is quite clear that the Democratic alternative, which the President has vetoed essentially for the second time now, the Democratic alternative is the one that meets the needs of each State in a much more demonstrable way.

As the gentleman talked I was thinking that the attitude toward unemployment compensation, toward the unemployment problem, is, as the gentleman said, is to show concern, to evince concern, to weep and wail, but do nothing.

That, in many ways, is just like the economic problem. They go closely on the same track, which is to talk about all the things that the Republican Party talks about, all the things it wants to do, yet the proof is 300,000 jobs less today than when George Bush raised his hand to take the oath of office.

Mr. FAZIO. Could the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] enlighten us as to what the President promised us in the last campaign as to how many jobs he would create?

Mr. WISE. We should be well on our way, if this promise were being met, to 30 million new jobs during the Bush administration. As I say, we are now 300,000 jobs less than when he started. This is the worst growth record of any post-World War II President.

At the same time, they are salivating. They are down at the White House right now drooling at the opportunity to build the economies of Eastern Europe, particularly that of the Soviet Union. These are all very laudable goals. But they will not turn their attention here, where this economy is rocking and bumping along.

It is interesting, following the Desert Storm operation, now following the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union, if you had a guessing game and said there is a nation where there is a job deficit, there is negative growth in the economy, where the infrastructure, I believe it is 40 percent of the roads are in some need of repair, where almost in some States 50 percent of the bridges are in some way substandard, and no major airport has been started under construction since 1972, save one right now, and air traffic control is hopelessly clogged, which nation is it? You would rush to say it is Poland, it is the Soviet Union, it is Iraq after all of the desolation there. But it is the United States of America.

Mr. FAZIO. I appreciate the points of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE]. I particularly want to repeat the fact that this is the first President who at this point, and we are almost in his fourth year, has created no new jobs in net terms. Not only has he seen the job market decline by 300,000 jobs, he is the first President who may complete 4 years in office without having created hundreds of thousands, and in some cases millions, of jobs in the first several years of his administration.

This is an unprecedented situation the President has put this country in. Yet, at the moment he just wants to talk positively about the direction that he thinks the economy is going in, putting aside the problems of these unemployed Americans.

Only 30 percent of the people in this country who are unemployed actually receive any unemployment benefits today. That is a historic low. So not only do we have a historic low in terms of a President creating jobs, we have a historic high in regard to the number of people who have been victimized, who have not been able to find employment, but who are now eligible for even the minimal benefits that allow them to keep body, soul, and family together.

I am particularly frustrated by the fact that there seems to be so little interest in the fact that 2,200 people are being laid off each business day in this country. They are adding to the lists of these people who will soon be eligible for unemployment, and if things do not improve soon, soon will be eligible for no further benefits.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is making an interesting point. It is 5 o'clock right now by the clock of the U.S. House of Representatives. That means that in this country as 5 o'clock rolls around, the traditional quitting time, 2,200 people in this country are getting their pink slips or have just received a pink slip to take home to their families.

□ 1700

What they can look forward to is 26 basic weeks of unemployment benefits, no hope of getting anything additional from the President, if they are not fortunate enough to find work, and an economy where jobs are ceasing to expand.

Referring back to the campaign for just a minute, the campaign of 1988, I think what a lot of Americans heard very clearly was when George Bush the candidate promised no new taxes. I do not think we heard in the background the apparent promise of no new jobs.

I wonder what the feeling and response would be to that today?

Mr. FAZIO. I think this is a President who clearly stood up to his opponent in the last election and wanted to distinguish himself on the job creation issue. I think it might have been late in the campaign when it was beginning to tighten up, and he felt that he needed to speak to the people in this country who are interested in economic growth and the creation of jobs.

So he said that he wanted to create 30 million jobs in 8 years, and he derided his opponent who he said claimed that we were turning this country into a Nation of hamburger flippers. He said he saw a different America.

What we have seen is a Nation that is not even preserving the hamburger flippers. It is not even able to maintain the level of employment that we had at that time.

The total number of service jobs has increased since George Bush became President, while the number of quality

manufacturing jobs has decreased by a significant amount—5.8 percent increase in hamburger flipper jobs, and yet a reduction of better paying quality manufacturing jobs of 1½ percent.

Job creation was four times as fast during the Carter years as it has been under the George Bush years. And this is, of course, something that most people will find hard to believe. They have been somehow brainwashed into thinking the economy was not moving forward during that 4-year span of time. But certainly in comparison to the period we have been through with this President, Jimmy Carter created a much larger number of jobs.

Mr. WISE. Does the gentleman remember, too, the refrain that I think candidate Reagan and then-President Reagan used successfully, "Are you better off 4 years later?" This is a refrain I hope that people are going to be asking President Bush as he turns back into candidate Bush. Are we better off?

The poor, hapless Jimmy Carter, blamed for so much, yet created 4 times the number of jobs, 4 times the rate of George Bush. And we do not see any change in that coming.

Jimmy Carter, whether or not one agreed or disagreed with him, he would come to the well of this House during his State of the Union message and put something on the table to move this country forward. What President Bush has put forward is rhetoric.

We have the education President, the environmental President. I notice we are not referring to ourselves recently as "the jobs President," but we are all kinds of things. But we did not come to put it forth.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would just put this in context. Compared to all other Presidents who had served in the post-World War II era, President Bush has the worst record on economic growth. We have seen only a 0.6 percent growth in the gross national product in those periods that he has been President. He is the only President with a record of annual growth below 1 percent; and it looks to me, as we continue to see the economic data come in through the rest of this year, it will probably mean that the average growth in this country during the various quarters since he has been President will be less than one-half of 1 percent.

This is almost a standstill economy.

Mr. WISE. I might add a little irony, I just heard on the news where Assistant Secretary of Defense Atwood is going to the Soviet Union to help them plan to make their transition from a defense economy, defense-oriented economy to a peacetime economy. He is going to be working with them to show them how to restructure their factories to go from making tools of war to engines of peace. Whatever that may be, I just find it interesting once again, a lot of effort being expended in other places. We have a lot of factories

here that are shutting down and could use some of that assistance.

We have been joined by one of our more active colleagues on the floor, the gentleman from Florida, LARRY SMITH. I would ask the gentleman if there is anything he would like to contribute?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I wanted to come over and join in this discussion because I think, in addition to the time that we have spent minimally on the floor with this particular issue, there are other issues that need to be examined as to the reason why the whole of the debate still does not focus on the President and his lack of a domestic agenda for really putting America back to work and beginning to achieve the greatness that obviously he and everyone else in this country want to achieve.

The President's main engine for change, the main economic catalyst, as enunciated by him, his economic advisers, his chief of staff, and all the others, and the gentleman from California knows this well, as well as the gentleman from West Virginia, has been to reduce the capital gains tax. That has been his chief instrument.

In fact, to the point of Chinese water torture, we have been subjected to the cry from the Republicans that this is the thing that will bring the economy to an enormous new high.

If I am not mistaken, back in 1981, neither the gentleman from West Virginia nor I were here, but the gentleman from California was here. We cut taxes on everybody. We certainly cut taxes on the wealthy.

Immediately after that the gentleman will remember, because the gentleman's memory is not only institutional but it also happens to be secular and parochial in terms of California, the former Governor of California, who was then the President, screaming for this great tax rupture for the rich presided over what was then one of the biggest recessions we have had in many a year.

The years 1982 and 1983 saw some of the highest unemployment rates this country had had in many a year, and it took a number of Democratic proposals to bring this country back, to move it forward. Now in 1988, Mr. Bush runs as a man who wants to help the economy. And he wins. He becomes the President of the United States. And the economy starts to slow down. And slows down and slows down and slows down to the point where we go into a recession.

Not once during that period of time did we get a long-term economic proposal for the future of this country. The gentleman in the well knows that all we got was tax cuts for the wealthy, which created the recession that we were in last time. And it took the Democrats, by moving on the front of changing the tax policy, to try and

move us out of it. This is where we are right now.

The gentleman has kindly put up a chart. While I cannot go through it all, I have just two figures here. In my own State of Florida 65,346 people less will be benefited by what the President proposes to do than what the Democrats have proposed to do. And at least \$1,244 less in benefits will be paid under the Republican proposal than under the Democratic proposal, benefits which the gentleman in the well knows have already been paid for by the employers and the employees, sitting in a special Unemployment Compensation Trust Fund waiting for the very kind of recession we have today.

Knowing this, the President has refused to act. Knowing the pain, knowing the hurt, knowing the number of Americans out of work, he has refused to act—insisting instead, as both gentleman well know and the whole country well knows, that the recession is over. His economic adviser, Chairman of the Economic Advisory Council, the head of the Federal Reserve, all of his economic advisers have been saying for months, "The recession is over."

Well, the gentleman in the well can tell me, but I can also tell him, every single businessman and working person in my district that I have spoken to, including a very respected head of a bank that I saw on the plane today—a bank which is not in trouble, which is doing well, which has plenty of assets; it certainly is within the law as defined by all the regulations. It is doing very well. He is a very bright man. He said, "This is the worst thing I have seen in years. Not only is this recession not over, it is not even close to being at the bottom."

□ 1710

That is what they all say.

If the gentleman in the well would even humor me, tell me, how is it that all of those people, all of those incredibly intelligent people, Mr. Greenspan and all the other economic advisers, Mr. Boskin and all of the other people working for the President and the President himself come before us or hold press conferences and tell us the recession is over, but there are 9 million Americans out of work, and every single one that we encounter, whether a businessman, a professional, or a common laborer in our own districts tell us this is the worst thing they have ever seen and are scared about losing their job? I do not know what to think anymore, and I do not think the American public knows what to think. Maybe the gentleman in the well can help.

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman from West Virginia will yield, I would simply point out that the information we gleaned over the weekend from corporate leaders meeting at the Homestead discussing, as they do annually,

the state of the economy was a very negative report. These are gentlemen who have seen the facts that, for example, as recently as August, factory orders in this country were down 9 percent. They do not see an end to this recession, and the public agrees with them. I think recent opinion polls taken in late September by Republican pollsters found that 60 percent of the public favors expanding Federal unemployment compensation benefits, because almost that many, well over 50 percent of them, think the worst of the recession is yet to come. They think that we are not at the bottom yet, and some who think we may be there do not see us coming up from the bottom for a long time.

Together I think we can conclude from all of this data that we have the old-fashioned rosy scenario coming out of the White House, a look at the real world with rose-colored glasses so that they can avoid any responsibility for their mistreatment of the unemployed people of Florida, California, and West Virginia. This is the only way one can rationalize not signing this bill that the Democrats have sent to the President now on several occasions. It is the only way to rationalize supporting such an inadequate alternative, which is what they are currently doing at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WISE. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I think the gentleman in the well has hit a significant point. But let me offer another rational explanation.

Neither the gentleman from West Virginia, nor the gentleman from California, nor myself believe, honestly feels that the President does not care about these people. He is an American, he is the President of the United States. He must care about all of these unemployed people.

But is it not rational to think that because he has painted himself in a corner with all of these statements about the recession being over, that he cannot sign this bill because he will not admit that there is an emergency, that the emergency has to be declared before the benefits can trigger, and he will not declare that because politically it would be admitting that he has either been given to himself, which he is, and then talking about false information from others, or that he has been telling people something that is not so? It is that not a rational explanation why these benefits for 9 percent unemployed, higher than the national average, are being denied their benefits, because the President will not politically damage himself by admitting there is an emergency? Perhaps the gentleman in the well has some thoughts.

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield, I can only conclude that the

President is stubbornly refusing to face the facts, that he perhaps feels that if he somehow admits that the country is in economic decline, that somehow it will get worse.

It seems to me what we are advocating is honesty, forthrightness with the American people to recognize the dilemma we face and do something about it. I think it would be a mistake for people to conclude that these benefits flowing out into the communities where these people live do not help the recovery. These benefits have been contributed by the employer and the employee not just to help them through the tough times, but to help stimulate the economy in these pockets of economic decline and unemployment that need this sort of attention.

What do we do instead of using the trust fund that has been created, that these workers have contributed to and expected to benefit from? We talked about it a minute ago. We go to a flawed way of funding this that frankly is not even pay-as-you-go, does not even comport with the budget act, because the revenues that are to be derived from the auction of this broadcast spectrum or the savings in the student loan program do not even accrue for a while down the road. So it is a hokey approach. It is put together so that they can say that they have an alternative. The alternative is not only flawed on the face of it, in terms of what benefits it provides, but it is a flawed vehicle in terms of raising the revenues.

We have a system in place. The President has chosen not to use it, and he chooses not to do so, it seems to me, because he refuses to admit that the country that he is governing and has governed for almost 3 years now is in a terrible economic decline.

I just want to put in perspective, and then I will yield back to my friend from West Virginia, that the middle-class share of total income fell during the 20 years from 1970 to 1990 from 52.7 percent in 1970 to 49.5 percent in 1990, and a lot of that decline occurred in recent years. People who are currently unemployed in the middle class, and this is a white-collar recession in many ways, are contributing to that decline in real income.

Of course, most of us here in Washington know the President is not interested in the country knowing that the reason that piece of the pie has been taken away from the middle class is because it has been shifted to the wealthy who have seen their share go from 43.3 percent to 46.6 percent in the same 20-year period. That is not only the accumulated effect of tax cuts for the rich and tax increases for the rest, but it is the result of a recession and an unwillingness to put money back into the hands of middle-class people in this country.

Mr. WISE. And I think that is an important consideration because the American worker, whether at work or at home hoping to be working again, has a right to ask what is it that is being proposed. And so we ask where is the President's growth package? And as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] has so aptly observed of the President's growth package, it is a mantra. I do not know whether they meditate on it or what, but it is capital gains cut, capital gains cut, capital gains cut. And it is an untargeted capital gains cut.

We are talking about if there are going to be tax incentives, making them targeted tax incentives to accomplish a specific end. If you want a capital gains cut, how about giving it to the middle class, working people and eliminate it entirely for the upper income, the rich people who have taken such great advantage of it.

We are talking about building. How about a highway bill? Happily the Democratic Party is going to have a highway bill out here, one that is a far greater one than the President has proposed a few short months ago. That goes to the infrastructure. We need to get airports built, we need sewers, water systems. Japan spends more in absolute dollars today, with half the population and half the gross national product, than the United States of America does in infrastructure. That is why they are eating our lunch in several areas.

And middle-income tax relief. The President talks about tax relief. Once again, as the gentleman from Florida says, the President talks about capital gains. We are talking about middle-income tax relief that puts dollars into the pockets of the American worker.

And research and development initiatives, education. Do not just tell me you are the education President; come out there. And yes, there are some points to the President's education package that are meritorious. But I do not think people are as concerned about having the right to choose the school that they will go to as having good schools to choose from, and knowing that their school in their neighborhood is going to be a good school.

So these are all things that need to be brought out.

We are going to hear over the next month from our colleagues, I am sure, a swirl of statistics on this floor trying to keep the drumbeat rolling, that all is going well, and what the American people I hope will keep asking, and what we need to keep pushing is how many jobs have you created. There is a job deficit in this country today, 300,000 fewer jobs than when you started, and you proposed 30 million.

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield for just a second, I really think it is important that we emphasize the breadth of the Democratic Party's ap-

proach to this problem. We are not simply saying that you solve the recession by providing additional unemployment benefits to people, extend them for those who have run out of them. That is a minimum way of dealing with people who are in desperate need, who need to be given the insurance that they have helped pay for through their contributions during their working years. But it goes far beyond that. If we want to create jobs, we have to repair not only the infrastructure, but we have got to reinvest in the resources that are human, the children of our society who are not coming to school prepared to learn and are not being given the opportunity to learn there because it is our human resources that ultimately in the information age are going to make the distinction between an economy that is growing and producing jobs and an economy that is stagnating, as has been the case for the last 3 years.

□ 1720

So this bill is only part of that program that the Democrats offer. It is only one way of showing where our concern is. It is for 800,000 people who benefit under the bill that we have offered versus the bill that is being pursued by our Republican colleagues, the so-called Dole bill.

It is really those people that we are advocating today against the alternative Republican bill which they are telling us we should now pass, because this President has vetoed our last best effort.

I am still hopeful that we can find the votes to override that veto in the other body.

I think that people who take a fresh look at this, compare on a State-by-State basis, the distinction between these two bills, will very quickly come to the conclusion that this is one they have to separate themselves from the President on.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. WISE. Reclaiming my time, I just want to observe that the title of the bill that the gentleman referred to, I think what this party can do, and hopefully what this House will do in voting to override the President's veto is vote to keep American workers off the dole.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I think we ought to take it a step further. It is not just the 800,000-plus who will be benefited under our bill who will get nothing under the President's bill.

The gentleman alluded before to the fact that this is not just for the people who are unemployed. It is for the families and the communities. The ripple effect of unemployment, high in a given city, in a given area, and, frankly, I hate to say this, but the gentleman from West Virginia will know very well, because of the unemploy-

ment rate and the problems in his own home State what I am talking about, the ripple effect is enormous.

There are towns in this country today where Main Street is deserted, not because the shopkeepers were thrown out of business by their employers. They were self-employed. They are out of business because their customers lost their jobs. There is no money in those towns to pay for the sundry shop, the grocery store, the pharmacy, the travel agency, the mom-and-pop shops that are all the other middle-class folks. These are not wealthy people who can hold off in a recession by turning to their huge pot of savings or by manufacturing more widgets and selling them somewhere, although in today's market you probably could not sell them anywhere, and you certainly cannot sell them overseas, because nobody wants to open their markets to us as much as we open it to them.

But Main Street is dying, and as the ripple effect of high unemployment, Pennsylvania, Michigan, California, Florida, Texas, you name the State, this is all over the country, and what bothers Americans is that somehow the President does not really seem to understand or know or care.

What we are attempting to do will treat only the symptoms. People will not have to lose their houses. How many banks are in trouble in this country already? Suppose they have to start foreclosing on workers' homes who have just lost their job through no fault of their own? They are already holding much more than they can. More banks will be threatened with going out of business, taking in real estate from workers who may have worked for 20 years, and now, because they were in middle-class jobs and they may have educated one or two of their children through college, which is darn expensive, and they may have paid a wedding for their child, they do not have much money. They did not have a big pot of savings.

Do we want them to lose their house if they have been working all their lives for that one thing? They had the piece of the American dream, and now they are going to lose it.

We cannot allow that to happen.

If the President does not want to sign this bill, take that veto back, and he will not, we owe an obligation to Americans to override that. I believe we can do it in this body. I hope the other body wakes up to the needs of this country and begins to understand that this is a major issue for right now, for today.

The gentleman said it is not long term. These are problems we need to address today, and I thank the gentleman for taking this special order in order to be able to allow some of us to make hopefully more people understand why we should override this veto.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], who was the instigator of this and the organizer and put together the informational materials State by State, and I greatly appreciate his contribution.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for any remarks he might wish to make.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend yielding me these closing minutes.

We are in this not just to deal with these individuals who are struggling today, and there are so many of them, many more who have exhausted their benefits even in some States and are anticipated to exhaust them in the next 10 months. I mean, it is a rolling economic decline in some regions of the country.

But I think it is really important for us to focus on the fact that even if you use the very optimistic projections that this administration uses for the growth of the economy, 3.5 percent between now and 1996, that we are going to see a very slow recovery.

This is not a recession that is going to be creating jobs. We are not going to get to our prerecession employment levels for another 5 years in this country. This is a recession where extended unemployment benefits are not only being highlighted for the short term but may be absolutely essential over the next several years.

We are going to have a difficult time coming back from this one. Every economist tells us that we are struggling along the bottom, the flatland. We are not going to get the kind of GNP growth that is going to produce the jobs that will make it possible for some of these people around the country to be able to hold on to their homes or to put their kids through school. They are going to need the help of this Government and their States when that is possible.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Would the gentleman consider this a defining issue between the Democrats and Republicans and between Democrats and the President of the United States?

Mr. FAZIO. I could not think of a better issue to define the real level, not just of concern, because the President says he is concerned, but a real willingness to put priorities in place, to say that in fact the lives of these Americans are just as important as those overseas that we have declared emergencies in order to assist, that the lives of these Americans and their families are too important to be given the back of our hand here in Washington, that their futures are not so unimportant that we can just hope for the best and assume that the recovery will come, when we know that every economic indicator tells us that we have a long way to go.

We are absolutely convinced that this Democratic bill which has been ve-

toed twice now by the President is the key to defining who the Democrats are in 1992.

If this President is not overridden in the Senate, we will be back fighting once again in a new way to place another opportunity before him to show more than concern.

Mr. WISE. I thank the gentleman from Florida and I thank the gentleman from California.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, over a million Americans are currently unemployed and have exhausted their unemployment benefits. It is these Americans who have the most at stake in whether the Congress has the courage to override the veto of S. 1722, which would reform the current system of extended unemployment benefits.

For these Americans, the end of their benefits has been more than an emergency, it has been a catastrophe. As they scrape for funds to keep food in their children's mouths or to pay the heat bills as the weather grows colder, they see no hope for the future—only the loss of their homes, the end of their dreams of a secure future. And they must be wondering what this Congress is doing to help them.

If any of them have been listening to the debate on the House floor over the past week, they must be especially confused. They've heard claims made for a new bill—one which the President would sign—allowing benefits to flow immediately. They must wonder why Congress would not acquiesce and allow them to receive these benefits.

The truth is that for the vast majority of workers who have lost their benefits, this alternative bill is a cruel hoax. Under its provisions, fewer than 20 percent of those who have already exhausted their benefits would receive anything. Under the bill's restrictive "reach back" provisions, workers in only six States would qualify.

In my home State, New York, none of the 137,938 workers who still have not found a job, but whose benefits have expired, would receive any relief under this bill. None.

This is why it is essential to override the President's veto: to provide relief to these 137,938 New Yorkers and the more than 1 million other workers in similar straits across the Nation.

In contrast to the administration-backed bill, S. 1722 would give assistance to over 80 percent of those who have exhausted their benefits. In New York, the vetoed bill would provide an additional 13 weeks of benefits, allowing these displaced workers more time to find suitable and secure employment.

Mr. Speaker, our current system of extended unemployment benefits fails to provide the basic safety net our workers expect, deserve, and have received in the past. In August, fewer than 3 percent of those exhausting regular benefits were eligible for extended benefits. This is in stark contrast to past recessions in 1975, 1980, and 1982 when in the comparable month of those downturns an average of more than 82 percent of those exhausting regular benefits received extended benefits.

The bill the President vetoed will repair the safety net and return hope to more than a million American families. For their sake it is es-

sential to override the veto. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to override.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order on today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PICKETT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT NOT AN EFFECTIVE DETERRENT

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

Mr. COX of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, "Deterrence" is defined as "the inhibiting effect of sanctions on the criminal activity of people other than the sanctioned offender." Proponents of capital punishment often say that this is the main reason they support the use of the death penalty—that it is the strongest and most effective deterrent to serious crime.

This would seem to make sense. It seems fairly logical that the threat of death—one of the most horrible of punishments—would effectively inhibit a potential criminal from committing murder or other serious crimes. It would seem that you cannot get any tougher on crime and that implementing the death penalty is necessary to keep our society as safe as possible.

First of all, this logic is based on one main, incorrect assumption: That those who commit serious crimes do so after rationally calculating the consequences of their actions. Study after study has shown that this simply is not true. Murders are most often committed in moments of passion when extreme emotion overcomes reason. They are often committed while under the influence of drugs or alcohol or in a moment of panic when a person is caught committing another crime. Furthermore, some people who commit serious crimes are mentally ill. The fear of the death penalty is not a deterrent in any of these cases.

Mr. Speaker, a prison psychiatrist in Japan questioned 145 convicted murderers. He asked them whether or not they thought about the possibility of being sentenced to death before or at the time they committed their crimes. Every one of them said "no." According to the doctor, even though they had been aware of the existence of the death penalty, they were incapable of being inhibited by the thought of capital punishment because of their impulsiveness and their inability to live except in the present.

A British doctor, after working in the Prison Medical Service for 35 years, stated:

Deterrence is by no means the simple affair that some people think. A high proportion of murderers are so tensed up at the time of their crime as to be impervious to the consequences to themselves.

Gabriel Tarde, the great 19th-century pioneer of criminology, originally favored the death penalty describing it as—

The most logical, most concise, and even the most humane solution to the penal problem in so far as social monsters are concerned.

He later changed his mind, however, when, as director of the bureau of statistics in the department of justice in Paris—

He found virtually no relationship between rates of criminal activity and the severity of punishment.

Offenders who do plan out their crime in a calculated manner most often proceed despite the risks because they believe they won't be caught. The key to deterrence in those cases is to increase the likelihood of detection, arrest, and conviction, not to implement a supposedly stronger or harsher punishment. Amnesty International has stated that they feel the death penalty may in fact be counterproductive in that—

It diverts attention from efforts needed to bring about real improvements in combating crime.

Second, Mr. Speaker, the deterrence argument used by supporters of capital punishment is not based on facts. If the death penalty did in fact deter potential offenders more effectively than other punishments, we should expect to find, in studies of comparable States and countries, that those who use the death penalty for a certain crime should have a lower rate of occurrence for that crime. Similarly, we should expect a rise in the crime rate in a State after it abolishes the death penalty and a decline in the crime rate after it implements the death penalty. Yet study after study has failed to establish any such link between the death penalty and crime rates.

The United Kingdom Royal Commission on Capital Punishment performed a study of jurisdictions which had abolished or ceased using the death penalty for murder. They studied seven European countries, New Zealand, and individual States within Australia and the United States. They concluded:

There is no clear evidence in any of the figures we have examined that the abolition of capital punishment has led to an increase in the homicide rate or that its reintroduction has led to a fall.

The United Nations requested a report of the effects of removing various offenses from the list of capital crimes. The report stated:

Such a removal has, in fact, never been followed by a notable rise in the incidence of the crime no longer punishable by death.

A second report, prepared in 1988, stated:

The fact that all the evidence continues to point in the same direction is persuasive a priori evidence that countries need not fear sudden and serious changes in the curve of crime if they reduce their reliance upon the death penalty.

Third, Mr. Speaker, some research has even suggested that executions may temporarily result in more homicides. Two U.S. researchers studied monthly homicide rates in the State of New York between 1907 and 1963 using a wide range of controls. They found that—

There had been, on average, two additional homicides in the month immediately after an execution.

They suggested that this momentary rise in homicides might be due to a "brutalizing effect of executions, similar to the effect of other violent events such as publicized suicides, mass murders, and assassinations." The same results were found in a monthly analysis of executions and murders in Chicago.

Over the last 15 years States which have and use the death penalty have continued to have extremely high murder rates while those without the death penalty have continued to have some of the lowest murder rates in the country. In 1979 John Spenkelink was executed in Florida. During the 14-day period following his execution the homicides in north Florida rose 16 percent. There was not even a short-term deterrent when the publicity of the implementation of the death penalty was most obvious.

In conclusion, I admit that these studies are not perfect. Methodological weaknesses are inherent in all such studies. But the fact that no clear evidence can be found that the death penalty inhibits criminal activity proves that it is not a uniquely effective deterrent as supporters of capital punishment would like you to believe. The death penalty is thus a moral and political question, not an empirical one.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CALLAHAN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today and the balance of the week, on account of personal reasons.

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. GEKAS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KYL, for 1 hour each day, on October 15, 16, 17, and 18.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 1 hour each day, on November 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11,

12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, and 29.

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes today.
Mrs. BENTLEY for 5 minutes today, in lieu of 60 minutes previously approved.

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

Mr. COX of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BONIOR, for 60 minutes, on October 17.

Mr. ESPY, for 60 minutes, on October 16.

Mr. SLATTERY, for 60 minutes, on October 22.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. WISE) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WISE, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
Mr. LEWIS of California.
Mr. GALLEGLEY.

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

Mr. ANDERSON, in 10 instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ, in 10 instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, in six instances.
Mr. BROWN, in 10 instances.
Mr. ROE, in two instances.
Mr. ERDREICH.
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.
Mr. MILLER of California.
Mr. AUCCOIN.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. HUBBARD.
Mr. COOPER.
Mr. ECKART.
Mr. VENTO, in two instances.
Mr. TOWNS.
Mr. SOLARZ.
Mr. MOODY.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 291. An act to settle certain water rights claims of the San Carlos Apache Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COX of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until to-

morrow, Wednesday, October 16, 1991, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2202. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of October 1, 1991, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 102-151); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2203. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Energy, transmitting a copy of an audit report entitled "Superfund Costs Claimed by the Department of Energy Under Interagency Agreements With the EPA—Fiscal Year 1990," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 7501 note; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2204. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 91-51, authorizing the furnishing of assistance from the Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund for unexpected urgent needs of refugees and other persons in the Middle East and the Horn of Africa, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2601(c)(3); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2205. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2206. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the sale to the Republic of Korea of obsolete ammunition from war reserve stocks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2207. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve the location of a memorial to George Mason; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2208. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting a copy of Status of the Nation's Highways and Bridges: Conditions and Performance, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 307(f); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2209. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting a report on the FAA Aviation Research Grants Programs; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

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. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 35. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of North Carolina as wilderness, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-248, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1297. A bill to amend the Dingell-Johnson Sport

Fish Restoration Act to authorize the use by coastal States of apportionments under that act for construction, renovation, and maintenance of shoreside pumpout stations for marine sanitation devices; with an amendment (Rept. 102-251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2436. A bill to expand the Fort Necessity National Battlefield, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 247. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 3371, a bill to control and prevent crime (Rept. 102-253). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. AUCOIN:

H.R. 3557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve family child care by prescribing the formula for allocating indirect expenses to a child care service business conducted in the taxpayer's residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEILENSON:

H.R. 3558. A bill to prohibit foreign assistance and arms sales to any country that does not recognize Israel or that maintains the primary economic boycott against Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 3559. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit certain practices in the use of automatic dialing devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ECKART (for himself, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 3560. A bill to protect the cable consumer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOSS:

H.R. 3561. A bill to limit the duration of payments of expenses of former Speakers of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GUARINI (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 3562. A bill relating to the use of unobligated moneys in the Customs Forfeiture Fund; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 3563. A bill to provide for the retention of the name of Mount McKinley; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 3564. A bill to improve the management of public lands used for military purposes, to require assessments of future needs for withdrawals of public lands for such uses, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Armed Services.

By Mr. VENTO (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 3565. A bill to withdraw certain Federal lands in the State of California for military purposes, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Armed Services.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.J. Res. 349. Joint resolution designating the week of October 27–November 2, 1991, as

"National Pornography Victims Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H. Con. Res. 221. Concurrent resolution commending Aung San Suu Kyi on the occasion of her receiving the Nobel Peace Prize and requesting that the Speaker of the House invite her to address a joint meeting of the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 20: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 318: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 446: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 585: Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 722: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 723: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 931: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 988: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 1048: Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 1212: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1213: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 1239: Mr. GALLO and Mr. WASHINGTON.

H.R. 1240: Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 1346: Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 1460: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1473: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1502: Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1546: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 1547: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 1664: Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 1691: Mr. MORAN, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. ROE, Mr. CONDIT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. VENTO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H.R. 1692: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 1820: Mr. COX of Illinois.

H.R. 1992: Mr. MCGRATH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FROST, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2070: Mr. LANCASTER and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2152: Mr. MORRISON.

H.R. 2248: Mr. BREWSTER, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 2304: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 2363: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 2383: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 2624: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 2756: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. OLIN, and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 2773: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 2784: Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 2830: Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 2862: Mr. EWING and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 2880: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MINK, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. DOWNEY.

H.R. 2890: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 2906: Mr. EVANS and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 2929: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CLAY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. FROST, and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.
 H.R. 3082: Mr. KOLTER.
 H.R. 3187: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. MINETA.
 H.R. 3199: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SKEEN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. ECKART.
 H.R. 3253: Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Ms. MOLINARI.
 H.R. 3277: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. WEBER, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 3281: Mr. GEJDENSON.
 H.R. 3345: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. YATES, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. McNULTY.
 H.R. 3372: Mr. FROST and Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H.R. 3454: Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WALSH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLUG, Mr. CAMP, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. HORTON.
 H.R. 3546: Mr. MORRISON and Mr. BARRETT.
 H.J. Res. 5: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. EWING.
 H.J. Res. 22: Mr. CAMP.
 H.J. Res. 125: Mr. FISH, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STEARNS,

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. WISE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. CHANDLER.
 H.J. Res. 210: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.J. Res. 228: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SWETT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HYDE, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.J. Res. 261: Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. WASHINGTON.
 H.J. Res. 274: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. GREEN of New York.
 H.J. Res. 296: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. ECKART, Mr. EVANS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. FISH, Ms. LONG, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RINALDO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. PORTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KLUG, and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.
 H.J. Res. 300: Mr. ROE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CARPER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mrs.

UNSOELD, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MOODY, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. LANTOS.
 H.J. Res. 324: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DELAY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. KLUG, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CARR, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. FEIGHAN.
 H. Con. Res. 123: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.
 H. Con. Res. 211: Mr. LAROCO, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. ECKART, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. LAFALCE.
 H. Res. 233: Mr. PENNY and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.
 H. Res. 234: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

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. 1028: Mr. HYDE.
 H.R. 3070: Mr. GRANDY.
 H. Res. 194: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.