

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, October 21, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

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

We remember in this our prayer, gracious God, all those people who are apprehensive about the day or anxious about the future. O God, Your blessings have been ever with us and Your goodness surrounds on every side. Our supplications this day are with those who are ill or in any distress, those who do enjoy the fullness of health or the confidence of renewed strength, and whose names we remember in the privacy of our own hearts. As You have created each of us in Your image and have breathed into us the very breath of life, so may Your strength and healing give each person the assurance that You are always with them and Your grace is sufficient for every need. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] if he would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ALLARD 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.

SUPPORT LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS OF CRIME BILL

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, later in this week, possibly tomorrow, the House will have an opportunity to, in effect, put its money where its mouth is in the fight against drugs and in the war which is being waged around the country against illegal drug activity.

When the Committee on the Judiciary on which I serve marked up the crime bill, it adopted my amendment which makes permanent the current 75-

percent/25-percent Federal/local match on law enforcement assistance grants dealing with antidrug efforts. If we had not adopted my amendment, the share would revert to 50/50.

There will be an amendment offered, possibly tomorrow, to strip the Mazzoli language from the House bill and to substitute in its place a temporary extension of the 75-percent/25-percent share. At a time when local governments, Mr. Speaker, have a very difficult time finding even the 25-percent match, we want to be sure that they do not run any risk of at some later date having to provide as much as 50 percent.

I would urge my colleagues to pay attention to the issue when it comes up, and I hope that they vote to keep the committee language in the pending bill.

HOW MUCH DID THE PRESIDENT KNOW?

(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, well, we have a new October surprise. There are a lot of us who really were not surprised.

We now hear from Ollie North that Reagan knew everything all along in the Iran/Contra scandal. I really find that absolutely condemning of this Government and how they have treated the Congress and the Senate.

We had hearings. We did all sorts of things. Official after official came and covered and stonewalled and covered up some more and stonewalled some more.

I think if this Government is to work, we have to deal with each other honestly and openly. I can see why they did not want to admit that they were dealing with the ayatollah, but they were, and the American public had the right to know.

I must say to Ollie North and Ronald Reagan and that whole bunch that that is a horrible, horrible record, and I hope we hear from President Reagan and others. I only wonder now if we will find out next week whether George Bush knew.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 18, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received at 10:33 a.m. on Friday, October 18, 1991 the following message from the Secretary of the Senate: That the Senate agreed to the Conference Report on H.R. 972 and agreed to the House Amendment to S. Con. Res. 21.

With great respect, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 18, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House at 11:45 a.m. on Friday, October 18, 1991 and said to contain a message from the President wherein he transmits a report concerning an international agreement governing large-scale driftnet fishing violations by the Republic of Korea and Taiwan to the Congress.

With great respect, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT GOVERNING LARGE-SCALE DRIFTNET FISHING VIOLATIONS BY REPUBLIC OF KOREA AND TAIWAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 102-155)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The conservation of high seas living marine resources and averting threats to such resources have become important international issues in recent years. Much of the concern has focused on the use of the large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing method. The United

□ 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.

States has worked with several high seas driftnet fishing countries to assess the impacts that these methods have upon the marine environment through cooperative high seas monitoring programs. The data collected in these programs has substantiated concerns about the destructive nature of this wasteful fishing technique.

The international community recognizes the problems posed by large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing on the high seas. In December 1989, the United States cosponsored Resolution 44/225 that was adopted by consensus by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), as was reaffirmation Resolution 45/197 a year later. UNGA Resolution 44/225 calls for an end to the use of large-scale pelagic driftnets on the high seas by June 30, 1992, unless jointly agreed conservation and management regimes can be put in place to prevent the unacceptable impacts posed by this fishing method on the marine environment. The scientific data show the indiscriminate nature of this fishing technique. Thus, I fully expect that all those involved in large-scale pelagic driftnet fisheries will make plans to end such fishing by June 30, 1992. Accordingly, I have instructed Secretary Baker to seek such commitments from driftnet fishing countries.

Pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b) of the Pelly Amendment to the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1978), I am reporting to you following certification by the Secretary of Commerce on August 13, 1991, that the Republic of Korea (ROK) and Taiwan violated the terms of the cooperative scientific monitoring and enforcement agreements the United States has with the ROK and Taiwan. The Secretary's letter to me was deemed to be a certification for the purposes of subsection (a) of the Pelly Amendment. Subsection (a) requires that I consider and, at my discretion, order the prohibition of imports into the United States of fish products from the ROK and Taiwan, to the extent that such prohibition is sanctioned by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Since certification, both the ROK and Taiwan have responded to U.S. concerns in some measure. The ROK has recalled to port all the Korean driftnet vessels that were detected by U.S. enforcement patrols beyond the high seas driftnet fishing boundaries, instructed its commercial and enforcement vessels to adhere to the ROK regulations enacted pursuant to the U.S.-ROK driftnet agreement, and imposed penalties on masters and owners of 14 violating vessels. Since the ROK certification, Korean driftnet vessels appear to have operated in accordance with the boundary provisions of the U.S.-ROK driftnet agreement; however, as of October 5, seven Korean driftnet vessels had failed to return to port in

compliance with the ROK recall notice. The Government of the ROK has expressed its regret for the violations and has assured the United States that it will do its utmost to ensure that its vessels adhere to all relevant enforcement provisions outlined in the U.S.-ROK driftnet agreement.

Taiwan has yet to take remedial and punitive measures with respect to its driftnet vessels found operating outside of the prescribed high seas fishing area in the North Pacific. The authorities on Taiwan, however, have noted that the vessels in question have been boarded and investigated on the high seas by Taiwan patrol vessels and that punitive actions would be contemplated at the close of the current fishing season when the fishing vessels return to their home ports.

Taiwan has responded to the general concern of the international community by positively addressing the fundamental objective of ending large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing on the high seas by June 30, 1992, as called for by UNGA Resolution 44/225. On September 13, 1991, our representatives received a letter from the authorities on Taiwan that stated that the Executive Yuan reiterated a government policy to end the use of this fishing method by June 30, 1992. We place great reliance on the authorities on Taiwan to implement this policy in a forthright and timely manner.

I have decided to defer sanctions against Taiwan and Korea for 90 days pending evaluation of any additional remedial and punitive measures that each may take regarding the 1991 violations for which it was certified and their adherence to the driftnet agreements.

Over the longer term, I will watch closely their commitment to end large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing on the high seas by June 30, 1992, in line with the desire of the international community to end such fishing by that date.

Certification of Korea or Taiwan will be continued pending review of their performance. I have directed Secretary Mosbacher, in cooperation with Secretary Baker, to continue to monitor developments relating to large-scale pelagic driftnetting conducted on the high seas by the ROK and Taiwan and to report to me in 90 days or as otherwise warranted.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 18, 1991.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 on Tuesday, October 22, 1991.

CRANSTON-GONZALEZ NATIONAL AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3576) to amend the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to reserve assistance under the HOME Investment Partnerships Act for certain insular areas.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3576

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

SECTION 1. RESERVATION OF ASSISTANCE.

Section 217(a) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12747(a)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of paragraph (1), by inserting "and after reserving amounts for the insular areas under paragraph (3)" before the first comma; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) INSULAR AREAS.—For each fiscal year, of any amounts approved in appropriations Acts to carry out this title, the Secretary shall reserve for grants to the insular areas the greater of (A) \$750,000, or (B) 0.5 percent of the amounts appropriated under such Acts. The Secretary shall provide for the distribution of amounts reserved under this paragraph among the insular areas pursuant to specific criteria for such distribution. The criteria shall be contained in a regulation promulgated by the Secretary after notice and public comment."

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 104 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12704) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "Guam" and all that follows through "American Samoa,"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(24) The term 'insular area' means any of the following: Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a technical amendment to the HOME Program which was enacted into law last year in the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act. This bill will correct a serious and unintended problem in that legislation. In defining which jurisdictions will be able to participate in the HOME Investment Partnerships Program and the formula criteria to determine participating jurisdictions, the four U.S. territories, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa,

Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands have been unintentionally excluded.

This bill will establish a set aside of funds from the total appropriation for HOME so that the four U.S. territories with serious shortages of affordable housing will be able to participate like all the other eligible jurisdictions. This was what was intended by both the majority and the minority in last year's housing bill and is acceptable to both sides of the aisle. I urge my colleagues to support this technical change.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just stress the distinguished chairman of the full committee is precisely right. This is a technical amendment. It is philosophically very significant in that it fulfills the intent of Congress that the insular areas, those being Guam, the Northern Marianas, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, share in this very important program under the National Housing Act.

I would like personally to thank the distinguished chairman for raising this issue at this time in such a timely way. I would also like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Guam [Mr. BLAZ] for his leadership in this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Guam [Mr. BLAZ] for any comments he might have.

Mr. BLAZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, indeed, I come to the floor to thank the chairman for this very, very gracious effort on his part, and also the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

I took this opportunity because I always take the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to remind our country that there are some responsibilities to the Americans on the periphery of the Republic. Unfortunately, in many instances, oversights such as this have just disappeared without any consideration, without the thought of going back.

□ 1210

One of the joys I have today is to see that the system does work.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] again and thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding me this time and thank the Speaker for giving me this marvelous opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3576 which seeks to amend the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to reserve grants under the HOME Program for certain insular areas.

When the HOME Program was enacted as part of the National Affordable Housing Act, the insular areas were not included. I would like to comment Chairman GONZALEZ and the

ranking member, Mrs. ROUKEMA, for their prompt attention to this situation.

The HOME Program seeks to improve the supply of decent and affordable housing for low-income families by encouraging new construction of affordable housing and by providing rental assistance to low-income tenants. The amendment being considered today will set aside a portion of the funds appropriated for the HOME Program specifically for the insular areas.

Affordable housing continues to be an area of concern for many of us in the territory of Guam. The boom in tourism has helped our economy to the point that we have become nearly self-sufficient. But the combination of a relatively small land mass and the high demand for property created by tourism has placed real estate prices out of the range of the average resident. It is difficult to watch children whose families have lived on Guam for generations, who I have watched grow into adulthood, now unable to afford adequate housing.

Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to correct an oversight in the National Affordable Housing Act and address an area of growing concern in the territories.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, let me just emphasize what an extraordinary tribute this is to the Delegate from Guam [Mr. BLAZ] and his efforts in this body, one of the truly impressive Members we have here.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I just merely want to thank both the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] and the Delegate from Guam [Mr. BLAZ] for their kind words, and also to thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] for the great work he continues to do as a member of the Banking Committee and everything connected thereto.

I also want to say that the record ought to show that the Delegate from Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUGO] was the one who had been perturbed when he discovered, in speaking with the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] that this oversight had occurred.

I also think the record ought to show that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] asked to be shown as a cosponsor of this request.

I am profoundly grateful to all these gentlemen, but particularly to the staff who worked diligently as soon as we saw what needed to be done.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3576, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs, HENRY GONZALEZ, and which I have cosponsored, as well as my distinguished colleague BOB TRAXLER of Michigan.

I thank the distinguished chairman for introducing this bill and bringing it to the floor for action today.

This bill corrects an oversight in the Cranston-Gonzalez Affordable Housing Act of 1990, which omitted the U.S. territories from participation in the HOME Program.

I would point out that the needs which project HOME is designed to meet very much

exist in the territories and in my own district, the U.S. Virgin Islands. Lack of adequate and affordable housing is the No. 1 social problem in the Virgin Islands. There is a severe housing shortage and many of the existing units are substandard and severely overcrowded. Project HOME will help us to solve this problem.

Again, I thank the distinguished chairman for taking the necessary steps to correct this oversight so that the U.S. territories can participate in this new HUD program as they do with virtually every other HUD program.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. 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 Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3576.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GONZALEZ. 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. 3576, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

LENGTHENING EXPIRATION PERIOD FOR CONSTRUCTION OF COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ON FEDERAL LAND

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3169) to lengthen from five to seven years the expiration period applicable to legislative authority relating to construction of commemorative works on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3169

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 10(b) of the Act entitled "An Act to provide standards for placement of commemorative works on certain Federal lands in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes" (40 U.S.C. 1010(b)) is amended by striking out "five-year period" and inserting in lieu thereof "seven-year period".

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1991.

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. ALLARD] 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. 3169, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3169, introduced by Congressman BILL CLAY from Missouri, extends from 5 to 7 years the amount of time allowed for sponsors of commemorative works on certain Federal lands in the District of Columbia and its immediate environs to begin construction after receiving congressional authorization. This legislation amends the Commemorative Works Act, in recognition that longer amounts of time have been consistently needed to make these statutes and monuments become reality.

The Commemorative Works Act was enacted in 1986 in response to congressional awareness that the precious open space of our Capital was being threatened by a proliferation of statues and monuments which, while well-intentioned, preempted all other uses of this land that hosts so many activities. The Commemorative Works Act was the product of our determination that the core of the Nation's Capital would not be indiscriminately filled with commemorative works but that additional commemorative works would be thoughtfully placed.

H.R. 3169 immediately affects four commemorative works: Korean War Veterans, Women in the military, Black Revolutionary War patriots, and the Peace Garden. The authorization for the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Memorial expires October 26, 1991, and for the Korean War Veterans Memorial October 27, 1991, the Memorial to Women in Military Service for America expires on November 5, 1991, and the Peace Garden next June 29. The bill provides existing authorized commemorative works with a one-time 2-year extension of their original 5-year authorization. Future authorized works will also be provided with a 7-year authorization. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs adopted an amendment to the bill that clarifies our intent that even if the legislation is not enacted before these deadlines it is congressional intent that the authorization for these commemorative works not expire.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation, the administration supports it,

and the groups seeking to construct commemorative works certainly support it and its speedy passage.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3169, a bill to extend the legislative time limitation regarding construction of commemorative works on Federal lands within the District and nearly Virginia from 5 to 7 years.

As the subcommittee chairman has described, the Commemorative Works Act was enacted in 1986 in order to address the numerous requests received by Congress to authorize commemorative works on public space in the D.C. area. Overall this act has been very successful in ensuring that only the most important works are constructed and that those works constructed are of the highest quality.

Of course, it takes time to develop an outstanding proposal and it appears that when Congress enacted this law 5 years ago, we underestimated the amount of time required to secure the necessary approvals and raise funds for these projects. Therefore, I support this modest extension of the time frame.

However, I want to make it clear in the passage of this amendment that I will not support any future increases in the time frame. To do so would begin to undermine the very law itself, whose purpose is to ensure that only the most important works are constructed.

I thank the chairman for his expeditious consideration of this measure, which is timely since several projects are fast approaching their deadlines.

I urge my colleagues to join with the administration and support this measure.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the committee for yielding me this time.

I certainly rise in support of H.R. 3169, a bill that would amend the Commemorative Works Act by extending from 5 to 7 years the authority for the construction of all memorials in the District of Columbia and surrounding area.

Next Monday, October 28, the authority to raise funds for the construction of the Korean War Memorial will expire. Earlier this year, at the request of the American Battle Monuments Commission, and the chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] mentioned this, I introduced H.R. 1744. The bill would extend the construction authorization for the Korean War Memorial for an additional 2 years. There is strong support, Mr. Speaker, among this Nation's veterans and Members of the Congress for the establishment of a

Korean War Memorial. This is demonstrated time and again by the numerous phone calls and letters to our committee, as well as to the committee represented by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Members of the House have also heard from veterans urging that we not forget the 54,000 American service-members who lost their lives, in the Korean war, the 103,000 who were wounded and the 8,200 who were listed as missing in action during the Korean conflict.

Mr. Speaker, the American Battle Monuments Commission and the Korean Advisory Board have done everything they could possibly do to get the Korean Memorial constructed. However, after months and months of working together and coming up with a design that cost a lot of money, the Fine Arts Commission rejected the design, and the process has caused long delays.

□ 1220

Time is critical for the Korean Memorial. To date, nearly \$15 million has been raised toward the construction of the Memorial. Tens of thousands of people have contributed and it would be a tragic mistake not to grant an extension of the construction authority.

The enactment of H.R. 3169 would solve the problem. It would extend the time for the construction authority of all memorials that are now pending under the 1986 Commemorative Works Act.

I want to commend the gentleman from California, Chairman MILLER, and the gentleman from Alaska, Congressman YOUNG, the chairman and ranking minority member of the full committee, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. BRUCE VENTO and the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. ALLARD, chairman and minority member of the subcommittee, for their timely action on the measure.

Let me say that we need to have the Senate move on this legislation or we have problems with the date of October 28, which is right upon us.

So I fully support the provisions of H.R. 3169 and urge its full consideration.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman MONTGOMERY, as I noted earlier, who had introduced another measure initially calling this matter to our attention. He acceded to work on a broad-based measure that dealt with the generic act, and I very much appreciate his cooperation and efforts in this matter.

It is, obviously, something he and many other Members of this House care deeply about, and those Members in the Senate, about establishing the Korean War Memorial.

Mr. Speaker, this Member feels very strongly also and supports this and the

other measures that passed through the subcommittee that called for various types of monuments and memorials. I think we have a basic reform in the overall law that had been written. I think with this modification it will be approved and the realization of these monuments will be possible.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3169 will lengthen from 5 to 7 years the legislative authority relating to the construction of commemorative works under the Commemorative Works Act.

The Commemorative Works Act was born out of a need to address the sheer proliferation of memorials in our Nation's Capital and to provide standards for the placement of commemorative works. This legislation provides authorization for memorial projects to acquire site and design approval and to raise the necessary building funds for construction within a 5-year period.

Since the enactment of this legislation in 1986, six memorial projects have been authorized but only one has been completed. I believe there are two primary reasons for the difference in the number of memorials authorized and those completed.

First, while the 5-year authorized period seemed in 1986 a reasonable timeframe for applicants to seek design and site approval, the process of obtaining this approval proved to be much more demanding and intricate than envisioned. In examining this issue, I believe that many of these challenges have arisen because the site and design process was new and untested. And as with all new processes, there are certain imperfections and delays. But after 5 years, most of those problems have been eliminated.

Second, and most importantly, the current economic condition has caused private sector donations to shrink, leaving a meager pool of available dollars for commemorative projects and causing fundraising efforts to fall far short of their needed goals.

Mr. Speaker, there are four memorials—Korean War, Black Revolutionary War Patriots, Women in the Military Service, and the American Armed Forces—whose legislative authority will expire within the next 30 days. To prevent this from occurring, I encourage my colleagues to support and pass H.R. 3169.

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. 3169, 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.

NEZ PERCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK ADDITIONS ACT OF 1991

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 2032) to amend the Act of May 15, 1965, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2032

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 "Nez Perce National Historical Park Additions Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO ACT DESIGNATING NEZ PERCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.

The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes", approved May 15, 1965 (79 Stat. 110; 16 U.S.C. 281 and following) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 1, insert after "the Nez Perce Country of Idaho" the words "and in the States of Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Wyoming".

(2) Add the following at the end of section 2: "Sites to be so designated shall include—

- "(1) Tolo Lake, Idaho;
- "(2) Looking Glass 1877 Campsite, Idaho;
- "(3) Buffalo Eddy, Washington and Idaho;
- "(4) Traditional Crossing Near Doug Bar, Oregon and Idaho;
- "(5) Camas Meadows Battle Sites, Idaho;
- "(6) Joseph Canyon Viewpoint, Oregon;
- "(7) Traditional Campsite at the Fork of the Lostine and Wallowa Rivers, Oregon;
- "(8) Burial Site of Chief Joseph the Younger, Washington;
- "(9) Nez Perce Campsites, Washington;
- "(10) Big Hole National Battlefield, Montana;
- "(11) Bear's Paw Battleground, Montana; and
- "(12) Canyon Creek, Montana;

each as described in the National Park Service document entitled 'Nez Perce National Historical Park Additions Study, dated 1990 and Old Chief Joseph's Gravesite and Cemetery, Oregon, as depicted on the map entitled 'Nez Perce Additions', numbered 429-20-018, and dated September 1991. Lands added to the Big Hole National Battlefield, Montana, pursuant to paragraph (10) shall become part of, and be placed under the administrative jurisdiction of, the Big Hole National Battlefield, but may be interpreted in accordance with the purposes of this Act."

(3) In section 3 strike the proviso in the first sentence and insert "except that, no such lands, or interests therein, or other property may be acquired without the consent of the owner thereof unless such lands are (1) located within an area depicted on the map entitled 'Nez Perce Additions', numbered 429-20-018, and dated September, 1991, or (2) at a site designated before the enactment of the Nez Perce National Historical Park Additions Act of 1991. In the case of Old Chief Joseph's Gravesite and Cemetery, Oregon, no lands, or interests therein, or other property may be acquired without the consent of the owner thereof unless located within the 8-acre parcel depicted on such map as 'Panel A'."

(4) In section 4(a) strike the third sentence.

(5) In section 6(a) strike the words "State of Idaho, its" and insert in lieu thereof the words "States of Idaho, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Wyoming, their".

(6) Add the following new subsection at the end of section 6:

"(c) The Secretary shall consult with officials of the Nez Perce Tribe on the interpretation of the park and its history."

(7) In section 7 strike "\$630,000" and insert "\$2,130,000" and strike "\$4,100,000" and insert "\$9,300,000".

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. ALLARD] 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 H.R. 2032, the bill presently before us.

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. 2032 is legislation introduced by Representative PAT WILLIAMS to make additions to the Nez Perce National Historical Park.

The story of Chief Joseph's bravery and military brilliance in the Nez Perce war of 1877 is well known. His band of 750 men, women and children managed to elude 2,000 Army soldiers for over 5 months and 1,500 miles through the wilderness of Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana. He was finally caught just 40 miles short of his goal of reaching freedom in Canada. The Nez Perce war of 1877 marked the last time that the U.S. Army and an Indian tribe engaged in hostilities.

Nez Perce National Historical Park was established in 1965 to preserve and interpret the history and culture of the Nez Perce Indian country. The park consists of 24 sites, only four of which are owned by the National Park Service. The other sites involve cooperative agreements with the Nez Perce Tribe, the State of Idaho, other Federal agencies and private landowners.

Because the park's authorizing legislation limited sites to the State of Idaho, a number of important sites which are critical to the interpretation of the history and culture of the Nez Perce and the 1877 war are not a part of the park. H.R. 2032 as amended would add 14 new sites to park in the States of Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Montana. The sites were recommended to be included in the park by a 1990 study prepared by the National Park Service.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has spent a considerable amount of time on this legislation and worked in a bipartisan fashion to address concerns which were raised about the bill. Action on the bill was delayed several times in order to get further information from the National Park Service on sites involving private lands

proposed to be included in the park. I worked closely with the author of the bill and Members from the affected districts from both sides of the aisle to address concerns about boundaries and acquisition authorities in the bill. Although not unanimously supported, the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted in full committee was carefully drafted to meet the concerns of the National Park Service, the Nez Perce Tribe, private landowners and affected Members.

The committee substitute limits the acquisition of private land by the use of eminent domain to only those identified parcels determined by the National Park Service to be absolutely necessary and referenced on the map accompanying the bill. Previously the bill would have granted that authority to any private lands related to the historical themes of the park in the States of Idaho, Wyoming, Washington, and Oregon. I would point out that in the 26-year history of the park, eminent domain authority has never been used, nor does the National Park Service intend to use it at any of the new sites added by this bill. However, as I have previously stated, it is not in the best interests of the National Park System for Congress to make a determination that a resource is nationally significant and worth protecting and then tie the hands of the National Park Service when it comes to the acquisition of such a parcel. In the committee substitute, this authority is granted for only 4 of the 14 sites added by the bill. In all cases, the landowners involved have been contacted and they are willing sellers.

The bill before us makes several special considerations for the old Chief Joseph Gravesite in Wallowa County, OR. The bill makes the boundary of the site smaller than the Senate passed bill to address concerns of county officials about the county tax base and to reflect the results of lengthy negotiations which occurred regarding that site. Furthermore, the bill limits potential condemnation of land to only 8 acres, the minimum necessary for the development of a visitor's center and to provide a protective perimeter for the sacred gravesite. This compromise is supported by the landowner whose lands are included in the boundaries as well as the Nez Perce Tribe and the National Park Service.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2032 as amended is a carefully crafted measure which would preserve and interpret an important part of the history of our Nation. It is long overdue and it is deserving of our full support. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as introduced and passed by the National Parks and Pub-

lic Lands Subcommittee. H.R. 2032 would have permitted condemnation of private lands for purposes of interpretation and preservation of the Nez Perce Indian culture, the Lewis and Clark expedition, gold mining, logging, and anything else which occurred in the Nez Perce country related to westward expansion. Further, it would have permitted this condemnation anywhere in a five-State region and in an unlimited amount. Clearly, it was objectionable and unreasonable to move such a boundless bill.

Following bipartisan discussions on this matter with Subcommittee Chairman VENTO, a letter was sent to the NPS requesting they conduct a study to determine exactly which private lands should be considered for addition to the park. The NPS conducted such a study in August and reported back to the Interior Committee in September. The changes made to this bill as a result of the administration study have resolved most of the problems with this measure.

The bill we reported will still allow condemnation of private lands to a limited extent. While use of condemnation is occasionally necessary, it must be tightly controlled by this body to prevent its abuse. Condemnation authority must be designed to meet the individual needs of the situation and the affected Members must have a significant voice in crafting policies which directly affect their constituents.

The final point to make relates to the extensive bipartisan effort which has taken place in the development of this measure. That effort resulted in a delay of several months in full committee in consideration of this bill. Clearly, this bill could have been moved several months ago over the objections of this side. After all, there was an administration study, plenty of groups could be found to support the original measure and we had held the obligatory hearing. Instead, we asked more questions, sought more information, and the result is a bill which is very different and substantially better than the original one. Even though there may not be total agreement on every word in this bill, the process by which it was developed characterizes the deliberate type of analysis which should be undertaken on every measure considered here.

I urge my colleagues to join with the administration in supporting this bill.

□ 1230

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

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr.

VENTO] for yielding, and, Mr. Speaker, I encourage the passage of H.R. 2032, the legislation authorizing the expansion and creation of the Nez Perce National Historical Park. I believe this is an important piece of legislation granting recognition to a truly historic chapter in this Nation's development.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans recognize the importance of the Civil War battlefields of the Northeast and the South. However, America has neither considered, nor understood, nor even begun to preserve, the critical battlefields of the American Indian wars out our way in the West. Those wars are as critical to the development of the West and the Nation as was the Civil War critical to the development of the South, the East, the Northeast, and the Nation.

Today this House considers my bill to preserve and recognize the Nez Perce Trail. For the record, I will include in my remarks the historian, Page Smith's, description of the battles that followed Joseph's refusal to surrender. This passage is from Smith's book, "The Rise of Industrial America." He notes:

What was most notable about all the engagements involving the Nez Perce was the outnumbered Indians inflicting a series of defeats on superior forces of, in the main, U.S. Army regulars. There was no parallel in all the years of fighting to the victories of the Nez Perce over their pursuers led by two of the ablest and most experienced Indian fighters of the West.

Assailed by three separate detachments, Chief Joseph fought his way across Idaho and Montana, moving the tribe's women and children across remote and difficult wilderness. Joseph finally surrendered just short of the Canadian border, just outside of what is now the Montana town of Chinook. History records Joseph's words, most likely given to his people rather than to his pursuers. Let me quote now what is widely regarded as Chief Joseph's surrender statement.

Tell General Howard that I know his heart. I am tired of fighting. Our chiefs are killed. Looking Glass is dead. Toohoolzote is dead. The old men are dead. It is young men who say yes or no. He who led the young men is dead. It is cold and we have no blankets. The little children are freezing to death. My people, some of them, have run away to the hills, and have no blankets, no food; no one knows where they are—perhaps freezing to death. I want to have time to look for my children and see how many I can find. Maybe I shall find them among the dead. Hear me, my chiefs. I am tired; my heart is sick and sad. From where the sun now stands, I will fight no more * * * forever."

Page Smith again notes; quoting the historian Smith now:

Joseph rode into the lines of the soldiers and handed his gun to General Miles. Of the handful of Nez Perce who escaped to Canada, some were killed by Assiniboine and Hidatsa. Joseph's six children survived. Miles did what he could to assist those who surrendered, some 400 in all. They were taken by train to Bismarck * * * within a few months a fourth of their number was dead from dis-

ease (among them all of Joseph's children), some doubtless from heartbreak. "I will fight no more forever," became an epitaph for the American Indian.

The legislation we consider today, Mr. Speaker, recognizes these historical events throughout the Nez Perce Trail, ending with the surrender site, and it preserves the places that Americans, Indian and U.S. soldiers, fell: White Bird Canyon, Clearwater, the Big Hole, Bear's Paw. This legislation also critically and importantly assures the protection of the gravesite of Old Joseph.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced this legislation and have worked with the House Public Lands Subcommittee and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] to pass it through the subcommittee and full committee, and now, hopefully, over to the Senate.

I want to make a critical point: that this bill is particularly attentive to the rights of landowners while it still assures the protection of the most important historic cultural and religious sites. I want to place, if I may, in the RECORD at this point, a letter from the attorney of some of the landowners in the most contentious places where we had disagreement about willing seller, willing buyer. The letter from the landowners' attorney will indicate that the landowners support this bill.

The letter referred to is as follows:

MAUTZ & HALLMAN,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
Pendleton, OR, September 23, 1991

Hon. BRUCE VENTO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VENTO: I have previously written on behalf of my clients, Parmenters and Steve Krieger of WGK Development Corporation, concerning the above-referenced Bill. My clients are the owners of the 68 acre parcel of land adjacent to the Nez Perce National Historic Site at the Chief Joseph Monument in Joseph, Oregon.

Sandy Scott has informed us of the details of the new Park Service proposal concerning this legislation. We understand that that proposal includes limiting condemnation authority to a specific 8 acre portion of my clients' property. The Bill would also provide authority to the Park Service to acquire fee simple or other property interests in additional acreage on a willing seller willing buyer basis.

This is to advise that a proposal of that nature is satisfactory to my clients. Although they still feel strongly that condemnation authority should not be exercised, granting of that authority to the Park Service when limited to 8 acres is not something to which my clients will object.

Sincerely yours,

MAUTZ & HALLMAN,
D. RAHN HOSTETTER.

I delayed bringing this bill to full committee and here to the floor of the House until we were as certain as we could be that the historic condemnation procedures, which are held to the Government, would not have to be used in order to create, establish, and preserve the important sites that we so protect with this legislation.

I also want to add, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation adds to and encourages the important work of the Forest Service. They have already completed much work in preserving the trail that the Nez Perce followed during this great American odyssey.

This is, my colleagues, important legislation, and I hope to be joined in recognizing this chapter in one of American's great national stories.

An army commission that included General Oliver Otis Howard had met with Joseph to try to persuade him to sell the land. The commissioners were clearly impressed by Joseph's presence and by the quiet but determined skill with which he defended the right of the Nez Perce to their homeland. "If we ever owned the land we own it still, for we have never sold it. . . . In the treaty councils the commissioners have claimed that our country has been sold to the government. Suppose a white man should come to me and say, 'Joseph, I like your horses, and I want to buy them but he refuses to sell.' My neighbor answers, 'Pay me the money and I will sell you Joseph's horses.' The white man returns to me and says, 'Joseph, I have bought your horses and you must let me have them.' If we sold our lands to the government, that is the way they were bought."

The decision of the commissioners was that Joseph's Nez Perce should be required to join the other Nez Perce on the Lapwai Reservation by persuasion or force. Howard, who was in charge of the territory that included the Lapwai Reservation, gave Joseph a month to bring his tribe, which numbered fewer than 100 warriors, into the reservation. Joseph protested that the Snake was too high for his band to cross safely, but Howard refused to allow him more time. After the Nez Perce band had crossed the river a group of young braves, who were not members of Joseph's band and were furious at being forced onto a reservation, broke out in an orgy of killing. It was a classic Indian uprising, triggered by a profound sense of grievance and frustration and fueled by traders' whiskey. Before they were through, some 20 whites had been killed, with farms burned and women raped.

Howard started out from the Lapwai Reservation immediately with some 110 soldiers and volunteers. The soldiers came up to Joseph's small band and, rejecting the offer of a truce, attacked its camp in White Bird Canyon. Although outnumbered, the Nez Perce, led by Joseph, killed 34 soldiers and wounded 4, administering a severe defeat to Howard's small force. Howard began to round up a larger contingent of troops, and, since nothing succeeds like success, Joseph found his own band augmented by other discontented groups of Indians spoiling for a fight. Howard, now with 400 soldiers and 180 Indian scouts, surprised Joseph's party, which now included five other bands of Nez Perce, on the Clearwater River, in early July. The first warning the Indians had was the fire from Howard's howitzer and Gatling guns from a bluff above their camp. The Indians rallied, and once more Howard suffered a humiliating setback. The Nez Perce chiefs believed that if they could get over the Bitterroot Mountains into Idaho, they would be safe from pursuit. In a remarkable hegira, herding along several thousand horses as well as children, the sick, and those wounded at the Clearwater River, they reached western Montana, where they found their path blocked by some 35 army infantrymen. The Nez Perce made their way around the sol-

diers and stopped at Stevensville, where they bought much needed supplies from the townspeople. After crossing the Continental Divide, they made camp in the Big Hole Valley, near the present-day town of Dillon, Montana. There Colonel John Gibbon, veteran of the fighting against Crazy Horse and the Sioux, came on the camp and caught the sleeping Nez Perce by surprise in a dawn attack. Men, women, and children were killed indiscriminately. Once more the warriors rallied and gave such a good account of themselves that Gibbon's larger force soon found itself on the defensive (the Nez Perce were noted for being the finest marksmen of all the Indian tribes). Gibbon lost 33 dead and as many wounded, and his command may well have been saved from Custer's fate only by the arrival of Howard. The Nez Perce lost 89, most of them apparently women and children and old men. Among the Nez Perce dead were two of their most noted warriors, Rainbow and Five Wounds. The Nez Perce buried their dead before abandoning their camp, but the Bannock scouts dug up the bodies and scalped them.

What was most notable about all the engagements involving the Nez Perce was that the outnumbered Indians inflicted a series of defeats on superior forces of, in the main, army regulars. There was no parallel in all the years of fighting to the "victories" (victories in the rather modest sense of avoiding annihilation and inflicting heavier casualties than they suffered) of the Nez Perce over their pursuers, led by two of the ablest and most experienced Indian fighters in the West. By the time of the Big Hole Battle, the attention of the nation had become fixed on the dramatic odyssey of the Nez Perce. Chief Joseph, although only one among equals and not, in fact, the most accomplished of the Nez Perce leaders, was credited with the victories and became an instant hero. Indeed, it is safe to say that, Montana and Idaho settlers aside, there were more Americans rooting for Joseph and "his" Nez Perce than for Howard and the United States Army. Never able to resist a military hero, whatever the color of his skin, Americans elevated Joseph to that pantheon of Indian heroes that included Tecumseh (the middle name of the commanding general of the United States Army was Tecumseh), Black Hawk, Osceola, and, more recently, Crazy Horse and Sitting Bull.

Fleeing from Howard's implacable pursuit, the Nez Perce passed through Yellowstone Park, which was already attracting tourists. They had hoped to find refuge among the Crow, allies from other days against the Sioux and Cheyenne, but they found that the Crow were not only at peace with the whites but acting as army scouts. It was decided to press on to Canada, as the remnants of the Sioux under Sitting Bull had recently done, but in camp not far from the border they were overtaken by Nelson Miles, who had been called up from Fort Keogh with 600 soldiers, including part of the 7th Cavalry. Miles ordered a charge which was stopped with heavy casualties; 24 officers and men were killed, and another 42 wounded. The Nez Perce, after four months of fighting against three different expeditions dispatched against them in a journey that had covered more than 1,300 miles, were still dangerous. Some of the Nez Perce women and children, among them Joseph's twelve-year-old daughter, escaped but the remaining warriors—some 120—found themselves besieged by Miles's much larger force. A few days later Howard arrived with more troops, ending all hope of escape. Joseph persuaded the

remaining warriors, cold and hungry, to surrender. He sent his message of surrender to Howard by way of Captain John, a Nez Percé interpreter, who wept as he delivered it: "Tell General Howard I know his heart. What he told me before I have in my heart. I am tired of fighting. Our chiefs are killed. Looking Glass is dead. . . . The old men are all dead. It is the young men who say yes and no. He who led the young men is dead. It is cold and we have no blankets. The little children are freezing to death. My people, some of them, have run away to the hills, and have no blankets, no food; no one knows where they are—perhaps freezing to death. I want to have time to look for my children and see how many I can find. Maybe I shall find them among the dead. Hear me, my chiefs, I am tired; my heart is sick and sad. From where the sun now stands, I will fight no more forever." From Chief Logan, mourning the murder of his wife and children by renegade whites almost 100 years earlier, to the words of Chief Joseph, there had been the same refrain of unfathomable sadness by Indian chieftains caught in the web of an inexorable fate.

Joseph rode into the lines of the soldiers and handed his gun to Miles. Of the handful of Nez Percé who escaped to Canada, some were killed by the Assiniboine and Hidatsa. Joseph's six children survived. Miles did what he could to assist those who surrendered, some 400 in all. They were taken by train to Bismarck on the way to Fort Abraham Lincoln, and there they were greeted by the citizens of that frontier Indian-hating town as heroes, showered with gifts of food and clothing. Joseph and other chiefs were given a dinner by the women of the town. But the reservation they were placed on was hundreds of miles from the land where their ancestors were buried; they were moved from the luxuriant forests and clean winds to an area of malarial dampness. Within a few months a fourth of their number was dead from disease (among them all of Joseph's children), some doubtless from heartbreak. "I will fight no more forever," became a kind of epitaph for the American aborigines.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] for his effort, and I want to suggest to everyone that there has been a great deal of cooperation and effort to avoid the National Government, in terms of the authority granted here, imposing or interfering with the legitimate concerns and rights of landowners, and this is as it should be. I could not help, as I was thinking about the plight of our Native Americans in this country; if only there had been more sensitivity to the rights of Native Americans some 150 short years ago. I could not help but note the gentleman's eloquent words as he repeated the prose of Chief Joseph. I think all of us know to the point where the Sun now stands in the sky is something that we have all recognized as the important commemoration of the efforts and of the utter frustration that Native Americans faced. But it is, I think, something appropriate for us to do as we again are dealing with an important piece of our national, our cultural, heritage. That is what this is.

Mr. Speaker, only 150 years ago—I was thinking that this community I

represent, St. Paul, MN, 150 years ago came into existence. It is such a short period of time, but the changes and the importance to the Native American peoples and the importance to our culture as a people are enormously important, and it is because of this reason and with the greatest sensitivity that we approach, through the National Park Service, trying to maintain that heritage.

□ 1240

Mr. Speaker, I hope that everyone will join with the author and with the committee in supporting this measure. I think the author and the staff have done an outstanding job on a bipartisan basis. I want to thank the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] for his statement and for his contribution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the generous and kind statements of the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to offer my perspective on legislation to expand the existing Nez Perce National Historical Park. This is an issue that has interested me for quite some time. In fact, I was part of the Oregon congressional delegation that asked the National Park Service to make recommendations for possible additions to the Nez Perce National Historical Park System.

The Nez Perce Indians have played a significant role in the history of Wallowa County in the northeastern part of my congressional district. This rugged area was claimed by Chief Joseph and his Nez Perce Tribe as their hunting and fishing territory. Chief Joseph and the story of the 1877, Nez Perce war should be recognized. However, this bill has provisions that may prevent it from becoming the law of the land.

The 1877 Nez Perce war was fought over property rights. The U.S. Government gave Chief Joseph and his band until April 1, 1877, to move to the Lapwai Reservation. When that deadline passed, the Nez Perce war began in earnest, forcing Chief Joseph and his band on a 1,700-mile dash for freedom.

It appears that we have learned very little about private property rights in the intervening 114 years. In the process of expanding the Nez Perce National Historical Park, this legislation gives the National Park Service authority to trample over the rights of private property owners through the power of condemnation. If he were alive today, Chief Joseph would most assuredly oppose this egregious assault on private property rights.

To be fair, the proposal we are considering today is an improvement on the bill that was originally heard by the National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee. We started with a proposal that had unlimited condemnation and lacked any information of any of the 13 sites proposed for addition under this act.

The boundary issue has been resolved and Chairman VENTO has made a good-faith effort to limit condemnation authority to 8 acres. Nonetheless, we have several other private landowners who also have the threat of condemnation over their heads.

During full committee markup, I offered an amendment that provided that private land interests may be acquired only on a willing-seller basis. I decided not to raise this issue on the floor today because I am hopeful that in conference committee, the bill we pass today will conform with the Senate bill that prohibits condemnation. The chief sponsor of this legislation in the other body has informed me that condemnation language is unacceptable and could prevent this legislation from becoming law.

Accordingly, in the conference committee I urge the sponsors of H.R. 2032 to recede to the Senate language that protects the rights of private landowners from the hammer of condemnation. You can be certain that Chief Joseph wouldn't want it any other way.

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. 2032, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

URGING THE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS TO DEVELOP PLANS TO RESPOND TO DISASTERS AND HUMANITARIAN EMERGENCIES

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 197) providing that the President should urge the Secretary General of the United Nations to develop plans for coordinating and expanding resources of the United Nations to respond effectively to disasters and humanitarian emergencies, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 197

Whereas international peace and security is increasingly dependent on prevention of disasters and humanitarian emergencies, and on the rapid response by the international community when disasters and humanitarian emergencies do occur;

Whereas recent natural disasters and man-made humanitarian emergencies, such as, in the past 12 months, the evacuees fleeing Kuwait and Iraq in the fall of 1990, the Kurdish emergency, the Bangladesh cyclone of spring 1991, the current refugee and relief emergency in the Horn of Africa, and the continuing problem of refugees and displaced persons in Liberia and neighboring countries, clearly demonstrate that the United Nations family of agencies and other international organizations are not currently properly organized to respond adequately;

Whereas the number of refugees worldwide requiring relief and assistance was more than 18,000,000 in May 1991 and has been rising by 10 percent each year since 1983;

Whereas the number of internally displaced persons is estimated to be even greater than the number of refugees;

Whereas in the present rapidly changing international political situation there is a new opportunity for the United Nations to develop its capacity to respond to disasters and humanitarian emergencies;

Whereas in May 1991 President Bush cited the need to build upon the United Nations' ability to respond to humanitarian crises;

Whereas the leaders of the Group of 7 at the July 1991 London Economic Summit declared that "we will promote a truly multilateral system, which is secure and adaptable and in which responsibility is shared widely and equitably" and that "central to our aim is the need for a stronger, more effective United Nations system . . .";

Whereas the Group of 7 also noted that "we will provide humanitarian assistance to those parts of Africa facing severe famine and encourage the reform of United Nations structures in order to make this assistance more effective";

Whereas reassessment and clarification of United Nations responsibilities for those needing humanitarian assistance is required;

Whereas mechanisms for early warning about emergencies need to be augmented and linked to more adequate and effective response mechanisms;

Whereas despite the fact that many United Nations agencies engage in emergency response activities, including UNHCR, UNDRP, UNICEF, WFP, UNDP, and WHO, there is no central United Nations authority for coordinating responses to disasters and humanitarian emergencies and for mobilizing additional resources from donor governments and additional effort from other agencies such as International Committee of the Red Cross and the League of Red Cross/Red Crescent Societies;

Whereas member governments have begun to make available to the United Nations their civilian and military resources for use in humanitarian emergency relief operations;

Whereas systematic mechanisms to call upon such resources and agreed procedures for their use would enhance the capability to enlist such additional contributions in emergency situations; and

Whereas the next election of a Secretary-General of the United Nations will provide an opportunity to address these needs as a high priority: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States should urge the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in consultation with appropriate United Nations and other agencies, organizations, and experts to—

(1) initiate within 90 days after the adoption of this resolution a study of existing structures and mechanisms for relief of both natural and manmade disasters and humanitarian emergencies, with special attention of the United Nations and its affiliated agencies;

(2) develop plans for expanding the standby and reserve resources available for disaster and humanitarian assistance, including the use of both civilian and military resources from outside the United Nations and its affiliated agencies,

(3) develop a plan for assigning and coordinating responsibilities within the United Nations at its headquarters and in the field that is adequate to begin responding to humanitarian emergencies within 24 hours, including the rapid designation of a field coordinator, and that is complementary with United Nations peacekeeping operations;

(4) develop a plan for coordinating such unified United Nations efforts with the efforts of other relief agencies, including those in the nongovernmental sector; and

(5) provide an initial report on such plans to the representative of the member nations of the United Nations not later than January 1, 1992, and a final set of recommendations for implementation as soon as possible thereafter and not later than May 1, 1992.

Such plans should include criteria and procedures for working with member nations in the rapid callup from member governments of standby reserves of personnel, logistics, communications, and other resources for disaster and humanitarian assistance, and should recommend criteria and procedures for how such reserve resources should be trained, deployed, managed, financed, and released from service when participating in an international disaster or humanitarian assistance effort under the auspices of the United Nations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON].

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 197, as amended, urges the next Secretary General of the United Nations to develop plans to make the United Nations more effective in responding to international disasters.

As an original sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 197, I want to commend Congressman BEREUTER for what is an extremely important and timely resolution. All of us here who have followed United Nations issues over the years were pleased to see the administration work through that organization and its affiliated agencies to advance U.S. policy objectives during the Persian Gulf crisis.

Give Iraq's noncompliance with many of the provisions of the permanent cease-fire resolution, the United States is continuing to work closely with the U.N. Security Council to take the appropriate measures under international law to respond to Baghdad's belligerent attitude.

However, the U.N. system's response to the humanitarian disasters emanating from the gulf crisis was simply not of the same degree as the U.N.'s successful efforts to thwart Saddam's aggression.

Bureaucratic tension among various U.N. agencies, an inconsistent response from major donors to fund U.N. relief operations, and an ambiguous chain of command within the international organizations system caused needless delays in facilitating critically important foodstuffs and medicines for countless thousands of refugees, displaced persons, and others suffering from the ravages of war.

These shortcomings can only be rectified by the member states of the United Nations and any reforms must be initiated by them. With the end of the cold war and the upcoming selection of a new Secretary General, the United States is in an excellent position to take the lead in addressing this problem.

The gentleman from Nebraska drafted this legislation well in advance of the current General Assembly session. Although the Department of State has not conveyed to Congress what policy reforms it plans to promote at the General Assembly, it appears that this effort reflects some of the concerns in Congressman BEREUTER's resolution.

Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the resolution, the subcommittee adopted an amendment by Congressman BEREUTER which points out that the President advocated reform to the U.N. bureaucracy earlier this year. This resolution, as amended, sends a message to the world community that the Congress of the United States strongly supports reforms at the United Nations which will result in a more effective response to disasters and that the new Secretary General should make such reforms a priority.

I want to commend Chairman FASCELL and Congressman BROOMFIELD, the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for their leadership on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as well as the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], for expediting this concurrent resolution, and I commend particularly the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for introducing this concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 197 calls on the President to urge the Secretary-General to develop plans to enable the United Nations to more effectively respond to disasters.

In the past 12 months we have witnessed several natural and manmade disasters. Among them were the Bangladesh cyclone, the Persian Gulf war, and famine on the Horn of Africa. While I was pleased with the response of American relief organizations and governmental agencies, the response of the United Nations to these disasters was inadequate. This was due in large part to a lack of adequate resources and organization.

It is time for the Secretary-General to take the lead in developing plans for several important areas:

First, expanding the standby and reserve resources available for disaster and humanitarian assistance;

Second, assigning and coordinating responsibilities so that the United Nations can respond to disasters within 24 hours; and

Third, coordinating United Nations efforts with those of other relief agencies.

There is need to make the United Nations more effective as part of the new world order. Improving the United Nations' ability to coordinate disaster relief and humanitarian assistance would be a good start.

This resolution has the support of the administration. I urge my colleagues to give it their support.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 197) as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

URGING PRESIDENT TO COMPLETE REVIEW OF CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 116) urging the President to complete the review of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women in order that the Senate may give its advice and consent to ratification, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 116

Whereas the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (hereafter referred to as the "Women's Human Rights Convention") seeks to advance the status of women worldwide for the purpose of guaranteeing the human rights and fundamental freedoms of women

on a basis of equality with men in all respects; political, civil, social, cultural, and economic;

Whereas the Women's Human Rights Convention was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 18, 1979;

Whereas the United States was an active participant in drafting the Women's Human Rights Convention and signed the Convention on July 17, 1980;

Whereas on November 12, 1980, the President transmitted the Women's Human Rights Convention to the Senate, but at that time did not submit the necessary reservations, understandings, and declarations required for Senate advice and consent to ratification;

Whereas 108 nations have ratified and acceded to the Women's Human Rights Convention;

Whereas there is a continuing gap between the status and rights of women and men, and there is still no nation in the world where this gap has been eliminated in all major fields of activity;

Whereas the Women's Human Rights Convention calls on nations which are parties to the convention to take all appropriate measures to ensure women, on an equal basis with men, access to education, economic opportunities, legal protection, representation in government, and health care;

Whereas two-thirds of the world's illiterates are women;

Whereas women produce more than half of the food in developing countries, as much as 80 percent of the food produced in Africa, and perform two-thirds of the world's work hours, yet receive only 10 percent of the world's income and own less than 1 percent of the world's property;

Whereas worldwide, including in the United States, women earn only two-thirds as much as their male counterparts, contributing to the growing feminization of poverty;

Whereas as a result of unequal economic opportunities women are the growing majority at the poverty level worldwide, and approximately 78 percent of all people living in poverty in the United States are women and their children;

Whereas in many nations women do not have the same legal or constitutional rights as men, particularly regarding family law—marriage, inheritance, property rights, divorce, alimony, and child support;

Whereas enactment of laws ensuring the rights and fundamental freedoms of women are ineffectual unless governments are willing to enforce them;

Whereas in most countries women attained the right to vote only in the last 35-45 years, and in some countries women still do not have the right to vote;

Whereas only 9.7 percent of the representatives in the world's parliaments are women;

Whereas childbearing carries the highest risk of death for women of reproductive age in the developing world, resulting in approximately 500,000 deaths each year, the majority of which could be prevented with adequate health care;

Whereas the Women's Human Rights Convention calls on nations which are parties to the convention to take measures to modify the social and cultural practices of men and women with a view to eliminating prejudices and practices which are based on the belief of the inferiority or superiority of either of the sexes;

Whereas violence against women is the extreme expression of the belief in women's inferiority and occurs in all cultures and countries;

Whereas there is a high degree of official and social tolerance of violence against women, and family violence is the most prevalent form of violence against women;

Whereas trafficking and slavery of women and female children for the sex trade and as forced labor takes place in many regions of the world and is a result of the subjugation of women;

Whereas preference for sons results in the severe neglect of daughters with respect to food, medical care, and education, and as a consequence girls aged two to four die at twice the rate of boys in some regions, female infanticide is practiced, and worldwide female children are three times more likely to suffer from malnutrition than male children;

Whereas the Women's Human Rights Convention emphasizes the equal responsibilities of men and women in the context of family life, and until that occurs women will never be able to exercise and enjoy full equal rights and they and their children both will suffer;

Whereas when women are better informed and educated, their family's health and income benefit, and when women are given training and skills, their nation's productivity increases and its economy grows;

Whereas worldwide there are women's and human rights groups working under adverse circumstances to promote and implement the principles of the Women's Human Rights Convention; and

Whereas by ratifying and acceding to the Women's Human Rights Convention the United States will become a more credible proponent of the rights of women and a more effective advocate in encouraging other countries to protect the human rights and fundamental freedoms of women: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the full realization of the rights of women is vital to the development and well-being of people of all nations; and

(2) the President should, therefore, promptly complete the review of the Women's Human Rights Convention and submit to the Senate any reservations, understandings, or declarations that he considers necessary in order that the Senate may give its advice and consent to ratification.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON].

□ 1250

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 116 urges the President to complete the administration's review of the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. The convention, referred to as the Women's Human Rights Convention, is the most comprehensive and detailed human rights instrument seeking the advancement of women. The Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations approved this resolution on September 26

and the full Foreign Affairs Committee reported the resolution on October 10.

To date, 108 countries have ratified and acceded to the convention. The United States is one of the few developed countries that has not ratified this convention, even though we were an active participant in drafting and promoting it in the United Nations. In 1979 the United States voted for the convention's adoption in the U.N. General Assembly and became a signatory in July 1980. Even though the convention was submitted to the Senate in November 1980, the administration has not submitted its review in order that the Senate may give its advice and consent to ratification.

The Senate held a hearing on the Women's Human Rights Convention last year. At that time, the Senate asked the administration to finish and transmit its review. Over 1 year later, the Senate has still not received a transmittal.

Mr. Speaker, the House should go on record as denouncing the deplorable human rights situation of the world's women, many of whom do not have such basic rights as access to education, due process, health care, and even personal safety.

I want to commend Chairman FASCELL, Congressman BROOMFIELD, the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the ranking minority member of my subcommittee, DOUG BERETTER, and Congressman GILMAN for their leadership on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Resolution 116.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am a cosponsor of this resolution, which urges the President to complete his review of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. This would permit the Senate to consider whether the United States should join the 108 countries that have ratified it.

In many countries, women still do not have the same legal or constitutional rights as men. In some countries, women don't even have the right to vote. Worldwide, women earn only a fraction as much as men in comparable positions. In addition, highly offensive practices such as female infanticide still occur in some places.

The United States took an active role in drafting the convention. We signed it and voted in favor of its adoption by the United Nations.

In 1980, President Carter transmitted the convention to the Senate, noting some legal problems that might be raised by ratification. However, he did not provide any specific reservations, understandings, or declarations to address those potential problems.

The Bush administration is now reviewing the legal issues, and the Senate has deferred considering ratifica-

tion pending the outcome of this review. House Resolution 116 simply urges the President to complete the review and submit any reservations, understandings, or declarations that are necessary in connection with ratification.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. Human rights abuses against women is an issue that has long been ignored. The plight of an ethnic or religious minority that is subject to discrimination often generates considerable attention from Congress and the human rights community. Unfortunately, less attention is paid to abuses that are directed against women.

Too many people are willing to turn their heads away from the mistreatment inflicted upon women because they are justified in the name of religion or cultural practices. Even as the United States was freeing Kuwait and protecting the oil fields of Saudi Arabia—the Saudi's were vigorously making sure that Saudi women never learn to drive a car—in the name of religion. But it really gets much worse than that. Women in the Middle East and Africa are subjected to female circumcision. In India, young women are burned to death because their dowries—which are supposedly illegal—are not large enough to satisfy their in-laws. In Pakistan, women who are raped then can be prosecuted for adultery and sentenced to up to 100 lashes. Female infanticide is common in much of the Third World. We in the West are not supposed to criticize the cultures that allow such vile customs because that would be ethnocentric. But the entire concept of human rights—the idea that people have worth as individuals rather than just as members of some political, social, or ethnic group—demands that we denounce these practices regardless of their foundation. Furthermore, this concept of human rights is one that the nations of the world voluntarily accepted when each agreed to the U.N. Charter and Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

I'm not saying that nations support these hideous actions, but they look the other way. A state that tolerates the murder or mutilation of women for cultural reasons is just as much a violator of human rights as one that jails and tortures political opponents. The primary duty of a government is to protect all of its citizens from aggression.

The U.S. Government must continually express its opposition and revulsion to these practices and attitudes. But in order to be effective at advocating this, the President has to complete the review on the Convention on the

Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women so the Senate can consent to its ratification. Once the United States ratifies this treaty, no longer will other nations be able to accuse us unfairly of not practicing what we preach.

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

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mr. MEYERS] for her leadership on this particular issue.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I'm thrilled to see the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women [CEDAW] on the floor today. We have been waiting since the convention was adopted by the United Nations in 1979 to see some action. Today we have the chance to send a clear message to the President that we are tired of waiting. It is time to send the convention to the Senate for ratification.

The convention is vitally important, and cannot be implemented until 20 countries ratify it. CEDAW establishes rights for women in areas not previously subject to international law. It defines discrimination against women, requires action on all fronts, and creates a Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women to review international progress.

Since the adoption of CEDAW, in 1979, women around the world continue to be subject to abuse simply because they are women. Most of the abuse they suffer is not as easily categorized as human rights abuses as, say, disappearances, and torture in detention, or other political and civil abuses. However, sexual harassment, rape, bride burnings, infanticide, genital mutilation, trafficking in women, and domestic violence are as serious, as painful, and as prevalent as any human rights abuse. The only difference is that the risk the victim takes is being a woman. An example: Disappearances as a result of political participation are more easily identified than disappearances from a refugee boat and subsequent sale of the woman into slavery.

Furthermore, courts around the world refuse to acknowledge crimes, which are dealt with swiftly when they occur between unrelated parties, that occur between a married couple. Often the widespread hands-off attitude about discrimination and violence against women is excused as awareness of other cultures.

Sexual harassment is harassment. Bride burnings and infanticide are murder. Genital mutilation is mutilation. Domestic violence is torture. Courts, foreign and domestic, that refuse to recognize the severity of these crimes must be held accountable. Just as the United States has made it clear that we believe that racism is not an acceptable cultural tradition, we must also send the message that neither is discrimination against women. Vote to tell President Bush that it is time to brush the dust off of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women and send it to the Senate.

[From the New York Times International, Oct. 21, 1991]

TEARFUL BRIDE, JUST 10, TOUCHES INDIA'S CONSCIENCE

(By Edward A. Gargan)

NEW DELHI, October 20.—It was a routine flight, a two-hour hop to New Delhi from Hyderabad in the country's south in a plane jammed with the usual business commuters and some tourists. But in one row, a young girl sat sobbing, covering her tears with her hands. Beside her, an unshaven man wearing a checkered Arabian headdress stared blankly out of the window.

A flight attendant, Amrita Ahluwaha, bent over the child and asked what was wrong. The girl wept even as the attendant and several passengers ushered her to the front of the plane to find out why she was crying so. According to an account in an Indian newspaper, this is what she told them:

"My name is Ameena. I am about 10 years old. This man came to our house. He found my elder sister dark and ugly. My father, who drives an auto-rickshaw, made me marry this man. He is taking me to Saudi Arabia. I don't want to go with him."

When the plane landed in New Delhi, the police arrested the man and took Ameena into protective custody. The man was identified in court later as 60-year-old Yahya M.H. al-Sagih, a Saudi who had been bride shopping in the Muslim neighborhoods of Hyderabad. He protested his arrest and produced an Islamic marriage certificate. He was hustled off to jail.

Since the case erupted in August, India's English-language newspapers have chronicled the fate of the child bride, scrutinizing falsified documents produced by the Saudi, interviewing the girl's father, who sold her off for 6,000 rupees, or \$240, with another payment of \$4,000 unconfirmed but widely rumored, and reveling in the pandemonium of each court appearance.

Women's organizations have taken up Ameena's cause, denouncing the custom of child marriages and calling for Government investigations into the practice. Lawmakers have held forth from the chambers of Parliament and Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao has demanded that New Delhi's Lieutenant Governor keep him abreast of the case.

But the case has brought not only the matter of child marriages bubbling to the surface of Indian politics and society, but also fundamental issues like irremediable poverty, religious tension and governmental complicity and ineptness.

What may be most surprising is not that Ameena was married off at the age of 10, but that the case has provoked such a furor. For the marriages of children, of young girls to old men, of children to each other, are not only unremarkable in much of India, but routine.

"It's very common," said Tavleen Singh, one of the country's most acerbic columnists. "The average lower-class Indian wouldn't even be shocked by it. Although there is a lot of noise in the press, you must remember that 90 percent of girls in villages get married before 13 anyway. You're a spinster at 16."

"This is the reaction of middle-middle and upper-middle class women," she said of the attention focused on Ameena's case. "I'm afraid it's a brutalized society. There is a little bit more horror now."

She paused in her thoughts for a moment, and then said, almost hopefully, "Maybe its a reflection of some kind of change."

ANTI-MUSLIM BIAS SUGGESTED

But the uproar from news organizations and Parliament has another, darker side.

Tahir Mahmood, a professor of family law at Delhi University, said he detected an undercurrent of anti-Muslim sentiment in the cries of outrage over Ameena's wedding. "A similar case involving a Hindu girl would have gone unnoticed," he said. Even so, Professor Mahmood insisted, there is widespread revulsion for Mr. Sagih among Indian Muslims and a general acceptance of the invalidity of the marriage itself.

Mr. Sagih remains free on bail but forbidden to leave the country. The original charge of kidnapping against him has been dropped, but charges of fraudulent marriage, forgery and use of forged documents are still pending.

Criminal statutes here prohibit any marriages of females under the age of 18 and males under the age of 21. But civil law, which is based in part on the individual practices of India's religious communities—that is, Hindu or Muslim—does sanction marriage among minors. In the case of Islamic law, girls who have reached puberty are permitted to marry if they agree to the match. Similarly, Hindu civil law recognizes the validity of childhood marriages.

It is difficult to find anyone in New Delhi, lawyer or public servant, who can call to mind another instance of a prosecution for childhood marriage. Indeed, some people contend that marrying off children has become a response to entrenched poverty, in a sense a rational response of the country's poorest citizens to their unchanging plight.

"This really shows that it's become a social alternative at that strata," said Brinda Karat, the head of the All-India Democratic Women's Association. "That you can get your girl to bear the whole burden of the family has become acceptable."

Ameena's father, Badruddin, admitted as much. Sitting in a lawyer's cubbyhole office near the court where his daughter's future was being decided, he lamented his inability to support his family.

"I earn between 25 and 40 rupees a day driving an auto-rickshaw," he said, a daily wage of only \$1 to \$1.60. "I can't get clothes for my children. It's difficult for me to pay rent on my house. That amounts to 150 rupees a month," or \$6.

The father, who was in New Delhi in an effort to regain custody of his daughter, appeared baffled by the outcry over his daughter's marriage. "I thought because I had nothing else it was good for the family," he said. "We have six daughters and two sons. How can I feed 10 mouths on my salary?"

The court refused to grant the parents' request for custody and has ordered Ameena into a children's home.

While sympathetic to the plight of Ameena's father, Mrs. Karat of the women's association said solutions to poverty must come from positive Government programs.

"The central Government has to take this up more seriously," she said. "The problem is there is quite a lot of money involved in this."

Still, she said, it is unrealistic to expect a rapid change in this society. "I'm sure," she said, an edge of resignation in her voice, "that there have been sales of young girls after Ameena. And there will be more."

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 116, which would urge the President to complete the review of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women in order that the Senate may give its advice and consent to ratification.

The United States needs to be in the forefront of the historical quest for equality be-

tween the sexes. Our country was an active participant in drafting the Women's Human Rights Convention which was adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in 1979 and was actually signed by the United States in 1980. Why has it taken so long for the Senate to act?

The convention, drafted more than a decade ago, chronicles the plight of women on this planet. It condemns every form of discrimination women are being forced to endure: economic, social, cultural, civil, political. Where women are granted citizenship it is usually of the second-class variety. Money, power, and good jobs are denied women in most countries of the world simply because they are female. This Convention not only describes the unfair predicament of females everywhere, but offers solutions.

The convention urged governments to affirm the value of equality between the sexes, to ban all forms of sex-based discrimination, and to institute a rights-based civil code that would guarantee all women the rights and privileges afforded men.

Although this treaty has been ready for ratification since the beginning of the last decade, the Reagan-Bush administration has handled it with malign neglect. The necessary reservations, understandings, and declarations required for Senate advice and consent ratification have never been submitted. Now, 11 years later, the problem of sexual unfairness is still with us everywhere. Two-thirds of the world's illiterates are women. Only 1 percent of the world's property is owned by women; 500,000 women die each year during child birth due to inadequate health care.

The United States prides itself as a role model for other nations when it comes to human rights. But women here still make only two-thirds as much money as their male counterparts. Sadly, 78 percent of all people living in poverty in the United States are women and their children.

For the last decade the issue of equality between the sexes has lost favor with many policymakers in Washington. Failure to act on the convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women would confirm this loss of support.

Fairness must become a top public policy priority. It is imperative the President comply with his part of the process to bring this matter up to a vote in the Senate.

U.S. leadership in world affairs requires that we not languish in making this important statement of guaranteeing basic human rights to all women everywhere.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for House Resolution 116.

Mr. YATRON. 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 Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 116) as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's

prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1300

APOLOGY FOR BANK INCIDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I asked the Sergeant at Arms to examine my account at the House Bank and have just received a report on the period of the audit that 17 checks had been paid against insufficient funds.

When I did not receive word from the Bank of an overdraft, it was made good by the normal flow of deposits to the account. When I was notified, I immediately deposited funds to cover within a day. At all times, I had an overdraft line-of-credit account at the Congressional Employee Credit Union available had the checks not been covered from other sources.

No taxpayer funds were involved. I have sent the Sergeant at Arms \$15 for each uncovered check for administrative costs incurred.

I want to apologize to my colleagues for contributing to this controversy which has so distracted us from other key issues.

I deeply apologize to my constituents for any embarrassment I have caused them by being part of this problem.

THOUGHTS ON THE U.S. ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for time in a special order today to make some points about what is happening to the American economy. Month after month, I have watched folks on the floor of this House and folks down at the other end of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue tell us that everything that's right in America ought to be credited to the Republicans and everything that's wrong ought to be blamed on the Democrats in Congress. This is a novel way of looking at this country and, in my judgment, not a fair way.

I think that both political parties have a lot to offer this country. I think both do some good things; both propose good ideas and both make mistakes.

Instead of getting the worst of what each political party has to offer this

country, I think it is critically important that we start getting the best of what both can give this country.

We are told that things are fine. Things are not fine in this country. We are suffering through a recession. More Americans are living in poverty than ever before, and we're told that our education system is a mess. Our health care system is in crisis too.

The Federal deficit is endangering our future. Our Government is beset by scandal after scandal, and we see failure in key American industries.

What is to be done about this? My sense is that most Americans feel deep inside them that something is wrong. They feel that America is losing its edge somehow.

As I grew up, every day that I woke up I understood that America was No. 1. America was the best. We produced the best. We competed the best. America was the preeminent economic power in the world. That has now changed.

We have seen the development of shrewd, tough international economic competitors. And this country has been beset with problems internally that have not allowed it to keep pace with the kind of progress necessary for America to maintain its standard of living that we want and expect for the American people.

If we are losing our edge, what can be done about it? A century ago American power shifted in this world from London to New York, from England to the United States. England was a preeminent world economic power, and then it shifted to the United States. It is shifting again, from this country to the Pacific Rim. It is not gone, but it is shifting.

We do not see it on a boat that leaves or on a plane that flies, but it is happening.

What can we do about it. We must decide as Democrats and Republicans, as a President and Congress to start worrying about what is happening at home, and start taking care of things at home. It seems that every time one reads a news report, the President is across the other side of the world in a foreign land or Congress is considering a new foreign aid bill. It is time to park Air Force 1, and it is time for Congress to focus on what is necessary to put America back on track at home.

Here are some of the ideas that I think that we ought to pursue, some old virtues and some ideas, some timeless truths and some new realities. It starts with something very simple. The old virtue that we ought to pay our bills.

The Federal budget deficit this fiscal year is going to be about \$420 billion. I know we will not hear that from the people keeping track of it. It is \$420 billion. They'll use the Social Security surplus this year to reduce it, but I think that is dishonest. They will tell

us that the deficit is really about \$348 billion. It is not.

The only way to get to \$348 billion is by taking money out of the Social Security system and using it to reduce the deficit. The real operating budget deficit this year is about \$420 billion. That is a billion and a quarter a day, 7 days a week, every day all year of money that is spent that we do have have.

President Bush and his followers would say, "That is Congress' fault. Congress spends all that money."

It is certainly true that some of the fault is in this Chamber. I cannot deny that. All of us bear that responsibility. Our fault is that we follow the leadership of the President. He sends down a budget that is so seriously out of balance and so seriously flawed that it calls for the largest deficits in the history of the country. Unfortunately Congress then decides to quibble about the yard lines but not about the stadium we are playing in. Thus we have these very large budget deficits.

I believe they cripple the country's ability to compete in the long term. It is spending today for immediate gratification and charging it to the kids. It is fundamentally dishonest and must be stopped.

How do we put an end to Federal deficits? Tough, tough political choices are necessary by the President and by the Congress. We cannot do everything. We have to decide what we can do and then decide if we are going to do it. We have to pay for it. It does not matter whether it is defense or health care. If we decide that the American people need and want, and if we decide it is necessary for this country, security, health care or education, then we must be willing to pay for it as we spend it.

It's time to understand the virtue of paying our bills as a virtue that is necessary, especially necessary in public spending. And as tough as it might be, the President ought to be forced to send to this Congress a balanced budget. We have not seen one even close for years and years. And the Congress ought to be forced, if necessary, by a constitutional amendment, to enact a balanced budget. Both, I think, are necessary.

It seems to me that we must reconcile with this issue of what we spend and what we raise, and stop these crippling, hemorrhaging, Federal deficits. For example, we can no longer afford to continue forgiving debt to every foreign country that asks for debt forgiveness.

Seven billion debt forgiveness to Egypt. The President of Senegal comes to town. We say, "That's fine." President Bush says, "We will forgive your debt, only \$42 million." And the list goes on and on and on. Thirty countries in the last couple of months have had foreign debt forgiveness, in this instance by the President, but in some

instances Congress has also been involved.

It's time, to take care of things at home.

Second, we ought to cut the size of the Federal bureaucracy. As I look at the Federal Government, it seems to me that we ought to decide, through attrition, to begin in a meaningful way to cut back the size of the Federal Government. I know that sounds like someone who is a hard conservative, and I am not that. I do believe, however, that we have too many people in too many areas of the Federal Government writing too many regulations that are causing too much pain and too much anguish.

We ought to step back for a little bit. We need to make things a little less complicated and stop having such enormous growth in Federal employment in almost every area.

I mentioned the other day that the farm program, which is so important to the State I come from, in the past decade has resulted in the following: The farm program has 24 percent more people in the last decade running the farm program. That is 24 percent more Government employees running the farm program. Yet, we have lost 34 percent of our farm population.

What kind of a farm program is it that allows us to lose 34 percent of our farm population but requires 24 percent more Government workers to run it.

□ 1310

It seems to me that is a farm program that is a failure. We ought to talk about cutting the size of the Federal bureaucracy and, yes, when we talk about a percentage reduction in employment, it ought to be in the Congress as well as the executive branch.

Third, we ought to write a farm program that works. There's no excuse for a country like ours not to have a farm program that works.

If you think food is expensive that is now produced by family farmers, just wait until corporations produce America's food. Then you will see what really is the cost of food.

The fact is people that are puffing rice are getting more money for the puff than the farmers who are raising it. The people flaking corn are getting more money for the flaking than the farmers who are raising the corn. It ought not happen.

There ought to be an opportunity out on the farm to make a decent living with a decent farm program. The way to do that is to change the farm program so that we provide farm program benefits that are a small bridge called price supports so when prices drop below the cost of production, family farmers can make it. And we should provide those price supports only to family size farms, and not to the giant agri-factories. They do not need it.

If they want to buy 30,000 acres and farm three counties, God Bless them.

But they can certainly do it without Government help. If you have a family farmer out there milking 80 cows and farming a family size operation, it seems to me that we ought to decide to provide a decent price support when international prices drop below the cost of production. We can do that if we decide that the purpose of a farm program is to help maintain and foster a network of family farms in this country's future.

If that is not our goal, I am not so sure we need a farm program at all. I think we ought to make that our goal, and retarget the family farm program that works to family farmers.

Fourth, we need affordable health care for all Americans. That sounds easy, but it is not.

The fact is we have too many people in this country who cannot afford health care. We have kids who do not go to the doctor because their folks do not have any money.

We had a young woman testify in Congress who told of being pregnant. She was poor. Her problem was she did not have any money. She was pregnant and going to have the baby delivered at home with the help of a midwife neighbor. If you do not have money, it is pretty hard to get a hospital in the part of the country she was living in.

When the baby came, it proved to be a difficult birth. The neighbor midwife could not help. They put her in a car and took her to a hospital. When they got to the hospital, the woman was asked, "Do you have insurance?" And she said, "No." "Do you have cash?" And she said, "No." They said, "We are sorry." This was a woman in labor.

The young woman was taken to a second hospital where they asked the same two questions and turned her away. At the third hospital, they delivered the baby, which was a breech baby. The umbilical cord had been wrapped around the baby's neck, cutting off oxygen. The baby lived, but will now be a baby who is destined for a life of terrible handicap because that woman did not have money when she showed up at a hospital door. It should not happen in this country.

Health care ought to be available to the American people at an affordable price, and if they cannot afford it, it still ought to be available.

We also need to shut down the activity in this country that represents the kind of casino economics we have seen in a decade. An orgy of greed on Wall Street has persuaded so many of our most talented people that you ought to go to school to get a degree, and then go to work for somebody so that you can put together a hostile takeover, floating junk bonds, and getting some S&L's to buy them. They've learned how to take over a company in a hostile takeover, only to ruin the company by taking it apart, to make some short-term money. The S&L's get

stuck with junk bonds, and the taxpayer is going to pay for the whole mess. That is what has been happening in this country for 10 years, and it is criminal.

There is no excuse for the kind of leveraged buyouts, hostile takeovers and junk bond activities that have been going on.

Hostile takeovers are prohibited in Japan. Do you know why? Because they know it cannibalizes their economic enterprises in a way that is terribly unhealthy for their economy.

How do we compete in the world? Well, you compete by building the best products available and selling them at a competitive price. You compete when halfway around the world tonight somebody sees a product on the shelf and they take it off and look at the bottom and it says, "Made in the U.S.A.," and they think to themselves immediately, "I know what that means. That 'Made in the U.S.A.' means that is the finest product I can buy anyplace." If and when that happens, we win. When it does not happen, we lose.

For a decade, we've seen people who have not gotten rid of their acne on Wall Street making a half-million dollars a year helping others take over another company by floating junk bonds. What does all of this add up to? It adds up to economic cannibalization of our enterprises so that there is no attention being paid to producing better products. All the attention is on how do we take over another company to get rich, or how do we set up a defensive system to avoid getting taken over.

The grotesque description of all of this is that the Federal Government finally ended up owning junk bonds in the Taj Mahal. I will bet not many Americans understand that. The American people ended up owning the Taj Mahal when the Resolution Trust Corporation took over the savings and loan that had junk bonds in the Taj Mahal. That means that when Donald Trump built the Taj Mahal, the world's biggest, glitziest casino, and floated junk bonds to do it, the ultimate speculation, we, the taxpayers, ultimately got stuck with the junk bonds. That is the final grotesque position that we found ourselves in at the end of a decade in which nobody seemed to care. Regulators who were supposed to have been hired by the executive branch to regulate this kind of behavior said, "As far as we are concerned, we do not like government. Government is evil. We were appointed to regulate, but we are not going to regulate. You folks do whatever you want. We will not look. We will not listen. We will not see."

There is almost criminal culpability on the part of regulators who refused to regulate to put a stop to this kind of greed.

What we ought to do is decide that we are going to shut down the kind of

junk bond, hostile takeover, and LBO speculation that is ruining this country.

Next, we ought to take a simple step to say it is time to force our allies to pay for their own defense. Why on Earth should taxpayers in the United States borrow money from Japan to defend France against an attack by Poland. What on Earth are people thinking of?

We are asking American taxpayers to pay \$100 billion a year and more for the defense umbrella to protect the free world. Yet, countries like Japan that spend one-tenth of what we spend on defense per capita are getting a free ride from us. So is Germany. So is France. So are so many other countries.

It is time for us to say that Uncle Sam cannot afford it anymore. "Uncle Sam cannot afford to pay your bills." "No. We do not want you to rearm, Japan, and that is not what we are asking. We are saying that when we keep the sea lanes open and the routes free so that you can ship your Datsuns and Toyotas to Pittsburgh, we want you to help pay part of the cost of the captains and the cruisers that we have got out there to help keep those sea lanes open. We want offset payments every year from those countries for whom we now spend American taxpayers' dollars for defense."

I think it is time, to stop borrowing from them so we can go in debt to defend them.

Also, in the area of international trade, America should employ a golden rule of trade. We want to be the open market of the world. We want to be the freest market of the world, and we want to tell other countries, "You are welcome to compete in our marketplace with your goods." There is only one small hitch to that: we tell other countries that we are tired of being played for a sucker. "If you want to move your goods into this country to our market and compete, then we expect and demand that you would open your markets to American producers who want to compete in your country as well. We will treat you just as you treat us, and for openers, our market is open to your producers, so come ahead and bring your goods. The American people want the opportunity to shop for your goods, but understand that when you do, your market must be open to Americans producing goods to sell to your markets. We will not allow any longer one-way streets on trade." We want and expect and demand reciprocal trade treatment from other countries.

Finally, we should work for a national commitment to have the finest education system in the world. Everything, it seems to me, starts with education.

I mentioned on the floor previously my experience in walking into a col-

league's office when I was a freshman Congressman. That colleague was Congressman Claude Pepper, the oldest Member of Congress. Claude Pepper had come to Washington when Franklin Delano Roosevelt was in his first term, and he was still here in 1981 when I came to Congress. On the wall, behind his desk, there were two pictures. One of Orville and Wilbur Wright making the first airplane flight, and it was autographed to Congressman Pepper. The second, below it, was a picture of Neil Armstrong standing on the Moon, similarly autographed to Congressman Pepper.

□ 1320

As I looked at the juxtaposition of autographed pictures to this living human being of the first person to fly and the first person to walk on the moon, it occurred to me what it represented. This incredible burst of knowledge, of technology, of progress, made possible in my judgment by this massive investment in education to allow the young people in this country to become the best they can be, to train the minds and develop the discipline so that those young people can flower in all their talents in an educational system that allows all that to happen.

In the long run, for this country to retain its edge we must have the finest education system in the world, because the genesis of progress starts with education. That might mean more payment for teachers. It might mean restructuring of ways to educate children, exploring new approaches, but it certainly must mean a commitment to having the finest education system in the world.

I mentioned briefly "Made In The USA." I think we also need at this time in our country a national program in which we marry public policy interests and private sector interests in a national program to produce quality products in this country.

I think we need a national commitment to product quality, because the way we compete in the years ahead is to produce the best products. If there are ways for the public sector and the private sector to join in a national commitment to product quality so that "Made In The USA" once again stands as a symbol of value and quality all across the world, then that ought to be our goal.

On foreign aid, I think it is time for us to change the way we think about it. I am not against all foreign aid. I have been in many countries where American aid has helped people live. I have been in neonatal clinics in countries and held in my arms children who are dying, who should not have died. I see, even in countries very close to us, where people die for the lack of an inexpensive inoculation against one of the dread diseases. But it was not done,

and the children died. I have seen young children die of starvation even when we have an abundance of food, bulging graineries in this country.

Yes, we ought to have foreign aid, a foreign aid program makes sense to me, but it ought to be aid that moves the kinds of things that people need directly to those people. We ought to produce food to feed the hungry, and we ought to produce medical aid that heals the sick.

What we ought to do is stop sending arms to governments and start sending some help to the people that govern.

In our foreign aid budget, paradoxically we have at times been sending arms to both sides of the same war. In the 1980's the USA was literally the arms merchant of the world. That makes no sense to me. We need to cut substantially today's foreign aid program and make sure that a program in which the bulk of our foreign aid program goes to help people who need help.

Another important element of putting this country back on track is to get regulators who will regulate. The fact is for the last decade we have had people put in charge of regulatory areas in this town who were basically hostile to the notion of regulating. They were paid to regulate, but they refused to do it.

Example after example abounds. Savings and loans, yes, Congress has some responsibility in that, but I am telling you that the greatest responsibility was among the regulators who were supposed to look over the shoulder of those in the S&L business, but these people simply stood back and said, "Do what you want. We won't look. We won't listen. We won't interfere." The result was we had a bunch of shysters in the S&L business who were willing to cheat, not all of them, but a pretty good-sized bunch willing to cheat and commit fraud. Our regulators got taken for a ride because they did not care enough. Unfortunately some of the same sort of things are happening now in banks.

And we also are not paying attention to what is happening in the airline industry? Airlines are merging and getting bigger. There is no merger apparently that anybody in this town seems to care about. Two airlines want to merge, get two or three airlines that are losing money and merge. Their people apparently think it is a wonderful thing.

Regulators who are supposed to regulate issues of public good have allowed airlines to merge in an uncontrolled way. They have allowed airlines to be loaded up with debt and LBO's and hostile takeovers and again said, "It's not our business. We won't look. We won't interfere."

The result is an airline industry that is in perilous trouble, loaded with debt, trying to fly through a recession and

we are going to end up with fewer airlines. And those that continue to fly are losing money. It all means less competition and higher prices for the consumer.

We need to put this country back on track, and there are some steps that we can take to do that which respond to the areas of education and trade, paying our bills, making quality products, a whole range of those things that I have just mentioned.

You know, we hear all the time about this new world order. What we need to do, the President says, is help create this new world order.

Well, I would be the first to say that what has happened in the world is almost breathtaking. I did not expect in my lifetime to see what has happened in just the last 2 years. The Berlin Wall is gone. It is down. Eastern Europe is largely free. The Soviet Union is coming apart through centrifugal force. I did not expect to see that in my lifetime, and yet it has happened.

Acts of courage all over the world abound. We had a fellow step to this microphone behind me a while back and tell a story that is being retold all over the world. He was a man who was unemployed. He was probably in pretty desperate condition, unemployed with a family, no income. He was an electrician, not a bureaucrat, not a politician, not a diplomat. He was an electrician at a shipyard in Gdansk, Poland and had lost his job.

Well, they had a strike at the shipyard and this man jumped over the fence to lead it. A couple years later he came back to speak in this Chamber. He is now the President of Poland.

Do you know what he said to us? He said, "We didn't break a windowpane. We didn't have any arms, no guns." That man is Lech Walesa.

Vaclav Havel walked through that door and spoke to us as President of Czechoslovakia. He talked about how 4 months earlier he had a midnight visit in Prague from the Communist police. He knew that knock meant he was going to prison because he was a dissident. He knew the terror of cell block isolation. He knew the brutality. The question was, How long would he be in prison?

Four months later he was standing here in this Chamber as President of Czechoslovakia. He came to us and told us that people were standing on street corners in Prague, reading the Declaration of Independence from the United States of America in street demonstrations to overthrow the oppressive yolk of communism.

Examples like that abound. Vaclav Havel had no arms either.

The issue it seems to me is not always arms. The issue is the power of an idea.

Another woman spoke from the microphone behind me a few years ago. Her husband Benigno Aquino had been

assassinated by Ferdinand Marcos and his regime. He was assassinated when he tried to return home to the Philippines. His wife went home later to the Philippines by herself without arms or guns. She too came back to this Chamber as the President of the Philippines.

The power of an idea, in the Philippines and Czechoslovakia, in Poland, the power of the idea that people who want to be free. Ideas are more powerful than guns.

In this country, it seems to me after languishing now for a long, long time, we must resurrect the notion that the idea of putting this country back on track, the idea of people being responsible, everybody, not just the Congress and the President, but the American people being responsible for our direction is an important idea.

There are things we must commit ourselves to as citizens and as public servants to put this country back on track. They are in most cases not new things. They are the timeless truths that most of us understand, but many have forgotten.

□ 1330

You cannot make better products by trying to take a corporation apart through hostile means. You cannot better America's economic future by spending money you do not have. You cannot long sustain a program in which you open your markets wide open and then are taken advantage of by other countries who close their markets to you.

The list of lessons that we have learned and forgotten is endless and we now must rededicate ourselves to relearn.

Most important, I think it is important for President Bush and for Congress to decide that the trouble this country finds itself in is not Republican or Democratic trouble; it is trouble for the long-term economic future of this country. And it is not a trouble from which we cannot survive. We can, if we do the right things now, decide to put the country back on track.

This country is a better country than we have seen in recent years. We have been told that government is somehow bad. Government is evil. Government is the problem. The fact is government is us, it is all of us. It is only as good as all of us are. And there are things that all of us have to rededicate ourselves to for the future of this country if we are going to have the kind of a country and the kind of a future that all of us want and expect.

In short, we need leadership. Yes, especially leadership from the White House. And, no, I am not happy with the current state of leadership coming from the White House.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to be critical, I know, but the fact is President Bush, who has such great capacity for leader-

ship, in my judgment, is flying around the world working on a new world order.

But we need leadership for a new economic order here in this country. It is really time to take care of things here at home. This country is off track and most of the American people, deep in their guts, know it. They know we are losing our edge and they know that soon we have to do something about that.

How, I ask, can a country which produces wonderful young scientists and engineers and others and moves them to support a \$300 billion defense industry—even as the cold war is now over, and uses those scientists and engineers to produce new tanks and new fighters and new bombers—how can that country compete in selling new toasters, tires, and television sets with another country that produces those scientists and engineers and sends them into the private sector to work on providing better toasters, tires, and television sets?

The answer is: The current system does not work for our long-term future and we must change. Our priorities need changing, and they probably cannot and will not be changed until and unless the American people tell the President and the Congress that we want to move on a different course, that we choose a different path, that we see a different future for this country and we are willing to sacrifice to do that.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, it is easy to be critical. There is an old poem about bullfighting, and it goes like this: "Bullfight critics, row by row, crowd the vast arena fold. But there is only one there who knows, and that is the one that fights the bulls."

It is easy to be critical of the President, it is easy to be critical of Members of the House and the Senate, but we do, all of us, need to understand the President and all of us serving here, that leadership is what is so critically necessary now to put this country back on track.

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. BROOMFIELD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DREIER of California, for 60 minutes, on October 29.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes each day, on November 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22.

Mr. KYL, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes today.
Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, on October 21.
Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, on October 21 and 60 minutes on October 22.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. ROHRBACHER in three instances.

Mr. MCEWEN.

Mr. GRADISON.

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

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida in two instances.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. SOLARZ.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. KILDEE.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1720. An act to amend the Saint Elizabeths Hospital and District of Columbia Mental Health Services Act to permit the Secretary of Health and Human Services to enter into an agreement with the Mayor of the District of Columbia with respect to capital improvements necessary for the delivery of mental health services in the District, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2622. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution designating October 1991 as "National Down Syndrome Awareness Month."

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On October 18, 1991:

H.R. 2608. 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;

H.R. 1415. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for the Department of State, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3280. An act to provide for a study, to be conducted by the National Academy of Sciences, on how the Government can improve the decennial census of population, and on related matters;

H.R. 2426. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2698. An act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2942. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 22, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2228. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-85, "D.C. Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 Temporary Amendment of 1991", pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2229. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final regulations for Services for Children with Deaf-Blindness Program, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2230. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistant Agency, transmitting the price and availability report for the quarter ending September 30, 1991, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2760; to the committee on Foreign Affairs.

2231. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of George Fleming Jones, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Co-operative Republic of Guyana; of John Giffen Weinmann, of Louisiana, as Chief of Protocol for the White House, and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on foreign Affairs.

2232. A letter from the Executive Director, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, transmitting the annual report under the Federal managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2233. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Legislative Affairs, transmitting comments on H.R. 1717; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2234. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, transmitting a report dated July 24, 1991, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, on Canaveral Harbor, Brevard County, FL, together with other pertinent reports and comments, pursuant to Public Law 89-789, section 209 (80 Stat. 1423 Doc. No. 102-156); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and ordered to be printed.

2235. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, transmitting a report dated June 29, 1990, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, on the inland navigation project at McAlpine Lock and Dam, Indiana and Kentucky, together with other pertinent reports and comments, pursuant to Public Law 89-789, section 209 (80 Stat. 1423 (H. Doc. No. 102-157); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3169. A bill to lengthen from five to seven years the expiration period applicable to legislative authority relating to construction of commemorative works on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs; with an amendment (Rept. 102-257). 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. 2032. A bill to amend the act of May 15, 1965, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Nez Perce National Historical Park in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 585. A bill to establish a national policy for the conservation of biological diversity; to support environmental research and training necessary for conservation and sustainable use of biotic natural resources, to establish mechanisms for carrying out the national policy and for coordinating related activities; and to facilitate the collection, synthesis, and dissemination of information necessary for these purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 101-259, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1464. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1992 for the Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. WYDEN (for himself and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 3591. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections

from legal liability for certain health care professionals providing services pursuant to such act; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCANDLESS:

H.R. 3592. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the coverage of a provision that prohibits contributions by foreign nationals in elections for Federal, State, and local offices, and to provide for an additional prohibition on contributions by foreign nationals in initiative, referendum, and recall elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 3593. A bill to increase the irrigable acreage for the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TORRICELLI:

H.R. 3594. A bill to exclude certain rebates received by families for State property taxes paid by such families from consideration as family income for purposes of the United States Housing Act of 1937 and section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FROST, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. STARK, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BROWDER, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 3595. A bill to delay until September 30, 1992, the issuance of any regulations by the Secretary of Health and Human Services changing the treatment of voluntary contributions and provider-specific taxes by States as a source of a State's expenditures for which Federal financial participation is available under the medicare program and to maintain the treatment of intergovernmental transfers as such a source; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

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

284. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, relative to the selection of Stapleton International Airport as the site of the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum extension; to the Committee on House Administration.

285. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to the extension of unemployment benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

286. Also, memorial of the Assembly of the State of California, relative to the Persian Gulf war; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

- H.R. 112: Mr. NUSSLE.
H.R. 371: Mr. DARDEN.
H.R. 710: Mr. WELDON.
H.R. 784: Mr. RIGGS and Mr. ZELIFF.
H.R. 1335: Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 1445: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 1472: Mr. VENTO, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. FAZIO.
H.R. 1582: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. QUILEN, Mr. BLBRAY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. ROE, and Mrs. LLOYD.
H.R. 1597: Mr. BARNARD.
H.R. 1663: Mr. PURSELL.
H.R. 2049: Mr. ALLARD.
H.R. 2180: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2410: Mr. KOLBE and Mr. EMERSON.
H.R. 2740: Mr. SIKORSKI.
H.R. 2749: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GUARINI, and Mrs. LLOYD.
H.R. 2780: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. FROST, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. FUSTER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, and Mr. ROE.
H.R. 2864: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. ROE.
H.R. 2872: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 3067: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. HORTON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 3071: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PORTER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. ANNUNZIO.

H.R. 3180: Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 3221: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, and Mr. MORRISON.

H.R. 3222: Mr. HUTTO.

H.J. Res. 239: Mr. SLATTERY.

H.J. Res. 317: Mr. ALLARD, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. WALSH.

H.J. Res. 327: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COX of California, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. ECKART, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EWING, Mr. F. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. NOWAK, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RAY, Mr. REED, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. WOLF.

H.J. Res. 350: Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H. Con. Res. 192: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. HORTON, Mr. CAMP, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. BROWDER, and Ms. LONG.

H. Res. 116: Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 152: Mr. LOWERY of California and Mr. BLILEY.