

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, November 6, 1991

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GEPHARDT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker.

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 4, 1991.

I hereby designate the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT to act as Speaker pro tempore on Wednesday, November 6, 1991.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. George W. Evans, Jr., pastor, Atonement Lutheran Church, Wyomissing, PA, offered the following prayer:

Lord of life, God whose choice is to dwell in the midst of people, mark well Your children in this House. Give them strength of vision to see through the chaos of interests that surrounds them and to discover Your clear will for them and Your people whom they serve. Be their strength and stay and thus provide the ground upon which they may marry words to actions. By Your grace, and by engaging the lives of these very women and men, cause the commerce and industry, and the fruits of homes, schools, farms, factories, and mines to result in a nation where the least of Your children may find a place to live and work. O God, bless the women and men of this House this day as they work for Your children across this land. In Your Name, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 278, nays 107, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

YEAS—278

Abercrombie	Emerson	Long
Ackerman	English	Luken
Anderson	Erdreich	Markey
Andrews (ME)	Espy	Matsui
Andrews (NJ)	Evans	Mavroules
Andrews (TX)	Ewing	Mazzoli
Annunzio	Fascell	McCloskey
Anthony	Feighan	McCurdy
Applegate	Fish	McDermott
Archer	Flake	McGrath
Aspin	Frank (MA)	McHugh
Atkins	Gaydos	McMillen (MD)
AuCoin	Gaydson	McNulty
Bacchus	Gephardt	Miller (CA)
Barnard	Geren	Mineta
Bateman	Gibbons	Mink
Beilenson	Gillmor	Moakley
Bennett	Gilman	Mollohan
Berman	Glickman	Montgomery
Bevill	Gonzalez	Moody
Bilbray	Gordon	Moran
Bonior	Gradison	Morrison
Borski	Green	Mrazek
Boucher	Gunderson	Murtha
Boxer	Hall (TX)	Myers
Brewster	Hamilton	Nagle
Brooks	Hammerschmidt	Natcher
Broomfield	Hansen	Neal (MA)
Browder	Harris	Neal (NC)
Brown	Hatcher	Nichols
Bruce	Hayes (IL)	Nowak
Bustamante	Hayes (LA)	Oakar
Byron	Hefner	Oberstar
Callahan	Hertel	Obey
Campbell (CO)	Hoagland	Olin
Cardin	Hochbrueckner	Oliver
Carper	Horn	Ortiz
Chapman	Horton	Orton
Clement	Houghton	Owens (UT)
Clinger	Hoyer	Packard
Coleman (MO)	Hubbard	Pallone
Coleman (TX)	Huckaby	Panetta
Collins (IL)	Hughes	Pastor
Collins (MI)	Hutto	Patterson
Combest	Jefferson	Payne (VA)
Condit	Jenkins	Pease
Conyers	Johnson (SD)	Pelosi
Cooper	Johnson (TX)	Penny
Costello	Johnston	Perkins
Cox (IL)	Jones (GA)	Peterson (FL)
Coyne	Jontz	Peterson (MN)
Cramer	Kanjorski	Petri
Darden	Kaptur	Pickett
de la Garza	Kennedy	Pickle
DeFazio	Kennelly	Porter
DeLauro	Kildee	Poshard
Dellums	Klecza	Price
Derrick	Kolter	Pursell
Dicks	Kopetski	Quillen
Dingell	Kostmayer	Rahall
Donnelly	Lancaster	Rangel
Dooley	Lantos	Ravenel
Dorgan (ND)	LaRocco	Reed
Downey	Laughlin	Richardson
Dreier	Lehman (CA)	Rinaldo
Durbin	Lehman (FL)	Ritter
Dwyer	Lent	Roe
Dymally	Levin (MI)	Roemer
Early	Levine (CA)	Rose
Eckart	Lewis (GA)	Rostenkowski
Edwards (CA)	Livingston	Roth
Edwards (TX)	Lloyd	Rowland

Roybal	Smith (IA)	Trafficant
Russo	Smith (NJ)	Traxler
Sabo	Snowe	Unsoeld
Sanders	Solarz	Valentine
Sarpalius	Spratt	Vento
Savage	Staggers	Visclosky
Sawyer	Stallings	Volkmer
Scheuer	Stark	Washington
Schiff	Stenholm	Waters
Schulze	Stokes	Waxman
Schumer	Studds	Wheat
Sharp	Swett	Whitten
Shaw	Swift	Williams
Shuster	Synar	Wise
Sisisky	Tallon	Wolpe
Skaggs	Tanner	Wyden
Skeen	Tauzin	Wylie
Skelton	Taylor (MS)	Yates
Slattery	Thomas (GA)	Yatron
Slaughter (NY)	Thornton	Young (FL)
Smith (FL)	Torres	

NAYS—107

Allard	Grandy	Ramstad
Armey	Hancock	Regula
Baker	Hastert	Rhodes
Ballenger	Henry	Ridge
Barrett	Herger	Riggs
Barton	Hobson	Roberts
Bentley	Holloway	Rohrabacher
Bereuter	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Inhofe	Roukema
Billey	Ireland	Santorum
Boehlert	Jacobs	Saxton
Boehner	Kolbe	Schaefer
Bunning	Kyl	Schroeder
Burton	Lagomarsino	Sensenbrenner
Camp	Leach	Shays
Campbell (CA)	Lewis (CA)	Sikorski
Chandler	Lewis (FL)	Smith (OR)
Clay	Lightfoot	Smith (TX)
Coble	Machtley	Solomon
Coughlin	Marlenee	Spence
Cox (CA)	Martin	Stearns
Crane	McCandless	Stump
Cunningham	McCollum	Sundquist
Dannemeyer	McDade	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	McEwen	Thomas (CA)
Doolittle	McMillan (NC)	Thomas (WY)
Dornan (CA)	Meyers	Upton
Duncan	Michel	Vucanovich
Fawell	Miller (OH)	Walker
Fields	Miller (WA)	Walsh
Franks (CT)	Molinari	Weber
Gallely	Moorhead	Wolf
Gekas	Murphy	Young (AK)
Gilchrist	Nussle	Zeliff
Goodling	Oxley	Zimmer
Goss	Paxon	

NOT VOTING—48

Alexander	Hall (OH)	Mfume
Bryant	Hefley	Morella
Carr	Hopkins	Owens (NY)
Davis	Hyde	Parker
Dickinson	James	Payne (NJ)
Dixon	Johnson (CT)	Ray
Edwards (OK)	Jones (NC)	Rogers
Engel	Kasich	Sangmeister
Fazio	Klug	Serrano
Foglietta	LaFalce	Slaughter (VA)
Ford (MI)	Lipinski	Torricelli
Ford (TN)	Lowery (CA)	Towns
Frost	Lowey (NY)	Vander Jagt
Gallo	Manton	Weiss
Gingrich	Martinez	Weldon
Guarini	McCrery	Wilson

□ 1024

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] will kindly come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILLIAMS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. HALLEN, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1117. An act to establish the Bureau of Land Management Foundation;

S. 1671. An act to withdraw certain public lands and to otherwise provide for the operation of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Eddy County, New Mexico, and for other purposes; and

S. 1745. An act to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to strengthen and improve Federal civil rights laws, to provide for damages in cases of intentional employment discrimination, to clarify provisions regarding disparate impact actions, and for other purposes.

"COME HOME" IS MESSAGE TO PRESIDENT BUSH

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a message for the President.

Arrivederci!

Yesterday's elections sent a clear message from voters. It's time to take care of our own. It's time to create a health care system that works. It's time for a tax break for middle-class Americans. Not the wealthy.

But the President is jetting off for yet another trip. This time it's Rome. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the President get it?

I think the President should consider an impromptu drop-in on another exotic place. The United States. He's got to think about our economy, our jobs, our taxes, our growth.

Come home, Mr. President; come home.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

MAKE CONGRESS FOLLOW THE LAWS

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, if the Republicans were in charge of the House today, we would insist on making the House follow the same laws we impose on every other business. It is wrong for Congress to pass laws that it does not itself follow. Whatever reason we have relied on in the past to justify this hypocrisy are not good enough. Separation of powers problems can be surmounted, budget problems can be met, and the inconveniences will be a good lesson to us as lawmakers.

The American people are tired of this double dealing. Every law that Bob's grocery store has to follow, we ought to follow. If Republicans were in charge we would repeal every existing provision that exempts Congress from coverage of laws and we would start with the civil rights bill due on the floor this week.

No public policy change would have more impact on the country than to require Congress to follow each law it passes. Why? Because Congress wouldn't pass laws that were to great a burden on its own operation. Just watch how fast many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle drop their interest in new bureaucratic oversights and paperwork requirements once they realize that every new regulation will apply to themselves. Talk about deregulation, it will make your head spin.

Let's put the whole country under the same laws.

MAKE NATIONAL HEALTH CARE TOP PRIORITY

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

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, as I have been saying for a long time, Americans want comprehensive health care reform. Nowhere has this been made more apparent than in yesterday's Pennsylvania Senate race.

The Democratic candidate decisively defeated former Attorney General Richard Thornburgh because he had a strong message. He emphasized his commitment to guarantee health care to all Americans. National health insurance is what Americans want and they aren't going to settle for anything less.

Americans want us to contain skyrocketing health care costs and they want universal coverage with comprehensive benefits. Only one bill has been introduced that can guarantee high-quality health care to all Americans for less money: H.R. 1300, the Universal Health Care Act of 1991. The Russo bill is the only bill that will save money for 95 percent of Americans while providing comprehensive benefits, including long-term care.

I'm tired of the inside-the-beltway mentality that says national health insurance isn't politically feasible. The American public has made it clear. National health insurance is politically feasible. The Russo universal health care bill is the only politically feasible plan around because it is the only plan that benefits all Americans by containing costs and increasing coverage.

The polls have told us, experts have told us, and now a major election has turned on this issue. Americans want comprehensive health reform now. It is time for the President and the Congress to wake up and listen to the American people and make the enactment of national health care their top priority.

□ 1030

EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Americans who need extended unemployment benefits are tired of waiting for the House Democrat leadership to stop playing games with this issue. It seems they would rather have an issue with which to bash the President than pass a bill the President can sign and get these benefits to the people who need them.

We need to pass legislation that extends unemployment benefits without raising taxes on the very businesses that will get us out of the recession. I call on the Democrat leadership to work with the President to give us a responsible extended benefits bill as well as an economic growth package. Let us solve our country's economic problems, rather than extend them into 1992. The American people are tired. They want lower health care costs, no more taxes, and no more rhetoric from this House.

They want the economy turned around. They are challenging us to move ahead. I speak from the conservative side of the aisle and challenge the Democrat leadership, conservatives, moderates, and liberals, let us work together and turn this economy around. The American people expect no less and give us this challenge to this House and to this Congress.

THE ADMINISTRATION CHANGES ITS MIND ON THE RECESSION

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

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, finally, finally the administration is telling us, yes, the recession is here, a fact that my constituents have known for a long

time. There is a record 23.6 million Americans receiving food stamps. People who have lost their jobs are suffering in this tough economy and have turned to this vital program for help.

Mr. Speaker, the average food stamp benefit is 70 cents per person per meal. Over 50 percent of the recipients are children. Remarkably, at this same time the administration is proposing regulations that threaten to cut the benefits in many ways.

As chairman of the subcommittee which oversees the Food Stamp Program, I am outraged that this administration is pulling the rug out from under the most vulnerable in our society. The President is telling us that he cares about people who are out of work and who have been hurt by this rocky economy. Unfortunately, the actions of this administration speak louder than words, and these actions are hostile to those most in need.

DO UNTO OTHERS?

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

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, what do the following laws have in common: the Social Security Act of 1933, the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, the Minimum Wage Act of 1938, the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Freedom of Information Act of 1966, the Age Discrimination Act of 1967, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, title IX of the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1972, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Privacy Act of 1974, the Age Discrimination Act Amendments of 1975, the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, and the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1988? What do these laws have in common? They all represent sound principles? Yes, and they are all laws from which the Democrat-controlled Congress has exempted itself.

Why, Mr. Speaker, does the Democrat-controlled Congress not apply these principles to itself? Shouldn't laws and standards which we believe best serve our country also best serve this institution? That is a question which the majority should have to answer.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend our Republican colleague from the other body, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY of Iowa, for his effort to force Congress "to live by the same laws that apply to everyone else," as highlighted in the Wall Street Journal's October 16 editorial. Let's support this effort.

MESSAGE FROM PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, it does not take a brain surgeon to figure out what happened yesterday in Pennsylvania. The message is clear. Stop closing bases in America and close a few military bases overseas. Stop worrying about NATO and start worrying about Blue Cross. Stop worrying about fast track and start worrying about illegal trade and the American worker.

Mr. Speaker, the people of our country are fed up. They are fed up with \$170 billion a year going to protect Japan and Germany, another \$25 billion in foreign aid, and they are getting food stamps.

The message is clear: Take care of No. 1, take care of America.

THE HOUSE OF PUBLIC MISTRUST

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, if Republicans were in control of the House, we'd move immediately to regain the public trust lost through 38 successive years of Democrat majorities.

In a recent Gallup Poll, Congress ranked behind the following organizations in public trust: The military, organized religion, the Presidency, Supreme Court, public schools, newspapers, banks, television, organized labor, and big business.

Under fundamental American principles, our Government derives its authority through the consent of the governed. Consent is unlikely to flow for long to one that is not trusted.

By the looks of things, Mr. Speaker, the trust Americans have in their Democrat-controlled Congress has all but disappeared.

THE STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Pennsylvania the people said again to this Government that they want us to turn homeward. Many of us have believed that for a long time. We can bet that President Bush finally heard it last night and this morning.

I am just willing to make my colleagues a bet this morning. Within 70 days, the President will stand right there and deliver his State of the Union message, and for the first time in his 4 years, he will focus domestically.

He will talk about the economy; bet on it. He will talk about employment; bet on it. He will declare himself to be the economy President.

Yes, sir, George Bush is going to come home now. In his upcoming State of the Union speech the President in

the last year of his term will say, "Trust me. I mean it. I am worried about the domestic economy. I am the economy President."

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, by abandoning the solid, progrowth economic policies of the Reagan administration and enacting higher taxes, budget busting spending bills, and burdensome regulations, the Democrat majority in Congress has caused this recession from which the American people are currently suffering. Moreover, this recession will not end until Congress changes policy.

The time to act is now. Congress must pass a broad-based tax cut and limit future increases in Federal spending before we adjourn this year. Let me outline the shape of such an economic growth package.

First, we must lower taxes on labor. Congress should repeal the increase in Social Security taxes that became effective in January 1990 and the ridiculous and counterproductive earning test on Social Security benefits.

Second, we must help middle class families by increasing the dependent child exemption to \$3,500.

Third, we must lower taxes on savings and investment. We should again allow all Americans to have individual retirement accounts [IRA's] and permit penalty-free withdrawals for first-time home purchases, college tuition, and catastrophic medical expenses. We should index the basis and lower the maximum rate on all capital gains for both individuals and corporations to 15 percent. We should repeal the passive loss rule.

Fourth, we must stop penalizing American businesses with punitive taxes. We should adopt a neutral cost recovery system either by enacting full expensing or indexing depreciation schedules. We must repeal counterproductive foreign tax provisions on American multinational firms that only help their Japanese and European rivals.

Fifth, we must enact an enterprise zone program to revive the inner cities.

Sixth, we must repeal all of the 1990 tax increases, including the stupid luxury excise tax.

Finally, we must enact a 4-year hard spending freeze to allow the additional revenue from economic growth to gradually bring the budget into balance.

□ 1040

HEALTH CARE FOR EVERY AMERICAN

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the people of Pennsylvania sent a message to their national leaders: if every criminal defendant has the right to a lawyer, every American family has the right to a doctor at a price it can afford.

Some of us have stood for this for a number of years, but powerful interests have long kept national health care off the national agenda. Those days are now over, because working families are fed up with worrying whether they can afford adequate medical care; because people are tired of being afraid that employers will have to cancel health care benefits because of exploding medical costs; because older Americans now are paying a higher percentage of their incomes for health care than they did 25 years ago; and because those who are out of work, including many people in Oregon timber country, face the terror of a serious illness without any health care coverage at all.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress I advocated a national health care program that provides universal access to health care. I am now convinced, based on events in Pennsylvania and the stirring across this country that we now can finally give all American families quality health care as their birthright. It is a fight I joined in the 1970's, and it is a fight that I intend to help Americans win today.

WELCOMING SLOBODAN RAKITIC

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Mr. Slobodan Rakitic to our Nations Capital. Mr. Rakitic is the senior vice president of the Serbian Renewal Movement, the largest opposition, anti-Communist Party in the Republic of Serbia and Yugoslavia.

Mr. Rakitic is recognized as the leading advocate of tolerance and negotiation in the current conflict in Yugoslavia. In his capacity as a member of both the Federal and Serbian Parliaments, he has taken the lead in the parliamentary fight to abolish Communist rule throughout all of the republics of Yugoslavia.

In Serbia, Mr. Rakitic works most closely with other opposition leaders such as Prof. Dragolub Micunovic, leader of the Democratic Party, leaders of the SDA, and leaders of the Hungarian Minority Group.

I will be holding a reception for Mr. Rakitic in room 1416 Longworth from 11 o'clock to 12:30 this morning, and invite any Members or their staffs to drop by and talk with him about the thriving political opposition in Serbia, and also the overall situation in Yugoslavia.

WOMEN NEED TO HEAR THE TRUTH ABOUT FAMILY PLANNING

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's new policy statement on family planning is actually nothing new at all. The President's statement says that a woman can get no information about her pregnancy options from a family planning program, but can only get a referral to a general practice health facility. Mr. Speaker, that is no change in the gag rule at all. Women are entitled to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth when they go to a family planning clinic, but under the President's statement that was issued late last night they will not get it. The President still does not believe that the first amendment ought to apply at federally funded family planning clinics.

I urge all our colleagues to support Chairman NATCHER's excellent labor-HHS bill today and ensure that women in this country have an absolute right to the truth.

WE MUST ENCOURAGE SMALL BUSINESS JOB CREATION

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

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, over the next 25 years, the United States needs to create 43 million jobs. Some 75 percent of those jobs will come from small businesses.

For the sake of all Americans, we ought to be doing whatever we can to encourage small businesses as they lead the way in creating the new jobs we so desperately need.

Instead, we will consider later this week a bill to mandate employee leave policies—even though 89 percent of Americans surveyed say that Government should not get involved in deciding what benefits employees receive. This bill would trade jobs that employees certainly do need for benefits that they may not even want.

We also may be asked to vote on yet another unemployment compensation bill—paid for through increased payroll taxes. If the bill contains such tax increases, it will be trading decent, full-time jobs for a few more weeks of Government handouts.

My colleagues as we consider these bills, stop, think and remember it is easy to say that you're for small businesses and the jobs they create. But it's how you vote that really counts.

WASHINGTON STATE VOTERS DEFEAT TERM LIMITATION INITIATIVE

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the voters of Washington State made a deliberate and very wise choice to defeat an initiative that would have unilaterally diminished Washington State's congressional delegation. Supporters of initiative 553 in Washington State were arguing for a three-term limitation on Members of Congress from just this one State, and they tried to capitalize upon the frustration that has spread across the Nation this year.

I am pleased to state this morning, however, that a majority of the voters in our State were able to see through this proposal, and despite the frustration that we know is there, they chose to defeat the measure.

I want to especially note the role that Speaker TOM FOLEY played. He campaigned across our entire State. Speaker FOLEY defended the Constitution, which this initiative clearly violated. He defended the citizens' right to decide. He defended the Congress, and he defended Washington State's right to have an experienced congressional delegation. This was a personal victory for the Speaker and a political victory for the people of Washington State.

YOU CANNOT FOOL AMERICAN WOMEN

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

Ms. MOLINARI. Did you hear that, Mr. Speaker? That is the sound that was heard several weeks ago in the other body. It is the bell that warns: "Time is up. You cannot fool American women anymore." That bell is about to go off in the House today.

When my colleagues vote against the Labor-HHS and education conference report, they will tell us it is because it is an abortion vote. But you cannot fool American women anymore. They will tell us they voted no because it spends too much on breast cancer and toward Medicare, that it is over budget. But you cannot fool American women anymore.

To vote no today will be a vote to close family planning clinics, to restrain free speech between a woman and her doctor, and to deny women their legal right to know.

So when Members vote on this report today, Mr. Speaker, be honest in your response because you cannot fool American women anymore. Time is up.

PRESIDENT BUSH WILL TURN OUT THE LIGHTS ON THOUSANDS ACROSS THIS COUNTRY

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

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, I think we finally figured out what the President meant when he talked about his thousand points of light. He must be talking about turning out the lights on over 1,000 hospitals across this country. In 1956 this body approved the Medicare Program which was designed to help senior citizens who lost their insurance policies, indigents, poor people, and children who did not have adequate health care. It was a unique program. It was a matching grant where the Federal Government put up money and the States and local hospitals put up money, and together they provided health care for those people.

Now the President, through the HCFA recommendations, is recommending to pull out the rug from the Federal Government's matching funds. It would cost my State \$1.1 billion. Mississippi would have to close every nursing home in their State.

Here we have a President on the one hand who will erase a \$6.7 billion loan to Egypt and will push for a capital gains reduction, a tax break for the rich; and on the other hand, pushes people out of nursing homes and hospitals across this country. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to come home and read his polls, and he will see that the No. 1 issue in this country is health care. And it is apparent that this President is standing in the dark.

□ 1050

VOTE FOR LABOR-HHS CONFERENCE REPORT

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

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, the women of America have an extraordinarily high stake in this legislation in the Labor-HHS conference report. Approval of this conference report will have a direct, positive impact on our lives.

First, this bill provides money to begin boosting research into a heretofore arcane and obscure medical subject: The women of this country. There is funding for research on breast, cervical, and ovarian cancer; sexually transmitted diseases; mammography and pap smear screening programs; and a long-term study on women's health.

For the women who have been important in Members' lives, this bill is the most meaningful get well soon card you could ever hope to send.

Second, the Labor-HHS bill reverses the title X family planning regulations which shamelessly condemn poor women to inferior and inadequate medical information, the deservedly infamous gag rule.

By overturning the gag rule, Congress will finally take Uncle Sam's finger off the mute button controlling doctor-patient relations. To have the

government dictating the medical advice women can receive is discriminatory, harmful and insulting to women in this country. If you support the gag rule, you are telling American women that you just do not trust them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to demonstrate their support of and faith in American women by voting to approve this conference report.

WAKE-UP CALL FOR AMERICA

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, for months now the American people have been calling out to its leaders in Washington, and for months the administration has turned a deaf ear.

Well, make no mistake about it: Yesterday, the people of Pennsylvania delivered a powerful message to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. By defeating President Bush's Attorney General and the head of his domestic policy council, the people have sent a message that they are tired of indifference in the face of growing economic bad times.

They are saying it is time for the President of the United States to do something for Americans for a change. It is time to recognize that we have emergencies here at home, too. It's time for the President to get out of the rut of tax breaks for the rich and start working for tax relief for struggling middle-class families. It is time for national health insurance, affordable health care for all Americans. My God, it's time to extend unemployment benefits for the 8.6 million Americans out of work.

That is the message of Pennsylvania. The President should listen. The Congress should listen, too.

Mr. Speaker, the people are looking for leadership and resolve to address this recession. Working- and middle-class families are on the line. They have just sent a wake-up call.

REDUCING TIME WITH BABY

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, strange as it may seem, the Family and Medical Leave Act—H.R. 2—is apt to reduce—rather than increase—the amount of time mothers devote to childrearing.

A recent Census Bureau report found that short-term, job-protected leave policies tend to encourage paid employment at the expense of mothering. According to the report, 71 percent of all women eligible for short-term maternity leave benefits return to the labor force less than 6 months after childbirth, while only 43 percent of those without short-term benefits do so.

That short-term, job-protected leave encourages a speedier return to paid work is not disputed by leading proponents of the Family and Medical Leave Act. In fact, some have expressed concern that if a longer term leave policy were offered, some women would subordinate careerism to mothering.

Given that the Family and Medical Leave Act is designed to build mother-job attachment more than mother-child attachment, policymakers interested in promoting the interests of families and children should not support H.R. 2.

TRIBUTE TO VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, the smoke is still hanging over 200,000 acres of burning forest land in West Virginia, but it is time to say thank you to the tired, exhausted firefighters, National Guard and volunteers, men and women, who spent countless days, now weeks, fighting these blazes.

I had the privilege of spending only 14 hours with the Malden and Chesapeake Volunteer Fire Departments this weekend, but they have spent days, now weeks, on steep hillsides that deer cannot run up, using water when they are lucky enough to get close, but more often chain saws, leaf blowers, and that final fire weapon, the rake, and during cold, heat, and smoke, listening for that popping that means there is a tree falling overhead.

Firefighters have always been there, but now, more than ever, we recognize their importance. They are getting little help from the Federal Government. Revenue sharing has been cut off years ago, and so they all play bingo, and hold bake sales, and they stop cars in the streets with upraised fire helmets.

There is a reason that the loss of life and property has been miraculously low in the last couple of weeks, and that is because of the volunteer firefighters, Mr. Speaker.

Congress must remember what they have done, and when this is over, remember what they need.

THE OCTOBER SURPRISE

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the committee investigating the so-called October surprise goes before the Committee on Rules, this notwithstanding the fact that this week's New Republic and Newsweek magazines have totally destroyed any pretense of credibility in this bogus story. Those

articles appear in my special order in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, November 4.

Mr. Speaker, I call on you and your leadership to face reality. Renounce this foolish pursuit and apologize to President Reagan and President Bush for dragging this mythical fabrication as far as you have.

If you really want to launch a worthy investigation, ask your current and former Democratic Members to appear before an investigative committee to defend their questionable dealings with the Sandinista Communists of Nicaragua in the mid-1980's.

Now, that is a story.

WOMEN NOT GETTING FAIR DEAL WITH HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the critical subject of women's health care. There is growing evidence that women are not getting a fair deal with respect to health care.

But today the House of Representatives has an opportunity to help correct this great injustice. The Labor-HHS-Education appropriations conference report significantly increases funding for research on women's health. This legislation calls on the National Cancer Institute to make breast cancer, ovarian cancer, and cervical cancer top priorities, and provides the funding for that research.

This conference report includes \$10 million for the National Institutes of Health for research on women's health and also funds the women's health initiative.

The Centers for Disease Control will receive funding for comprehensive early cancer detection programs for low-income women in eight States, and the conference report also blocks the administration from imposing the so-called gag rule. This administration policy would deny women the right to full and fair health information.

Mr. Speaker, women with diabetes, women with cancer, women with multiple sclerosis, these women need to know the effect a pregnancy has on their condition and all the options available to them. Any attempt to deny them this information is both mean spirited and extremely dangerous.

When we vote today for the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the Congress sends an important signal to women: we care about health care, we will fund research, we will fund the early detection, and we will block any attempt to deny women all the health care information they need.

WELCOME TO GEORGE ALLEN AND TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE FRENCH SLAUGHTER

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate George Allen, who will be the new Republican Congressman who was elected in the Seventh Congressional District by an overwhelming vote.

George was the son of the former Redskin coach, George Allen, and distinguished himself in the general assembly, and I think he will be a credit to this body.

I also want to pay a special tribute to Congressman FRENCH SLAUGHTER, who will be leaving us. FRENCH was a very decent, honest, ethical man who, I think, has been one of the hardest workers and a good man whom we will deeply miss.

So I know all the other Members at an appropriate time will want to pay tribute to FRENCH and say, "FRENCH, we are going to miss you."

□ 1100

SUPPORT FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues that we have a mandate and a mission to stand up for the American people. As this Nation wallows in the pain of an economic recession, we have an obligation to put the needs of the American people above anything else!

We need to consider the needs of working Americans as we debate the Family and Medical Leave Act. Passing this legislation would send a message of hope to all working Americans. The family and medical leave bill would lift a tremendous burden off the shoulders of working people.

REMEMBER POW/MIA'S: WEAR RIBBONS

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, there is a family in my southwest Florida district that waits anxiously for news as to the whereabouts of a loved one—Capt. Donald Carr, who has been missing in action in Southeast Asia since 1971. Captain Carr's family is one of more than 2,200 families nationwide who have yet to know for sure what has happened to their relatives, known to the world as our POW's/MIA's. In recent days there has been a flurry of ac-

tivity—much of it hopeful—that has spurred the Pentagon to return this matter to the top of its priority list. Every lead is being followed—and every day the families become more hopeful that news and truth will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, a local organization in my district has painstakingly assembled black and white ribbons joined with a flag lapel pin, designed to remind us all that there are still loved ones missing. I have sent one ribbon to each of my colleagues.

And I urge everyone to join me in wearing them, sending a message throughout the Nation that we have not—and we will not—forget.

A REPUBLICAN GAG RULE

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, after we finish the 1-minute speeches, we are going to discuss another gag rule. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to gag our legal staff to only be able to say those things that they censor.

Now, what is worse about this gag attempt on the legal staff of the U.S. Congress is that they are going to divide the time. It is my understanding from the side that is always demanding that we give them half the time, which we do, they are going to give us 20 minutes on our side and they are going to take 40 minutes. It is an interesting lesson for us. Every time the Democrats bring a bill to this floor, we give half the time to the other side. We lean over backward to make sure there is a fair debate here.

Mr. Speaker, we will be watching to see how the Republicans handle their time when they control it.

THE LESSON OF THE ELECTIONS

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

Mr. HOLLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, we have listened to talk about the race in Pennsylvania yesterday. I am here to talk about a race in New Jersey. The people of New Jersey spoke and said, "We don't want any more taxes."

If the figures I have are correct, and I do not say they are final, but we saw a change that 58 Members of the House are going to be Republicans and 22 Members of the House are going to be Democrats; 23 Members of the Senate are going to be Republicans and 17 Members of the Senate are going to be Democrats.

I am here to tell you that business and people in this country are saying, "You can't be everything to everybody in government."

It is time that we give people a dollar's worth of good for a dollar's worth of taxes. It is time that America wakes up and realizes where our deficit spending is coming from, to realize that the legislative body here every year appropriates 15 percent more to run this House.

We all want affordable health care, but I will tell you, let us find out where we are going to pay for it and what we are going to cut in our present budget before we try to pass a bill.

PASS THE LABOR-HHS BILL

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I want to send my congratulations to the voters of Pennsylvania. They got a great Senator and they also did something terrific. They got the President to cancel yet another foreign trip, and he is going to stay home because he wants to watch Congress. Of course, he is going to Rome first. I wish he would watch us today, because today we are going to pass a great bill, the Health and Human Services Act. We are going to finally fund health programs for women at a higher rate to attack the problem of breast cancer and ovarian cancer and cervical cancer.

The President opposes this. He also wants to continue a gag rule which would in America in 1991 stop a physician from telling his or her patients the truth about that patient's legal options.

Mr. Speaker, this gag rule is not about abortion. It is about freedom of speech and freedom of speech in America is something we have come to rely on. It is what makes us so great, and I look forward to working with the chairman and passing the Health and Human Services Act.

A FAIR DIVISION OF TIME ON A PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION

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

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of our 1-minute addresses this morning, the House will take up a very serious question and that is the question of whether the taxpayer's resources and the officials' funds and resources of this House of Representatives should be used to weigh in and interfere with State elections on term limits.

As an individual Member of the House, I have brought a resolution on a question of privilege, of the whole House, not a personal privilege, but privileges of the whole House, to be consulted on a matter such as this.

Frankly, it is not an easy thing for an individual Member to challenge the

leadership in this fashion, but I thought it important to do so.

The rules of the House, which I want punctiliously to follow, give a Member bringing a resolution of this type 1 hour. They give me that entire time.

Now, even though that is what the rule does, I have agreed with the distinguished majority leader, and he is in concurrence with me on this subject, that the time will be divided 15 minutes to myself, then 20 minutes of time that the majority leader will distribute as he sees fit, and 20 minutes to my side, and I will conclude in 5 minutes; but I want to emphasize that under the rules, this Member is entitled to all of the time.

Frankly, if we follow those rules, there would not be any time whatsoever allocated to the other side. The minority in this House has a very difficult time bringing our matters of interest to the floor. This question of privilege, frankly, is about a decision taken without consultation whatsoever with the minority, without approval of our leadership, and without any debate or vote on the floor of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is urgent that we precipitate that debate this morning, and that is the purpose of my action.

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD LEARN THE LESSON OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, there is a valuable lesson that the President could learn during his trip to Europe today to visit our NATO allies. It is not about the Soviet-Warsaw Pact threat. It is not about new rationales and why the U.S. taxpayers should spend \$160 billion a year to defend our wealthy allies in Europe against a nonexistent threat.

No, if our NATO allies can afford to provide health care to each and every citizen, that is the lesson the President should bring back today, how to provide that needed health care here to every citizen of the United States of America, not how to perpetuate the cold war in Europe.

JOB CREATION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH NEEDED NOW

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's election, the American people sent a clear message to the Democrats who control this House.

Jobs are in, higher taxes are out.

In New Jersey, the people spoke loud and clear by throwing out the Democrats who raised their taxes, and

throwing in the Republican candidates who campaigned on a platform to cut taxes and ignite economic growth.

Using a progrowth, antitax message, Republicans took over the New Jersey Legislature for the first time in 20 years.

And in Mississippi, voters changed history by electing a progrowth, antitax Republican Governor—the first since Reconstruction.

The message from these elections is clear: the American people want jobs and growth, not higher taxes. And the people will change history to get the progrowth program they want.

Now, it is time for the Democrats in this House to give up on their higher tax agenda, and pass a progrowth, projobs, protaxpayer, and profamily economic growth package.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting at home. And if the Democrats who control Congress do not take action to take care of the American people, then American people are going to take action to take care of the Democrats who control Congress.

These are historic times, Mr. Speaker. I hope the Democratic leadership is listening.

PRESIDENT SHOULD STAY HOME AND GET UNEMPLOYMENT BILL PASSED

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning right before he left Washington for another trip overseas, the President said that he canceled a future overseas visit, this time to Asia, because "I hate going away with Congress still in session. Heaven knows what will happen."

□ 1110

Mr. Speaker, we do know what happens when the President goes on these foreign visits because the United States winds up giving more away. When the President visited several NATO countries that summer, he ended up promising Greece two Navy ships and millions of dollars in surplus Navy equipment. After he visited Turkey, the administration has been telling us they want to provide that country with 80 F-16's worth \$2.8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, so far my committee has objected because of the foreign aid implications, but the administration keeps putting the pressure on.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say, "Mr. President, I hope when you get home, you'll help us fashion an unemployment insurance bill, but when you're out there in Rome with our allies, I hope you don't go promising any more F-16's, or anything like that. We simply can't afford the foreign aid implications."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

DOCTOR-PATIENT RELATIONSHIP IS NOT VIOLATED BY NEW TITLE X REGULATION

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the President in his title X memo yesterday shattered the myth that the doctor-patient relationship is violated by the new title X regulation. The President writes in part, and I quote:

We must insure that the confidentiality of the doctor-patient relationship will be preserved and that the operation of the title X family planning program is compatible with free speech and the highest standards of medical care. In order to clarify the purpose and intent of these regulations, I am directing that in implementing these regulations to insure that the following principles be adhered to: one, nothing in these regulations is to prevent a woman from receiving complete medical information about her condition from a physician; two, the title X projects are to provide necessary referrals for appropriate health care facilities when medically indicated.

The claim that doctors could not refer a pregnant woman for medical care with AIDS, cancer, or diabetes, as suggested in a recent Dear Colleague, is simply false. In fact, a doctor is required to refer a woman to a specialist even if such referral ultimately results in the loss of the baby's life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote no on the conference report and preserve the President's prenatal care rule.

SUPPORT THE LABOR-HHS CONFERENCE REPORT

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, later on today we will consider the Labor-HHS conference report. I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to making a record of the fact that this House of Representatives opposes the Reagan-Bush gag rule, this conference report makes a significant stride forward in medical research for Americans. There is an increase of over \$400 million to the National Institutes of Health to find cures for the diseases which plague American families. Many of my colleagues, particularly the Congresswomen who serve with me, have stood up and said that they support the bill because of the strides we made in this legislation for women's health care, and I think that is critically important.

But I would like to correct the record. I say, "If you ask most Americans what is the No. 1 cancer cause of death among women in America, what would they say? Ovarian and cervical cancer? No. Breast cancer? No. The No. 1 cancer cause of death among American women is lung cancer caused primarily by smoking."

Mr. Speaker, I want to salute this conference committee for adding money in this bill for the Office of Smoking and Health to educate, not only women and men, but children, across America not to take up smoking. That is a step forward, not only for women, but for all Americans.

WHY AMERICA DISRESPECTS US

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, in the 15-years that I have been here, which is a short amount of time comprised to the 50 years served by JAMIE WHITTEN of Mississippi who started his 51st year today, I have only seen one October surprise. And that was the cockamamie, so-called budget compromise that was, surprise, the mother of all tax hikes. But what about that other October surprise? You know, that October 11 years ago, just before Ronald Reagan was first elected in a landslide.

Listen to what the New Republic says about it. "What October surprise?" And below that is this:

But the truth is the conspiracy currently postulated is a total fabrication. None of the evidence cited to support the October surprise stands up to scrutiny. The key sources on whose word the story rests are documented frauds and impostors.

How about the cover of Newsweek? "The charge, treason; the evidence, myth." Eleven reporters worked on this Newsweek story from New York, London, Paris, Jerusalem, Moscow, Bonn, Chicago, Houston, and Los Angeles.

The two authors of the New Republic story, Steven Emerson and Jesse Furman, said they will finish their investigation for \$3,000, but the Congress is going to put up half a million. If Congress really has to go through with this charade, it should give Steve and Jesse the \$3,000 and save the taxpayers some money.

Mr. Speaker, this is why America disrespects this legislative body. If we just did our jobs around here the American people would certainly forgive the odd salad with Raquefort dressing. But when Congress consents to spending half a million dollars investigating a fairy tale, every little abuse of Congressional parks becomes magnified. The October surprise witch hunt is unworthy of this Chamber and all those pursuing it for political reasons should feel small.

THANK GOD THE DEMOCRATS HAVE BEEN HERE FOR 40 YEARS

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, someone from the Republican side mentioned earlier that people were irritated that people were going to get another couple of weeks of handouts from the Government. These are unemployed folks that are out of a job and cannot find jobs. They are going to get another handout.

Mr. Speaker, they paid into this fund, and the administration has barred the money. There is no trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, I say, "Your record ain't good, boys, on working folks. When we talked about 60-day notice for plant closing, you said, 'Oh, that's a terrible thing. You have to let people know they're going to be out of work in 2 months.' When we talked about minimum wage, you said, 'Oh, that's going to be terrible. It's going to ride the price of everything up, going to drive fast food people out of business.' It didn't work. It seems to me your record ain't too good."

One other thing somebody mentioned over here time and time again: If the Republicans had been here all these years, we would have had so and so. Well, let me tell my colleagues, "if the Republicans had been here all those years, I'll tell you some of the things you wouldn't have had. You'd have had less of Medicare, you'd have had less Social Security, and you'd have had a lesser safe place to work had the Republicans been here."

So, Mr. Speaker, I just thank God that the Democrats have been here for 40 years.

GOVERNMENT MUST TELL WOMEN THE TRUTH ABOUT THEIR MEDICAL OPTIONS

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, late last night the Members received a copy of a memorandum from President Bush to Secretary Sullivan pretending to change the gag rule.

This memo does nothing. It is rather a last-minute attempt to confuse the issue.

Please don't be fooled. The gag rule prevents a title X clinic from telling a pregnant woman coming to them for help, who has cancer or diabetes, that her pregnancy might kill her. Yes, that's right. Even in that extreme case the clinic, under the gag rule, could not tell the women about her right to have an abortion that would save her life.

Mr. Speaker, the memo purports to address this. But it is fascinating that

the President does not direct the Secretary to revise the gag rule regulations. He attempts to tell how clearly opposite language should be interpreted.

Mr. Speaker, the memo is obviously extralegal and could have no effect whatsoever. But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, the underlying problem with the gag rule remains. A woman who asks about her medical options cannot be told them. Eighty percent of the American women believe this is wrong. The AMA and the ABA believe this is wrong.

Citizens in our country are entitled to be told the truth by their Government. Support the conference report today and insure that they will be.

OVERTURN THE GAG RULE

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider legislation to block implementation of the gag rule. This rule prohibits health care professionals from providing appropriate medical information concerning their patients' legal option to choose abortion—even when a woman's life may be endangered by a full-term pregnancy.

The gag rule is bad policy and bad medicine. It violates every principle of ethical medicine, increases the potential for malpractice suits, and places political ideology over sound medical judgment.

Physicians are sworn to uphold the Hippocratic Oath, not a political loyalty oath, and it is their responsibility to offer patients informed consent of all their medical alternatives.

I understand this administration wants to restrict abortions. But gagging doctors and withholding family planning funds is not the way to do it.

The Supreme Court has said that it is legal to prevent some women from obtaining reliable medical information. But it is neither right, fair, nor wise to do so. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Labor-HHS conference report today.

RESOLUTION ON TERM LIMITS

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] will present a privileged motion to rescind action taken on behalf of the House, but on which there was never any debate or a vote. Twenty-five thousand dollars has been made available for a brief to be filed in the Florida Supreme Court against the

term limitation proposal there, but we have never had a vote on that issue here in the House, and I suspect we are never likely to get one. Mr. COX has 1 hour of time under the rules of the House, but he was just criticized by the gentleman from Connecticut for giving opponents of his resolution 20 minutes of that 1 hour.

□ 1120

Mr. Speaker, I think it takes gall to constantly vote for closed rules precluding debate, precluding the offering of amendments, and precluding the making of points of order, and then criticize the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] for not being fair. I think it takes gall to support a secret decision made without debate, made without any vote anywhere, and then criticize the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] for being unfair. I think it takes gall to prevent a vote on the issue of term limitations, let alone filing the brief and then criticizing the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] for not being fair.

Whether the majority is given 15 minutes, 20 minutes, 30 minutes, or 5 hours, it is not going to be able to explain to the American people why it is fair to authorize the filing of a brief on behalf of the House when the House never acted on the issue and has not been given an opportunity to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution of the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

GUN VIOLENCE TARGETED BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA VOTERS

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the people of the District of Columbia moved in the tradition of self-help and in the exercise of self-government against epidemic gun violence in the streets of the Nation's Capital. The Congress, through years of inaction, has in effect invited local jurisdictions to take care of the rampage of gun crimes themselves. To Americans who did not get it, this body hung out a mile-high, look-elsewhere sign last month when it defeated the assault gun provision of the crime bill the day after the tragic Killeen, TX massacre.

If the D.C. assault gun referendum had passed anywhere else in the United States, including any of the territories with nonvoting delegates, the Congress would have been compelled to defer to democracy. The people of the District of Columbia say to the Congress and to the country, "Do not let the place where our democratic government does its work be the place that disrespects and overturns the will of the people who live in this place."

VOTERS' RESPONSE TERMED "ANTIINCUMBENT, ANTITAX, AND ANTIBIG GOVERNMENT"

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I just drove down this morning from Pennsylvania after having worked the entire day listening to the voters of my commonwealth and my district. I understand that many of my colleagues this morning, Mr. Speaker, have said that President Bush should listen to the lessons learned from Pennsylvania.

Perhaps my colleagues still have not gotten the message. Perhaps they should look at what happened in Mississippi and in Virginia, and perhaps they should look at the State of New Jersey where for the first time in 20 years the Republicans have established veto-proof majorities in both the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the message yesterday from my voters and across this country was not anti-Republican nor anti-Democratic. The message was antiincumbent, antitax, and antibig government.

Mr. Speaker, this institution is next. Congress had better take heed.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM IS A BETTER SOLUTION THAN TERM LIMITS

(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, among the many elections that were held yesterday was a referendum on the question of term limits. It was conducted in the State of Washington, and I am happy to say that the voters of the State of Washington rejected what I would characterize as a quick-fix solution to the problems of big government and political incumbency.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this fervor for term limits is really a symptom of an underlying uneasiness and underlying disaffection on the part of the American people and the voters toward the political system, not so much toward Congress itself but toward the system.

A better solution than term limits, which would get rid of a lot of Members, including the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] who is on the floor with me today, is making sure that we have good, solid campaign finance reform. Later this month, Mr. Speaker, we will take up that issue. I certainly hope that the House passes this bill. That would be, to me, the best solution to our problems on Capitol Hill.

REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES WIN BIG IN NEW JERSEY

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

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday voters in my home State of New Jersey spoke out loud and clear against the Democratic majority's \$2.8 billion tax hike by turning out Democrat incumbents in droves. Not only did the Republicans recapture the State senate and the State assembly, but they did so by overwhelming margins that will assure them of veto-proof control of both houses—58 to 22 in the assembly and 27 to 13 in the senate.

In town after town, in county after county, Republican candidates were victorious.

This was probably the greatest single victory for any one party in the history of the State. In Middlesex County, for example, Republicans gained control of the county board of freeholders for the first time in 62 years, even before I was born. Republicans gained control of 17 out of 21 counties. The message was simple.

Mr. Speaker, these returns should leave no doubt in anyone's mind that the days of higher and higher taxes are over, and that you cannot ram tax increases down the throats of the people. The people are sick and tired of tax hikes, of more spending, and of the conventional wisdom. They are tired of the solutions of the past. They want a new vision for the future, and they are turning to the Republican Party for it.

Mr. Speaker, they demonstrated that in New Jersey yesterday.

PRESIDENT URGED TO STAND FIRM ON TRADE ISSUES

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

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to see the spin that different Members put on the elections yesterday. It is very difficult to tell really what the true story is, but obviously in Pennsylvania the two big issues had to be health care and jobs, unemployment.

The rumors are that the President is going to Europe and will have an opportunity to go by and talk about trade, the trade agreement. If in fact this administration caves in on these trade talks and does away with the textile industry over the next 10 years, then that is the wrong signal to send to the rest of the country. I think the people of Pennsylvania have recognized that unemployment is real in this country and we do not need to be over in the Uruguay round telling the rest of the world that we will give up the rest of our industries, that "You don't have to worry, we will cave in at the last minute."

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the President does not do that.

A NEW DIRECTION FOR THE GARDEN STATE

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

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a momentous day in the Garden State. Yesterday the voters of New Jersey, men and women of all races, colors and creeds, and, Mr. Speaker, I do want to emphasize this, Republicans and Democrats alike, joined together to say no to arrogance, no to heavy-handed governance, and no to taxes.

In the end, when the dust had settled, the Republican Party took control of supermajorities in both Houses.

Mr. Speaker, I know that some Members were thrilled with the defeat of the term limit initiative. For my self, I am thrilled with the defeat of taxes in New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, for 13 hours yesterday, record numbers of New Jersey voters poured into their polling places and cast their votes. And, in the end the message was crystal clear.

VOTERS SEND A NEW MESSAGE TO LEADERS IN GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, some Members are attempting to portray the results of yesterday's election as an anti-incumbent vote. It seems to me that it is much more of an antibusiness-as-usual vote. People across the country have said that this institution and the Presidency at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue have to produce real results on the real problems of the American people, and do it now.

When people turned down term limits, they were not saying they were not angry and frustrated; they were saying that this system which our Founding Fathers put together can work if it is led properly.

I am convinced that this election will send a message to many on both sides that if we address the fundamental issues, health care, tax relief for the average American, and the other economic issues that have been so neglected for 12 years, the American people will continue to reject term limits, that easy solution to the problem of holding politicians accountable.

□ 1130

VOTE AGAINST HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CONFERENCE REPORT

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting here listening to the revival of government by bumper strip when I heard phrases like "the gag rule."

I would just like to point out later on today when we vote on the Health and Human Services conference report, that they have loaded that otherwise good bill with proabortion legislation which is designed to give Planned Parenthood more money for abortions.

They want to make family planning clinics steer young women to the Planned Parenthood abortion clinics. They already make \$30 million a year for abortions. They want to take a program that is designed to make people fertile if they want children and to provide contraception if they do not want children, and turn it into a way station for abortion, the killing of unborn children.

Abortion has never been a part of family planning, but that is what they want.

They talk about a gag rule. The President has issued a directive yesterday that makes clear that the doctor-patient relationship is unimpaired. A doctor can give a pregnant woman complete and comprehensive medical advice, even if it involves an abortion. It is a receptionist, it is the nurse, it is the counselor, who are untrained volunteers, steering young, pregnant, frightened women to abortion clinics run by Planned Parenthood that we do not want giving medical advice.

That is the sad but necessary reason why I urge Members to vote against the conference report, so the President can veto it, and we can reconsider it and sent it back, unimpaired by the albatross of abortion language.

PENNSYLVANIA SENATORIAL ELECTION A STAIN ON THE PRESIDENT'S MANTLE

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, you can spin the bottle 1,000 ways, but you cannot wash away the results that were spoken by the voters of Pennsylvania last night when they rejected one of the closest people to President Bush. Mr. Thornburgh was the Attorney General of the United States. He has been a politician, elected and appointed, for many years. He served two terms as Governor of Pennsylvania.

He was defeated last night soundly and roundly by Mr. WOFFORD, who was appointed just a few months ago to the Senate. And try as they will, no Republican is going to be able to wash that stain off the President's mantle.

The bottom line is that the people of Pennsylvania understood what the people of America understand: this admin-

istration has failed, and is failing, and it looks like it will fail in the future to come to grips with the real problems that Pennsylvania and Americans face; unemployment, a lousy economy, losing jobs overseas, and a tax structure which favors the wealthy.

This is being perpetuated by this administration. This Congress is going to change it, and, in the process, we are going to do for the average American a health care package that the President of the United States has not even talked about yet.

AMERICA TIRED OF BELTWAY CROWD NOT RESPONDING TO PEOPLE OF AMERICA

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, it is nice to hear people from Florida and Illinois, Michigan and California telling everybody here in America what the people of Pennsylvania say. Well, I happen to represent some people from Pennsylvania, and let me tell these gentlemen who are standing up here with such knowledge that the people of Pennsylvania are saying one thing: They are tired of what is going on down here.

Senator WOFFORD ran a campaign saying that he was the outsider and he too was tired of what was going on down here. That is the message.

Mr. Speaker, that is the message you should hear loud and strong, that they are tired of taxpayer dollars being used to pay for legal briefs down in Florida to fight term limits. They are tired of things going on where this inside-the-beltway crowd is not responding to the people of America. That is the message.

MESSAGE FROM NEW JERSEY ON TAXES

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

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the Delaware River in New Jersey yesterday the voters spoke out loud and clear. They spoke against the brand of government that the Democratic Party has forced on New Jersey for the last 2 years. They said no to New Jersey's enormous tax hike, which has stifled the economy, cost jobs, and chased business out of our State.

New Jersey said yesterday that high taxes are not the way to battle a recession, and they are not fair to hard working people. New Jersey residents knew that taxes did not have to be raised, but that State spending had to be reduced. They said cut the waste, stop the spending. But the Democrats

and the Democratic Governor ignored them, until yesterday.

The taxes were rammed through the legislature over the protest of thousands of New Jersey residents who took to the streets. While the people responded to higher taxes, bloated budgets, and arrogant Democrats, they took control of both houses of the New Jersey Legislature away from the Democrats and gave control to the Republicans by historic margins.

The Governor of New Jersey should heed this warning, as should Members on the other side of the aisle where the Governor once sat. America does not need more taxes and more spending. And if you do not listen to the people of New Jersey today, your constituents will tell you more clearly next year.

WE ARE THROUGH WITH THE EIGHTIES, AND THANK GOODNESS FOR IT

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, well, the eighties have come to an end, finally. You know, when we started in 1980 we had an annual deficit of \$60 billion. By the mideighties the deficit had gotten up to about \$225 billion. Of course, under a continuing Republican administration, it is now up to over \$300 billion.

Of course, in the beginning of the eighties we were the largest creditor nation in the world. Today we are the largest debtor nation in the world.

I was just looking at statistics in my home State. The average person in my home State is making less today than they were in 1978.

The national debt at the beginning of the eighties was \$1 trillion; today it is \$3 trillion.

So we are through with the eighties, and thank goodness for it.

BOTH PARTIES CAN LEARN FROM 1991 ELECTIONS

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me say that both parties have something to feel good about yesterday. The Democrats can legitimately focus on Pennsylvania where they won an important Senate race. Republicans can look at New York, New Jersey, Virginia, Mississippi, Savannah, GA, and a wide range of places where we won.

But I think there is one consistent theme to the victories everywhere. I think it is a theme that every incumbent in this Congress ought to pay attention to, and it is a theme the President ought to pay attention to. The American people are sick and tired of

paying their taxes to a political establishment which accomplishes very little for the American people.

We had the fiasco in this House on Monday of a banking bill we worked on for 3 days that went down in flames. We have the Sergeant at Arms scandal. We have a restaurant scandal. We have all sorts of problems in the House.

All I would say to my friends, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, is the bipartisan message of election day yesterday is that the people who are currently in office had better take change very seriously. They had better fight for change. They had better represent the taxpayers, and they had better be concerned about changing government. Because if the taxpayers conclude that you are not on the side of changing government, they are going to change you.

BUSINESS IS NOT THE VILLAIN IN AMERICA

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, I was not going to give a 1-minute today, but in response to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. IRELAND], who came in and talked about the fact that we are going to need to produce 43 million jobs in the near future, and we are going to be dependent upon small business for this, I felt compelled to do so.

In a few minutes we are going to be considering a resolution by the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] addressing limitation of terms.

I have long felt that we sit here in the House of Representatives and make it more and more difficult for businesses to employ the people of America, as if businesses were somehow the villains.

□ 1140

It was not long ago that George McGovern, who had been serving in the U.S. Senate for many years, ran for President twice, went out into the private sector, into Connecticut. And he bought a hotel to participate in that great American dream. Then the regulators started coming down on him, the EPA, OSHA, the IRS, the Health Department, I suspect everyone else.

Finally he had to throw this dream into bankruptcy. This is the statement that he made:

I wish I'd done this before I'd run for President. It would have given me the insight into the anxiety any independent businessman or farmer must have. Now I've had to meet a payroll every week. I've got to pay the bank every month. I've got to pay the State of Connecticut taxes. It gives you a whole new perspective on what other people worry about.

If we in this body knew that someday we would have to go out and make a living under the laws that we pass, we would behave differently.

U.S. OIL IMPORT VULNERABILITY: THE TECHNICAL REPLACEMENT CAPABILITY

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Technology Assessment Board I am pleased to bring to my colleagues' attention a report which was released last week by the Office of Technology Assessment entitled "U.S. Oil Import Vulnerability: The Technical Replacement Capacity." While our demand for oil has increased, domestic oil production has continued to decline. We cannot afford to continue down this treacherous path. OTA's report on oil import vulnerability points out that oil as a source of energy remains deeply rooted in our country's economy, and policy options that maintain domestic production and encourage oil and gas development must be part of any oil replacement strategy. If we are to sever our dependence on imported oil, we must make the long-term commitment now to developing a long-term energy security plan. I commend this report to my fellow colleagues and I am confident that it will be very beneficial in guiding the Congress as the House gets down to work on developing legislation to implement a national energy strategy that encourages sound economic growth while at the same time meeting national security and environmental objectives.

THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in a column that appeared in the Washington Post last week, David Broder wrote that if Republicans were given the chance, they would govern effectively.

In an article that will appear in the Heritage Foundation's Policy Review, Republican Leader BOB MICHEL tells us how Republicans will govern when given the chance.

A Republican Congress will embark on a truly historic reform of the House. It will restore many cherished values of American democracy that have been lost over 37 years of Democrat control.

Chief among those values is the right to free and open debate. Too many times in this House, debate on crucial issues is curtailed, frustrating many who have no voice in the process.

Another of these values is thrift. By tightening our own belt, by cutting the staff and doing away with useless and wasteful subcommittees, we will restore the people's faith in the Congress.

A final value is one of accountability. A Republican Congress will adopt full and comprehensive campaign reform,

so that Members will be accountable to their constituents, not to powerful special interest groups.

Mr. Speaker, as David Broder put it, Republicans have the ability to govern well. Now, they just need the opportunity.

SUPPORT FEDERAL COMMITMENT TO WOMEN'S HEALTH RESEARCH

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

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, just a few short weeks ago every Member of this body received letters from women in their district urging support for a Federal commitment in the fight against breast cancer. These letters, totaling 175,000, represent the number of women diagnosed with breast cancer this year alone. These women wrote of their struggle against a disease not well understood by our medical community.

Still many more family members wrote on behalf of loved ones who lost their lives to breast cancer.

A woman from my district asked me why there has not been a priority in research when breast cancer rates continue to rise unabated and mortality rates have remained largely unchanged.

I want to recommend to my colleagues a yes vote on the Labor, HHS conference report today. I want to commend the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman NATCHER, and his colleagues for their support to increase the awareness, increase the funding for breast cancer research.

My colleagues, this bill increases the funding 46 percent to a total of \$133 million. It is very important. This is our chance. This bill does provide the startup funds to build a knowledge base to identify proper diagnostic, prevention, and treatment strategies for women.

Support the women in your district and their loved ones by voting yes on the Labor, HHS conference report.

RESULTS OF THE VOTE

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM], in what he said a few minutes ago. It is rather strange to hear a lot of Members who are non-Pennsylvanians telling us what Pennsylvanians thought yesterday.

What Pennsylvanians wanted to say yesterday was they want a change, and they picked an outsider over someone they viewed as an insider.

They want some real change because they want change in bodies like this one where the Democrats have run things constantly for almost 40 years.

For example, the people of Pennsylvania think it is rather laughable that the Democrats in the House of Representatives were out here considering bank reform at the same time they could not even run their own little bank in the House of Representatives. The American people, who think it is a little bit strange and pretty tragic that the Democrats have been talking a lot about unemployment but cannot seem to pass a bill that actually becomes law to help the unemployed, they find that rather tragic.

Pennsylvanians also think it would be rather strange to hear the things on the House floor today where Democrats got up and talked about gag rules when time after time after time on the House floor that is all they will debate under. We have gag rule after gag rule on the House floor when we seek to debate the whole issue.

The American people think there is a real need for change. One of the places they would really like to change is the House of Representatives. End 40 years of Democratic control.

THE FIDDLING MAJORITY

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, while Rome burns the Democrat leadership fiddles, oblivious to America's plight. Americans are out of work. Taxes are forcing people out of their homes. We are taxed today at the highest percent of gross national product in our history.

Americans are suffering, and there is no prospect for relief.

Malcolm Forbes has written that this recession that we are in is the most unnecessary recession since World War II, dramatically worsened by Democratic tax increases.

Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes, the House is going to address the issue of the \$25,000 of the people's money spent on a brief opposing term limits in the State of Florida. That expenditure represents our fiddling while Rome burns.

If the Democratic leadership wants to lessen Americans' support for term limits, they should take a page out of history. Americans support our institutions when the economy is growing. They want the economy to grow again. We in the Congress should control our spending and cut the taxes now and put people back to work. That is our job, and we should set about doing it.

CONGRESS CANNOT MAKE LAWS WITHOUT THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to give a 1 minute, but I have

sat here and listened to what is happening here in Washington. I do not know who has the Presidency of this country. I hear these Members come forward and say, look what is happening in Washington, look at these tax bills.

This President has not had one veto overridden, not one. This Congress cannot make law without the President. This Congress has not passed one tax bill in the last 12 years over Presidential veto, not one.

I hope the people of America know who is the President of the United States. He happens to be a Republican. His name is George Herbert Walker Bush.

He has vetoed two—one just did not implement—unemployment bills to help the unemployed of America. We are trying to work out something that maybe the President will sign.

He has canceled some trips overseas. He apparently has gotten the message that maybe things are not going as well as he said.

He said prosperity was right around the corner, when he would not declare an emergency on the first unemployment bill that we passed in August—the Democrats passed in August with a lot of help from this side of the aisle.

□ 1150

Why? Because you saw there was a problem.

But ladies and gentlemen, America knows who the President is and they are glad to see him coming home, because they know, the voters of Pennsylvania know, the voters of America know, our people know that we need to pay attention to America and the problems of Americans.

Yes, we are home.

WHERE TAX BILLS COME FROM

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland is absolutely correct. The Congress ordinarily does pass a bill and it is ordinarily enacted into law on the signature of the President.

It very well may be true that we have not passed a tax bill in the past 12 years by enacting a veto override with respect to the President's action on a bill. But the fact is clearly understood by any seventh grader in America today that all tax bills must originate in the House of Representatives. The President cannot originate a tax bill. He can recommend a tax bill to this Congress, and he can and does recommend, on time, a budget to this Congress. But all actions to extract money from the American working man and woman or to spend their money originate in this body. In some cases it is

necessary to enact them over a presidential veto.

The fundamental problem we have in terms of the inability of this government to function in compliance with the hopes of the American people is that the government is divided. The American people have elected a Republican President and then with trichinosis of the brain have elected a Democratic Congress. When they correct their affliction, we will have a unified Republican government, and they will then get the tax relief and the economic growth they so richly deserve.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—USE OF HOUSE RESOURCES BY HOUSE COUNSEL TO PREPARE LEGAL BRIEF ON CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TERM LIMITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, November 4, 1991, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 268) presenting a question of the privileges of the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 268 is as follows:

H. RES. 268

Whereas Rule IX of the Rules of the House of Representatives provides that questions of privilege shall arise whenever the rights of the House collectively or the integrity of its proceedings are affected;

Whereas, under the precedents, customs, and traditions of the House pursuant to Rule IX, a question of privilege has arisen in cases involving the actions of officers and employees of the House, including the use of the House of Representatives legal counsel to represent individual Members or the House collectively, where such representation could reflect upon the House as a whole;

Whereas the rights of the House collectively are affected directly by the House of Representatives legal counsel preparing a formal legal brief arguing the unconstitutionality of Congressional term limits;

Whereas the rights and the reputation of all Members of the House of Representatives are directly affected by the House of Representatives legal counsel preparing such a legal brief which could be understood to imply the support of the House of Representatives and its membership (or at least a majority thereof) for the positions taken therein;

Whereas no vote of the Members of the House has occurred on any resolution or bill authorizing the House of Representatives counsel to prepare a legal brief for or against the constitutionality of term limits;

Whereas the decision by the House of Representatives counsel to use the funds and resources of the House to prepare arguments against the constitutionality of term limits—without any formal or informal vote of the Members—subjects the House collectively, and each of its Members, to legitimate question concerning the integrity of House proceedings;

Whereas the use of official House resources to prepare a legal brief for an individual Member in a case where he is not a party, but where instead he has personal political

interest, could subject Members in their representative capacity to ridicule and contempt; and

Whereas the constitutionality of state-imposed term limits for Members of Congress is an open question, undecided by our legal system, and on which reasonable persons can differ: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House shall take all necessary steps to notify interested parties, including the Florida Supreme Court, that the House of Representatives regrets that official resources were used to prepare a brief against the constitutionality of State-imposed term limitations for Members of Congress, and that the House has no official or unofficial position thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. COX] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, at the outset let me say under an arrangement with the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] it is my intention to speak for such time as I may consume, which will be approximately 15 minutes at the outset, and then I will yield, for purposes of debate only, 20 minutes to the majority leader, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to divide that time in such manner as he sees fit. Thereafter, I will allocate a like 20 minutes to proponents of the resolution, and then use the balance of the time to close debate.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, the results in the Washington State term-limit election yesterday illustrate the overwhelming advantage of incumbency. Congratulations are in order, I believe, to the Speaker of the House for the singular role that he played. By all accounts, he single-handedly turned around the results in Washington State where the term-limit initiative was ahead prior to his campaign. His vigorous campaigning in the last few days undoubtedly did the trick, although we may not be sure until further information is available to us whether it was the Speaker's arguments that that term-limit initiative is unconstitutional, using arguments contained in the brief provided by the House counsel, that carried the day. We may not be sure that it was the fact that the Washington State initiative was retroactive, unlike the Colorado term limitation on Members of Congress, which was not retroactive. It may be that the NRA put thousands of dollars behind the Speaker's effort to defeat limits in Washington. It may be that the TV ads telling people in Washington State that they should be scared of Californians, 52 strong in the next Congress, whose terms would be unlimited who would then dominate California.

It may be that former California Gov. Jerry Brown going to Washington State was enough to turn voters

against this initiative, because former California Gov. Jerry Brown went to Washington State and campaigned in favor of term limits. It may be that voters of Washington State recognized that under this particular term-limit initiative, their home-grown Members of Congress would be ineligible to run for office, but that Jerry Brown, if he would only move to Washington, might himself be eligible, and if that was the reason I share their concern.

But the fact is that whatever the reason, all of us should agree that it should be up to the people of Washington to make this decision. It should have been a decision free of special interests, including the interests of professional incumbents using the voters' own tax dollars to fight the voters. The resolution that I proposed today is a simple one. It requires this body to vote yea or nay on a decision to keep the House out; to keep the House of Representatives, both officially and apparently, out of State term-limit election contests.

The facts are essentially these: The House counsel, counsel for the full House of Representatives, employed by the Clerk of the House, was requested on behalf of a number of Members of Congress to file a legal brief arguing that the Florida proposed term limitations for Members of Congress were unconstitutional. Without debate in the House, without a vote of the House giving direction one way or another to the leadership, a decision was taken to permit the filing on this brief on behalf of the Members. In fact, on the cover of the brief, which I have here, it states that this is a brief of an *amicus curiae*, stating the name of the Member, prepared, as it states on the cover, by Steven R. Ross, general counsel to the Clerk, Charles Tiefer, deputy general counsel to the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, the Capitol, Washington, DC.

It is alleged by some in Florida and elsewhere that this brief cost \$25,000. That is not my contention, nor do I think that that is a relevant issue in today's debate. There is a legitimate question what is the retail value of this brief, if one obtained it not with taxpayer resources in-house, but went out to a law firm outside. Maybe it is \$25,000, maybe it is \$10,000. Who knows, given what lawyers charge today. But I will say that the expertise within the House on legal subjects such as this is such as would require an outside lawyer doing the same work a substantial amount of time. There is no question that significant taxpayer resources were committed to this venture.

There is also no question that the filing of the brief has been widely reported, widely reported outside these Chambers, and it has resulted in criticism of the House. That is the purpose in my bringing this resolution today.

I intended by this resolution not to criticize any Member, not to even sug-

gest any impropriety on the part of any Member, but rather to look forward to suggest what we do next. What I would suggest we do next is to take a position very firmly that we will not forthwith use the official resources of the House in behalf of legal arguments against the constitutionality of term limits when that is such a contentious issue on which this House has not voted.

This is not, therefore, a referendum on the wisdom of term limits. It is not a referendum on the constitutionality of term limits. It is certainly not a referendum on the conduct of any Member of this House.

It is a resolution of a question of judgment, a question of discretion in the use of the official resources of the House to mount legal challenges in State elections. I should add that some of my colleagues, upon reading in the newspaper that the House counsel had taken this action, wrote him a letter and asked that having written a brief opposing the constitutionality of term limits that he then do so in support of the constitutionality of term limits.

□ 1200

Personally, I believe that that is a silly gesture. I question the weight that any court would give to legal briefs on both sides of an issue filed by the same source.

There are ethical constraints on lawyers that require lawyers in making arguments before courts to cite all relevant precedent. In reading this brief, I note that some of the precedents and authorities that I would cite arguing the constitutionality of term limits are omitted. There is no mention even of the ninth or the tenth amendments, which are the center of one of the fundamental arguments in support of the constitutionality of term limits.

I think it would tie the hands unnecessarily of a lawyer arguing the constitutionality of term limits to have to omit not only those provisions of the Bill of Rights but also a number of Supreme Court cases relative to the arguments which were omitted from the initial brief. So I think that that is an unwise step.

The purpose of this resolution today is to make sure we do not compound the error already committed by using taxpayer funds to get further enmeshed in what should be an issue for the decision of the voters, in this case in the State of Florida.

I should add further that my colleagues who initially made this request were satisfied with the answer of the counsel for the House that he would be willing to provide such a brief, but have proposed to withdraw that request, no longer interested in obtaining a brief on the other side of the issue.

When the actions of the officers or employees of the House reflect upon the House as a whole, the regulations

of this House permit a Member to protect the reputations and rights of all Members so affected. As a result of the House counsel's preparation and filing of this brief, the entire Nation has read in newspapers, heard on radio, and seen on television either that the House Democratic leadership has taken sides in the term-limits debate or that an individual Member has done so using free legal services, another perquisite for Members of the House.

In either case, this has reflected poorly on our House of Representatives. All have seen these news reports. We can argue over whether they are fair. We can argue over whether this or that story is accurate in particular detail or complete, but most of us have been in politics long enough to know that the press reports were entirely predictable.

Once again, those in a position to control this Congress have brought criticism to the institution.

It is argued that this action, filing a legal brief, is different than actually opposing term limits on the merits. I agree. Technically that is correct. But at our peril, we ignore the obvious appearance to the American people that this is one more example of the entrenched incumbents who control Congress using the taxpayer funds at their discretion to guarantee their lifetime reelection.

The proposition that I am asking the House to approve today is that involving ourselves in State term-limit elections is unwise, not that it is illegal, not that it is violative of the rules of the House, not that the House counsel has not represented individual Members in other cases before, but, rather, that this is unwise, because it creates the appearance that this body, or least those who control it, intend to frustrate the will of the people and the democratic process.

The people of America are very interested in the subject of term limits, and yet here in this House we have never had a vote. We have never scheduled a debate on any of the term-limit bills that now languish in our Committee on the Judiciary.

Surely, each of us is wise enough to recognize that if the Democrats who run this Congress are unwilling to move term-limit legislation to the floor, then it is especially unbecoming for them to declare that it is unconstitutional and illegal for the States or the voters or anyone else to do so.

Frankly, I do not think the American people will listen any longer to a Congress with a chorus of, "You cannot get there from here."

So the purpose of my resolution is to direct the Democratic leadership to get Congress the devil out of State term-limit elections.

Why is this prudent? And it is the core of my argument that this is a question of judgment and prudence. It

is prudent because, first, we have never had a vote to authorize the House to use official resources to lobby against term limits.

Second, contrary to the position taken in the House counsel's brief, the constitutional question here is anything but an open-and-shut question of constitutional law. The fact is that reasonable persons may differ on the question of the constitutionality of State-imposed term limitations on Members of Congress. The Constitution is silent on this question.

Neither has the Supreme Court nor any lower Federal court ruled dispositively on this question. This is a case, fairly appraised, of first impression for our Federal courts, and yet the House counsel has argued that article I, section 2 prescribes three, and only three, qualifications for office which cannot be varied by this Congress, by the States, or by the voters.

Let me quote from the brief. The brief says definitively, "The term-limit initiative," referring to the Florida initiative, "violates article I, section 2, clause 2, and section 3, clause 3, of the U.S. Constitution, which prescribe the sole qualifications for eligibility for election to the House and Senate: Age, citizenship, and residency." And the brief relies heavily on the Supreme Court decision of Powell versus McCormack for that proposition.

The fact is that the Supreme Court has never said these are the sole qualifications for office; not even in Powell versus McCormack did the Supreme Court say that.

Let me read footnote 41 from page 520 of the Supreme Court's decision. I quote from it:

In addition to the three qualifications set forth in article I, section 2, and article I, section 3, clause 7, there is authorized the disqualification of any person convicted in an impeachment proceeding from any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States. Article I, section 6, clause 2, provides that no person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either House during his continuance in office, and section 3 of the 14th amendment disqualifies any person who, having previously taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. It has been argued—

And I am still quoting from the Court's opinion.

that each of these provisions, as well as the guarantee clause of article IV and the oath requirement of article VI, clause 3, is no less a qualification within the meaning of article I, section 5, than those set forth in article I, section 2. We need not reach this question, said the Court in Powell v. McCormack, since both sides agree that Powell was not ineligible under any of those provisions.

So the Court in Powell against McCormack did not decide whether there are only three qualifications that may be imposed by the Federal Constitution, by the Congress, or by the

States or by the voters. They simply did not say that.

It is interesting to me that Powell versus McCormack is a case that limits the power of this Congress, and Powell versus McCormack was not so much an interpretation of article I, section 2, as it was an interpretation of article I, section 5, providing that each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members.

There were some in the House who wanted to exclude Adam Clayton Powell who said this provision, making them the judge of the qualifications of their Members, gave them discretion to leave out someone because of the cut of his jaw, and the Supreme Court said:

No, your power to judge the qualifications of Members is limited to these three things, 25 years old, citizen for 7 years, inhabitant of the State from which he was elected when he was elected.

Article I, section 4, clause 1, a different part of the Constitution, says that States may prescribe the time, the manner and place; the States have been given the power to prescribe the time, manner, and place of holding elections for Senators and Representatives. This provision is not relied upon in the brief filed by the House counsel.

The ninth amendment, which provides that the enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people, is missing from this brief.

The 10th amendment states that the powers not delegated by the United States—not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States and so forth. The 10th amendment has been held by the Supreme Court to have been a reservation of power by the States to control elections. This is missing from the brief.

The brief dismisses out of hand the 1974 case of the Supreme Court in *Storer versus Brown*, which said a 1-year cooling-off period before an independent candidate for Congress can have access to the ballot was constitutional. If the House counsel's brief were accurate, then the Supreme Court would have decided that the California State decision to exclude independent candidates who had belonged to a majority party within a year was an added qualification and violated article I, section 2.

□ 1210

But the Court did not say this. Instead, let me quote from the Court's opinion. The Court said:

Art. I, §4, cl. 1, authorizes the States to prescribe "[t]he Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives." Moreover, as a practical matter, there must be a substantial regulation of elections if they are to be fair and honest and if some sort of order, rather than chaos, is to accompany the democratic processes. In

any event, the States have evolved comprehensive, and in many respects complex, election codes regulating in most substantial ways, with respect to both federal and State elections the time, place, and manner of holding primary and general elections, the registration and qualifications of voters, and the selection and qualification of candidates.

The brief did not mention the 1982 Supreme Court decision in *Clements* against *Fashing*. It held that individuals can be prevented from running for office if they are incumbents and certain other elected offices.

The Congress in the view of some has become an ossified structure that accomplishes little of value, wastes much, and impedes progress made by others in society.

The term limit movement is a response to that.

Harry Truman proposed term limits for Members of Congress when he was President in 1950. This Congress would do well to take heed to that movement abroad in the land.

My colleagues need not agree with me that term limits proposed by States are constitutional. That is not what this resolution is about. I make the argument simply and make it very clear that reasonable people can differ, that as a lawyer for the President working in the White House, I had the opportunity to look at these arguments and reach a different conclusion, and I do not think that the House, certainly without debate and without a vote, should put its earmark on this.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for a question about whether he has ever used the House Counsel Office?

Mr. COX of California. I will yield time to the majority leader, as I have described, and will the gentleman please get his time from the majority leader.

Mr. WISE. So the gentleman will not yield for that question?

Mr. COX of California. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like us simply to vote on one proposition, and that is let us keep the Congress the devil out of this.

Let us recognize that when voters seek to have some influence on the way that this place operates, they are entitled to do so. We may disagree with them and as individuals we can go abroad and discuss it and so on, but we have got enough problems here ourselves. We have got enough problems in the Congress to take care of without getting involved in State term limit elections. With all the problems that we have got with our deficit, with all of the BCCI scandal, the check cashing and the restaurant bills and the problems we have here in the Congress not bringing a balanced budget amendment to a vote and passage, it seems to me we should keep our noses out and keep the taxpayers' money out of these term-limit elections around the states.

That is why my resolution today provides as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House shall take all necessary steps to notify interested parties, including the Florida Supreme Court, that the House of Representatives regrets that official resources were used to prepare a brief against the constitutionality of State-imposed term limitations for Members of Congress and that the House has no official or unofficial position thereon.

That is the wise course for us to take.

To repeat, I am not asking for a vote for or against term limits. I am not asking for a vote for or against the constitutionality of term limits. I am not asking for a vote for or against the propriety of any action taken by any Member in this case. I am not asking for a vote on whether the House counsel can under our rules represent individual Members.

I am asking for a vote that henceforth we will decide that the House counsel ought not to do this in the interests of this institution, the rights of the voters, and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished majority leader, for purposes of debate only.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat saddened by what I just heard for the last almost 20 minutes from the gentleman from California who is the sponsor of this privileged motion. The maker of this motion has just gone through a long process of explaining what he wants and intended to do, but then when he read the resolved clause, obviously none of what he said he wanted to do is in there.

He is not seeking to limit the use of the House counsel at all. Basically what he has done is to attempt to argue term limitations here, even though he said he is not.

The reality of this situation is really quite simple. Is the Office of House Counsel authorized and appropriately entitled to provide to Members of this House legal counsel on various issues which affect the House constitutionally or Members individually?

Let me give the chronology and some of the facts that the gentleman from California, the maker of this motion, did not do and neglected to give in full discourse for the purpose of allowing all Members to understand what has happened here.

About a year ago an issue developed in Wisconsin concerning the constitutionality of State-imposed recall provisions applying to Members of the U.S.

House. At the request of Congressman GUNDERSON, the Office of General Counsel researched and prepared a legal memorandum on the subject. Congressman GUNDERSON is a Republican from Wisconsin. The research entailed the review of the law governing the power of the States to regulate membership in the House. This is an issue that has been of continuing interest to the House and this office for any number of years, the Office of House Counsel, since it relates to the basic constitutional status of the House and its Members.

The gentleman from California was here at the time. The gentleman from Wisconsin put out a press release which was widely seen by people in the radio and television on both sides of the aisle. No one objected, not the gentleman from California who says this is the wrong thing to do.

This past August, a suit was filed in the State of Washington, that which was in fact defeated yesterday at the polls, term limitation which is the subject of this suit. A brief was prepared and circulated to the staff counsels of the members of the Speaker's Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, which is comprised of the leaders and whips of the Democrat and Republican parties. The proposal was to have the brief filed as an amicus curiae on behalf of that group, and it would have stated on its cover that it was filed by the Speaker and Bipartisan Leadership Group and that it was filed to protect the institutional interests of the House of Representatives. Because of the August recess, it was impossible to schedule a meeting of that group and by the time the House reconvened, the Washington legal action had been dismissed.

This fall the State of Florida initiated a process pursuant to its laws by which the Florida Supreme Court would be called upon to issue an opinion on several aspects of a term limitation initiative which is currently being circulated for signature. Under Florida law, where proponents of an issue obtained 10 percent of the signatures necessary, they are required to submit the proposal for review, first by the AG and then by the State supreme court.

The report of the attorney general filed with the State supreme court specifically raised the issue, citing both Federal and State court precedents, that it appeared unconstitutional for a State to impose a term qualification on Representatives for Federal Congress.

Under Florida law, the State supreme court will review this court and will accept the views of any interested person.

The Bipartisan Leadership Group met and was asked whether they wanted to file a brief. It would have stated on its cover again that it was filed by the Speaker and Bipartisan Leadership Group and would have stated that it was filed to protect the institutional

interests of the House of Representatives. At the meeting the view was expressed by some Members of the group that they did not believe this was an issue, or at least not the juncture that the Bipartisan Leadership Group should take an official position.

At that meeting the Speaker deferred to this belief, but specifically indicated that he would consider whether he would go forward and file the brief in his name. No objection was voiced to that statement.

Following the meeting, the Speaker determined not to file a brief in his own name, but authorized a brief being prepared for Members of the Florida delegation who had expressed an interest.

I am the Member who expressed the first interest in such a brief. I confirmed my desire that a brief be filed setting forth my position. The brief stated on its cover that it was the brief of the amicus curiae U.S. Representative, and for those who do not know, amicus curiae means "friend of the court."

U.S. Representative LAWRENCE J. SMITH. It does not state anything about anyone else.

The gentleman's assertion that somehow the House has been called into question about its role in this is dead wrong. There is nothing in this brief which indicates anything but that I myself filed this brief with the aid of the House counsel.

No one is named in this brief, no one's name, no one group or anything else but the name of LAWRENCE J. SMITH as the amicus curiae.

Even outside this Chamber, at no time did anyone ever suggest that this brief implied any other Member's views or that it was anything other than what was said; namely, an individual brief for me. This brief is in the same form as the other briefs and memoranda provided by the Office of General Counsel for numerous individual Members over the years, such as Republican Representative Stu McKinney, Silvio Conte, DON SUNDQUIST, and STEVEN GUNDERSON and Bobbi Fiedler, and Democratic John Sieberling and WILLIAM J. HUGHES.

And just so that all this should be put in proper perspective and without any inappropriateness being attached, because the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] was perfectly entitled under the Speaker's qualifications for the use of the House counsel, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] himself last year availed himself of the privilege of using the House counsel for legal determination on a jury summons which he received from his own county.

□ 1220

They gave him a legal opinion. He wrote a letter under his own name. That letter was rejected by the election supervisor. He then asked the

House counsel to prepare a further letter written by the House counsel on House stationery. It was prepared; it was sent. I do not know the outcome, but he availed himself of the privilege of the House counsel.

Mr. Speaker, I do not hear the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] now asking himself or volunteering to repay any money that it might have cost for the House counsel to be employed for that purpose, nor do I hear him complain or criticize any of the other uses that the House counsel was put into until this particular use.

And it might, just to put this in proper perspective, be understood that at the same time this was happening, our colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HARRIS], was getting a jury due notice, and he went to serve until he was stricken by virtue of *voir dire*.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is this is not an issue of the House counsel at all. This is an issue of policy.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

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

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, is it the ruling of the Chair that the extra 30 seconds allocated to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] will be subtracted from the time of the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. The gentleman said that he has an interest in making sure that the House counsel is not used for this purpose any longer, but if my colleagues will read the resolved clause of this motion, they will find out that that is not it at all. He wants to embarrass this House once again. It says in the resolved clause:

That the Clerk of the House shall take all necessary steps to notify interested parties, including the Florida Supreme Court, that the House of Representatives regrets that official resources were used to prepare a brief against the constitutionality of State-imposed term limitations for Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is not as he says it is. He wants to embarrass this House. The Speaker and others have already determined that this was a perfectly valid use of the House counsel.

Mr. Speaker, this motion should be absolutely defeated. It is used for political purposes, and not to determine what is right or wrong with reference to the use of the House counsel.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make two points here.

One is I think, if I understood the comments of my colleague, the gen-

tleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH], he thinks he has been misinformed, and I just wanted to straighten the record out. To the best of my knowledge, the committee which meets on the House counsel, which is bipartisan, did not at any point make an affirmative decision about sending any kind of documents to Florida. I can say unequivocally I was not informed that House counsel was drafting that document, and I am not in any sense alleging that the gentleman from Florida did anything wrong or knew that this was the case. But I just want to make the record clear that that bipartisan committee did not approve of the House counsel being involved, and we did not approve of this particular document, and there is a real difference between what happened in Wisconsin, where on a bipartisan basis, which involved both the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], agreed—

Mr. OBEY. That is not true.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's name certainly came up in the discussions.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield since he mentioned my name?

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the first time I discovered that any appeal was made in Wisconsin was when the gentleman called me to tell me about it, and I specifically told him I had doubts about that action.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me just continue.

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

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, being I am somehow innocently being brought into the debate, let me point out exactly what I did.

Mr. Speaker, I did nothing more than ask for an advisory opinion of the House counsel. No legal brief was produced or filed anywhere at any time by me, and I want that very clearly understood.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] yielding to me.

Mr. GINGRICH. But the point I was making, if I may say to both of the gentleman on each side of the aisle, was simply that in their case there was a clear discussion in the meeting, and the meeting agreed on a bipartisan basis that the House would take actions without reflecting on either Member, that this was a decision made by the House for the House's reasons and was protecting the House's institution without regard to the individual Members.

Now, in the case of term limitation, the bipartisan committee did not reach that agreement. The House counsel was

not acting on behalf of the bipartisan committee, and, as far as this gentleman was concerned, I did not know that a brief was being prepared for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH], and I am not saying the gentleman from Florida in any way did anything wrong in getting the brief or had reason to know these facts.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, all I did in my time allotted was indicate that in fact what the gentleman is saying was absolutely correct, but that the Speaker of the House indicated that he reserved the right to file a brief on his own, not as a member of the bipartisan leadership, and no one objected thereto.

Mr. GINGRICH. Sure.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. That is all that we are talking about here.

Mr. GINGRICH. No, no. Let me say to the gentleman it is not a question of whether anyone objected or not. There were serious questions, and I do not want to get involved in those discussions.

But I will say that what the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] has raised is a legitimate question for the House to address, and the topic he is bringing up is a legitimate question for the House to make a decision about.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, let us begin with the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the Office of General Counsel exists to provide Members of the House with professional, nonbiased legal advice on constitutional issues which affect this institution. These services are routinely utilized by Republicans and Democrats alike in conjunction with official duties.

Many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have requested and received legal briefs and memoranda from the House counsel: the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUNDQUIST], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress need such legal advice about constitutional issues, and the integrity of this institution requires that advice be available.

Well, just last year, as we have discussed, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] asked the counsel's office to prepare a memorandum on the constitutionality of a recall election in Wisconsin. A comparable amount of time was spent on that by our counsel, comparable to what we are discussing here. When the memorandum was prepared, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] called it a public service. The gentleman from California

[Mr. COX] was in this institution as a Member of Congress at that time. Where was he then? Where was he then?

Just last week the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and 12 other Republicans asked the House counsel to prepare a brief on the very same issue we are discussing today, the constitutionality of State-imposed term limits, an action, by the way, which the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] no more than 15 minutes ago characterized as a silly gesture. Work on that request has begun. Expenses have been forthcoming for that work.

In addition, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] has indicated, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] has himself asked the counsel for help on a jury duty question.

Mr. Speaker, since the General Counsel's Office has been in existence we have never, never had a vote on any of these routine requests for a Republican or a Democrat. This institution would be tied up in knots if it required a floor vote every time a Member needed advice on a constitutional issue.

In this case our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH], requested a brief be prepared on his behalf concerning the constitutionality of State-imposed term limits. The brief clearly indicates that he represents the views of one Member of the House. Nothing in that document implies that it expresses the views, official or unofficial, of the House of Representatives, and no one who has actually read the document can misunderstand that point. It is clear that the request of the gentleman from Florida was just like all the others I have mentioned, an official request for professional legal services about a constitutional issue affect the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, it was an appropriate request in keeping with the responsibilities of the legal counsel's office, and it was carried out in the same nonbiased, objective fashion as such other requests.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us be honest. This resolution is not about the brief of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH]. It is not about the legal counsel's office, by the way, which is represented by one of the more decent, competent public servants, Mr. Ross, that we have on the Hill. It is not even about term limits.

□ 1230

The real purpose of this resolution is to divert our attention from the real economic crisis that is facing this country. Over the last few months, as the recession has dragged on, our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have time after time tried to change the subject. They are trying to change the subject again with diversionary tactics, with delays, with

phony proposals, with stalling and obstruction. This frivolous and pointless resolution is just another chapter in that same book. But I want to say to my colleagues that this tactic is not going to work. You can stall for an hour, you can stall for a day, but you cannot avoid dealing with the real issues facing this country.

The election results all around the country yesterday sent a strong and a clear message that the American people are sick and tired of procedural gimmicks and delays. They are tired. They want us to get down to business and deal with the issues that affect their lives. They are tired of George Bush's recession.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. They are tired of 11 years of Republican mismanagement. They want a change. The economy is dead in the water, and they are playing around with legal gimmicks, tactics, and obstructions.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. The people of this country are wont to have their say. They want a middle-income tax cut for the economy to get moving, they want health care reform, they want better education, they want better roads and bridges, and we are going to respond. We are going to bury this frivolous resolution of the gentleman from California.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, before I yield for purposes of debate to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON], I yield myself such time as I may consume so I may observe first that in the midst of suggesting that this resolution on its face was a diversion, the Member neatly diverted the question into other issues about George Bush and the economy, and so on. It is an admirable tactic, and I will aspire to it myself some day.

Second, I have been, I think, careful in my argument to abstain from any criticism of a Member. I have not mentioned a member's name, and I have stated specifically that it is not my purpose to criticize the conduct of any Member but, rather, to focus on what we should do next. That is the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. BONIOR. Did the gentleman call this a serious—

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield. The gentleman can get his time, as he should, from his own side. I have already yielded.

Mr. Speaker, there is a very significant difference between the legitimate use of the counsel to this body, whether it be using their form letters on jury duty or what have you, and the use or misuse of this legitimate function as a political perk or at least in a way that appears to be a political perk. If we fail to make these judgments, fail to make

these distinctions, we do so at our peril.

Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON].

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise as an opponent of term limits who is reexamining his position. Like many in this body I have argued that the voters should not be denied the right to reelect an incumbent as long as they wish. But as I reflect on the powers of incumbency and the way the cards are stacked against challengers, I can understand better why term limits are so popular. Incumbents have the advantages of easier fundraising and greater visibility in addition to the well-known political perks of office. And, in addition, we as incumbents, and our friends in the legislatures, do everything possible through redistricting to tilt the playing field in our favor and to minimize the number of competitive districts.

Nothing I've said so far is especially original. What may be original is my growing conviction that the present state of affairs undermines the legitimacy of our legislation actions. If we have been elected and reelected through a noncompetitive process, should it surprise us that voters want to change the process?

If my assessment is correct, the silliest thing we as a body can do is to appear to take sides on this issue. All this does is strengthen the belief that our actions are self-serving and to further undermine the public's sense of the legitimacy of our actions—and by this I mean to include our traditional legislative action as well as the issue at hand of a legal brief.

What to do? Well, first is to balance the scales by approving the Cox resolution. But more fundamentally we have to decide if we really trust the people. If we do, the Congress will eventually submit a constitutional amendment for congressional term limitations to the States with or without recommendation—and then abide by the results. To continue the present situation could well lead to the Congress being one of a diminished number of legislature bodies in the country without term limits, and yet afraid to let the people decide if they want limits for the Congress.

In my view this would only intensify the feeling that the Congress is out of touch. But worse still, it further undermines the sense of legitimacy of our actions without which representative government could be viewed as a mere slogan used by those whose overriding concern is maintaining power, not serving the public.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just renew my question of the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], first, and I would ask whether he has used the House counsel and, second, if indeed he has, whether he submitted himself to the procedure he would urge upon this body for this matter.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman yield to me to respond?

Mr. WISE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my view that this calls for judgment. If we have a political contest going on in a State and we are filing documents urging one side or another effectively, that is a different matter entirely than if there is a routine legal question involving the rights of Members in this body.

Under the precedents of rule IX, which I have had the opportunity to inspect, of course, preparing for this debate, I note that in the history of the House of Representatives, routinely when Members were made a party to litigation, the question of representation was first put to an advisory vote of this House. I think that is an admirable procedure, and I would support it.

Mr. WISE. So the gentleman has not submitted it to that group and he did use the House counsel and he did not adopt the procedure he is now recommending that others adopt?

Mr. COX of California. No, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has misunderstood precisely what I said.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a couple of points.

Appearances do matter. The issue of term limitations is a complicated constitutional issue. The legitimate uses of our House legal counsel is also not clearly spelled out in our rules, but what we are discussing here today is not legalities, it's appearances. I think we cannot afford to have the slightest implication that we, the House, oppose the public debate on term limitations.

I am opposed to term limitations, but I believe the debate about them is healthy. We have not been able to get the public seriously involved in the deficit reduction debate. We have failed to get them involved in most important aspects of our policy work here. I believe this debate about term limitations provides us with an opportunity to educate the public on the complexity of national policymaking, the complexity of the national and international issues that we try to deal with here on this floor.

I think this is an opportunity, and I believe the public has a right and a responsibility to think through not only term limitations but, frankly, whether

it is any longer in their best interest to have 2-year terms for Members of the House.

□ 1240

I intend and I hope to be a part of winning this debate out there in the public area, but I do not want any limitation of any sort on that debate. But I think right now, because of the reaction we have had to the involvement of House counsel, whether his involvement was correct or not according to the letter of the law, we have to say to ourselves, back off. We are for democracy. We are for public debate. We are for spirited engagement by the public in government. It is time for us to back off and say no, we did not intend for our resources to prejudice the case. And, yes, we will get out there and engage in this important debate.

Mr. Speaker, I look to that debate as part of the revitalization that our democracy desperately needs, if we are to be capable of governing in an era that places before this body extraordinarily complex challenges that require considerable knowledge and lengthy explanations, rather than new bumper sticker politics.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, the spin doctors are leaping into the breach in the term limit movement that was created by the voters of Washington State yesterday. We have heard here today that it was the incumbents who somehow mesmerized the voters.

How easy it is to explain away an unhappy result by suggesting that the voters are too unintelligent to be able to make up their own mind, that they had been led by evil forces, that they are only wise when they agree with you.

There were allegations made here today that the opponents of the initiative in my State galled the people with a series of great television ads, and the person who said it spoke as though he really knew what was going on in this State. You will be surprised to learn there were no television ads and that the opponents of 553 in my State were outspent three to one. We did have some radio.

Somehow it was suggested here that the Speaker should not have even commented on an issue of such grave public importance. The facts are, we were outspent three to one, that the leadership of this movement against term limitations was the League of Women Voters and Common Cause, and that a majority of the newspapers in the State of Washington opposed the initiative.

What happened was that people were angry. But as the issue was debated, people moved not from pro to con, but from pro to undecided, and thought about it, and then moved to con.

No wonder that is scary to proponents of term limits, because what it

suggests is if you would give people time enough to think about this, they understand that you do not gain anything by shooting yourself in the foot.

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear the people are angry. It is also very clear that people, given time to think through for themselves, know that term limits is not the solution to any of the problems that they seek.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from California [Mr. COX] has 8½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the subject that we are here discussing today refocused is this is the question about the House counsel preparing a brief that was filed in the Florida Supreme Court case involving an initiative regarding the question of term limits.

I want to state up front that I do not impugn the motives of any Members, and certainly not the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH], who filed the brief. I also want to note that while some will say that this vote is going to be an ethics vote, I do not think that it is. Some will also say that it is going to be a term limits vote or a vote on term limits. I do not think that it is.

I think that the vote we are about to take on this resolution is a vote on whether legal counsel for the House should prepare and submit a brief when requested by a Member in a case where there is great controversy, where the heart of that controversy is a legislative issue before this body, and where the House has not spoken with a vote, and, further, where Members are clearly divided.

I submit to Members that it is precisely the case that is before us today, and it is a case where the House counsel should not prepare a brief when requested, and it is a case where, in this instance, we have the opportunity to vote for a resolution which retracts that idea and says clearly it is not appropriate to file a brief in this situation.

Mr. Speaker, that does not mean that there are not myriads of other situations where briefs are appropriate. In fact, I would submit that the category I just described is very narrow. But term limits and the issue before us today is very specific, very important, very controversial, very hotly debated, and I would submit it is not appropriate for that brief to have been prepared or filed.

Now, I happen to support term limits. I have been a term limit supporter

since 1981 when I first came to Congress. I have filed a congressional amendment to limit terms of Members of this body and the Senate every Congress since then. My term limit proposals for 12 years have been supported as widely as any that have been filed during that time.

During the process, I want to make a clear point that bothers me: Not one time has there been a hearing in the committee where I sit on this issue. Not only that, of course, there has been no vote.

There is a certain arrogance about this body in not taking up this issue, an arrogance that the public perceives. That is the reason why term limits is such a great issue.

I do not also happen to think though that the process out here is in the initiative stage through the States is going to be held constitutional. In fact, in the brief that was submitted on the merits, I would probably agree with the constitutional issue involved in it. I can understand why the voters of the State of Washington may have rejected the ballot initiative yesterday, because it applied only to their State. It was not an issue that could be applied uniformly across the country. It was also retroactive.

The fact of the matter is there is an arrogance about this body not considering term limits. The fact of the matter is the public wholeheartedly supports limiting the terms of Members of Congress, and with great cause. It is because they realize we are career-oriented in this body. It is because they realize that career orientation leads to mistakes. It means that special interests, every interest, for that matter, must be supported time and again, and therefore this body does not set priorities. We do not balance the budget. We do not make other decisions that we should. And it is a problem that will not be corrected until we limit terms.

There is one other way we could correct it, I would submit, and that is since 1954, this body has been controlled only by one party, the Democratic Party. If that majority were to change, and some day my party, the Republican Party, gained the majority, a great deal of changes would occur in here. But in the long haul the only other way to correct this and the best way to correct it, because it would apply equally to my party eventually, is to limit the terms, take some of the career orientation out of this, take some of the special pressure out of it, make sure we do not have Members serving as chairmen for too long, and correct an evil the public well understands.

Again, I do not fault anyone for their requesting this brief or for the brief having been filed by the Member once he got it. But I think there is an egregious problem in the policy process that we need to correct by this resolution today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote for this resolution, and I urge that we take up the term limit question expeditiously in this body.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of time on our side.

Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in opposition to this motion. I hope that Members have listened carefully to the debate, and understand that what is involved here is a controversial question. It is a question on which there is political controversy and legal controversy. It is a question that should be debated in the country, in the States, and should be debated to a conclusion.

But in this case, what is being asserted is that a wrong was done by being able to ask the legal counsel of the House to prepare an opinion that could be used in a court of law on this issue.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I really devoutly did not want to speak on this issue. The gentleman from California [Mr. COX] is one of the ornaments of our party, in my judgment, and a great guy. This is not a frivolous petition at all.

But in my honest opinion, I think Steve Ross has never said no. I would be hypocritical, because I have called upon him for advice on the Virginia income tax laws as they pertain to a Member of Congress.

□ 1250

He has represented me in court on subpoenas having to do with legislative matters. I think what he did perhaps was improper in the sense that he should not have listed himself as attorney for the Clerk, even though he is. He was not acting as attorney for the Clerk. He was acting as attorney for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

It is useful and helpful to have an institutional counsel that we can go to, and get advice from, without always having to run out and hire a lawyer. And I think what he did concerns this institution.

This should not be turned into a pro or con term limit issue. This is another matter. The question is, was it improper to go to the counsel for the Clerk and ask for help on a legal matter that concerned the institution.

I find that proper. As I say, with deep regret, I think the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] is right in the sense that the House has not taken a position, and nothing in the brief should indicate that, and nothing did, except he listed himself as attorney for the Clerk. And that might be interpreted as a position of the Clerk, who is an officer of this House. But I do not think that it ought to be turned into

partisanship and George Bush and term limits.

I think Mr. Ross did act properly, at least I find that he did, because I have used him and he has been helpful to me. I would be hypocritical if I did not say so.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

I would further say that he is now responding to a request from Members on the other side for a brief on the other side of the issue. There is a debate among legal scholars about what the Constitution says on this issue, and he will be preparing, and I am sure Members here will be preparing, a brief on the other side so that the Court has the benefit of the best arguments that can be brought in and, as the gentleman from Illinois said, on an issue that goes to the heart of the constitutional questions that surround membership in this House.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak, but I do respect the gentleman from California for what he is trying to do. And there were some procedural problems with this. But I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

I would also raise the point that it is my opinion that there are constitutional rights and prerogatives of the House of Representatives which do not arise from a formal vote being taken on the floor of the House but arise from the Constitution itself, where in this case the qualifications of Members of the House are spelled out.

So, with the greatest reluctance, I have to say that I will be voting against the Cox resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would simply conclude by saying that there are legal questions and then there are legal questions. This is one that goes to the heart of the constitutionality of our being in office.

If Members cannot go to the legal counsel, which is on duty, someone said this costs \$25,000. If he had not been doing this, he would have been doing something else.

We have hired him to do this kind of work. Members ought to be able to go to him and say, "I want to file a brief in a case that goes to the heart of the constitutional status of Members of the House of Representatives."

He is going to do it for the view of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH], and he will do it for opposite views on the other side.

I urge Members to vote against the resolution.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

We are not here today to debate the pros and cons of term limits. However, the incident giving rise to this resolution is an excellent example of why limiting the terms of Congressmen is a popular idea.

Too many Members have lost the ability to separate their personal goals and desires from the common good or the good of the institution. Using the House legal counsel to argue the unconstitutionality of State-imposed term limits serves the political interests of individual Members of Congress. While it may represent the position of a majority of Members, it does not necessarily serve the interests of this institution or the American people.

Members tend to confuse their own political interests and ambitions with the best interests of the institution of Congress. Similarly, congressional responsibility on occasion takes a back seat to partisan politics.

The growing frequency of these trends have degraded the institution in the eyes of people it was created to serve. The American people do not want Congress to use its power to protect its Members from the American people.

Thomas Jefferson, after reviewing a new draft of the Constitution in 1787, said, "I dislike, and I greatly dislike, the abandonment in every instance of the principle of rotation in office."

Jefferson foresaw the temptation to use political office for the personal gain of the officeholder. Yet, I doubt whether he foresaw the potential magnitude of the problem.

If Members cannot break themselves of using the institution of Congress to promote their careers instead of good government, then the public is correct in seeking to change the institution.

The resolution before the House will not prevent Members of Congress from confusing personal with public interests. But it will present the accurate position of full House to the members of the Florida Supreme Court.

And more important, it will encourage Members to reconsider whether their actions serve their constituents or their own political interests.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and to help put Congress back on track.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, this is not going to the counsel to get advice on the tax law of Virginia. It is not going to the counsel to get advice on a personal matter on which there is some need for help to a Member of this body.

It is, rather, doing research on a very controversial political issue pending before the States. It would have been wiser had no member of this staff of this House done so. It would have been wiser on either side. It does not cure the ill, Mr. Speaker, that an employee of this House will now do research on the other side.

The point is that this is a controversial issue, a political issue, and no vote was taken of this membership. Of

course, we should have a counsel who gives advice to Members on questions such as "May I leave for jury duty, or is my first obligation here?" This is not that case. I believe all Members know that.

What this case is is a very controversial issue on which legal opinions differ. It should be resolved in an appropriate court of law. It is entirely appropriate for any Member of this House to file a brief. It is not wise for that brief to bear the name of an employee of the Clerk's office, which, for whatever our intention, gives the implication of the imprimatur, the approval of the House. And there is the distinction between all the examples that have been raised.

There may be one point where the rights of the House are so clearly at issue that it would be wrong to delay even for a moment, but to file a brief at once because the prerogatives are jeopardized. That is not this case. Term limits may very well be constitutional.

I put to my colleagues that the only Supreme Court-decided case remotely on point held in favor of the State of California, when the State of California imposed an additional obligation to those specifically in our Constitution. In that Supreme Court opinion, the Court held that the rule, and I quote from the Supreme Court: "is no substitute for hard judgments that must be made. Decision in this context, as in others, is very much a matter of degree, the facts and circumstances behind the law, the interests which the State claims to be protecting, the interests of those who were disadvantaged, and so forth.

What the Court held in that one case, *Storer v. Brown*, 415 U.S. 724 (1974), is that a State may impose an additional restriction if it has a compelling interest in doing so and if it does not discriminate. Neither, it seems to me, are the case here.

In conclusion, we should not have filed this brief with the name of an employee of the Clerk. My colleague from California eloquently and in a scholarly manner gave the arguments that this was not wise. That is all this resolution states, and I agree with it.

I conclude with reference to one last point, the 10th amendment:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited to it by the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will now conclude the argument by, I hope, bringing us back to first principles. My resolution seeks to do one thing and one thing only, and that is to make it clear that this House is on record officially neutral on the question of constitutionality of State term limits. There is a very important reason we should do so. It is an open question.

It is not an easy question, as our counsel has asserted in this brief. The Supreme Court of the United States has not decided this question. No Federal court has disposed definitively of this question. It is contentious in the extreme.

No Member of Congress was made a party to litigation and requested the help of counsel in responding. Rather, this was volitional. Rather, we had a choice whether to involve ourselves.

In my view, the wise exercise of that choice is to stay the devil out of these term-limit elections with taxpayer dollars. I think it is vitally important that we recognize that this is a question of judgment and, at our peril, we fail to recognize the distinction between routine legal advice on routine matters or actual legal cases to which Members are parties from the House counsel in volitionally involving ourselves in legal actions around the country.

This is not a question of whether any Member acted properly. It is a question of what do next, and what we should do next is vote "yea" on this resolution, vote to keep taxpayer resources out of the State term-limit elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). All time has expired.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] to lay on the table the resolution offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox].

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 265, nays 160, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

YEAS—265

Abercrombie	Bilbray	Clement
Ackerman	Bonior	Coleman (TX)
Alexander	Borski	Collins (IL)
Anderson	Boucher	Collins (MI)
Andrews (ME)	Boxer	Condit
Andrews (NJ)	Brewster	Conyers
Andrews (TX)	Brooks	Cooper
Annunzio	Browder	Costello
Anthony	Brown	Cox (IL)
Applegate	Bruce	Coyne
Aspin	Bryant	Cramer
Atkins	Bustamante	Darden
AuCoin	Byron	de la Garza
Bacchus	Campbell (CO)	DeFazio
Barnard	Cardin	DeLauro
Beilenson	Carper	Dellums
Bennett	Carr	Derrick
Berman	Chapman	Dicks
Bevill	Clay	Dingell

Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hefner
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Horton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Jacobs
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecza
Kolter
Kopetski

Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Manton
Markey
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Smith (IA)

Price
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Reed
Richardson
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Lloyd
Sabo
Sanders
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Meyers
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)

Johnson (TX)
Kasich
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Leach
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lowery (CA)
Machtley
Marlenee
Martin
McCandless
McCollum
McCreery
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nichols

Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Paxon
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays

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

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3350.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3350, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 7, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]
YEAS—420

NOT VOTING—8
Hopkins
Martinez
Sangmeister
Slaughter (VA)
Waters

□ 1318
The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:
Mr. Dymally for, with Mr. Davis against.
Mr. LOWERY of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."
Mr. NAGLE and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."
So the motion to lay the resolution on the table was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon tomorrow.
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

□ 1320
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed on Tuesday, November 5, 1991, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

To concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3350, by the yeas and nays, and H.R. 3298, as amended, by the yeas and nays.

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allard
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bellenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Billbray
Billrakis
Bliley
Boehliert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coble

Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dorman (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Ewing
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)

Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jones (GA)

Allard
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Billrakis
Bliley
Boehliert
Boehner
Broomfield
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Chandler
Clinger
Coble

Coleman (MO)
Combest
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Fish
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest

Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hobson
Holloway
Houghton
Hunter
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Johnson (CT)

Jones (NC)	Myers	Schumer
Jontz	Nagle	Serrano
Kanjorski	Natcher	Sharp
Kaptur	Neal (MA)	Shaw
Kasich	Neal (NC)	Shays
Kennedy	Nichols	Shuster
Kennelly	Nowak	Sikorski
Kildee	Nussle	Sisisky
Kleczka	Oakar	Skaggs
Klug	Oberstar	Skeen
Kolbe	Obey	Skelton
Kolter	Olin	Slattery
Kopetski	Olver	Slaughter (NY)
Kostmayer	Ortiz	Smith (FL)
Kyl	Orton	Smith (IA)
LaFalce	Owens (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Lagomarsino	Owens (UT)	Smith (OR)
Lancaster	Oxley	Smith (TX)
Lantos	Packard	Snowe
LaRocco	Pallone	Solarz
Laughlin	Panetta	Solomon
Leach	Parker	Spence
Lehman (CA)	Pastor	Spratt
Lehman (FL)	Patterson	Staggers
Lent	Paxon	Stallings
Levin (MI)	Payne (NJ)	Stark
Levine (CA)	Payne (VA)	Stearns
Lewis (CA)	Pease	Stenholm
Lewis (FL)	Pelosi	Stokes
Lewis (GA)	Penny	Studds
Lightfoot	Perkins	Sundquist
Lipinski	Peterson (FL)	Swett
Livingston	Peterson (MN)	Swift
Lloyd	Petri	Synar
Long	Pickett	Tallon
Lowery (CA)	Pickle	Tanner
Lowey (NY)	Porter	Tauzin
Luken	Poshard	Taylor (MS)
Machtley	Price	Taylor (NC)
Manton	Pursell	Thomas (CA)
Markey	Quillen	Thomas (GA)
Marlenee	Rahall	Thomas (WY)
Martin	Ramstad	Thornton
Matsui	Rangel	Torres
Mavroules	Ravenel	Torricelli
Mazzoli	Ray	Towns
McCandless	Reed	Trafoicant
McCloskey	Regula	Traxler
McCollum	Rhodes	Unsoeld
McCrery	Richardson	Upton
McCurdy	Ridge	Valentine
McDade	Riggs	Vander Jagt
McDermott	Rinaldo	Vento
McEwen	Ritter	Visclosky
McGrath	Roberts	Volkmer
McHugh	Roe	Vucanovich
McMillan (NC)	Roemer	Walker
McMillen (MD)	Rogers	Walsh
McNulty	Rohrabacher	Washington
Meyers	Ros-Lehtinen	Waters
Mfume	Rose	Waxman
Michel	Rostenkowski	Weber
Miller (CA)	Roth	Weiss
Miller (OH)	Roukema	Weldon
Miller (WA)	Rowland	Wheat
Mineta	Roybal	Whitten
Mink	Russo	Williams
Moakley	Sabo	Wilson
Molinari	Sanders	Wise
Mollohan	Santorum	Wolf
Montgomery	Sarpalius	Wolpe
Moody	Savage	Wyden
Moorhead	Sawyer	Wylie
Moran	Saxton	Yates
Morella	Schaefer	Yatron
Morrison	Scheuer	Young (AK)
Mrazek	Schiff	Young (FL)
Murphy	Schroeder	Zeliff
Murtha	Schulze	Zimmer

NAYS—7

Armey	Hancock	Stump
Crane	Herger	
DeLay	Sensenbrenner	

NOT VOTING—6

Dymally	Hopkins	Sangmeister
Hayes (LA)	Martinez	Slaughter (VA)

□ 1339

Mr. HERGER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and

the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the additional motion to suspend the rules, on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

FARM CREDIT BANKS AND ASSOCIATIONS SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3298, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3298, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 203, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 379]

YEAS—221

Abercrombie	Conyers	Hammerschmidt
Alexander	Costello	Hastert
Allard	Coughlin	Hatcher
Anderson	Cox (IL)	Hayes (IL)
Andrews (TX)	Coyne	Hefley
Annunzio	Darden	Herger
Aspin	Davis	Hertel
Barnard	de la Garza	Hoagland
Barrett	DeFazio	Hobson
Barton	Dingell	Horton
Bateman	Dixon	Hubbard
Bennett	Dooley	Hutto
Bentley	Dorgan (ND)	James
Bilbray	Downey	Johnson (SD)
Boehler	Duncan	Johnson (TX)
Boehner	Durbin	Jones (GA)
Bonior	Edwards (OK)	Jones (NC)
Boucher	Edwards (TX)	Jontz
Brewster	Emerson	Kaptur
Brooks	Engel	Kildee
Brown	English	Kleczka
Bruce	Evans	Klug
Bryant	Ewing	Kolter
Bunning	Fields	Kopetski
Burton	Ford (MI)	Lagomarsino
Bustamante	Ford (TN)	Lancaster
Byron	Frost	LaRocco
Camp	Gejdenson	Laughlin
Campbell (CO)	Gephardt	Lehman (CA)
Cardin	Geren	Lent
Carr	Gibbons	Levin (MI)
Chandler	Gilchrest	Lewis (FL)
Chapman	Gillmor	Lewis (GA)
Clinger	Glickman	Lightfoot
Coleman (MO)	Goodling	Lloyd
Coleman (TX)	Grandy	Long
Collins (IL)	Gunderson	Lowey (NY)
Collins (MI)	Hall (OH)	Luken
Combest	Hall (TX)	Marlenee
Condit	Hamilton	Matsui

Mazzoli	Pickett	Smith (FL)
McCloskey	Pickle	Smith (OR)
McCurdy	Poshard	Smith (TX)
McDade	Pursell	Solarz
McDermott	Quillen	Spence
McEwen	Rahall	Spratt
McHugh	Ramstad	Staggers
McMillen (MD)	Rangel	Stallings
McNulty	Ravenel	Stearns
Mfume	Ray	Stenholm
Miller (CA)	Richardson	Sundquist
Mink	Ridge	Swift
Mollohan	Riggs	Synar
Morrison	Ritter	Tallon
Murphy	Roberts	Taylor (NC)
Murtha	Roemer	Thomas (CA)
Nagle	Rogers	Thomas (GA)
Nichols	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas (WY)
Nussle	Rose	Thornton
Oakar	Roth	Torres
Oberstar	Sabo	Trafoicant
Obey	Sanders	Unsoeld
Olin	Sarpalius	Upton
Ortiz	Savage	Vander Jagt
Orton	Schiff	Vento
Owens (NY)	Schulze	Volkmer
Owens (UT)	Schumer	Walsh
Oxley	Sikorski	Washington
Panetta	Sisisky	Weber
Pastor	Skaggs	Weldon
Payne (VA)	Skeen	Williams
Penny	Skelton	Wyden
Perkins	Slattery	Young (AK)
Peterson (MN)	Slaughter (NY)	

NAYS—203

Ackerman	Gallo	Michel
Andrews (ME)	Gaydos	Miller (OH)
Andrews (NJ)	Gekas	Miller (WA)
Anthony	Gilman	Mineta
Applegate	Gingrich	Moakley
Aroher	Gonzalez	Molinari
Armey	Gordon	Montgomery
Atkins	Goss	Moody
AuCoin	Gradison	Moorhead
Bacchus	Green	Moran
Baker	Guarini	Morella
Ballenger	Hancock	Mrazek
Bellenson	Hansen	Myers
Bereuter	Harris	Natcher
Berman	Hefner	Neal (MA)
Beverly	Henry	Neal (NC)
Bilirakis	Hochbrueckner	Nowak
Bliley	Holloway	Olver
Borski	Horn	Packard
Boxer	Houghton	Pallone
Broomfield	Hoyer	Parker
Browder	Huckaby	Patterson
Callahan	Hughes	Paxon
Campbell (CA)	Hunter	Payne (NJ)
Carper	Hyde	Pease
Clay	Inhofe	Pelosi
Clement	Ireland	Peterson (FL)
Coble	Jacobs	Petri
Cooper	Jefferson	Porter
Cox (CA)	Jenkins	Price
Cramer	Johnson (CT)	Reed
Crane	Johnston	Regula
Cunningham	Kanjorski	Rhodes
Dannemeyer	Kasich	Rinaldo
DeLauro	Kennedy	Roe
DeLay	Kennelly	Rohrabacher
Dellums	Kolbe	Rostenkowski
Derrick	Kostmayer	Roukema
Dickinson	Kyl	Rowland
Dicks	LaFalce	Russo
Donnelly	Lantos	Santorum
Doollittle	Leach	Sawyer
Dreier	Lehman (FL)	Saxton
Dwyer	Levine (CA)	Schaefer
Early	Lewis (CA)	Scheuer
Eckart	Lipinski	Schroeder
Edwards (CA)	Livingston	Sensenbrenner
Erdreich	Lowery (CA)	Serrano
Espy	Machtley	Sharp
Fascell	Manton	Shaw
Fawell	Markey	Shays
Fazio	Martin	Shuster
Feighan	Mavroules	Smith (IA)
Fish	McCandless	Smith (NJ)
Flake	McCollum	Snowe
Foglietta	McCrery	Solomon
Frank (MA)	McGrath	Stark
Franks (CT)	McMillan (NC)	Stokes
Gallegly	Meysers	Studds

Stump	Waters	Zelliff
Swett	Waxman	Zimmer
Tanner	Weiss	Dornan (CA)
Tauzin	Wheat	Dymally
Taylor (MS)	Whitten	Hayes (LA)
Torricelli	Wise	Hopkins
Towns	Wolf	Martinez
Traxler	Wolpe	Roybal
Valentine	Wylie	Sangmeister
Visclosky	Yates	Slaughter (VA)
Vucanovich	Yatron	Wilson
Walker	Young (FL)	

NOT VOTING—9

Dornan (CA)	Hopkins	Sangmeister
Dymally	Martinez	Slaughter (VA)
Hayes (LA)	Roybal	Wilson

□ 1352

Ms. MOLINARI and Messrs. LAFALCE, EDWARDS of California, GAYDOS, YATRON, MINETA, DICKS, LEHMAN of Florida, PALLONE, and SAWYER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma and Mr. HUBBARD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 446

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 446.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report and the amendments in disagreement on the bill (H.R. 2707) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2707, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2707) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Friday, November 1, 1991, at page 29733.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] opposed to the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] opposed to the bill?

Mr. PURSELL. No, Mr. Speaker, I am not.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill, and I request one-third of the debate time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For the purposes of debate, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

(Mr. NATCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present the conference report on H.R. 2707, the fiscal year 1992 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies. The full conference agreement was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 1, 1991, and has been available to Members since Monday morning.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report is \$71 million below the discretionary budget authority, 602(b) spending subdivisions and \$34 million below the outlay subdivisions.

Before I begin, I want to thank my big chairman, Mr. WHITTEN, for all the help he has given us down through the years on this bill. This year, as always, he has provided valuable counsel and leadership.

The conference agreement contains \$203,845 million for the three Cabinet departments and 18 related agencies under the jurisdiction of the Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee. Of the total \$144,829 million is for mandatory programs such as Medicaid, aid to families with dependent children, and supplemental security income; \$59,016 million is for the discretionary programs. These totals are within our 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays.

As I have indicated to Members throughout the year, it has been very difficult to construct a bill under our 602(b) allocation, which is \$1 billion

below the amount needed to maintain current services. During our 13 weeks of hearings with 730 witnesses, we have been confronted with many competing needs and priorities. We have done our best, but certainly not as much as we would have liked.

The tightness of our allocation, combined with a Senate bill that reflected different priorities than the House, made our conference very difficult—the longest and most difficult since I have been chairman of the subcommittee. We met with the Senate over a period of 3 weeks trying to hammer out an agreement on the 219 amendments in dispute. Both sides have had to make compromises they are not pleased with. Nevertheless, the conference agreement supports many programs that are critical to the health and welfare of our Nation's citizens. I will highlight just a few of these programs, and provide a more detailed description for the RECORD:

Total education discretionary spending is \$22,873 million, an increase of \$1,887 million over 1991.

Chapter 1 is funded at \$6,707 million.

The National Institutes of Health receive \$9,010 million, of which at least \$133 million is expected to be spent on breast cancer research.

Job Corps is funded at \$920 million.

Head Start receives \$2,202 million.

Low income home energy assistance is funded at \$1.5 billion, with an additional \$300 million available in a Presidential emergency fund.

Total funding for AIDS is expected to exceed \$1.9 billion, of which \$280 million is for programs authorized under the Ryan White Act.

Funds are not made available for State legalization impact assistance in fiscal year 1992, but are provided in full on October 15, 1992, 5 months after they would normally become available. This delay is unfortunate, but it is preferable to the President's budget which would have totally eliminated these funds. This was the only option possible given the budget ceilings facing the subcommittee.

I also want Members to know the disposition of several abortion-related issues. The conferees dropped the Senate amendment permitting Federal funds to be used for abortions in the case of rape or incest. The conference agreement therefore maintains current law with respect to the Hyde amendment. This permits Federal funding for abortions only when the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term. The conferees also dropped the Senate floor amendment regarding parental notification. This matter will be left to the authorizing committees. The only change in traditional bill language related to abortion retained by the conferees is the prohibition against implementing the so-called gag rule. This provision will go to the President in exactly the same form as passed the House on June 26.

This provision was not in conference. It was adopted in full committee in the House and was contained in identical form in the Senate bill. I realize that Members may feel very strongly about this issue, but it was not possible to address it in conference.

In summary, I believe the conference agreement is the best compromise between the House and Senate bills we could obtain. It should be supported by this House and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Chairman NATCHER and our entire staff: Mike Stephens, Bob Knisely, Mark Mioduski, Susan Quantius, Kevin Kraushaar, David Recker, and John Blazey on our side. I congratulate them for an outstanding piece of legislation, one which I personally support.

I also want to thank Chairman NATCHER for his leadership over the last 6 months in bringing this conference report to the floor.

I support this conference report. It is filled with good programs to assist the poor, the elderly, the sick, and the unemployed, and there are programs here that educate our children. These programs are expensive, but they are an investment in our future.

This report is within the 602(b) allocation. In fact, it is under the cap by \$71 million in budget authority and \$34 million in budget outlay.

There is one serious flaw, however, that I must bring to the attention of my colleagues, and that is the problem of delayed obligations. Simply stated, the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education was given more budget authority than it could spend and remain within its budget outlay limitation.

□ 1400

In order to appropriate all the money that the subcommittee was given authority to spend, the conference committee voted to delay \$4.2 billion until the last day in fiscal year 1992. This means that the money cannot be obligated until then and effectively shoves this \$4.2 billion into the next fiscal year.

However, I want to point out that other subcommittees have also used this budget practice, including the OMB and the administration. It is not sound fiscal policy and will make next year's appropriation process more difficult. I know that Chairman NATCHER and our entire committee, myself included, are seriously concerned about this practice and we are committed to resolving this problem next year.

I would like to point out some of the highlights of the bill. For the National Institutes of Health, this bill appropriates just over \$9 billion for the first time, an increase of \$734 million. That is an increase of 8.9 percent and it is the jewel of this bill. NIH scientists are

searching for breakthroughs in cancer, heart and lung diseases, hypertension, and several other illnesses.

Within the Centers for Disease Control we have funded a new program, Preventive Health, and included \$135 million for antismoking efforts. I think this is an educationally sound and good public policy.

We also have a new immunization program which is now almost at \$300 million, an increase of 37 percent. This will prevent rising health costs in the future.

I want to congratulate Dr. Bernardine Healey for her leadership as the NIH Director. She has instituted some new leadership in calling attention to an all-male committee on the issues that have to do with women's health. There is \$30 million for breast cancer research and \$50 million for breast and cervical cancer research, which is a total of \$80 million.

On the education front I want to congratulate Secretary Lamar Alexander for his leadership. The conference report provides \$100 million for the President's America 2000 activities, and I want to thank the committee for making that a separate line item, but subject to authorization by April 1, 1992.

The report provides \$2.3 billion for Head Start, showing strong bipartisan support for this important program. We also give tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Education and Labor, for his effort in leading the fight for Even Start, which will ensure that children in America will start school early and are ready to learn. The report provides \$70 million for Even Start.

Mr. Speaker, we also provide \$623 million for drug-free schools and communities, so that every school can offer a disciplined environment that is conducive to learning.

We also have \$6.9 billion for student financial aid, an increase of approximately \$171 million.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I offer this on our side of the aisle, and encourage all Members to support it when we vote on the conference report.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in sad and reluctant opposition to the conference report, because as a member of the subcommittee I take great pride in all the work done by our subcommittee, and do not disagree with a word said by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] or the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL]. One could not work with two finer leaders than the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Michigan, the new ranking member of our subcommittee.

But this fine bill, in my view, is fatally flawed in two respects: First of

all, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] has already acknowledged that the bill unfortunately forward funds \$4.2 billion into the next fiscal year, making it fiscally irresponsible.

I want to emphasize on our side of the Capitol, we would have solved that problem. The problem occurred in the conference committee with the Members of the other body.

But even more serious, in my judgment, as a flaw is the tearing down of the wall between family planning and abortion.

Mr. Speaker, this is a nurturing bill. This is a bill that nurtures families through its education programs, its social service programs, its job training programs, and its health programs. We should not put this bill and this Government in the business of promoting a destructive procedure such as an abortion by tearing down the wall that exists today between family planning and abortion.

Mr. Speaker, this issue has been misconstrued to the public time and time again. But the President has now made clear what is at stake here through a memorandum to the Secretary of Health and Human Services. He says,

Nothing in these regulations is to prevent a woman from receiving complete medical information about her condition from a physician. Title X projects are to provide necessary referrals to appropriate health care facilities when medically indicated. If a woman is found to be pregnant and to have a medical problem, she should be referred for complete medical care, even if the ultimate result may be the termination of her pregnancy.

Mr. Speaker, that interpretation has been upheld by an internal memo from the general counsel of the Department of Health and Human Services. What it says, simply put, is that this is not a gag rule. There is no gag rule on the confidential personal relationship between a doctor and his patient in any of these facilities.

The real issue here is are we going to tear down the wall between family planning and abortion and put the Department of Health and Human Services and the Federal Government and the taxpayers in the business of promoting and referring for abortion?

Mr. Speaker, we should not. Members should vote "no" on the conference report.

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, this vote is an abortion vote, plain and simple. Since the day of the Rust versus Sullivan decision, the matter of abortion referrals by title X funded clinics has been obscured by claims of free speech. This issue has nothing to do with free speech and everything to do with abortion.

As a matter of fact, the regulations permit a doctor to refer a woman to a facility that provides abortions. What they don't permit is referral to "health care providers whose principal

business is the provision of abortions." Principal business. We're talking about abortion mills, Mr. Speaker. The regulations don't allow federally funded clinics to refer women to abortion mills. When a woman's health is at stake, a title X program is required to make an appropriate referral, even if the result may be an abortion. And in cases of medical emergency, the project is required to refer a pregnant woman to an appropriate provider of emergency medical services, even if the result may be an abortion.

Abortion is a multimillion dollar business in this country, my colleagues. Apparently that's not enough for abortion providers—they want the Federal Government to send them more potential abortions. We're not talking about free speech, we're not talking about women's health issues—we are talking about the multimillion dollar business of abortion in this country, and the American taxpayers don't want to support it. I urge you to vote against the conference report.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to just say what a great subcommittee we have here. At this time, when we are looking around the world for places to spend our money, it is absolutely essential that we take care of our own people, on whom everything else depends. We have got to give our country that attention, because our country is what all of our money is based on. An educated, healthy population, with adequate housing, food, and nutrition from a strong agricultural base, provides the foundation for our national strength and future.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is anyone in the Congress on which we can depend any more than the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], who has a tremendous record back through the years, as well as all other members of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, let me say again, whatever our problems are, we had better look out for our own country, because all the rest depends on that.

Mr. Speaker, this bill includes funds for all phases of education, both higher and secondary, including universities, colleges and community colleges, vocational education, disadvantaged education, adult education, and historically black colleges, including Mississippi Valley State University at Itta Bena, MS.

At this time when we are in debt I think it would be wise to roll ahead whenever possible the programs that, because of ceilings, we have been unable to put into this bill. We did make it clear that we believe in it, and did the very best that anybody could do.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a member of this subcommittee, though I am unable to attend as often as I would like because of the press of other com-

mittee business. I want to compliment every member of the subcommittee, the chairman, Mr. NATCHER of Kentucky, the ranking Republican, Mr. PURSELL of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin, Mr. ROYBAL of California, Mr. STOKES of Ohio, Mr. EARLY of Massachusetts, Mr. HOYER of Maryland, Mr. MRAZEK of New York, Mr. PORTER of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WEBER of Minnesota, and Mr. MCDADE of Pennsylvania, because it is to them we have to look to take care of this country.

This bill looks after our people and our country. We must look after the people's health and education, but in the same breath we must look after the physical health of our own country because it is our country to which we have to look to take care of all the needs that we have.

Mr. Speaker, ours is a great country. We need to take care of all of it in order to maintain a strong, healthy nation. Strength and health that can come only from protection and developing the Nation's resources—our real wealth.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure as always to work with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] and the members of the committee. I would like the Members of the House to know that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] is doing a fantastic job in filling the very big shoes of Sil Conte.

The conference report denies funding to implement the gag rule for one year, allowing HHS time to draw more balanced regulations. This provision is the same as it was as it left the House, and since the Senate adopted this same provision on their side, the matter was nonconferenceable.

We had hoped, however, in the course of the conference that compromise language might be worked out. Senator CHAFEE, Raine Archer of HHS, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, abortion rights groups, and Roger Porter, the domestic policy counselor, all worked for many months to work out fair and equitable compromise language. They did so. That language was submitted and then apparently rejected by John Sununu at the White House.

Mr. Speaker, we have fought over the question of abortion for a long, long time in this Chamber. We have reached a balance, I think a reasonable and fair balance with the Hyde amendment being law providing no funding to encourage abortion, and, with Roe versus Wade being also the law of the land, making it a decision not for the Government, but for the individual.

That balance has never satisfied some, however. They have continued to

press for Government control on a number of fronts, title X reauthorization, UNFPA funding, the Mexico City policy, and now the gag rule. They have justified this intrusion on individual rights representing that abortion counseling has been directive, encouraging women to have abortions, not just informing them of their rights. That is a lie directly refuted by a GAO investigation, by a separate investigation by the IG at HHS, and the fact that no title X clinic was ever denied funds nor found to be doing that.

□ 1410

The gag rule denies a poor woman seeking help from a title X clinic the information about her legal, medical option to terminate her pregnancy. It directs specifically what a doctor or other health professional may or may not say regarding abortion, and I submit the gag rule for the RECORD at this point.

§59.8 Prohibition on counseling and referral for abortion services, limitation of program services to family planning.

(a)(1) A Title X project may not provide counseling concerning the use of abortion as a method of family planning or provide referral for abortion as a method of family planning.

(2) Because Title X funds are intended only for family planning, once a client served by a Title X project is diagnosed as pregnant, she must be referred for appropriate prenatal and/or social services by furnishing a list of available providers that promote the welfare of mother and unborn child. She must also be provided with information necessary to protect the health of mother and unborn child until such time as the referral appointment is kept. In cases in which emergency care is required, however, the Title X project shall be required only to refer the client immediately to an appropriate provider of emergency medical services.

(3) A Title X project may not use prenatal, social service or emergency medical or other referrals as an indirect means of encouraging or promoting abortion as a method of family planning, such as by weighing the list of referrals in favor of health care providers which perform abortions, by including on the list of referral providers health care providers whose principal business is the provision of abortions, by excluding available providers who do not provide abortions, or by "steering" clients to providers who offer abortion as a method of family planning.

(4) Nothing in this subpart shall be construed as prohibiting the provision of information to a project client which is medically necessary to assess the risks and benefits of different methods of contraception in the course of selecting a method; provided, that the provision of this information does not include counseling with respect to or otherwise promote abortion as a method of family planning.

(b) Examples. (1) A pregnant client of a Title X project requests prenatal care services, which project personnel are qualified to provide. Because the provision of such services is outside the scope of family planning supported by Title X, the client must be referred to appropriate providers of prenatal care.

(2) A Title X project discovers an ectopic pregnancy in the course of conducting a

physical examination of a client. Referral arrangements for emergency medical care are immediately provided. Such action is in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (a)(2) of this section.

(3) A pregnant woman asks the Title X project to provide her with a list of abortion providers in the area. The Title X project tells her that it does not refer for abortion but provides her a list which includes, among other health care providers, a local clinic which principally provides abortions. Inclusion of the clinic on the list is inconsistent with paragraph (a)(3) of this section.

(4) A pregnant woman asks the Title X project to provide her with a list of abortion providers in the area. The project tells her that it does not refer for abortion and provides her a list which consists of hospitals and clinics and other providers which provide prenatal care and also provide abortions. None of the entries on the list are providers that principally provide abortions. Although there are several appropriate providers of prenatal care in the area which do not provide or refer for abortions, none of these providers are included on the list. Provision of the list is inconsistent with paragraph (a)(3) of this section.

(5) A pregnant woman requests information on abortion and asks the Title X project to refer her to an abortion provider. The project counselor tells her that the project does not consider abortion an appropriate method of family planning and therefore does not counsel or refer for abortion. The counselor further tells the client that the project can help her to obtain prenatal care and necessary social services, and provides her with a list of such providers from which the client may choose. Such actions are consistent with paragraph (a) of this section.

(6) Title X project staff provide contraceptive counseling to a client in order to assist her in selecting a contraceptive method. In discussing oral contraceptives, the project counselor provides the client with information contained in the patient package insert accompanying a brand of oral contraceptives, referring to abortion only in the context of a discussion of the relative safety of various contraceptive methods and in no way promoting abortion as a method of family planning. The provision of this information does not constitute abortion counseling or referral.

An example that is part of the gag rule regulation states, "A pregnant woman requests information on abortion and asks the title X project to refer her to an abortion provider. The project counselor tells her that the project does not consider abortion an appropriate method of family planning and therefore does not counsel or refer for abortion."

If this conference report does not pass into law, this regulation will be implemented. The conference report puts this regulation on hold and allows time to reconsider and draw a more balanced rule.

Late last night Members received a copy of a memorandum from Secretary Sullivan. The language of that memorandum does nothing. It is extralegal and has no force or effect. I insert at this point a copy of the memorandum.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, November 5, 1991.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES

Throughout the debate about the relationship of the Title X family planning program and abortion counseling, some have raised questions about the regulations dealing with services offered to pregnant women.

We must ensure that the confidentiality of the doctor/patient relationship will be preserved and that the operation of the Title X family planning program is compatible with free speech and the highest standards of medical care.

In order to clarify the purpose and intent of these regulations, I am directing that in implementing these regulations you ensure that the following principles, inherent in the statute, are adhered to:

1. Nothing in these regulations is to prevent a woman from receiving complete medical information about her condition from a physician.

2. Title X projects are to provide necessary referrals to appropriate health care facilities when medically indicated.

3. If a woman is found to be pregnant and to have a medical problem, she should be referred for complete medical care, even if the ultimate result may be the termination of her pregnancy.

4. Referrals may be made by Title X programs to full-service health care providers that perform abortions, but not to providers whose principal activity is providing abortion services.

I am determined to assure the integrity of the Title X program in its mission to provide family planning services to low-income individuals; adherence to this guidance will produce this result.

GEORGE BUSH.

This is America, Mr. Speaker. No matter how we feel about abortion, and I speak as a supporter of the Hyde amendment, we have never been in the mind control business. For Government to fail to tell people, women who come to it for help, about their rights, for Government to fail to tell people the truth and the whole truth is simply not the way we do things in America.

Mr. Speaker, support the conference report and ensure that people in America will continue to be told the truth about their rights.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD another document on this issue.

POSSIBLE AGREEMENT ON POLICY WITH RESPECT TO PREGNANCY RELATED SERVICES IN TITLE X FUNDED CLINICS—OCTOBER 25, 1991

A. TREATMENT OF TITLE X PROJECTS WHICH PROVIDE PRENATAL CARE, SUCH AS, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS, HOSPITALS, OR FAMILY PLANNING CLINICS THAT OFFER SUCH CARE

When a woman comes in for family planning services and is determined in the course of the visit to be pregnant, she should be offered information regarding her pregnancy. The provider of services will furnish a list of community resources for medical care and social services which may include providers of pregnancy termination if they also provide prenatal care. If the woman elects to remain in that project for services, she will be provided with the same pregnancy related services and information that all of the projects' patients receive. The project would

be allowed to retain Title X funds as part of its general operating support. The Title X projects under Part A may use Title X funds for all services that are allowable under Part B.

B. TREATMENT OF TITLE X PROJECTS WHICH DO NOT PROVIDE PRENATAL CARE

(1) When a woman comes in for family planning services and is determined in the course of the visit to be pregnant, she should be offered information regarding her pregnancy. If she is found to have a significant medical problem, she should be referred to a provider of comprehensive medical care. The project will furnish a list of community resources for medical care and social services which may include providers of pregnancy termination if they also provide prenatal care. If requested, the project will make every effort to assist the pregnant woman in making an appointment with a prenatal care provider. In addition, the project will provide the woman with written information to be developed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services about appropriate prenatal care that includes a discussion of proper nutrition and exercise, the need to avoid alcohol, drug and tobacco use, and the importance of receiving medical care.

(2) The project shall give factual answers to questions the woman has about her pregnancy and her legal and medical options. Questions about an individual's medical conditions that relate to her pregnancy should be referred to an appropriate practitioner, on or off premises. Upon a woman's request, identification of providers of adoption and pregnancy termination services will be made available, including providers who do not also provide prenatal care. Factual information may also be provided about the mix of services provided by each provider and the payment sources they accept. The project is not to provide directive counseling to the woman regarding her pregnancy. Should this process of answering questions be found to advocate pregnancy termination or adoption the Title X project would be subject to the procedures which apply to misuse of grant funds, including termination of the grant or portion of the grant which funds the project.

(3) Nothing in this statute is intended to preclude a health care professional or trained clinician under the supervision of a medical director, from fulfilling his or her generally-accepted professional duty.

C. RELATIONSHIP TO NON-TITLE X SERVICES

Nothing in this statute is intended to circumscribe the services offered by a recipient of Title X funds with other public or private funds. Nothing in this statute is intended to address 42CFR59.9 (Feb. 2, 1988).

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly in opposition to the conference report because of the budget gimmicks that are in it.

Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable reluctance that I must oppose adoption of the conference report for the 1992 appropriation for Labor-HHS. I acknowledge that my position is taken with reluctance because I supported this appropriation bill when it was initially adopted in the House and I had high hopes it would return similarly clothed in a fiscally responsible fashion. I am saddened that those hopes have been dashed.

But there is another reason for my reluctance. Most of the debate today will center

around that provision in the bill which blocks enforcement of the so-called gag rule. I strongly support this provision in the bill. Yesterday, the President issued a memorandum in which he attempted to clarify the scope of title X separation regulations. But the President's clarification is unacceptable because it fails to resolve the problem of providing a woman who seeks medical care at a federally funded title X clinic complete information about her options concerning unintended pregnancies. To deny a woman information about the options available to her is deceptive. It is bad policy and worse medicine. The gag rule should be overturned.

Because of the intensity of the debate on this issue, there are those who will mistake my vote against the conference report as an endorsement of the gag rule. I acknowledge that, but I cannot let it deter me from voting against an appropriation which so completely undermines the budget summit agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the funding tricks and gimmicks in this bill are offensive. Certainly, I would like to support increased funding for Head Start, for assistance for the homeless, for higher education, and more funds for cancer and AIDS research. All of these are worthy programs.

Unfortunately, the conferees have chosen to offer hollow promises to the beneficiaries of these programs. They have avoided making tough choices about priorities—a choice clearly demanded by the budget agreement. They have completely undermined the spirit, if not the letter of that agreement.

Let me mention just two examples of this gimmickry. The worst, clearly, is the delay in obligatory authority of \$4.3 billion until September 30, 1992—the last day of the fiscal year. This way, the conferees can claim credit for funding programs in this fiscal year, but not pay for them until the next. But next year's funding cap will be even tighter than this year's. Delaying the obligations just makes a bad situation worse.

The second example I would cite is the added funding for Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP] in an emergency account. Like firefighting—an issue we have addressed earlier—the needs in this account can be accurately estimated. Putting more in the emergency account, thus avoiding the budget caps, is nothing more than an admission that the committee—and this body—lacks the will to choose between LIHEAP and other programs.

The budget summit agreement of last October was not a measure which I supported. But it is the only discipline we have; it is the only tool available to control spending. The conferees have brought back an overstuffed appropriation bill, one that asks us to overspend to the tune of \$4.2 billion, one that asks us to postpone responsibility for overspending into the next fiscal year. Mr. Speaker, that is what we have been doing year after year. That is the practice that must end.

I urge my colleagues to vote no and send this agreement back to conference. Insist that they remove the budget tricks and return with an agreement that respects the covenant we made with the American people last year. If the conferees do that, I will vote for the agreement, and I will vote to override any veto

which seeks to deny women the right to full counseling on reproductive rights.

Medical responsibility and fiscal responsibility. These two principles should go hand in hand in this appropriation bill. We ought not to scuttle one to save the other.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, every year, Planned Parenthood counsels, refers, or performs over 200,000 abortions—an absolutely staggering loss of human life.

Every year, Mr. Speaker, tens of thousands of teenage mothers—many of them poor, vulnerable, frightened, and extremely impressionable—walk into Planned Parenthood carrying perfectly healthy babies only to leave the clinic having had their babies shredded and ripped apart by powerful suction machines or chemically killed by injections of poison. And in many of these cases, the teenagers' parents aren't even informed or notified, but, not to worry, Planned Parenthood's so called counselors assume that role.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, Planned Parenthood, an organization that said in its literature in 1963: "An abortion kills the life of a baby after it has begun * * *. Birth control merely postpones the beginning of life," now operates the largest chain of abortion mills in the land. And, sadly too, Planned Parenthood is directly responsible for the death of millions of infants over the last two decades.

Thus, I guess, it should come as no surprise that Planned Parenthood and like-minded abortionists bitterly oppose the prochild, prowoman, prenatal care title X reforms that now await implementation by the President.

If this conference report becomes law, needed reforms would be thwarted and the President's prenatal care rule overturned. This isn't a gag rule at all it is a prenatal care rule.

Today's debate, Mr. Speaker, isn't about free speech. It is about taxpayer subsidized abortion advocacy in what was intended by Congress to be family planning clinics, preconception clinics—not abortion marketing centers.

This debate is about reigning in on the facilitation of, and promotion of, abortion. For those Members who regard the life of an unborn child as one might regard a diseased pancreas, the decision is simple. If an unwanted pregnancy—if an unwanted baby—is the moral equivalent to a tumor or cyst, your vote is to overturn the regulations.

But if you accept the fact that unborn children are human and alive—and deserving of respect, compassion, and care—you will vote to sustain the President's prenatal care rule. If you accept the fact that every abortion stops a beating heart, your vote is to preserve the title X regulations.

It seems to me that the question turns on whether you and I want to put the considerable clout of Federal funds behind encouraging prenatal care referrals over abortion referrals.

It seems to me that you can't have it both ways. Prenatal care has absolutely nothing in common with abortion. One nurtures. The other destroys. Yet even these modest pro-life regulations are not airtight. They only require that referrals for prenatal care avoid those "health care providers whose principal business is the provision of abortions." In other words, avoid referrals to abortion mills.

Prenatal care, Mr. Speaker, respects the health and well-being of both mother and baby. Prenatal care, by definition, nurtures life and is life affirming. Prenatal care recognizes and treats two special patients with the blessings of the best nutrition and the best medical care available.

Abortion, by definition, destroys life and results in death.

Recently, the head of the U.S. Public Health Service, Dr. James O. Mason, pointed out that the President's new title X regulations—the prenatal care rule—would have a positive impact on the utilization of prenatal care in the country and would result in reduction in infant mortality.

Dr. Mason said on June 24, 1991,

Let me underscore the importance of this program as a key component in our Department's effort to reduce the national problem of infant mortality. I believe that an important and often overlooked aspect of this regulation is its requirement that if a client is pregnant she will be assisted in obtaining access to vital prenatal care. From the point that pregnancy is confirmed, the public health role is to provide quality medical care for two patients, the mother, and her unborn child.

And to those who have expressed concerns that the regulations somehow intrude on the privileged doctor-patient relationship, the President has made crystal clear in his memorandum for the Secretary of HHS that doctors may continue to discuss abortion with women within clinics receiving title X funds, when the doctor believes that such discussion is medically warranted. In his November 5 memorandum, President Bush said,

We must ensure that the confidentiality of the doctor/patient relationship will be preserved and that the operation of the Title X family planning program is compatible with free speech and the highest standards of medical care.

In order to clarify the purpose and intent of these regulations, I am directing that in implementing these regulations you ensure that the following principles, inherent in the statute, are adhered to:

1. Nothing in these regulations is to prevent a woman from receiving complete medical information about her condition from a physician.

2. Title X projects are to provide necessary referrals to appropriate health care facilities when medically indicated.

3. If a woman is found to be pregnant and to have a medical problem, she should be re-

ferred for complete medical care, even if the ultimate result may be the termination of her pregnancy.

4. Referrals may be made by Title X programs to full-service health care providers that perform abortions, but not to providers whose principle activity is providing abortion services.

I am determined to assure the integrity of the Title X program in its mission to provide family planning services to low-income individuals; adherence to this guidance will produce this result.

And, Mr. Speaker, the bogus claim that doctors could not refer a pregnant woman for medical care with AIDS, cancer, or diabetes is flatly refuted by the regulations themselves: "Each Title X project must * * * provide for * * * necessary referral to other medical facilities when medically indicated." [42 CFR Ch. 1 59.5 10(1)] In fact a doctor is required to refer the woman to a specialist, even if such referral ultimately results in the loss of the baby's life.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, national public opinion polls clearly show that Americans do not want birth control abortions in their national network of family planning clinics.

The Wirthin Organization recently asked Americans "Do you favor or oppose offering abortions as a method of birth control in taxpayer-funded family planning programs." The results—77 percent oppose offering abortions in family planning clinics. And the reason should be obvious—abortion is not a method of family planning and Americans soundly reject any suggestion to the contrary.

Support the President's prenatal care rule. Vote down this conference report.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking member, all members of the committee, and the staff for the amount of time and effort expended on this bill. This bill affects everyone in the United States from conception through death and burials. Everyone is affected by this bill.

It involves health. It involves training. It involves retraining. It involves safety. It involves the Social Security Administration. It involves everyone in some way in the United States.

This bill should not be held hostage to two or three emotional provisions that merely delay funding for 1 year for one of the many programs in this bill. Again, this Congress has added another emotional matter to this bill this year.

It would have taken the same number of votes to report out an authorization bill that settled this matter on the gag rule as it does to hook a 1-year delay in implementing the regulation to this bill, and it is not without harm when it is hooked onto this bill.

We are already into the new fiscal year. All programs in the bill are being held up in their full funding because this emotional issue is on the bill and until it is finally signed each program is capped at last year's level and denied even a cost-of-living adjustment. Also, the bill may not be enacted for 2 or 3 more weeks if it is vetoed.

This separate bill that would permanently overrule the gag rule ought to be reported out and voted on separately. It ought to be acted on in the House and the Senate. There is obvious evidence that it would pass overwhelmingly in both bodies because there were enough votes to add provision for a 1-year delay included in this bill.

The organizations that supported putting the delay on this bill could have spent the same amount of time getting the permanent bill reported and the question would have been settled by now. This issue should not be adversely affecting this bill.

I hope we do not come in here next year and find the same procedure used to delay the important programs in this bill so some can argue over one sentence in the whole bill. We just should not be holding this bill hostage to that issue instead of settling it on a separate bill.

I support the bill this year. But I say, let us not come back here next year and find this same argument on this same issue.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we consider this conference report, we face one red herring and one real issue. The red herring is the issue of the so-called advanced funding or delayed obligations: Everyone who knows this bill knows that the proper administration of its programs in many instances requires advanced funding. Why, after all, did the administration ask for almost \$1.5 billion of advanced funding in this bill for programs like the Centers for Disease Control, the National Institutes of Health, Child Care and others?

The real issue we face is the gag rule.

I should simply like to remind my colleagues that the family planning clinic is often the only access that the poor woman who goes there has to medical personnel. And I say to my colleagues that when a poor woman goes to the doctor who serves as her only access to the health care system, she is entitled to the truth and the whole truth about what her health care options are.

□ 1420

That is what we are here to fight for. If Members believe that the poor woman who has the family planning clinic as her only access to the health system should have the whole truth, then vote for this conference report.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a great deal about the title X regulations, and as I read them they are quite different than what had been portrayed. They seem really quite reasonable.

I think it is important to note that this whole program deals with services prior to conception. Once a woman is pregnant and seeks to keep the pregnancy, title X cannot help her. She needs to be referred out. Once she is pregnant, and seeks to end the pregnancy, title X cannot help her. They need to refer her out. Title X deals only with family planning. It does not deal with post-conception services.

Criticism has been made of title X because these regulations preclude referral or encouragement of people to have abortions as a method of family planning. The overwhelming majority of the American people think that abortion for the purpose of birth control is morally wrong. Reflecting that sentiment, the Congress of the United States passed a law, and the administration implemented it with these title X regulations. The will of the people has been faithfully implemented, and we should vote no on this conference report because it overturns these regulations and goes against the will of the American people by seeking to encourage abortions as a method of family planning.

I also would observe, Mr. Speaker, that this bill spends \$4.3 billion more than the President requested. Obviously this Congress has a hard time restraining, spending, and we ought to do it right here and live within the funding level requested by the President.

Vote no.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding time to me. I rise in strong support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2707, the fiscal year 1992 Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. This bill provides \$204 billion for those entitlement and discretionary programs which help to keep Americans employed, healthy and educated. I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee upon which I serve for the exemplary leadership and adroit skill he exhibited in getting this bill reported out of conference.

I also would like to acknowledge the contributions of the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman CARL PURSELL, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. CARL, during his first year as ranking minority member, has supported this bill and played an outstanding role in helping to bring this bill to the floor today.

The conferees had to make some difficult funding choices this year. When the House

and Senate first went to conference, we had major differences in funding priorities. The Senate had proposed \$1 billion more than the House for the health programs, and recommended \$1 billion less than the House for our Nation's education programs.

After our first meeting, we reached a tentative agreement on funding levels, and later returned to learn that, in terms of budget authority, we were \$800 million over our 602(b) allocation. All in all, we met five times trying to resolve our differences. This, Mr. Speaker, was one of the most arduous conferences ever.

We drafted this bill in the midst of rigid, and seemingly impossible parameters established by the budget agreement. Despite the difficult decisions we faced, the conference report we bring to you today provides a balanced approach to supporting our Nation's education, health and labor programs. In fact, H.R. 2707 provides significant funding increases for compensatory education for the disadvantaged, cancer research, minority health improvement activities, higher education, and many other programs. I am proud to have been able to help secure increased funding for these programs, as well as those programs which improve the quality of life for my constituents as well as persons across the Nation. There are several programmatic increases I would like to mention specifically.

For the Department of Education, H.R. 2707 provides \$6.7 billion for compensatory education for the disadvantaged, representing a \$900 million increase over last year's figures. This program provides grants to support supplementary educational and related services designed to increase the attainment of educationally disadvantaged children. About 14,000 local school districts participated in the program, which served an estimated 7 million pupils in 1991.

In the area of higher education, the bill provides \$100 million for the title III undergraduate program, strengthening historically black colleges and universities. This represents a \$12.2 million increase over the President's budget request and the 1991 amount; \$300,000 was provided to complete construction of a fine arts center at Bethune Cookman College in Daytona Beach, FL.

For those institutions located in urban areas, the bill provides \$8 million for the urban community service funds, title XI-B. These funds will support cooperative projects between urban universities, such as Cleveland State University, and the urban areas in which they are located.

Howard University will receive \$212 million. This represents a \$22 million increase over the President's budget request. These funds will assist the university, one of our Nation's oldest African-American universities, in starting over \$140 million in renovation activities.

Additionally, the bill provides \$385.3 million for the TRIO programs. This represents a \$51.5 million increase over last year's appropriation. The TRIO programs have proven successful in assisting low-income persons who are potential first-generation college students in pursuing their education.

Significant increases were also provided for those programs authorized under the Department of Health and Human Services. One of

the largest increases was provided for cancer research. The National Cancer Institute would receive \$2 billion for research activities. This is about \$276 million more than the amount provided last year. While the bill does not earmark funds specifically, it does direct the National Cancer Institute to make breast, prostate, ovarian and cervical cancer its top priorities and to treat these diseases with utmost urgency.

For lead poisoning prevention and screening activities, the bill provides \$23 million. This is a \$17 million increase over last year's level. Currently, it is estimated that 17 percent of our nation's children are exposed to lead concentrations which place them at risk of adverse health effects.

Also contained in this bill are funding increases for several minority health improvement initiatives. With more than 60,000 excess deaths in the African-American community, and with the widening disparities between the health status between minority and white Americans, these increases are both necessary and appropriate.

Over \$80 million was provided for the disadvantaged Minority Health Improvement Act—legislation I authored, which was signed into law last year. This initiative supports the education, training, and recruitment of minority students and health personnel in the health professions. The total appropriation includes: First, \$20 million for student scholarships; second, \$24.1 million for the centers of excellence; third, \$15 million for the health professions student loans; fourth, \$6 million for public housing health grants; and fifth, \$16 million for the Health and Human Service Office of Minority Health. Language also was included encouraging States to establish offices of minority health in coordination with the Federal effort. Additionally, \$1 million was provided to develop a national education demonstration program communicating health lifestyle messages to minority populations. Additionally, the National Institutes of Health Office of Minority Health will receive \$7.5 million. Moreover, language directing the institutes to increase their efforts to address the health disparities between white and minority Americans was retained.

For the infant mortality initiative, \$75 million was provided. This is \$50 million more than the amount provided last year. Of this amount, \$10 million will go to community health centers. This program is of special interest to my constituents in Cleveland. Cleveland has one of the highest infant mortality rates in the Nation. In fact, in one study prepared in 1988, it ranked fifth, a rate higher than that of some developing countries. As one of the first 15 cities to receive assistance under the healthy start initiative, funds provided for fiscal year 1992 should assist Cleveland and many other areas in saving the lives of infants who are dying prematurely, and oftentimes unnecessarily.

Other Health and Human Services initiatives funded under this bill include \$1.8 billion in funding for the low-energy and assistance program, expansion of research and prevention activities in the areas of osteoporosis, diabetes, hypertension, kidney transplantation, aids and its effects on women and minorities, violence prevention, and the evaluation of health

care in the correctional setting. Regarding the AFDC payments to the States, \$14.6 billion was provided, representing a \$1.2 billion increase over last year.

For the Department of Labor, one of the most notable increases was provided for the Job Corps Program. Job Corps would receive \$919.5 million. This is \$52 million more than the amount provided last year. This increase will allow for the construction of several new job corps centers. My office was contacted by several Members of Congress supporting the construction of new Job Corps centers. Representative DON PEASE expressed his interest in bringing a center to Mansfield, OH; and, Representative MERVYN DYMALLY would like to see one constructed in Compton, CA.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly address the issue of language contained in this bill which delays implementation of the gag rule for 1 year. As you know, on May 23, 1991, the U.S. Supreme Court, in *Rust versus Sullivan*, upheld Federal regulations—known as the gag rule—prohibiting discussion or referral for abortion at family planning clinics funded through title X of the Public Health Service Act.

In June of this year, the House voted to delay implementation of the gag rule, 353 to 74. The Senate voted to delay its implementation as well. Therefore, this issue was not a conferenceable item. Congress already has spoken on this issue. We have found that implementation of this rule raises serious questions regarding free speech and the underlying principles of the traditional physician-patient relationship, including the right of unrestricted communication with patients. We had serious concerns regarding the Federal Government prohibiting a health care provider receiving Federal funds from advising a pregnant woman of her legal option of abortion, even in those instances where her life may be in danger. In fact, I know there are many like myself who find this type of prohibition to be absolutely abhorrent, not to mention unconstitutional.

Because this body has previously settled this issue, let us not be swayed by the politically posturing we have seen today against this bill, rather let us get on with the business of funding those unemployment, health, and education programs our people at home need and deserve. The height of a recession is no time to hold these vital programs hostage.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, you displayed remarkable skill in balancing the many competing interests contained in this bill. And, you did so without balancing the burden of the budget agreement on the backs of the disadvantaged and poor. We had very difficult decisions to make in reaching final agreement. And while we delayed funding some of these programs until the latter part of the fiscal year, we were able to fund the majority of our Nation's labor, health and education programs without sacrificing the needs of low-income, elderly, and disadvantaged Americans.

I am proud to stand with you in bringing this measure to the floor, and I ask my colleagues to join me in final passage of H.R. 2707.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the gag rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations conference report.

The Supreme Court's decision in *Rust versus Sullivan* to uphold the gag rule is, indeed, a disastrous one. This decision, however, is not even primarily about abortion. It is about free speech, medical integrity, and the sanctity of the doctor patient relationship. It is about the trust that people—especially the poor—place in the Government to assist them in their most serious times of need. When women seek counseling on health matters, they should not have to question the honesty of their physician nor fear the motives behind their doctor's words.

In my State of Texas alone, approximately 180 clinics would be affected by this narrow-minded directive. It is wrong for the Federal Government to control the speech of our Nation's doctors just because that government provides funding to family planning clinics. It is a dangerous and ominous precedent we set when we let the Government ignore the first amendment simply because it helps pay the bill.

The burden now falls on Congress to act. I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations conference report and overturn the gag rule.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am frankly very disturbed by one provision in this bill, so disturbed that I had intended to vote against it but in the end I could not bring myself to do that. When we get to that point in the amendment process I will explain my concerns about one amendment, but in the end I simply felt that I had no choice but to support this bill for some very good reasons.

First of all, we provide major increases to funding for childhood immunization that will save thousands and thousands of kids from life-crippling diseases. We provide major increases in assistance for education to help kids get along on the road in life. We will provide assistance to 40,000 additional kids under Head Start, the most valuable educational program that we fund. We will help 40,000 additional families through child care block grant efforts, and we restore 8 percent of the reduction that was made in the low-income fuel assistance program in the President's budget.

I think it is essential to support this bill for one very good reason, even though I have a major objection to what we have done in the health field. It seems to me that we have had an administration which has wanted to play Churchill abroad while we have been playing Scrooge at home. It seems to me that it is time to recognize that this is the major action that this Congress will take in this session to deal with the problems of our people, to take care of our own.

I make no apology for the efforts that the committee has made to try to

provide that by stretching a budget limit here and perhaps bending one there without breaking them. It is essential to do that if we are going to recognize our own domestic priorities here at home. I would urge Members, therefore, to support this bill.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, throughout my entire career in Congress I have consistently supported the right-to-life philosophy. Our vote on this conference report today is being portrayed as the biggest pro-life vote of this session. So for me this bill is a conflict between very strongly held personal philosophies. However, I cannot vote against funding unemployment compensation for 4,000 Uni-royal employees about to lose their jobs in my district just to prove I am pro-life. I cannot vote against trade adjustment assistance or now job training assistance for some 3,000 constituents who need it more than ever just to prove that I am pro-life. I cannot vote against student financial aid for some 50,000 college kids in western Wisconsin just to prove that I am pro-life. With the record cold weather back home, I cannot vote against low-income energy assistance for some 22,000 households in my district just to prove that I am pro-life. I cannot vote against the rural health transition for my small-town hospitals just to prove that I am pro-life. I cannot vote against funding for 169 senior citizen meal sites in western Wisconsin just to prove that I am pro-life. I cannot vote against \$2 billion in funding for cancer research, the No. 1 cause of death in western Wisconsin, just to prove that I am pro-life. I cannot vote against a \$140 million increase in vocational education, and I cannot vote against the funding for educational reform for some 40 schools in my district just to prove that I am pro-life.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the political price that I will pay for this vote in the pro-life constituency, but if the choice is between my district's needs and my political future, I cast my vote today for my district's needs and in support of this conference report.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the conference report. I reject the notion that we should decide the fate of the title X Program on any appropriations bill. Since the Supreme Court handed down *Rust versus Sullivan*, the Energy and Commerce Committee has considered and forwarded to the full House H.R. 3090, a bill to overturn the 1988 title X regulations. This was over 3 months ago. I fought H.R. 3090 at committee, and I'm looking forward to fighting it

on the floor of this House. It's scurrilous that some don't want to fight a fair fight, though. They want to confuse the issue by tying this to a bill which contains such good programs as breast cancer and diabetes research funding. I urge my colleagues to reject this underhanded attempt to obfuscate the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that before an abortion could be performed on an unemancipated minor, parental notification should be required. I attempted to add this to H.R. 3090 at committee, but was defeated by the narrowest of margins. I was hoping to bring this to the floor of the House as well, in the hopes that the full House would show more common sense. But this conference report has no such safeguards for the girl. This bill's language is tantamount to saying "the Federal Government knows better what is good for your daughter than you do. You do not count in this very private decision of your 13-year-old daughter. Your daughter does not need the benefit of your love and care. Our federally funded medical technocrats have a much better idea about what is best for your daughter." This notion must be rejected.

Parental involvement works. The American Journal of Public Health details the effect the Minnesota parental notification law had on abortion and birth rates. The study concluded that for teens affected by the law, "the abortion rate falls dramatically after the enactment of the law" and, "birth rates decreased in all age categories following enactment of the law *** however, the decline was most pronounced in 15- to 17- and 18- to 19-year-old women." Prof. James Rogers who led the study concluded that "it appears that parental notification has encouraged responsible sexual behavior among teenagers in Minnesota."

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this is not a free speech issue as some would have you believe. Now I'm directly quoting the court in *Rust versus Sullivan*:

The Secretary's regulations do not force the title X grantee to give up abortion-related speech; they merely require that the grantee keep such activities separate and distinct from title X activities."

Furthermore, how can anyone possibly claim that forcing a pro-life physician to counsel for, refer for, make the appointment for, and provide the transportation to an abortion is free speech?

Mr. Speaker, over and over again you've heard, and will continue to hear that the Federal Government shouldn't be involved in this private decision of females. How true. By upholding the 1988 regulations we are ensuring that the Federal Government remains out of the decision entirely. You can't possibly believe the Federal Government will be out of this process when it's

paying for the decisionmaking process. Vote to keep the Government out of the abortion business. Vote against the conference report.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report because of the repeal of the title X regulations.

It is time to tell the truth about the title X regulations. The best way of getting to the truth is to read them. Here's what the regulations have to say about providing health options:

Because title X funds are intended only for family planning, once a client served by a title X project is diagnosed as pregnant, she must be referred for appropriate prenatal and/or social services by furnishing a list of available providers that promote the welfare of mother and unborn child. She must also be provided with information necessary to protect the health of mother and unborn child until such time as the referral appointment is kept. In cases in which emergency care is required, however, the title X project shall be required only to refer the client immediately to an appropriate provider of emergency medical services.

Mr. Speaker, to the contrary much rhetoric surrounding this issue, the regulations clearly require that a client's health care needs be met. It also makes clear that doctors are to provide emergency health advice and referral to pregnant women even if it results in abortion.

The regulations which will be in effect under the provisions of the bill would require counselors to counsel for abortions even if it is against their conscience. Abortion is not family planning.

I invite my colleagues to actually read these regulations before the vote which will determine their fate. A reading of them is their own best defense.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report, and my major reason for doing so is my deep objection to the gag rule which this addresses.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. EARLY].

□ 1430

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2707, the fiscal 1992 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

I want to complement the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of our subcommittee, who did such a fine job under very difficult circumstances.

I also want to acknowledge the fine work of the gentleman from Michigan. This was his first full year as ranking

minority member. It has not been an easy year for our subcommittee, and without his leadership and hard work we would not have a bill that addresses some of the many critical problems that face our Nation.

The conference agreement provides \$1.5 billion for the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program—\$575 million more than the budget request, but \$600 million less than we provided in fiscal year 1985.

It provides \$825 million for the child care block grant. The increase will provide an additional 40,000 slots for working families.

In the area of health: The agreement provides an \$80 million increase for childhood immunization programs. It includes \$650 million for the maternal and child health block grant, \$96 million more than requested. The \$733 million increase for the NIH will support increased research on cancer, Alzheimer's, vaccine development, heart, and other diseases.

It includes a substantial increase for women's health research, including funds for the women's health study; for research on endometriosis, uterine fibroids, and the effects and cancer risks of DES; and funds to establish an Intramural and Clinical Laboratory Gynecology Research Program at the NIH Campus and Clinical Center.

It provides a \$275 million increase for the NCI to fund urgently needed research in areas such as breast, ovarian, cervical, and prostate cancer.

Yet, we will be funding at less than a 30 percent success rate for investigator initiated research grants, and many approved and promising clinical trials will still go unfunded.

It provides increased resources for community health centers, the only access to health care that many Americans have, and for health prevention programs.

There is \$3.1 billion provided for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration, including increases for the State Block Grant Program and for prevention.

In the area of education: The conference agreement provides a total of \$6.7 billion for compensatory education programs, including \$6.1 billion, or \$577 million more than fiscal year 1991, for chapter I grants to local school systems; there is a \$239 million increase for special education programs; \$2.1 billion is provided for rehabilitation services; almost \$6.9 billion is provided for campus-based student aid programs, and \$2.7 billion for new guaranteed student loans.

Mr. Speaker, is there enough money in this bill for the health, education, and labor programs so important to the American people? No. Would the conferees liked to have provided greater resources for the broad spectrum of needs addressed by this bill? Yes, if we could have. But, it is an equitable bill,

and the subcommittee has produced the best bill possible given the fiscal limitations it faced.

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman of Kentucky has so often said: This is the people's bill. It provides funds for the health of our citizens, the education of our children, the training and retraining of our work force, and assistance and support for those in need.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve the support of this House, and I urge the adoption of the conference agreement.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I rise in support of this portion of the bill which has tremendous elements to benefit the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on Labor, Health, Human Services, Education, and related agencies appropriations bill, which contains vital funding for the National Institutes of Health [NIH] to continue its program of biomedical research conducted by bench scientists throughout our Nation. The bill contains \$9 billion in 1992 funding for the NIH. I urge my colleagues to invest in America and reduce the investment deficit.

I want to commend Chairman BILL NATCHER and ranking member CARL PURSELL for their excellent work in bringing this conference report to the floor. Mr. PURSELL has just completed his first year in shepherding this appropriation and he has in all respects been a "good shepherd" and has stepped into to fill the void left by former Member Silvio Conte's untimely death. We all appreciate his effort to take on this role. Last year, I remember the comments of Chairman NATCHER, when he brought this bill to the floor and defended it from attempts to cut the funding, by stating don't cut this bill because it represents all that is really America and valued by the people: Nutrition programs for children and expectant mothers, Head Start for preschool children, job training programs and school loans so that our youth have a future, funding for school facilities and health care, including the program that I have learned so much about over the last year, the National Institutes of Health. For all these reasons, Chairman NATCHER asked his colleagues to support the bill and once again I will do the same, but with a special focus on the NIH as the reason to support the bill.

Since last year, I have cochaired the Biomedical Research Caucus along with Representatives BILL RICHARDSON, SONNY CALAHAN, and ROY ROWLAND. We have conducted seven briefings on biomedical research including: Why is there no AIDS vaccine?, The cloning of the cystic fibrosis gene, research on women's health, heart disease and new treatments for cancer using gene therapy. We were honored to have Chairman NATCHER in attendance and Dr. Bernadine Healy, the first woman Director of the NIH, along with too

many distinguished researchers to mention by name. I have never before met so many winners of the Nobel Prize and the most outstanding minds, that I truly stand in awe of our accomplishments in biomedical research. The United States is No. 1 in this area and in fact this was the topic of our first caucus briefing, to explore the reasons why and to maintain our economic and competitive edge. As I listened and learned, a whole new world unfolded before me that holds the potential of discovering the keys to aging and within the decoding of the behavior of cells, the cure for cancer. I truly mean a new world opened up to me and its potential: The molecular world. The scientists I met are the new "Discoverers—Christopher Columbus" in this molecular sea of our cells. I was told that what we know now about genes and their role in disease and the ability to alter them was not known 10 to 15 years ago and that in 5 years time our knowledge will take another vast leap forward. None of this would be possible without the funding scientists receive from the NIH.

I was greatly impressed that the four Nobel Prize winners that I met Drs. Varmus, Bishop, Nathans, and Brown all stated that they were introduced to biomedical research by the research efforts of the NIH. They are funded by the NIH to carry out their research. Unlike the social programs in the bill, the NIH actually creates industry and jobs. We taxpayers not only get treatment for disease but a favorable return on our financial investment. One caucus briefing was on the emerging biotechnology industry, an offshoot of NIH funded research on DNA replication. The positive results from NIH funding are such that I think we should double our investment in the area. I am gathering data now on the financial returns, and I'll put it in the RECORD when I get them.

There is only one possible cloud on the NIH funding for 1992, if it is not planned appropriately. Over \$432 million of NIH funding for 1992 is not to be obligated until September 30, 1992. This will enable CBO to score the funds for 1993 and keep the bill within the budget agreement limits for outlays. Obviously, this may create a pinch in 1993, if the limits are not adjusted, but I'm not addressing this now. I am concerned that research grants not be unduly delayed by NIH in 1992. There was a rumor that the \$442 million in delayed obligation would be placed totally on the extramural grant program by NIH, thereby delaying grant awards for many months. I urge Dr. Healy and the NIH administration to spread out the impact of delayed obligations so that one program is not severely impacted, particularly one that has brought us so much glory. I am certain that this result may be accomplished with adequate planning by NIH.

I commend again the work of the subcommittee and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill. Your vote today in favor of the bill is a vote in favor of America: Invest in America, invest in biomedical research and reduce the investment deficit.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious vote for all of us. It is an especially serious vote for the 95 Republicans who voted for

this bill when it passed the House the first time.

I would say to my colleagues who want to vote against this bill because they believe their pro-life principles require it, I would say that the Secretary's memorandum demonstrates that we must all vote for this bill to delay the implementation of the gag rule for 1 year. This is why: That memorandum is more destructive than anything that has preceded it. Listen to what it says, listen carefully: "If a woman is found to be pregnant and to have a medical problem, she should be referred to complete medical care."

Mr. Speaker, if a woman is pregnant, should she not be referred to complete medical care? Does she have to have another medical problem as well? Do we have any instances or can we cite a single situation in which a male in America who needs medical attention is not allowed to be referred for medical attention until he has another illness?

Listen to what this says, and this is the Secretary's own language: "If a woman is found to be pregnant and to have a medical problem;" I urge my colleagues to support the bill and defer the implementation of the gag amendment.

I echo the comments and pleas of the other Members who have pointed to all of the important programs this legislation funds and to their great impact on people's lives and opportunities. I would remind the Members that the budget gimmickry affects only 2 percent of a \$205 billion budget. Do we ever do anything better than 98 percent? Members that voted for this bill on its first time through this body voted for such gimmickry and are only faced at this time with a bit more mischief for next year's budget than originally.

I urge support of the Labor and Health and Human Services conference agreement.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully rise today in opposition to this conference report. As many of my colleagues know, I am the first Congresswoman to be diagnosed with breast cancer while in office. I understand what has been said by advocates of breast cancer research and have fought hard for programs that will work toward finding a cure for this deadly disease. This conference report calls for funding for several worthwhile and essential programs. Among these funds are a recommendation for \$50 million for breast and cervical cancer control programs, \$135 million for the preventive health services block grant, and funding for the National Cancer Institute. Language in the conference report urges the Institute to increase attention to breast, ovarian, cervical, and prostate cancer.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no reason to believe that funding for cancer, diabetes, education, impact aid, or any other program will be affected by a promised Presidential veto of the legislation in its current form. These programs enjoy overwhelming support and will certainly be protected in the final version of the Labor-HHS-Education bill.

I find it disturbing that despite the fact that for months, the Senate and the House have had other vehicles available to challenge the title X regulations, the Labor-HHS-Education conference report has been chosen instead and has caused these vital programs to be entangled in a heated and unnecessary debate. This has been done in hopes that those who support the many important programs contained in the conference report will vote in favor of the bill in spite of our views against the abortion provisions therein.

It is important to note that if the conference report is adopted in its current form, title X grantees will be required to refer for abortion as a method of family planning in order to receive Federal funds. Federally funded clinic personnel—most of whom are not doctors—will receive congressional sanction to schedule the time for an abortion, arrange transportation to the abortion clinic, seek private funding for the abortion, and followup to make sure the abortion was obtained. I believe that this active involvement in obtaining an abortion by federally funded clinic personnel is entirely inappropriate.

Voting against this conference report to retain current title X regulations will not reduce funds for family planning programs by one penny. The money taken from organizations which will not comply with the regulations will be redirected to family planning organizations which do not promote abortion as a method of birth control within the context of the title X program.

Once the President's veto of this legislation is sustained, I am confident that the proabortion provision currently in this legislation will be stripped out of the bill. A cleaned up bill will enjoy our strong support and will certainly be signed into law by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on this conference report so that we can speedily sustain a Presidential veto and bring this bill back to the floor in order to provide the funding for these programs that is so desperately needed.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation before us, because I believe it is a bill that definitely meets the needs of the people of this Nation.

It does, in fact, increase funds for health and education, for medical research, for Alzheimer's disease, for cancer, and for AIDS. It also increases funds for community health programs throughout the Nation that meet the health needs of communities all over the United States.

While I believe that this is an excellent bill, I must at this time reiterate my disappointment that no funding was made available for the State legalization impact aid grants, known as SLIAG's, and this is for the year 1992. Funding, instead, was deferred to 1993. Not only are SLIAG health care services in great demand, but the educational program made available to aliens through SLIAG are a prerequisite to obtaining citizenship.

I am deeply concerned Congress has not upheld its promise to assist these immigrants in their quest for citizenship.

I still urge support of the legislation. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2707, the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992.

I am pleased that this appropriations bill provides many significant increases within the Department of Labor, especially additional funds for the Job Corps Program. The expansion of existing centers and implementation of new programs will allow additional young persons to receive training and a new opportunity. Also within the Department of Labor, the migrant and seasonal farmworkers programs received an increase of more than \$7 million to augment existing services for these workers. The number of farmworkers who are potentially eligible for, and who need these services, has grown significantly in recent years. This funding increase is a step forward in meeting this additional demand. I also commend the conferees for providing an increase for the Community Service Employment Program for Older Americans.

Within the Health Resources and Services Administration, the conferees expressed their interest in prioritizing services to minority communities in several key areas. The community health centers along with migrant community health centers received a substantial increase to be used, in part, for the healthy start initiative.

The Hispanic and Native American Centers of Excellence both received increases in appropriations and report language specifying that additional centers be established to better serve these communities. These minority centers of excellence seek to improve recruitment and retention of minority students in the medical and health professions. The centers will focus on removing cultural, education, and other barriers that historically have discouraged Hispanic and minority students from pursuing the health professions and have impeded Hispanic communities from receiving quality health care.

Moneys were also provided within the centers for disease control for a tuberculosis demonstration project that will target underserved minority and inner-city communities in an effort to immunize all children for TB.

I am pleased that the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education appropriations bill continues to strengthen the Ryan White AIDS care programs by adding \$55.7 million to the three titles. The increased funding in title I will allow additional urban centers to receive emergency assistance to combat this deadly epidemic. The conferees also provided increased funding for the reimbursement to dental schools for services provided to HIV/AIDS infected patients. These funds also provide an increase for the special projects of national significance to support the priority areas designated by HRSA, especially mental health, rural and native American priorities.

I remain dedicated to a Federal commitment that ensures continued research and services in the area of Alzheimer's disease and I am pleased that the Alzheimer's care grants now received funding for needed demonstration projects, training, and research. Grants such as this demonstrate our understanding of the growing problem and our commitment to finding its solution.

Included in this appropriations bill is a significant increase for the National Institute on Aging. These moneys will be dedicated not only for Alzheimer's research, but also to other high priority areas such as osteoporosis, incontinence, minority aging initiatives, the Claude D. Pepper centers, and frailty research.

As a member of the conference, I take particular pride in the increases for research on illness that affect women. Within the National Institutes on Health, the National Cancer Institute was substantially increased, and the agency was directed to spend this increase on breast, ovarian and prostate cancer. The NCI will be working in conjunction with other institutes to expand research initiatives in the field of women's health.

I commend the conferees for sustaining adequate funding for a variety of aging programs under the Older Americans Act such as nutrition, elder abuse, transportation services, social services, and ombudsmen activities. I am pleased to report an increase of \$3 million for the elder abuse and ombudsmen programs, and will continue to advocate for the authorized funding level for the other facets of the Older Americans Act.

The Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related services appropriations conference committee has demonstrated its commitment to the education of our nation by providing significant increases in many education programs. The appropriations for chapter I and impact aid increased substantially, allowing for further assistance to disadvantaged children and school districts. Bilingual education also received an increase of over \$27 million, \$12 million of which will be used to fund competitive grants for communities with large numbers of new immigrants. Domestic activities within international education programs and urban community service grants as well as the Star School Program are three other areas which received the renewed focus of the conferees and increases in funding.

Lastly, I feel that I must reiterate my disappointment that no funding was made available for the State legalization impact aid grants [SLIAG] for fiscal year 1992 and funding was deferred to fiscal year 1993. Not only

are SLIAG health care services in great demand, but the educational programs made available to legalized aliens through SLIAG are a prerequisite to obtaining citizenship. I am deeply concerned that Congress has not upheld its promise to assist these immigrants in their quest for citizenship. Mr. Speaker, both Congressman NATCHER and Senator HARKIN are honorable men; men who keep their word, and follow through on their obligations. Both chairmen have given their word that SLIAG will receive funding in fiscal year 1993. I continue to have faith that next year, when we bring this appropriations bill to conference again, the conferees will remember their pledge to provide funds for the SLIAG program in fiscal year 1993. However, I must state that if SLIAG funding is not intact for fiscal year 1993, I as well as my fellow members of the California delegation, will have great difficulty voting for the passage of next year's appropriations bill.

For the legislation before us, I urge my colleagues to support this conference agreement.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], who has followed this committee for the last couple of years.

□ 1440

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern many people have expressed today with the provisions of the so-called gag rule.

I rise today to compliment and to thank the chairman, the ranking member and other members of this subcommittee, for what they have done, particularly for cancer.

Fifty years ago the primary treatment for cancer was surgery, but because we have made an investment in research in the past 50 years, we have come a long way. Many people are alive today because of that research. My wife happens to be one of those people, so I speak with some experience.

Mr. Speaker, this committee has come a long way. It has done a good job on this particular bill. Cancer is rapidly becoming the No. 1 killer in this country from disease-caused deaths. So this committee this time is going to keep some people alive. It is going to continue the research. I am told by the NCI, Dr. Sam Broder, that we are going to continue research into better treatment to keep people alive who might not otherwise have survived, but particularly research for examining therapy, which holds a lot of promise that maybe we can find out the causes of cancer so that we can prevent cancer. Now we are just trying to treat it, but maybe we can prevent it sometime in the future.

So, Mr. Speaker, this bill does contain a lot of good. I am sorry that the so-called gag rule was still provided. I wish we had not done that, but we cannot wait for research and the other good things this bill contains.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from California [Mr. DANNE-MEYER].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report.

As the senior Republican on the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, I have been intimately involved in the efforts to preserve the controversial family planning regulations from congressional attempts to introduce abortion counseling and referral into that Federal program. In that capacity, I have followed this debate in the media and have been disappointed by the widespread misrepresentations that have found their way into print and onto the airwaves. I would like to correct some of the most oft stated and repeated myths about the title X family planning program.

EFFECT ON LOW-INCOME WOMEN

Opponents of the title X regulations argue that they deny constitutional protection to low-income women. This is simply untrue. Low-income women can obtain abortion counseling and referrals from any physician or hospital that accepts Medicaid patients. The Hyde amendment, of course, prohibits the Medicaid program from funding abortions, but contains no restrictions with respect to counseling and referrals. In addition, pregnant women whose incomes are too high to qualify for Medicaid benefits can obtain these services through their private insurance plans.

The only group of women who may feel shut out by the title X regulations are minors from middle and upper income families whose parents have private health insurance, but who want to obtain an abortion without their parents' knowledge. Unlike pregnant minors who actually come from impoverished backgrounds, these women are not eligible for Medicaid. Unless they seek counseling covered through their family's health insurance, they may have nowhere to turn but to the local title X clinic, which must treat even a minor from a millionaire's family as poor for the purposes of program eligibility.

FREE SPEECH AND THE DOCTOR-PATIENT RELATIONSHIP

Opponents of the title X regulations have also made the point that the regulations torpedo the right of free speech within the doctor-patient relationship. Again, I must take issue with this assertion. If the title X program were a comprehensive health program for women, rather than a program limited to the provision of pre-pregnancy family planning services, this point might be a legitimate one. But, the title X program is not, and never has been, a substitute for Medicaid or comprehensive health care provided through the private sector. In fact, according to Assistant Secretary for Health James Mason, M.D., fewer than 20 percent of all title X patients are actually counseled or examined by a licensed physician.

Chief Justice Rehnquist addressed the question of the doctor-patient relationship in the Rust versus Sullivan decision, which upheld the constitutionality of those regulations, and concluded:

Nothing in the title X regulations requires a doctor to represent as his own any opinion that he does not in fact hold. Nor is the doctor-patient relationship established by the title X program sufficiently all-encompassing so as to justify an expectation on the

part of the patient of comprehensive medical care.

Simply put, the title X program is so narrow in scope—the provision of pre-pregnancy family planning services—that it precludes any credible discussion of the “doctor-patient” relationship.

PROTECTING THE LIFE OF THE MOTHER

Remarkably, the opponents of the regulations raise an issue which both the title X regulations and the Supreme Court have laid to rest—the question whether the prohibition on abortion counseling and referrals ties the hands of a physician who wants to refer a pregnant woman for a medically necessary abortion.

Section 1008 of the title X statute prohibits the use of title X funds in any program “where abortion is a method of family planning.” As Chief Justice Rehnquist held in Rust:

Abortion counseling as a ‘method of family planning’ is prohibited, and it does not seem that a medically necessitated abortion in such circumstances would be the equivalent of its use as a ‘method of family planning.’ Neither Section 1008 nor the specific regulations would apply. Moreover, the regulations themselves contemplate that a Title X project would be permitted to engage in otherwise prohibited abortion-related activity in such circumstances.

Specifically, section 59.8(a)(2) of the regulations includes an exemption for emergency care and requires title X projects to “refer the client immediately to an appropriate provider of emergency medical services.” I support this requirement; indeed, to the best of my knowledge, no one opposes it.

Why, then, do the organizations opposed to these regulations argue that the regulations pose a threat to women who face life-threatening complications from a pregnancy?

MEDICAL MALPRACTICE

Finally, those opposed to the regulations argue that the title X regulations will force physicians to commit medical malpractice. Again, I find this assertion to be without merit.

As already stated, the title X regulations require physicians to refer the woman for emergency care where the pregnancy threatens the woman's health. By definition, then, the prohibition on abortion counseling and referral applies only where the woman would choose abortion for reasons other than the protection of her health. This being the case, under what circumstances would issues relating to medical malpractice arise?

CONCLUSION

The fundamental question arising out of the Rust decision is whether the American taxpayer should subsidize the promotion of abortion as a method of family planning. Like the vast majority of Americans, I do not believe that abortion should be used as a backup method of birth control. To me, abortion is morally acceptable only where the life of the mother is at risk.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I commend him for a wonderful job done in very difficult circumstances. I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce my support for H.R. 2707. This bill provides much-

needed support for Americans everywhere. The bill appropriates over \$205 billion for programs such as the National Institutes of Health, OSHA, special education, low-income energy assistance, SLIAG, bilingual and immigrant education, and the Centers for Disease Control.

The Labor-HHS report will provide over \$297 million for the Childhood Immunization Program. This is more than \$80 million above last year's allotment. This funding should help us reach children all over the country who have not been immunized for measles, mumps, whooping cough, and rubella.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is perhaps the most significant and supportive bill that will come across the President's desk this year.

And he may not sign it. He is caught up in the political hype over the gag rule. The gag rule, is a slanted, awful attempt to silence federally funded family planning clinics. Family planning clinics will not be allowed to provide honest, sound medical advice to their clients as they have since the title X program began in 1970. Under the gag, medical doctors will be forced to abandon the standard ethical medical policy of telling patients about all medical options; and instead doctors must tell a pregnant woman that she may have her child and keep it or give it up for adoption. Let's face it: Clinics will no longer take Federal funds and in many areas safe abortions will be impossible to find. We owe it to the poor women of this country to pass this bill, thus providing necessary services to the needy, and overturn the gag of the Reagan administration.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ROWLAND].

Mr. ROWLAND. Mr. Speaker, the gag rule is not an issue about whether or not an individual can have an abortion. It is an issue about whether or not people who work in family planning clinics are gagged. It is an issue about whether or not we interpose ourselves between physicians and those people who work in family clinics and the patient.

I can tell you that there are many patients who come to family planning clinics who have diseases that later in pregnancy may be life-threatening to them, and it is very important for the physician to be able to give all the information that he has to that patient so that patient can make an informed decision about what they will do.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, it also poses a malpractice liability threat to the physician and those people who work in family planning clinics not to be able to provide all the information that is available to them to that patient.

There have already been cases of wrongful births because physicians have not advised individuals about all of the options they have available when they are pregnant.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this conference report.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the conference report on the appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, which, among other things, would bar the enforcement of the title X gag rule.

It appears that the issue of the gag rule is finally understood: No Federal funding can flow to any health agency which even mentions abortion as one of a woman's legal options concerning her pregnancy except to save the life of the mother. No matter how sick she is, no matter if she is carrying a seriously malformed fetus, no matter what her desperate condition might be. In other words, a woman with diabetes, AIDS, or cancer could not be told of all of her options, regardless of what it could mean to the health of the mother if she were to carry her pregnancy to term.

The memorandum sent to Secretary Sullivan by President Bush does nothing to change that. If anything, this memo indicates that there is a realization in the White House that the gag rule is bad public policy.

This is not an abortion issue. In fact, the overwhelming majority of women who walk into a title X clinic are not seeking an abortion or abortion-related services or counseling. Mr. Speaker, this is a family planning issue.

This issue is worded very carefully in the law right now. It says that no money can flow to organizations that promote abortion as a means of family planning. Well, no organization does that, and no one here supports that.

The gag rule limits the information that a woman in a title X clinic can receive about all of her legal options concerning her pregnancy. If the gag rule goes into effect, the only response that can be given to someone in a title X clinic who asks about the option of abortion is: "Abortion is not an appropriate method of family planning."

Mr. Speaker, this issue is not about abortion. It is about denying a woman information about all of the legal options concerning her pregnancy. The President's memorandum does nothing to change that. I urge my colleagues to join with me to prohibit the implementation of the gag rule.

Mr. Speaker, it is the right thing to do, and the time to do it is now.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker and my colleague, do not be misled. All the good things in this bill, and there are good things in this bill, will be retained after the offensive abortion baggage is excised and the President vetoes it and we sustain his veto. It will go back to him with all the cancer research and all the good things in it, as it has on five previous occasions when similar vetoes were had.

I salute the chairman. There is nobody I admire as much as the gen-

tleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]. It is painful for me to have to say vote "no" on this issue, but the defense of innocent preborn human life to me is a transcendent issue. It is not a political issue.

This country is divided, very divided on this issue, but abortion is not a legitimate method of family planning, because it involves the intentional destruction of an unborn human life. Family planning is meant to prevent or promote pregnancy, not to promote extermination of a pregnancy.

This issue is about abortion, not about a gag rule. If you read the President's memorandum which was sent to you, you will find that the doctor is not gagged, and I really regret the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut who only read a part of this document. It is axiomatic in interpreting a document that you read the whole document. You do not excise or excerpt a part of it. Nothing in these regulations is to prevent a woman from receiving complete medical information about her condition from a physician.

See, the hooker here is the President says a physician. The doctor-patient relationship shall be unimpaired.

Oh, but Planned Parenthood wants the receptionist, wants a nurse's aid, wants a counselor to steer these women to abortion mills, to abortion clinics. That is what this is all about.

Now, counselors, whom they refer to as medical personnel, I think we ought to know a little something about counselors.

Now, a preliminary report on the counseling function in affiliates of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, and this is a Planned Parenthood document, so let us see what they say about these counselors who are going to steer pregnant women to abortion mills. They say:

Data from nearly 500 individual counselor profiles gives a clear picture of a counseling staff which is largely young and inexperienced, much of it working unpaid and probably using PPFA employment for training, experience and preparation for other jobs in the future. Counselors' formal training is relatively modest.

So they want medical advice steering abortions from these counselors.

The President has said and Secretary Sullivan has agreed that the doctor-patient relationship is ungagged. A doctor can give comprehensive medical advice to anybody who is pregnant who comes in to a family planning clinic. That is not enough for Planned Parenthood. They would want the nurses' aids, the counselors, to do the steering, to make the abortion appointment, to provide the transportation to the abortion clinic, and they want people who are not medical doctors to give a woman medical advice.

Abortion is not a proper part of family planning. This is a family planning program. This is what we are paying for.

Now, the Porter amendment in this legislation, and that is why I want you to vote "no," will reverse the regulations and turn the program into a funnel for abortion with so-called counselors mandated to do the steering.

The doctor-patient issue, the gag has been ungagged, if it ever was there, and it is off the table.

Now, do not tell me there is not notice of abortion clinics. Go to the yellow pages in your offices. They leap up at you. They are prolific. The yellow pages from Maryland, from Virginia, from the District of Columbia, bristle with abortion clinics, so they are there, but do not claim to be pro-life and vote "yes," because you will be supporting a program that makes the abortion referral, sets up the appointment, provides the transportation and the followup. That is pro-death. That is not pro-life.

I tell you, by voting "no," you are not destroying this bill. You are saving it. It should not have been weighted down with this baggage, this abortion baggage. It does not belong in this bill, and the President will veto it and it will come back to him without this baggage.

Look, abortion is so degrading. It degrades the unborn. It deprives him or her of its humanity, of its dignity. It deprives the mother of her dignity. It deprives the doctor, the abortionist, of any dignity and it degrades the society that tolerates abortion.

So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, a "no" vote is the pro-life vote and you can have both, the good programs and save unborn children.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

□ 1450

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the controversial part of the Labor/HHS bill this year has not been money but title X, or so we are led to believe. I am reminded of the day when I was sitting in the chair of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] and arguing and arguing and arguing over money, money, money. And the next day billions of dollars—the next day, in the press, having the deliberations covered, not one line about money, only about maybe the abortion issue.

Now, again you never read much in the press today on this bill about delayed obligations. It is one of those esoteric budget terms we love so much and which have no meaning, quite frankly, beyond the beltway. What it

means is appropriating funds in one year but delaying the actual expenditures until the next year, and, quite frankly, it is an out and out gimmick, let us face it. This conference report is full of delayed obligations, over \$4 billion, to be exact.

Take the low-income energy assistance program as an example of this gamesmanship. The conferees would like you to believe that they are making \$1.8 billion available for this program in fiscal 1992, an increase of \$200 million over last year. Sounds nice, does it not? Oh, it is beautiful.

In reality, \$400 million of that total is not available for expenditure this year because it has been shifted into next year.

Another \$300 million is contingent upon the President declaring an emergency, thus exempting the expenditure from the budget cap.

But we all know the President is not going to do that. The result, therefore, is not an increase of \$200 million but actually a reduction of \$500 million in the amount of assistance people will receive this year. Only in the Congress can you add \$200 million to \$1.6 billion and come up with less than you started with.

What we have here is a legislative shell game, now you see it, now you don't, presto, gusto, sleight of hand. We ought not to be surprised. The chief negotiator from the other body was obviously wearing two hats. His Presidential campaign manager, from all reports, was in the conference calling the shots. Is that the majority version of truth-in-governing? If it is, all I can say is Katy bar the door and hold on to your pocketbooks, your wallets and your silverware.

I am proud to say that our House Republican conferees stood up against these shenanigans at the appropriate time. I only wish we had more support in that conference.

If we are ever to gain control over our budgetary excesses and restore respect to this Congress, this conference report today ought to be voted down initially and then go on to doing the business in a right and appropriate and proper way.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL].

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be as honest about this and remind the Members that this practice was initiated by OMB. And I have discussed that with OMB. So the fault does not lie entirely with Members on either side of the aisle but it really started, Mr. Leader, with OMB. I agree 100 percent that this gimmick ought to be corrected because it is seriously going to jeopardize our outlay numbers next year.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman full well knows, having

served with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for some 24 years on that committee—no disrespect to any one of our Members here—just that we have always had our differences and arguments, particularly on this bill where there are so many billions and billions of dollars involved, that we have had the right to say what we really felt was appropriate on that occasion. That is what this Member felt he ought to say today.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report and commend the chairman for his outstanding work and the work of his subcommittee.

This bill contains funding for our Nation's most critical domestic programs—labor, health, and education. The programs in this bill touch the lives of every American.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I would like to express my particular appreciation to Chairman NATCHER for the enormous effort he has made again this year to increase funding for our Nation's education programs. The conference report is once again a tribute to his foresight and determination to see that America's schools become the best in the world.

This bill will also have a profound effect on the 5 million American women who rely on federally funded title X clinics for family planning services. The bill overturns the administration's gag rule regulations which prevent women from getting information about all of their medical options when facing an unintended pregnancy.

The facts are plain and simple. The gag rule puts the quality of health care in jeopardy and infringes on our fundamental rights to free speech and to choose safe, legal abortion.

Make no mistake about it: Over 20 medical organizations, including the American Medical Association, agree that the gag rule prohibits doctors from exercising their first amendment rights to give patients full information about their health care. Even if a woman asks about abortion, even if she has a medical condition such as diabetes, AIDS or heart disease that would be aggravated by a pregnancy, she could not be told that abortion is a legal option. It would not even be legal to tell her where to go to get abortion information. Don't let the extremists fool you. This regulation goes against the very grain of medical ethics and effectively requires doctors to violate the principles of their Hippocratic oath.

Moreover, title X clinics are the sole source of health care for many low-income women. Women rely on these clinics, not only for family planning but for cancer and sexually transmitted disease screening, prenatal, and general medical care. Many of these clinics have indicated that they will reduce services or shut down completely rather than censor information given to their clients. Such a result will be devastating and can only lead to more Americans having reduced access to health care.

All across the Nation, American citizens are making clear that they are tired of worrying if

they can afford to go to the doctor. Americans have had enough of the fear of catastrophic medical costs. The triumph of title X clinics is that they provide preventive care that reduces unintended pregnancies, that catches cancer early, and that ensures healthy babies. In fact, studies have shown that every dollar spent on family planning saves over \$4 in medical costs down the road. Certainly this Congress should not be in the business of eliminating this essential health care service.

This bill is also important to American women and their families because it contains important funding for women's health research. The conference report calls on the National Cancer Institute to make breast, ovarian, and cervical cancer a research priority. These diseases, which affect thousands of American women and their families, have received totally insufficient attention in the past, and this bill is designed to rectify that.

You have all heard the statistics, but have you listened to a constituent who is or knows a cancer survivor? One of my constituents is the daughter of a breast cancer survivor. Her moving words say what the statistics cannot.

She writes,
My mother taught me years ago right from wrong; how to protect our resources; war hurts both sides; you've got to help the little guy. I've watched her learn to cross country ski, perform clowning for children, climb among the Navajo ruins, all in the last 5 years. If it hadn't been for the early detection of breast cancer, my mom wouldn't have done any of those things. Thanks to early detection, she's been around to inspire my whole family. She urged me to write to ask for more research dollars for low-cost early detection screening. Mom says, "It's horrible, they've made practically no advances in the research in the last 20 years." Let me tell you my mom's rarely wrong. Are moms ever wrong? Please devote energy, time and your influence for this cause.

Today is the day for us to use our influence for this life-saving cause. For my constituent's mother, and for all of our mothers, daughters, sisters, aunts, spouses, and friends, vote for this bill. It is a vote to help American families remain whole and to avoid incredible pain and tragedy.

Another key provision of this conference report will provide \$478 million in vital funding for our Nation's community health centers and transfer an additional \$49 million from other programs to supplement our support for their important work. These centers provide much-needed health services to communities where these services would not otherwise be available, and they respond to particularly vulnerable populations in our society. It is absolutely critical that the Congress continue to provide them with the support they need.

I also want to congratulate the chairman and all of the conferees for their leadership in including provisions to nearly triple funding for community lead screening and lead poisoning prevention activities. As many of my colleagues know, the Centers for Disease Control earlier this year concluded that even trace amounts of lead in the bloodstream can cause serious and irreversible brain damage in children. Accordingly, the CDC has substantially lowered the standard for allowable blood levels of lead in children.

In many communities where the risk of lead poisoning is considered high, including West-

chester County, the new CDC guidelines will necessitate screening large numbers of children, a job beyond the means of many local health departments. The conferees have agreed to fund Federal grants for lead screening in fiscal year 1992 at \$23 million, up from last year's level of \$7.79 million. This funding is sorely needed. During the last fiscal year, for example, Westchester County submitted a successful application for lead screening assistance only to find that all the funds in the program had been exhausted before their application was reached in the priority rankings.

By nearly tripling the funding for lead screening grants, the conferees have made an important contribution in the fight against the No. 1 environmental health threat facing American children. The additional funding will help ensure that adequate resources are available to support worthy lead screening and lead poisoning prevention programs such as the one being administered by Westchester County.

Finally, I would also like to commend Chairman NATCHER for his enormous foresight in supporting the Community Food and Nutrition Program [CFNP] which will receive \$7 million under the conference report. CFNP is a small but extremely effective program that is the only source of Federal funding for local and statewide antihunger efforts. The increase in funding provided in the conference report will help ensure that children around the Nation have access to desperately needed anti-hunger programs. This increase is vital in a year in which the community childhood hunger identification project [CCHIP] conservatively estimates that 5.5 million low-income children are hungry and as many as 11.5 million children are either hungry or at risk of being hungry.

Chairman NATCHER and the other conferees clearly understand the link between nutrition and a child's educational performance. In addition to the obvious health concerns, hungry children are more likely than their peers to suffer from fatigue, irritability, and concentration problems while at school. These interrelated problems of nutrition and learning require a comprehensive approach. Under the conference report, this will be possible, and the CFNP Program will help many more children reach their educational potentials.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains innumerable improvements in many programs which are essential to the people of our Nation. It is once again a testament to the hard work and commitment of Chairman NATCHER and the entire Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee. I would urge all of my colleagues to support this worthy conference report.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of the conference report and with gratitude for the committee on its strong support in the name of the people of the District of Columbia.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I rise in strong support of the gentleman's bill, the people's bill, and I ask for an "aye" vote.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of final passage of H.R. 2707, the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies conference report for fiscal year 1992.

First, I must applaud the subcommittee chairman, Congressman BILL NATCHER, as well as his subcommittee staff, for the commendable job that they have done drafting this legislation. We all know how difficult it is to put this particular bill together. Yet, Chairman NATCHER has managed to fund many vital programs, in spite of this year's tremendous budget constraints.

H.R. 2707 is a pro-family bill with a heavy focus on funding basic benefits and services for American women and children. H.R. 2707 contains a \$250 million increase for Head Start, which provides mental and physical development services for low-income children and their families. This increase will enable Head Start to serve an additional 39,000 children this year, still only 27 percent of those eligible. H.R. 2707 also includes the foster care and adoption assistance program, infant mortality initiatives, the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant Program and family support payments to States, including Aid to Families with Dependent Children [AFDC].

Additionally, a vote for H.R. 2707 is a key women's health vote because H.R. 2707 contains a \$250 million women's health package. There is increased funding for the National Cancer Institute [NCI], with a heavy emphasis on breast, ovarian and cervical cancer, as well as funding for the National Institutes of Health's Office of Research on Women's Health, including the establishment of a comprehensive gynecological and obstetrical research program at the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. There is also new funding for the Centers for Disease Control's expansion of several important women's health programs, such as comprehensive mammography and pap smear screening programs for low-income women in eight States and a nationwide screening program for chlamydia in women and their partners.

H.R. 2707 funds the Department of Education to the tune of \$27.8 billion. This includes a \$577 million increase for chapter 1 grants to school districts for supplemental compensatory education and related services to disadvantaged children. It also funds Even Start's model programs combining early childhood education with adult education for parents and chapter 1, which is for children of migrant workers and neglected and delinquent children.

However, there are those who oppose H.R. 2707. They argue that, because payments for some programs are delayed until fiscal year 1993, the entire bill should be scrapped because it circumvents the budget agreement. But even the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] confirms that this bill is within spending guidelines and does not break the budget agreement. There are some who are willing to reject the whole bill—and all of its vital pro-

grams—under the smokescreen of the budget agreement.

What H.R. 2707's opponents are really opposed to is the provision in the original House and Senate bills which overturns the administration's so-called gag rule. These gag rule regulations leverage Federal funding against family planning clinics in order to deny them the freedom to counsel honestly and objectively. This medical censorship by the Federal Government robs women dependent on Federal funding of their right to know and to choose. It prevents doctors from total disclosure of information that a patient has a right to know. Opponents of H.R. 2707 want to deny poor American women their right to firm, informative, nondirective counseling by people trained to advise women about their reproductive rights and alternatives. So, all this rhetoric about budget gimmicks is really a last-minute effort to divert us from the real issue: they are opposed to an override of the administration's oppressive gag rule policy.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider that a vote against H.R. 2707 is a vote against the women and children of this country. I strongly urge my colleagues to avoid hiding behind the smokescreen of the budget agreement and stand up for what is right. I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2707.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against this bill when it left the House because of the excessiveness of its expenditures. It comes before us again, now, with many additional millions of dollars added; and it is in its present form more than \$4 billion more than the President has budgeted.

Mr. Speaker, a tangential issue has been raised, the matter of the repeal of regulations on abortion advice. These regulations being repealed is not the reason for my negative vote. After all, even if repealed, these regulations are not the controlling matter on Federal spending on the issues already fixed by law. In other words, even if the regulations are repealed, the existing law on the use of Federal funds is not being repealed and new regulations can be drawn that would suit both sides of this abortion argument—that is what should be done.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise to support the legislation and the chairman and to commend him for the good job that the House is going to do today.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding time to me, and I rise in strong support of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2707, the fiscal year

1992 Labor-Health and Human Services-Education bill. I commend Chairman NATCHER, ranking member CARL PURSELL, the members of the subcommittee, and the staff for their hard work on this conference report.

I applaud the subcommittee members for maintaining the language in the conference report barring enforcement of the gag rule which prohibits abortion counseling in federally funded clinics. I also strongly support the increased funding for women's health research. Today's vote is not just about reproductive rights but about women's right to full, accurate information on available health care options and an increased commitment to research on women's health concerns.

The gag rule regulations put our first amendment right of free speech at stake. Not only would the gag rule violate the physician-patient relationship by dictating what can and cannot be said, but poor women would be denied the same rights granted to wealthier women solely because they are unable to pay for a private physician or clinic. We must not create a two-tier health care system by allowing these regulations to be implemented.

The women in our country deserve the health care research funding included in this conference agreement. Women's health care issues have long been disregarded and overlooked. I am optimistic that we may now get serious about breast, ovarian, and cervical cancer research and education.

I am also grateful to Chairman NATCHER and the subcommittee for their thoughtful response in the conference report to the many challenges of the AIDS and drug abuse epidemics. This conference agreement provides increases for the National Institutes of Health, which will allow significant advances in AIDS research. Funding for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration will allow for a continuation of the highly successful AIDS prevention research projects and AIDS outreach prevention programs for injection drug users. The increased funding for drug abuse treatment will hopefully allow local governments to reduce waiting lists and expand drug treatment capacity.

The conference report also goes a long way in fulfilling the promise of the Ryan White Care Act approved by Congress last year. Over the past year, the number of AIDS cases in high impact cities has increased by 32 percent. This conference report responds with emergency assistance to better enable these local governments to cope with this growing crisis.

While there is still more to be done to respond to the AIDS and drug abuse epidemics, especially with prevention outreach efforts, this is a good bill which has set responsible priorities within limited resources imposed by our Federal budget crisis.

Again, I commend Chairman NATCHER for his leadership and I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the chairman and his ranking member for a difficult task. These are

not easy issues that both of them have had to deal with. But I also rise to express the concern about the level of advanced funding, which is a concern that I share as well. But I think that Members need to ask three questions about the question of advanced funding.

The first is: Does it violate the budget agreement? The fact is this committee has brought to the floor a bill that both with regard to budget authority and outlays is well within the 1992 ceilings, and therefore it does not represent a violation of the Budget Act. Nor does it in any way create a risk for sequester.

Second, the question that has to be asked is: Is there a precedent for advanced funding? There sure is.

As the gentleman pointed out, the OMB has led the charge on advanced funding. The President himself asked for \$1.4 billion in this bill with regard to advanced funding.

Mr. Speaker, 5 of the 10 bills we have sent to the President included advanced funding. As a matter of fact, the defense bill which passed the House, the defense appropriation bill, contained \$3.3 billion in advanced funding. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the arguments when that bill came to the floor.

Is this a good practice? In some limited areas, it is a good practice because it provides for continuous funding without disrupting the school year. So there are some points where it makes some sense.

Generally, however, I do share the concern, but here it does not violate the budget agreement. It follows precedents. Very frankly, this bill funds the right priorities for this country.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get right to the heart of the matter by urging each Member to reverse the ill-advised and counter-productive gag rule imposed on federally funded health clinics by voting for the conference report. Requiring doctors and clinic personnel to withhold vital family planning services and medical information is unethical and blatantly wrong.

Every woman has the right to receive complete and accurate information on all aspects of reproductive health. How women respond to that information is their personal decision, no one else's. Government has no right to participate in the intensely private discussions between women and their doctors.

This conference report provides a responsible family-planning measure which guarantees that the education and essential health care services of women are met from the start, thus preventing painful decisions regarding unintended pregnancies.

Nationwide enforcement of HHS title X regulations could destroy federally funded family planning clinics. Their loss will only lead to a greater occurrence of unintended pregnancies, not to mention a decrease in affordable, accessible health care for women.

Clearly, these are not the times to be curbing access to medical care. To support such action is to ignore entirely the American peoples' most pressing concern.

In the final analysis, we should all remember, government should serve our needs, not dictate our choices.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

□ 1500

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, let us focus on what this bill is about. It is about America's health, and it is about America's freedom. It is about real problems of real people, real families; Alzheimer's, cancer, AIDS. A woman's health initiative is included in this bill for the first time.

Mr. Speaker, the American people need this bill, and, if my colleagues do not vote for it, they are voting against something the American people need and want.

Now the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER] says that there is no problem, there is no gag rule in place. Maybe in his dreams. Because in reality there is a gag rule, and this bill overturns it.

The Justice Department said before the Senate Judiciary Committee, and I am quoting now:

"When the Government gives Federal dollars, the Government can control what is said."

This is Big Brother at its worst. If we can tell a physician what to say, tomorrow will we tell a teacher what to say? And then will we tell a policeman what to say? And pretty soon we are all gagged.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important vote for freedom and for health care.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY].

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference bill.

There are those who might suggest that it may be immoral to pass this bill. But while we wait, someone is going to die of cancer, someone is not going to get the Head Start moneys that they need. Another person is not going to have the drug and alcohol abuse programs that they need.

Mr. Speaker, this country is on the brink of moral decay, and we must come to its rescue. We must help them.

For those who say that abortion is the only issue, they miss, I think, a very important aspect of this bill. It is going to help many people, and this is not about abortion. This is about keep-

ing Government out of a decision between an individual and a physician.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleague to remember that the person who holds the scale of justice is a woman. She understands justice as well as we men in this Chamber. There are only 29 women in this Chamber. Let us let the women, as well as the men, determine their fate.

I would urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2707.

This provides funding for many important programs from our schools to women's health care initiatives. However, one of the most important aspects this bill is the provision it does not fund; the so called gag rule.

We know the gag rule prohibits doctors from discussing abortion as an option for an unintended or dangerous pregnancy in title X clinics. But, most important, the gag rule prohibits doctors from telling their patients the complete truth about their health care options. Even in the case when a woman's health is in serious danger because of her pregnancy, a doctor cannot inform her of abortion as a medical option, even if it is to save her own life.

This is not an abortion issue. It is an issue which violates the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship which has been in place for thousands of years. For the 5 million women served each year in federally funded family planning clinics, this issue undermines their right to effective medical care. And for the many health care workers in these clinics, the gag rule limits them in good medical practice. This censorship of our trained and expert medical professionals dictates our choices in health care. This censorship is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will not be the end of the debate over the gag rule. However, it does stop the censorship of doctors for a year, a year in which Congress can discuss abortion counselling policies and determine what is best for patients and doctors on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the conference report and take this first step forward in allowing doctors to tell their patients the truth.

In particular, I commend the House conferees to agreeing to additional funding for Energy Assistance Programs, especially the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP].

By adding \$200 million in funding to LIHEAP, bringing its funding level to \$1.8 billion, we are allowing many people to survive the cold of the winter than before. Many more people, the elderly, the disabled, low-income families, will be able to heat their homes this winter.

While I am concerned that \$400 million of this funds will not be made available until next September, I am pleased that the House conferees sought to agree that at least \$1.8 billion is needed for this crucial program.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the con-

ference report on H.R. 2707, a bill to provide appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for fiscal year 1992. I wish to commend Chairman NATCHER, Chairman WHITTEN, and the conferees for producing what is overall a very fine conference report. This bill, in terms of the health provisions, represents a long-awaited victory for the women of this Nation. This conference report represents a good beginning in Congress' recognition and reversal of the long-standing neglect of women's health concerns at the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Speaker, every hour in this Nation, five American women die of breast cancer—yet, as a Nation, we will invest only \$90 million to combat this killer, and only \$20 million on basic research to find a cure. This year alone, breast cancer will claim the lives of 45,000 American women and over 400 from my hometown, Cleveland, OH. But aside from the human toll, this killer will cost our Nation over \$8 billion in direct and indirect costs this year. We are short-sighted if we do not invest now in finding a cure.

Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions this year I have appealed to the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. NATCHER, and his counterpart in the other body, Senator HARKIN of Iowa, to provide a \$50 million increase for fiscal year 1992 to the National Cancer Institute for research on breast cancer. Both gentlemen assured me that they would make every effort to accommodate this request, and I am pleased with this final result.

Mr. Speaker, I have also taken my appeal to the women of this Nation and they have spoken. Within the last month, the newly formed breast cancer coalition, which includes many groups, both old and new, brought 500,000 letters to Capitol Hill in support of my request. Both Dr. Broder and Chairman NATCHER have assured me that with the additional funds provided in this conference report, the NCI will spend no less than an additional \$42 million, or a 46-percent increase for breast cancer research in fiscal year 1992. The bill will also ensure a 67-percent increase in NCI efforts on ovarian cancer, a 37-percent increase for cervical cancer research, and an essential 100-percent increase on prostate cancer that will affect 122,000 men in this country this year.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished subcommittee chairmen for their diligent efforts to keep their word. I would also like to thank Senator BROCK ADAMS, who introduced the companion to my bill in the other body, for his extensive efforts to secure these funds. I know that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] also deserves our thanks for his effort to ensure strong report language regarding the NCI priority for breast, cervical, and ovarian cancer.

I thank my Select Committee on Aging Chairman, ED ROYBAL, a conferee on this bill for his long-standing support of my work on breast cancer issues, and also for including significant increases in the bill for elder abuse and for the National Institute on Aging. In addition, I appreciate the committee's full funding of \$50 million for the CDC breast and cervical cancer screening initiative authorized last year, \$10 million of the new NIH office of women's research, and \$25 million in seed money for NIH Director Healy's new comprehensive women's health study.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this conference report a great beginning and a major victory in a long enduring battle against the scourge of breast cancer in our Nation. I appreciate the support of all of my colleagues on the congressional caucus for women's issues. I dedicate this victory to the Eleanor Preds and the Rose Kushners of this Nation who have paved the way for others, but are not here to share in this day. I urge all of my colleagues to support this conference report—you will truly make a positive difference in the lives of millions of Americans.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HOLLOWAY].

Mr. HOLLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this conference report. This vote is crucial for two main reasons: It deals with the fact that abortion is very different from family planning. The two should not be confused. Second, this bill undermines the Hyde amendment by allowing federally paid employees to encourage women to have abortions.

It is time to make it clear that abortion is not an acceptable method of birth control. We must allow Federal family planning programs to be involved only in family planning.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report for the Labor-Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill. It provides important funding increases for health and education, and it denies the use of funding in the bill to implement the gag rule.

The final bill includes critical funding for women's health research, including a substantial increase for the new Office of Research on Women's Health. It provides first-year funding for the women's health initiative, the historic long-term study on women's health. It also provides increased funding for basic research on breast, ovarian, and cervical cancer. After many years of neglect, this bill finally recognizes and begins to address the gap in research on women's health.

The conference report retains the Porter language denying the use of the

bill's funding to implement the gag rule. Congress must take every action possible to overturn the Supreme Court decision in *Rust versus Sullivan*. This decision has devastating ramifications for poor women in this country; it will create a class system for women's health by denying poor women full information about their legal reproductive options, while women who can afford private physician care will have complete information and access to these health services.

Thus, this decision will further exacerbate the already insufficient health care available to poor women. They represent the most at-risk population, and yet the gag rule will further erode their ability to obtain health services, even when they are the victims of rape, incest, or life-threatening illnesses.

It will also set a dangerous precedent by denying first amendment rights to health professionals and breaking their obligation to their patients to provide complete information. In fact, this decision is expected to result in the departure of many family planning providers from the title X program, thereby further eroding the health of poor women and increasing the number of unintended pregnancies and abortions.

Family planning providers will have to choose between providing complete information to their clients and losing Federal funding, or providing only Government-approved information in order to receive Federal support. This is not a choice that should have to be made in a free society, a society that prides itself on the right to free speech.

This issue is one that should have the support of every Member of the House, regardless of their view on abortion. It establishes a dangerous system of censorship that could be repeated for any number of Federal programs and it discriminates against poor women. In a health system that already provides inadequate care to low-income people, this decision only widens the gap between the haves and the have nots.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report. I thank Chairman NATCHER and the members of the subcommittee for their hard work in bringing out a bill that manages to fund critical health and education priorities, despite budgetary constraints.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on a \$204 billion bill—that will finance three Government departments for the next fiscal year. Under ordinary circumstances, I might come to the well and argue in favor of the fiscal merits of this bill. After all, with this bill we are financing such programs as child support enforcement, foster care, and child care.

But, we all know that these are not ordinary circumstances. We all know that the fiscal realities of this bill are overshadowed. We all

know that for most of our colleagues this vote will come down to a vote for or against the gag rule.

The gag rule is a 3-year-old rule prohibiting physicians in federally funded clinics from telling women what is law in these United States of America; that abortion is a legal option. Some 3.7 million women in this country are served by federally funded clinics. And because of their economic status or where they live, most of these women have no other medical option. On top of this, an estimated 600,000 of these women have a history of health problems that could make pregnancy dangerous for them.

Yet under the gag rule, a doctor is barred from telling a woman all her legal medical options, even if her life is in danger. Even if her life is in danger. Can you imagine how difficult this is for a doctor, whose professional responsibility it is to best advise his or her patient.

If we fail to pass this bill, we will be sending a loud and clear message to the women—particularly poor women—across this country. The message will be: We in Congress, the men and women you have voted to best represent you, do not care about your first amendment rights, do not care about your doctor-patient relationships, and frankly, do not care very much about your health or your life. Please, let's not send this message. It is wrong; it is unfair; it is dangerous.

Let us pass this bill with an overwhelming majority. We must send an urgent message to the White House that if the President vetoes this bill, he and his advisers will be playing with more than just politics; they will be intervening in the lives of women across this country and denying them information to which they are legally entitled.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this conference report.

Let me say that there are 353 of us on the floor of this House who voted for this bill. Let me suggest to my colleagues that since we did that nothing has changed in this bill. There is no reason for any one of the 353 people who voted to make sure that children in this country were properly immunized, who voted to make sure that NIH did its appropriate research, that voted to have Head Start and chapter I help lift up and give opportunity to young people in America; there is not one reason to change that vote.

Why?

Two issues have been discussed significantly on this floor, one of which is the so-called gag rule. Eight out of ten Americans on every poll are against the gag rule. Eight out of ten Americans polled say that physicians and medical personnel ought to be able to tell people their legal medical options, and not to do so is not proper. Eight out of ten Americans.

The other issue that has been raised on this floor has been the issue of forward funding. As the gentleman from

Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] pointed out, OMB and the President suggested \$1.4 billion in forward funding. When 353 Members of this House, on June 26, voted for health, voted for education, voted for workers safety, there was \$2.9 billion in forward funding, almost \$3 billion. Yes, there is a little more this time because we reached out for additional cancer funds for women's health issues. We reached out for SLIAG to make sure that immigration was taken care of.

Mr. Speaker, 353 Members were correct on June 26, and they will be correct today when they vote yes on the people's bill.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2707. Family planning is not abortion. It is killing human life.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of bringing the Members up to date on where the NATIONAL MARROW DONOR PROGRAM is today.

Mr. Speaker, included in the 1992 Health and Human Services appropriations conference report under consideration today is \$16.3 million in funding to continue the outstanding lifesaving work of the National Marrow Donor Program.

My colleagues should take great pride in the role the Congress has played in establishing and supporting this national and international registry of volunteers who are giving the living gift of life and hope to thousands of men, women, and children who would die from leukemia or one of more than 60 blood disorders now treatable with a marrow transplant.

With funds included in past appropriations bills for the National Institutes of Health and the Navy to fund the operations of the national program and a nationwide donor recruitment campaign, we have more than doubled the size of the registry in the past 12 months and soon will exceed 500,000 volunteers. With the donor rolls increasing at the rate of 20,000 per month, we are experiencing greater success in finding matched donors for patients in need of a transplant. The number of transplants utilizing unrelated donors identified through the registry this year will be double the number completed in 1990. To date, almost 1,000 patients have been a second chance at life with a marrow transplant.

My colleagues also should take great pride in knowing that the National Marrow Donor Program established by this Congress spans the globe and saves lives here and abroad. On 64 occasions, marrow has been harvested from a volunteer in another nation and been transported to the United States for transplant. On another 48 occasions, Americans have donated marrow for patients needing a transplant in Canada and abroad.

The National Marrow Donor Program works, it saves lives, and it gives otherwise terminally

ill patients and their families hope where just a few short years ago there would have been none. The success of this program is measured in the faces of those patients who are alive today because of the generosity of another person willing to donate marrow to a complete stranger.

Just about every day somewhere in our Nation a patient suffering from leukemia or any one of a number of blood cancers is receiving the gift of life in the form of a marrow transplant. It is with great pride that I can report to you that this Saturday, at All Children's Hospital in St. Petersburg, FL, my constituent and friend Grant Hartley will be receiving his gift of life. For Grant, a courageous and very sincere 28-year-old, who I have introduced to many of you, Saturday will be the first day of his new leukemia free life.

When I first met Grant 2 years ago, he had already been searching the registry for more than a year for a matched donor. At the time, there were fewer than 90,000 volunteers in the national registry and the chances of finding a donor were slim. This was especially so for Grant because he is a black American and 3 years ago when he began his search, there were fewer than 1,000 black American volunteers.

Because genetics play such a vital role in matching the marrow of donors and patients, it is more than likely that the donor for a black American patient will be a black American. The same is true for all ethnic groups such as Hispanics, Asians, and native Americans. As Grant's case indicates, we are having greater and greater success today identifying matched donors for minority patients.

This is in large part due to my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and in this Congress who have supported my requests over the past 2 years for expanded Federal funding for donor recruitment and testing programs, especially targeted to minority communities. With funds appropriated in two supplemental appropriations bills last year, we kicked off a concerted national minority donor recruitment campaign last fall in Pinellas County, FL, which I represent, and throughout our Nation and since that time minority representation in the registry has increased more than three-fold.

There is no secret that the success of the National Marrow Donor Program is people because the more people we educate about the program and recruit as volunteers the better the chance that we have at finding matched donors for every patient in need of a transplant. You need only to meet someone who has had the opportunity donate marrow to know that mere words cannot describe the excitement of being able to save the life of a complete stranger.

David Smith, another constituent and friend of mine from St. Petersburg, FL, is one of the most eloquent spokesmen I have met who can describe the thrill of donating marrow. He has donated not once but twice and is one of the few people anywhere in the world who can say that through his willingness to volunteer he has offered life to two people.

Mr. Speaker, this is a program of heroes devoted to the greatest cause of all—saving lives. Every member of this Congress is a hero for the role they have played in support-

ing the establishment and growth of the National Marrow Donor Program. Grant Hartley and David Smith are heroes for their roles in encouraging others to become involved in this program.

The short amount of time I have today does not enable me to name all the heroes who have built this program and made it such an international success. At a later time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to dedicate a special order of this House to identify all the doctors, medical scientists, and nurses who pioneered the technology of marrow transplantation and perform life-saving transplants every day. I also would like to salute the individuals at the transplant and donor centers around the country and the world who coordinate every step along the way required to bring about a marrow transplant.

Mr. Speaker, they are all heroes in a program which got its start right here in this chamber and will continue to expand, with funds included in this bill, to save lives and give hope to families throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] to close debate on this side.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I approach the podium, and I must confess that I speak on this conference report unable to separate out my being as a legislator and as a female. I must confess that I am astounded and overwhelmed by what I have heard advised here today.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "If you don't like a law, don't fund it, don't fund a discussion about it," and I must confess that I find it remarkable that in this great well of democracy some have suggested we have no legal obligation to a law, we have no moral obligation to inform women of their rights in this country.

However, Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, American women cannot be fooled anymore. They know that whether this gag rule is enforced or not, abortions will continue, but family planning clinics will close. American women cannot be fooled anymore. They know this is not about budget busting, and they know that the President did not change the regulations.

□ 1510

American women cannot be fooled any more, but today we can be hurt and today we will find out just how much freedom we have in America. And we are afraid, I believe, of the answer.

Mr. Speaker, I must confess, so am I.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report, and I commend the chairman of the subcommittee on his excellent work.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCCOIN].

Mr. AUCCOIN. Mr. Speaker, Bush's memo yesterday on the gag rule is one

of the most cynical documents I have ever seen. It applies only to doctors, a very small percentage of the family health care professionals who counsel low-income women under title X. Professional nurses are still gagged, and so are others who work in the clinics.

The memo and the rule only allows abortion referrals when a doctor knows a woman's health is threatened by pregnancy. Even if that is relevant, it is impossible to make that determination.

Finally, to top it all off, a poor woman can only be referred to a health care provider whose primary care activity is not abortion. That sounds fine, except that most States do not have a full service health care provider that does abortions.

The White House memo is designed to get the administration off the hook on the gag rule and to give protection to the gag rule, antichoice supporters in the House. I say that it will not work. If we vote for the conference report, we will put an end to that fraud.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to vote for the conference report and support all the programs that the American people so richly deserve.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN].

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, let me commend Chairman NATCHER as well. Without this bill, our country will again widen the gap between the health care haves and the have-nots. Here is what is going to happen in the next few months:

If you are a rich woman and you want to know about family planning, you go to your private doctor. Your private doctor tells you about all your pregnancy options. If you are poor, if you are a poor working woman, you go to a federally funded family planning program. But the woman who does that would get no information about her pregnancy options.

The gentleman from Minnesota said that the President has changed the gag rule. The fact is that nothing has changed. A poor working woman still could not get any information about her pregnancy options. Medical censorship would still be in place.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement on H.R. 2707. This bill includes funding for our Nation's most important domestic programs. In addition, it bans the use of funds to implement the administration's regulations that prohibit federally funded family planning clinics from providing information about all legal medical options.

This is not a decision I have reached lightly or without considerable thought and reflection.

Indeed, as my congressional record indicates, I have always felt it important to be an advocate for those who have no voice. This is still my firm position. But I stand here today as a Member of Congress who feels it's imperative that health care be given the attention and resources necessary to assure that all women, whether they be rich or poor, have access to the quality health services necessary to lead a full and active life.

Should the administration's regulations on restrictive counseling procedures go forth, some organizations which currently receive title X funds may have to decide whether to forgo Federal funding. Should clinics be forced to make this decision, progress in meeting the health care needs of women, which is already tenuous at best, will be set back considerably. I cannot support that.

Title X clinics have made important contributions to women's health care since the program's inception in 1970. This funding facilitates voluntary family planning and educational services to almost 5 million low-income women each year through a network of nearly 5,000 family planning clinics. In Tennessee alone, title X services are provided at approximately 141 clinic sites throughout the State.

Title X is the only major program for low-income women providing comprehensive reproductive health care services. While the range of services can vary among individual clinics, key services include screening for cervical and breast cancer. With the rates for these cancers reaching alarmingly high levels, I feel it imperative that all women, regardless of their ability to pay, have access to the best care possible.

And to title X critics, I must point out that since the enactment of the program, use of title X funds for abortion as a method of family planning has always been prohibited by statute and regulation. Title X guidelines have required clinics to provide nondirective counseling—that is, counseling which does not favor one option over another—to women who request information on options for the management of their unintended pregnancy. Should the administration's gag rule be funded through this bill, poor women, who by virtue of their economic circumstances must rely on federally funded planning clinics rather than consultations with private physicians, will bear the brunt of cutbacks in essential title X-funded health care services.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in reaffirming congressional support for women's health care. Support the conference report.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, we have 13 appropriation bills each year that go through our committee. Each year we say to the people of the United States of America that this is the bill that has something in it for every man, woman, and child in the country.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that if we educate our children and take care of the health of our people, we will con-

tinue living in the strongest country in the world. In this bill we have \$6,707,000,000 in chapter 1, elementary and secondary education. There is \$9 billion in this bill for biomedical research grants, 6,000 new grants and 22,000 total grants.

In this bill, Mr. Speaker, we have \$1,989,000,000 for the National Cancer Institute. We have \$920 million for the Job Corps, \$650 million for maternal and child health grants, \$1,900,000,000 for the AIDS research, education, and care program, and \$2,202,000,000 for Head Start.

Mr. Speaker, \$133 million is set aside for breast cancer research, and there is \$50 million in addition for screening. We have \$298 million for childhood immunization, and we have \$825 million for child care.

Mr. Speaker, in this bill for the feeding program for the elderly, we are funding Meals on Wheels for our older people. They go in at noon, and they are hungry; they need help. We see some of them walk through the door with their heads up, some with their heads down. These are the people we love, Mr. Speaker, the people we love and respect, and we take care of them. Meals on Wheels is included in this bill.

This is the bill that means so much to the people of the United States of America. I ask every Member of this House to vote for this conference report and say to the people of the United States that we know what is going on with this bill. I ask the Members to take a good look at all of it. The Members can ask my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], the ranking minority member, one of the very able Members of this House. We know what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, let us stay with the conference report. I ask respectfully that every Member of this House vote for this conference report.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2707, the fiscal year 1992 appropriations act for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. Much of the discussion on this conference report has centered on the issue of the future of the title X program. I have serious concerns about that program and the continuing inability of the Congress and the President to reach an agreement on this question. In addition, I object strenuously to the budgetary treatment of many of the programs in this conference report.

There are serious budgetary problems, totaling over \$4.2 billion, with this conference report. For example, over \$3.6 billion of obligatory authority is delayed under this bill until the last day of the 1992 fiscal year, thereby pushing the resulting outlays into fiscal 1993. This gimmick permits the conferees to claim credit for funding these various programs in fiscal year 1992 without actually paying for them until fiscal year 1993. However, this is clearly counterproductive since the fis-

cal year 1993 discretionary spending caps are already tighter than those for fiscal year 1992.

The summer youth employment program is a perfect example. Normally, funds for the summer 1993 program would be included in the fiscal year 1992 appropriations. This year, the conferees have advanced funded the \$188 million for the program.

Another gimmick is to provide \$406 million in additional funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP] by classifying that funding as an emergency under the budget agreement. Without question, this emergency designation will not hold up to Presidential scrutiny. The promise to increase LIHEAP funding this matter, therefore, is an empty one and will do nothing to provide additional funds for the program.

There has been some discussion on this floor today about whether the conference report directly violates the budget agreement and who—OMB or the Congress—is more responsible for the use of delayed obligations as a budgetary gimmick to evade problems with the spending caps. In my view, as the ranking Republican on the House Budget Committee, this discussion begs the question. The issue is whether this House should sanction the use of budgetary gimmicks at all. I believe we should not. To do otherwise violates the spirit of the budget agreement and, in my view, the spirit of that agreement is just as important as a technical violation. Condoning budgetary legerdemain gradually erodes the foundation of the budget agreement and, at some point, all fiscal discipline is likely to be lost. The gamesmanship over fiscal policy must end or it will end the budget process.

The other and, in the public's mind, more significant issue in this conference report is the Porter amendment which would preclude the administration from implementing regulations issued in 1988 to govern the title X program.

I have long been a strong supporter of the title X program. This preventive family planning program is a critical Federal initiative to bring needed services to the poor and to women of low and moderate income. I have also opposed the appropriation of Federal funds for abortion except where the life of the mother is at risk.

I appreciate the concern of the administration that the title X program should adhere to its statutory mandate as a preventive family planning program which separates itself from the provision of abortion services. However, I remain concerned about the provisions in the Federal regulations issued in 1988 to govern the program which appear to restrict, in many cases, the ability of a woman who requests information from a title X clinician about the option of abortion from receiving that information. My chief concern is that a woman who requests information about abortion ought to be provided with an opportunity to have her questions answered. I am not interested in, and will not support, any effort to provide backdoor Federal funding for abortion. I am concerned about maintaining the integrity of the federal family planning program.

The title X program has lacked an authorization for several years. This concerns me greatly. It is unwise for any Federal program to lack a clear expression of congressional in-

tent. I, along with several other Members of this House, have offered suggestions to the administration on a compromise on the title X issue that might be acceptable to all parties.

The President, in a November 5, 1991, memorandum to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, outlined the basic principles that, in his view and based on his interpretation of current law, should govern the program. I believe that memorandum may provide the basis upon which we may be able to craft a compromise on the title X program that has eluded us for so long. In my view, the President should go farther and clearly delineate publicly what he is prepared to except. To reach a compromise, however, both sides on this issue will have to give a little, but the onus is on the President to show us where he wants the program to go. We are not there yet, but, I believe, we are getting closer.

Mr. Speaker, defeat of this conference report will give us an opportunity to remove the offending budgetary gimmicks in this bill and continue to work toward a compromise on title X. Failure to do both of these will guarantee a Presidential veto. It would be irresponsible of the House to not return to conference to work out these problems. I urge my colleagues to defeat H.R. 2707.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2707 because of the many health and social service programs funded by this bill. These programs are essential to our lives.

Among the necessary programs, H.R. 2707 provides funding for the low-income housing assistance program [LIHEAP]; Head Start; AIDS research, prevention, and treatment; substance abuse and maternal and child health. These programs aid low-income Americans with energy costs. They educate and care for our children and teenagers. They are helping to eliminate the devastating infant mortality rate in this country, and they are fighting against AIDS, a disease that is tearing this Nation apart. The American people need and deserve these programs.

Additionally, this bill includes language that would block enforcement of the gag rule in 1992 on abortion counseling for federally funded family planning clinics. Family planning clinics provide health services and counseling to women who have nowhere else to go. In many cases these clinics are the only places poor women can go to receive all their health care. The gag rule will impede the ability of health professionals in title X funded clinics to give the care and information women need. I believe we need to encourage and support family planning clinics, not obstruct and deter what is known to be a successful component of family planning and health care programs.

Mr. Speaker, while I will support this bill in the end, I would also like to voice my objections to the delayed-funding mechanism used in this bill. While I was not here last year to participate in the budget negotiation process, a budget agreement was reached and passed by this House. The agreement called for tough choices to be made in all spending areas. However, this year rather than making tough budget choices required under last year's agreement, Members of Congress continue to fund programs at levels which the budget cannot support. This conference report will in-

creasingly limit next year's funding options for labor, HHS, and education appropriation programs. Eventually the piper must be paid.

In closing, while I support many of the programs funded by this bill, I hope that next year the Appropriation's Committee will make the tough choices rather than putting them off yet another year.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on this bill numbers 124 pages, and there are people in this Chamber who think the only important thing is one paragraph.

If we are going to overturn the gag rule, let's do it. Bring up a straight reversal, no strings attached, no money involved. But let's not go through this every year, as this bill would have us do, and have our colleagues forced to vote for more spending simply because they're concerned with one paragraph.

When it gets right down to it, I'd support an effort to overturn the title X regulations. To fulfill their medical responsibilities, I believe a health care worker must present all options to a patient, including the factual option of abortion. It is then up to the patient to make a choice.

But I am not going to be bullied into voting for another budget-buster just because of one paragraph. This bill is \$21.7 billion over last year's levels totaling over \$200 billion in spending next year. Thanks to budget gimmicks like delaying costs until the last day in the fiscal year, we meet our budget summit ceilings, but we must remember this is the summit that is bringing us record deficits. This is not a game to see how close to the budget ceilings we can get.

For the last 4 years, Labor-HHS bills have grown at an annual rate of 10 percent and above, with this year coming in at 12 percent growth. Over the next few years, it is projected spending will grow at a similar rate. When is this going to stop?

I'm not going to let that one paragraph blind me to the real issue. This conference report is not an abortion bill; it's another big government spending bill with the same old deficit trickery which just happens to have one paragraph on abortion. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting no on this conference report.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2707, the fiscal year 1992 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. As ranking Republican of the Committee on Education and Labor, I want to commend Chairman NATCHER, the ranking member Mr. PURSELL, and the members of the Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee, for having so successfully defended the priorities of the House in the vital policy and programmatic areas encompassed by this bill. Moreover, I believe they should be further congratulated for having once again achieved this success in the face of perhaps the most difficult conference they have had to deal with in years.

The Appropriations Committee and this body once again expressed their steadfast commitment to the funding of elementary and secondary education programs. I was very pleased to learn that the conference report provides for a very generous 10.4-percent increase over the past fiscal year's level of fund-

ing for the ESEA chapter 1 account on an overall basis. This remarkable level of overall support for the backbone of the Federal effort to help our disadvantaged children in school is also reflected in the funding increases the conference report provides for many of chapter 1's various programmatic components. Thus, I want to express my particular appreciation for the increases over last year's funding provided to the basic grants to LEA's—10.5 percent—to the Even Start Program—40.6 percent—and to the State Migrant Child Program—4.7 percent.

This past spring the Committee on Education and Labor worked on a major new literacy bill, the National Literacy Act, which the President subsequently signed—Public Law 102-73. Among the new programs this legislation created was one I hoped this appropriation measure would be able to launch right away: the establishment of State Literary Resource Centers, which were one of the components of the President's education initiatives. The conference report reveals that this will be the case; I was very pleased to find that it provides \$5.0 million to get these centers established.

Our conferees should also be thanked for their steadfast efforts to support the funding of our postsecondary student assistance programs. Among these, the College Work Study Program has never experienced any difficulties and is unanimously supported by my committee. I was glad to find that the conference report increases its funding by \$20.3 million over last year's level.

Turning now to the conference report's funding proposals for the Department of Labor's agencies, programs, and activities, I would like to express my appreciation to our conferees for restoring all of the other body's proposed cuts in the funding of two key Bureau of Labor Statistics programs: the Federal Economic Indicators program, a long-term effort to improve the quality of Federal economic data, and the program of surveys needed to make the locality-based comparability pay adjustments for Federal workers required under the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act of 1990.

Finally, I was pleased to find that the conference report funds the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's [OSHA] Federal and State enforcement activities at a level that is \$500,000 over the President's request. My concern here, and I'm sure Chairman NATCHER and Representative PURSELL share it with me, is that when the Secretary of Labor applies the \$32 million undistributed reduction to the Department's salaries and expenses accounts required by the conference report's general provisions, I would hate to see OSHA's share of the undistributed reduction impare the agency's enforcement function. I would appreciate the Appropriations Committee monitoring the application of the reduction so that the agency's enforcement function is not weakened.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce my opposition to H.R. 2707, the Labor, HHS, Education Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1992. I do so with great disappointment because while there are many worthwhile provisions contained in this important bill, there is one provision to which I have objected in the past, and will do so again

today by voting no. I would also like to commend Chairman BILL NATCHER and the ranking minority member, Congressman CARL PURSELL for their continuing dedication to bringing this bill to the floor.

I speak in reference to what has become widely known and touted by various interest groups as the infamous gag rule. Mr. Speaker, despite the hoopla which has been generated by these groups, I stand firm in my belief that we need to retain the current title X regulations. Since I'm on this topic, I will take the opportunity to remind my colleagues the purpose and intent of the 92d Congress when they enacted the title X program.

First, it was designed to provide family planning services to couples who needed assistance with conception or who needed help in preventing conception. Because the program was established to assist in preconception planning, I repeat, preconception planning, it was not their intent to provide service of any kind once a pregnancy was involved. Although post-conception services are not provided through title X, many pregnant women do qualify for a host of other Federal programs that do provide pregnancy services.

Second, these preconceptions services were intended to prevent abortion from every becoming necessary. In 1988, the Department of Health and Human Services enacted regulations to clarify what activities do and do not constitute family planning as defined by the title X program. With regard to abortion, the regulation is neither vague nor ambiguous. To the contrary, it is clear, concise, and unequivocal. It states, and I quote:

Family planning does not include pregnancy care (including obstetric or prenatal care). As required by section 1008 of the Act, abortion may not be included as a method of family planning in the Title X project.

In short, the title X program's restriction to preconception family planning means that once a woman is diagnosed as pregnant, she no longer qualifies for services through title X.

I could go on for days and weeks on this contentious and divisive issue because I know that there are colleagues of mine who differ with me on this issue, both Republican and Democrat. However, I would also like to stress other programs that are funded by this bill which I have always supported in the past, and still do support in principle and substance, but will have to vote against today because of the inclusion of the provision which would overturn the title X regulations.

As we all know, this conference report significantly increases funding in areas relating to medical research. I think that it is safe to say that one of the most important aspects of this relates to women's health. I am glad that the House and Senate conferees agree with me that the national Cancer Institute should make breast, cervical, and ovarian cancer one of its top priorities. It is especially heartening to know that the requested \$50 million for the breast and Cervical Cancer Mortality Program was kept as part of the final bill. With approximately 1 out of every 10 American women developing breast cancer during her lifetime, this funding is vital in helping them maintain their health. Underserved women all across the country, including those in my district will be able to obtain quality mammograms and pap smears.

Another health related concern of mine is that of Alzheimer's disease. Approximately 4 million Americans are inflicted with this dreadful disease. Back in March of this year, I introduced a resolution that designates the month of November in 1991 and 1992 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month." It shares the wide bipartisan support of 225 of my distinguished colleagues. I have discussed in detail the importance of funding Alzheimer's research on and off the floor to them repeatedly. With this disease affecting one out of very three American families, it remains one of our Nation's most expensive health problems—costing the United States \$90 million per year. I've seen up close what the dreadful effects of this disease can do to the patients and their families. The endless burdens of having to take care of an Alzheimer's patient merit the Federal Government's support.

With respect to the education front, I would like to pay particular attention to the Head Start and Impact Aid Programs. I am proud to say that I have supported these programs from the first days I served as a public servant when I was the deputy mayor of San Diego.

The Head Start Program is one I am always proud to support. It is one I support not only because of its success since its inception in 1965 * * * ; I support it because every single one of its goals and intentions are worthy of all of my colleagues support. This program has been able to assist preschool aged children from low-income families effectively function in their school environment and take an active role in their community. This program has shown our youth the importance of an education and implanted in them the basic values that help make our society a better place to be. I have always been a strong supporter of the concept that a solid education should be made available to all of our Nation's children, and to that end, I will do everything I can as a member of the Appropriations Committee to make sure that this program continues to receive adequate funding.

Another provision which I have always ardently supported is that of the Impact Aid Program. As the representative of a city which is the homeport to one-fourth of the United States naval fleet and contains over 15 military installations, I can appreciate the significance of this program. Approximately 25,000 federally connected students reside within the boundaries of my district. It gives me great pride to be able to stand here today and note that San Diego has consistently provided a high-quality, well-balanced educational curriculum to the children of our military families. With the rising cost of educating students at-risk of dropping out or, those students from military families who transfer frequently from school to school, federally impacted schools bear a special burden of providing instruction without the benefit of an adequate budget to cover these costs. I commend the chairman, Mr. NATCHER, and members of the conference committee for their continued support for this program.

In closing, I would like to stress that while I am forced to vote "no" on this conference report, I support a convincing majority of the programs that will benefit from its passage. However, it distresses me greatly that a majority of the conferees elected to retain the title

X language knowing that it would face a guaranteed veto by the President. I support the President on this issue and stand firm in my own personal opposition to its inclusion. It is my sincere hope that after the President vetoes this bill, that the appropriations subcommittee will expediently drop the Porter amendment and immediately repass this important piece of legislation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations conference report which includes language prohibiting the enforcement of the administration's gag rule regulations.

The 21st century is almost upon us and I find it difficult to believe, let alone understand, that a regulation prohibiting access to information on women's health would be tolerated or accepted. If such a gag rule were placed on information on health services for men, I don't think it would be tolerated.

The gag-rule compromises the patient/doctor relationship. A physician has the obligation to inform a patient of all medical options and every patient has the right to know those options. The administration's regulations prohibit the exchange of this vital information, preventing a physician from performing his/her duties and limiting the information a patient needs to make an informed decision about her reproductive health. Additionally, it adversely and disproportionately effects low-income women not women who can afford to go to a private physician.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations conference report and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report, which prohibits implementation of the administration's gag rule in family planning clinics.

The gag rule is unwise, it is unethical, and it should be illegal. When the Congress created the title X family planning program 20 years ago, we did not intend to muzzle health care providers. Rather, we intended to ensure that all women, regardless of their economic circumstances, have access to complete information about their health care options.

Supporters of this dangerous regulation would have us believe that this is a debate about abortion. But it is not. Ask our colleagues who are not pro-choice but who oppose the gag rule.

We are not talking about the Federal Government funding abortions. That is prohibited by law and nothing in this bill would change that. All we are ensuring is that low-income women and teenagers will be entitled to complete information about their medical condition, to the same description of medical options available to them as to those who can afford private care.

Mr. Speaker, with this vote today, 406 men will be setting Federal policy in an area that we personally know nothing about—on a subject that affects a woman's life in the most profound way. Not one of us has ever been or ever will be faced with an unplanned pregnancy. Not one of us will ever experience the anxiety of the pregnant 16-year old from the Bronx, or Hyannis, or New Bedford. Not one of us will be forced to receive medical advice that we cannot trust because it is incomplete.

We can only imagine ourselves in the shoes of the barely literate woman who is suffering from severe diabetes and uncontrolled high blood pressure, who visits the family planning clinic and learns that she is pregnant. The administration says that she could not be told that her pregnancy might be a threat to her life, and that she might want to seek abortion counseling.

Yet, many of our colleagues today will vote to place restrictions on her physician's ability to advise her and on her ability to receive quality medical care.

Mr. Speaker, a Republican consultant reported in today's Washington Post that a compromise acceptable to both sides had been torpedoed by the President's Chief of Staff, John Sununu. Once again, politics has triumphed over principle at the White House. President Bush may have scored a few more points with the anti-choice forces, but with 70 percent of Americans opposing the gag rule, he is flouting the public will.

I urge my colleagues to side with the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American Nurses Association, and the American Public Health Association. I urge my colleagues to side with American women, and not with John Sununu.

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for H.R. 2707, the Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education appropriations conference report before us which restores the cuts the administration proposed for the Impact Aid Program. Impact aid provides Federal dollars in lieu of lost tax revenues to local schools districts that are impacted by Federal installations and must educate federally connected students. Most importantly, this conference report ensures funding for federally connected "B" students which President Bush proposed to eliminate. These are students whose parents usually work on Federal property but do not live on Federal property.

I testified and prepared a letter to the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, which 83 Members of the House joined in signing, expressing our opposition to the administration's impact aid cuts. We are very grateful to the Appropriations Committee and especially Chairman NATCHER for their hard work and recognizing that these cuts would cause serious harm to our Nation's school districts and the families of those schools.

In my congressional district—the home of Offutt Air Force Base and the headquarters of the Strategic Air Command—impact aid is a critical source of funding to educate 10,000 federally impacted students. For example, the Bellevue school district last year received about \$10.9 million of its total \$45 million budget from the impact aid program. In 1992, Bellevue will receive approximately the same amount of funding even though the cost of educating its students will rise by 7 percent. And meanwhile the numbers of federally impacted student continue to grow. The Bellevue school district's enrollment has grown from 8,326 to about 8,800 student in the past 3 years. There is a tremendous Federal responsibility to these communities.

Ultimately, the issue is one of equity. All parents expect their schools to provide these

students a quality education. Impact aid does not provide extra funding to these schools. It provides basic funding, for books, teachers' salaries, educational materials and equipment. Congress did not establish this program as a special benefits; it is the fulfillment of a Federal responsibility because schools lose property and sales taxes because of the presence of Federal property.

I will vote "yes" today to maintain the impact aid program. This is a clear Federal obligation which means a great deal to the students in my congressional district and schools across the country.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2707 and urge all of my colleagues to vote with me in favor of this important legislation.

The Labor, Health, and Human Services appropriations bill contains many important provisions. Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Head Start, infant mortality initiatives, research of breast and cervical cancer, and many other important initiatives have all been extended in this legislation. While all of these provisions are important to the health and well-being of our citizens, none are as important to the integrity of health professionals as the provision overturning the gag rule.

By restricting physicians from discussing specific medical options with their patient, the administration is placing a muzzle on the rights of women and health care providers. The administration is telling doctors and counselors at federally funded clinics not to discuss abortion, even if the woman is the victim of rape or incest as well as in cases of gross fetal abnormality. The administration is subverting the rights of women to receive adequate medical information and forcing physicians to limit their medical advice.

This gag rule sets an alarming precedent that extends beyond the scope of health care workers and effects all recipients of Federal funds. In fact, Chief Justice Rehnquist, in writing the majority opinion regarding the gag rule, argued that the Federal Government has the right to censure individual speech for partisan political motives.

If this ruling stands, many physicians and counselors across the Nation will pull out of this program rather than compromise their ethics. Counselors and physicians who refuse to accept this ruling and stand up for the rights of their patients will have their funding cut and will be forced to close down. Thousands of low income women across this country will be denied access to family planning care and will be denied the same safe and legal medical options as those women who are able to go to a private physician.

The irony of this situation, Mr. Speaker, is that the Congress created the title X family planning program in 1972, to ensure that all women have equal access to pre-natal health care. This ruling subverts this mandate and graphically demonstrates that the administration is determined to destroy this important program for partisan political gain. The net effect of this gag rule will be that less women will receive crucial information regarding health care and less women will practice sound family planning. I ask my colleagues, is this the direction we want to take for health care, for women's rights, for free speech?

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the conference report and overturn this gag rule.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I would like to praise the conferees for retaining language that would preclude the administration from implementing the so-called gag rule. I would like to add my voice to those of my many colleagues who are supporting this provision.

The gag rule is censorship, it is nothing else. I would also like to commend our two physician colleagues for their forward stand on this issue. They are absolutely right. By warping the doctor-patient relationship, this rule would force health professionals to violate their ethical oaths and legal obligations. As I have stated before, if we are going to restrict physicians and nurses in federally funded clinics from discussing all pregnancy-related options with their patients, what is the next step? Would it be constitutional to prohibit discussing the ill effects of drug abuse based on the argument that it might actually encourage drug use? Or prohibit physicians from warning patients about the dangers of AIDS because arguably it might encourage intercourse? Or prevent them from discussing specific options for treatment that might involve expensive procedures, because this might increase Federal health expenditures?

At a time when there is great concern about the health care women in this country are receiving, the gag rule would be a step backwards. We must strive to continue marching forward toward improving health care to all of our citizens. The election yesterday in Pennsylvania explicitly demonstrated the will of the people in this matter.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for accepting this conference report and send the message to the President that his interest in health care is crucial, but that his interest must not be toward dismantling our system, but working to improve it.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, today's vote on the Labor/HHS/Education appropriations conference report puts me literally between a rock and a hard place. On the one hand, the bill represents the programs I most believe in—the people programs—the heart and soul of good government. It increases spending for Head Start, chapter 1, childhood immunization, healthy start and disease research. These are all correct and good priorities.

On the other hand, the bill perpetrates a spending sleight of hand that fools no one. The conference agreement delays the obligation of \$4.3 billion in spending until September 30, 1992, the last day of fiscal 1992, conveniently sliding most of the outlays into fiscal 1993. Technically, the bill meets the 602(b) budget targets for discretionary budget authority. However, it violates the spirit if not the letter of the 1991 budget agreement, and seems to assume that the spending limits will magically disappear next year allowing us to go back to business as usual.

Is this any way to run a government? I don't think so. As I have said many times, we have to be honest about how we pay for these programs and not mortgage our children's future in the process.

Despite my strong distaste for the methods used in this bill, I will support it. I also pledge to work for more honesty in financing these

programs in fiscal 1993 by making cuts in other areas. I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the Labor/HHS appropriations bill, H.R. 2707. I do so because of its focus on a program highly important for the needy in the Northeast. The program is Low-Income Energy Assistance [LIHEAP].

When the House first considered this bill in June, I questioned whether it did do enough for the program. The fact is that it cut LIHEAP to a level 38 percent below last year—tough medicine for the elderly, the poor and the disabled throughout the northeast, particularly those in my district—the 34th District of New York State.

A few details: Last winter, LIHEAP provided aid to 30,032 families in the 34th District—one-fifth of all families. Fifty percent of the funds in Allegany County were spent on emergency cases. If there had been no LIHEAP funds these people would have lost their heat. Half of the recipients in Allegany County are elderly and 60 percent must live on less than \$6,000 per year.

In June, Chairman NATCHER assured me that he would work in conference to increase spending on LIHEAP. He kept his word. The total funding for LIHEAP in this bill is \$1.486 billion. That is 5 percent above last year. It also does not violate the budget agreement.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, we will vote on the Labor, HHS and Education conference report. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the conference report. This is not an abortion vote. This vote is about access.

First, the administration's gag rule denies women access to basic medical information. The gag rule would prohibit federally funded family planning clinics from counseling on abortion. Even women who request information regarding abortion will be denied that access—even where the life of the mother is in danger. As a result, the prohibition forces doctors and nurse practitioners to violate medical ethics and puts them in jeopardy of malpractice.

Second, enforcement of the gag rule could severely limit access to family planning services. Currently, one out of every five women receiving family planning services relies on a federally funded clinic. For 83 percent of these women federally funded clinics are their only source of family planning services. In addition to contraceptive services, these clinics offer diabetes, anemia, and breast and cervical cancer screening, as well as screening for sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV. Enforcement of the administration prohibition on abortion counseling will compel these clinics to reject Federal funds in order not to violate ethical standards. In many cases these clinics will be forced to close. Thousands of women will be denied basic health care services.

Where will these women seek services? In many cases they will go to a hospital, or a prenatal care clinic. However, in hundreds of counties with a federally funded family planning clinic, there are no hospitals or prenatal clinics. In addition, only half of all OB/GYN and family practitioners provide contraceptive services to Medicaid patients. In short, in

many cases these women have no place else to go.

Access to medical care, a basic human right, is what this vote is all about. Vote "yes" on the Labor, HHS, and Education conference report.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2707, the fiscal year 1992 Labor, Health, and Human Services and Education appropriations bill. I do so as a Republican, as a woman, and as a mother of three, and I do so in the name of simple decency. I want especially to address my remarks to those of my colleagues who want to keep Government out of our lives.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware this report contains language that would prohibit regulations which deny Federal support to family planning programs that use other resources to provide abortion services, information or referrals. In other words, we act today to lift the gag rule.

This issue is the most intimate and most profound moral decision that a woman has to face. Do we want to put Government into the position of making these decisions?

I say to my colleagues that without the language in the conference report we are saying that we support a two-class system. A two-class system in this society that is: those who have the money to make the choice can make their own moral choice for themselves; but those who do not have the money to give them access to private health care will have to continue to be victimized. In my own district, family planning services which rely on Federal funding, would lose 12 percent of their budget, forcing them to close clinics, thus reducing the number of women they can care for.

I also warn my colleagues that without this language, physician-patient relationships are in jeopardy. The need for open dialog between patient and physician is crucial. Constraints on what a physician can say to a patient can only result in serious medical implications for the patient.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of simple decency I say to my Republican colleagues that we must keep Government out of this moral decision and I urge them to vote "yes" on this conference report.

As I have indicated, H.R. 2707 addresses one of the most pressing issues facing the Nation today, by ensuring the rights of physicians and patients in title X. Yet that is but part of the legislation, and but one reason to support this conference report.

It has been said that the moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life—the sick, the needy and the handicapped. In funding the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, we would do well to remember those words.

The programs supported through these departments represent vital lifelines to American citizens of all ages, and I am pleased to see the committee efforts to increase the funding of programs of such importance.

To ensure that the causes of research and science move forward, the committee recognizes the invaluable work done at the Centers

for Disease Control, the National Institutes of Health, the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration, and the Family Support Administration, and has brought funding to these agencies to historic levels. Through these agencies, we commit ourselves in working to end horrors as divergent as Alzheimer's disease, breast, ovarian, and cervical cancer, and infant mortality. At the same time, we act to bring immunization, drug and alcohol treatment and research, and vitally needed health professionals to those who are in need.

Perhaps foremost in fiscal year 1992, Head Start will see its highest funding level ever—\$2.2 billion. This program is one of the few in Congress that we can call an unqualified success, and I am encouraged that H.R. 2707 recognizes the crucial role Head Start plays in the lives of so many disadvantaged children. With that said, we must continue our support of Head Start in years to come, to work toward 100-percent eligible participation. While that may seem a distant goal, the committee's action this year, and our own commitment, will serve to bring it increasingly closer.

I am likewise pleased to see funding for several crucial initiatives in my own State of New Jersey. Certainly, one of the most important health concerns to face the Nation, especially in our region, is the growing prevalence of Lyme Borreliosis, the most common tick-borne disease. The committee recognition of this, and support of the work of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease in combatting this disease, are encouragement to those afflicted with Lyme disease, and a source of hope that we will find treatment and cure of this epidemic.

Similarly, while we have acted in this bill to target an unprecedented \$2 billion to AIDS research, care, and intervention, I would call the special attention of my colleagues to vital work being done under title II of the Ryan White CARE Act, and the Special Projects of National Significance [SPINS]. In fiscal year 1992, under SPINS, \$5 million are targeted to AIDS-related indigent dentistry, often the front-line of detection for patients with AIDS. I know every member of my delegation is proud of the work being done by the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, and St. Joseph's Hospital, in treating these patients.

Owing to the committee's action in funding more than \$2 billion to the National Cancer Institute, I am pleased to see that UMDNJ will also be able to continue its benchmark work in cancer treatment and prevention.

These are but a few of the programs we will act to fund today, representative of a larger whole which will truly touch every American in some way. I extend my thanks and congratulations to the members of the Appropriations Committee for their excellent work in crafting so vital a piece of legislation, and again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2707, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1992.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering legislation appropriating almost 205 billion taxpayer dollars to finance three of our largest Government departments. The programs we are discussing today will provide health care to the poor and elderly, educational opportunities to the underserved,

badly needed research funds for Alzheimer's disease and cancer, and training and employment services to a country increasingly in need of economic relief. No one denies the necessity of these programs—but, Mr. Speaker, do these concerns outweigh our responsibility to fiscal accountability and to support important Federal regulations about the appropriate use of taxpayer dollars?

Today I cast my vote with many reservations. This bill I am voting against maintains the status quo of a badly torn Medicare and Medicaid health care safety net and an unsatisfactory Social Security bureaucracy. I suppose we should be grateful that these overburdened programs did not suffer further arbitrary cuts.

This bill provides \$175 million for cancer and Alzheimer's research but holds these funds until the last day of the 1992 fiscal year, ensuring that they will not be scored against this year's spending limits, and instead hiding these obligations in the fiscal 1993 closet. Who knows what havoc this will wreak on next year's budget? These are empty promises. No one will even see this money until next year and we will have to reconcile these obligations with next year's budget restrictions.

Another major issue must also be considered along with the complexities of this bill. For it seems as if we are not talking about health care, we are not discussing senior citizens or the future of education. Instead, it seems as if this vote will turn on the issue of abortion. It is unfortunate that programs as important as those contained in this bill are clouded by the politics of abortion. However, this seems to be the case, and we cannot ignore it.

Therefore, I must remind my colleagues that this country does not recognize abortion as a method of family planning. The administration does not recognize it, the Supreme Court does not recognize it, the American people do not recognize it. Federal funds should not be used for abortion counseling and I unequivocally oppose any loopholes which allow this to occur. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I must stand firm and ask the conferees to reconsider their report and come back with responsible and enactable legislation, as I am sure they now will.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Labor-HHS conference report. I support this agreement for several reasons, including the provision that overturns the administration's gag rule that outlaws the discussion of all legal medical options in clinics supported by title X funds. I urge my colleagues to support this important conference report.

The conference report is crucial to women in this country. Recent studies have shown that women's health needs have long been ignored and this legislation will help rectify this injustice. The conference agreement significantly increases funding for the National Institutes of Health's Office for Research on Women's Health. It also urges the National Cancer Institute to make breast, ovarian, and cervical cancer its top priorities by increasing funds for research in these areas. Far too many women suffer and die each year from cancer. By increasing the research funding we will be better able to fight this terrible disease and save many more women's lives.

The conference agreement also increases funding to title X which provides family planning assistance to poor women and most importantly the agreement overturns the administration's policy with this program that discriminates against these women. The administration's policy, which was upheld this summer by the Supreme Court's decision in *Rust versus Sullivan*, injects government into the doctor-patient relationship by directly restricting the professional advice that a doctor can give a woman about her pregnancy.

The administration's title X regulations absolutely forbid doctors in family planning clinics that receive any Federal funds from counseling patients about abortion, even when the patient requests such information or when abortion might be medically indicated. This policy forces doctors to violate their Hippocratic oath, which requires that they always give their best professional opinion. It gags health care professional care and advice and has thus become known as the gag rule.

The Bush administration's gag rule is poor health policy. It sets up a two-tiered system of medicine based solely on income and it denies health care professionals the right of free speech.

I find the broader implications of the gag rule to be truly frightening. Under the logic of this policy any professional receiving Federal funds could be forced to limit or alter their professional advice to meet political dictates. I believe it is unethical to mandate what a professional can tell patients strictly because Federal funds are involved.

Today Congress can act to reestablish the right to free speech for every American, regardless of whether or not they receive Federal funds. We can also reestablish the right to know all your legal medical options regardless of your income level.

It is also important to note that this bill has funding for many important programs including Head Start, employment and training, Social Security, low-income home energy assistance, guaranteed student loans, and a variety of other education and health programs. The funding in this bill is critical to so many Americans at a time when they are feeling the strains of recession.

Please vote for the Labor-HHS conference report for all Americans and support the women of this country by increasing the funding for their health care needs and to protect their right to know all their legal medical options.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2707, the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 1991. As chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I want to commend Chairman NATCHER and the House conferees for doing the best job possible under difficult budget constraints to fund our Nation's anti-drug programs.

The conference agreement provides \$2.989 billion for substance abuse programs. This amount is \$99.6 million more than appropriated for 1991 and \$10.5 million over the administration's requests, although the priorities established by Congress in the bill differ somewhat from the President's proposals. For example, the administration's budget re-

quested no increase for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Services [ADMS] block grant, the primary vehicle for Federal support of State substance abuse and mental health efforts. Instead, the administration proposed a new capacity expansion program to be financed in part by \$68 million in new funding for HHS. The conference agreement increases the existing ADMS block grant by \$91.3 million and provides no funds for the as yet unauthorized capacity expansion program. The bill also provides nearly \$10 million more than requested for grants to States under the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program. It increases the amount for emergency grants to schools severely affected by drugs by nearly \$6 million over 1991 funding, although the 1992 level is about \$9 million less than requested.

I am particularly pleased that the conference agreement provides nearly \$10 million for the Community Youth Activities Program [CYAP]. The administration had proposed to eliminate this program in 1992. This would have prematurely terminated funding for a number of projects including a 3-year grant to New York State for model community mobilization-drug education programs for high-risk, inner-city minority youth in Buffalo and Albany. At a hearing in Buffalo earlier this year, the select committee was impressed by the testimony we heard from Western New York United on the encouraging results they have achieved to date with their CYAP funds. The bill before us today protects the 2-year investment we have made in this and other similarly situated programs. By allowing these programs to be completed, we will be able to obtain a complete evaluation of these promising prevention efforts to guide us in future funding decisions.

While I strongly support H.R. 2707 as the best result possible given current budgetary limitations, I am in no way satisfied that this bill is adequate to meet the substance abuse problems we face. A well-known, senior White House official recently told me that he conservatively estimates the cost of substance abuse on our society to be nearly one-quarter of a trillion dollars annually in lost productivity, lost revenue, and added governmental spending for health, welfare, criminal justice, and other drug-related program costs. Reducing the demand for drugs offers the best chance to reduce this enormous drain on our national resources, yet this bill provides not quite \$3 billion for these efforts. This amount is just a drop in the bucket to fight a raging inferno.

Unquestionably, we need to do more, and the American people want us to do more. Some have speculated that public concerns about drugs have been replaced by rising doubts about the economy. But a recent Washington Post/ABC News poll shows that drugs and crime top the list of America's biggest worries.

Finally, this bill provides for delayed obligation of \$4.3 billion. While I understand the budgetary restrictions that necessitated this decision, I am concerned that this delayed funding could force drastic cuts in programs next year under the current budget agreement. Having to resort to a device like this to meet important health and social needs of our citizens for this year makes all the more clear to me the need to redefine our budget priorities.

The world today is far different from the world that existed a year ago when the current budget agreement was reached. We have invested billions of dollars to address problems overseas. It is time we renewed our commitment to address the pressing problems we face at home, including drug abuse and the social and economic ills that contribute substantially to drug abuse. It is time to invest in the American people, upon whom the strength of our Nation ultimately depends, by providing decent jobs, affordable health care, and good schools. It is time to provide opportunity and hope for all citizens.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, our vote today marks an important milestone in the national effort to educate America's homeless children.

We have heard so much in the past few months about providing our children a choice in education. But we have heard almost nothing about the hundreds of thousands of homeless children who have no choice at all regarding their education.

This year, it is estimated, 500,000 to 1.5 million children will experience the horrors of homelessness. Among those of school age, more than 1 in 4 will miss school on a regular basis. In some cities, the ratio is estimated to be 1 in 2 who miss school.

Even the most conservative estimates from the Department of Education indicate that at least 67,000 homeless children do not attend school regularly.

The children who make up these statistics are our future work force. Without schooling, they will join the ranks of the unemployed and the underemployed.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the House has the opportunity to approve funding that will begin addressing the difficult problems which homeless children face getting an education.

Last year I introduced a measure to educate homeless children as part of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act, and Congress authorized \$50 million to implement the program. However, because the new law was passed after the appropriations process was completed, Congress actually allocated only \$7.3 million for the program.

The bill we are considering today contains an appropriation of \$25 million. Though this amount is still short of the full authorization of \$50 million, I believe it represents a substantial improvement over last year and offers school systems around the country a better opportunity to deal with this growing problem.

Besides meeting basic transportation needs, these additional funds will help States provide health screening, counseling, and extra tutoring before and after school for homeless children and set up programs to identify and nurture the gifted and talented. In many school districts more Federal funding will provide transportation at family shelters so that children can attend their old neighborhood schools rather than be forced to change schools every time they move to a new shelter.

For those who insist such Federal expenditures are too much in light of our current budget deficit, consider this: the \$25 million we seek to educate homeless children is less than one-sixth of the amount which the Federal Government spends each year on military

bands. Yet at stake is nothing less than our economic future.

Each class of dropouts costs this Nation \$240 billion in lost wages and future social services. With a declining worker base paying into Social Security, our country will not be able to meet the needs of its senior population in the future if we deny these children a chance to become productive participants in our society. Unless we invest in these children now, we face spending billions in the decades ahead coping with a new generation of homeless adults who are untrained and uneducated.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, it saddens me to have to rise today in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2707. Mr. NATCHER, our distinguished subcommittee chairman, CARL PURSELL, our ranking Republican Members, and my fellow subcommittee members on both sides of the aisle have invested a great deal of time and energy in what our chairman terms the "people's bill." I wish to thank them for the many courtesies they have shown me during the long months over which we have developed this measure.

In many ways, this measure as it emerged from the conference committee is still the people's bill. As my constituents in Minnesota struggle through the worst winter storm our State has ever experienced, I am reminded that this bill restores funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

As I work with my communities to address the critical and growing shortages of health professionals and closures of hospitals in rural Minnesota, I am reminded that this bill increases funding for the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan programs, for family physician and allied health education, and for the Rural Health Outreach Grant Program. Further, it preserves funding for the Rural Hospital Transition Grant Program and other health professions education programs.

In many ways, this legislation puts our Nation's children first. We have provided substantial new funding for infant mortality and disability prevention initiatives, immunization programs, and Head Start and chapter 1.

I care about those facing a choice this winter between heating their homes or putting food on the table. I care about rural residents forced to travel miles to urban areas for their health care. I care about our children being born sick for want of prenatal care and contracting potentially life-threatening disease for lack of immunization. I care about our children whose only chance to succeed in school may be the help they receive from Head Start and chapter 1.

But I also care about the lives of the unborn, and that's why I must vote against this bill today. This bill includes a provision that would allow organizations to use Federal family planning money to promote abortions and steer clients to their abortion clinics. It would make abortion an acceptable option under the title X family planning program, and I cannot support that.

It saddens me that some are trying to use this bill as a way to fund counseling and referral for abortions. There is other legislation they could have used to bring this issue to a vote. Instead, they chose to hold the people's bill hostage in an attempt to require taxpayers to support abortion counseling and promotion.

Unfortunately, this issue has been misunderstood by many. They have been wrongly informed that this is an issue of free speech and will somehow intrude into the doctor-patient relationship.

The truth is that the title X program was set up in 1970 to provide preconception family planning. It was explicit in stating that abortion was not an acceptable method of family planning. Unfortunately, the program strayed from its original purpose. It became a way to refer a high number of women for abortions by Planned Parenthood and other recipients of title X funds. Over 85 percent of the pregnant women that walk into some of these title X clinics end up getting an abortion.

For this reason the Reagan administration promulgated regulations that would stop the counseling and referring of women for abortion at federally funded clinics.

Much has been said about what these regulations prohibit. Let me make clear what they do not prohibit. They do not prohibit a physician, in fact they require him or her, to refer a woman to proper and immediate care if her life is endangered, even if that care may result in an abortion. That is specifically provided for in the language of the regulations, and the President's letter of yesterday reiterates that point.

Second, it does not prohibit a provider from using the word "abortion." The regulation simply states that title X programs are not engaged in the abortion referral, counseling or providing business, but they may provide a list of other clinics which offer a wide range of services including abortion, as long as that is not the clinics' primary function.

I will today sadly vote against this legislation. It is too bad that with all the good this bill would do, it is being held up by those who are trying to use tax dollars in the promotion of abortion. I look forward to supporting this bill, after the House sustains the President's veto and strips this objectionable provision from the bill.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my concern over the provisions in this conference report that address the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. The House approved a total of \$1.6 billion in funding for fiscal year 1992, while the conference adopted a total of \$1.8 billion.

But the increased appropriation masks the true situation. In actuality, only about \$1.1 billion will be available for poor families to heat their homes this winter, a figure which represents a cut of more than \$500 million from funds appropriated in fiscal year 1991. More than \$405 million will not become available for the LIHEAP Program until September 30, 1992—1 day before fiscal year 1993 begins—and \$300 million can be released only if the President declares an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to cut such a critical program year after year. In fiscal year 1985, spending for LIHEAP was \$2.1 billion. By fiscal year 1991, the total had been reduced to \$1.6 billion. Now, in the winter of 1992, this already strapped program will be slashed again to \$1.1 billion. Even if the President declares an emergency, only \$1.4 billion will be available for the cold months of fiscal year 1992.

The majority of LIHEAP recipients are families with incomes under \$6,000 a year. These

households pay 65 percent of their entire income on rent and utilities only. Before this year's wrangling, the LIHEAP appropriations were already woefully inadequate. Fewer than 25 percent of eligible households receive assistance from LIHEAP, and of these few recipients, the program on average pays less than 25 percent of their energy bills.

My State of Maine will suffer this winter, Mr. Speaker. Average heating costs have risen from \$600 per year in 1989 to a projected \$880 in 1991. The average LIHEAP assistance payment in my State would only cover this price increase. As the LIHEAP funding dwindles, the number of Mainers receiving assistance plummets. It is estimated that in fiscal year 1992, more than 17,000 fewer Maine households will be able to participate in LIHEAP than in 1989, and this in a severely recessionary environment.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can recognize the impact of our LIHEAP appropriations errors on real people in this country. Next year I will continue to fight vigorously for reasonable funding for one of the Government's most critical programs. I only hope that future funding will reflect more concern about the crucial needs for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report and in opposition to efforts to reinstate the gag rule.

Abortion is not the issue at stake here, although there is no question that the administration efforts to gag doctors at federally funded health clinics are clearly designed to further erode a woman's right to choose.

Instead, the real issue is freedom of speech and whether or not women will be allowed to receive medical advice from their doctors without Government intrusion.

If Congress were to allow this gag rule to stand, it would open the floodgates to all kinds of meddling and social engineering by Government into areas which the Government should not be involved.

If this gag rule were to stand would we next allow the Government to limit what lawyers could tell their clients? Would we tell teachers what they could teach their students?

The gag rule would force health clinics to choose between Federal funds and their clients' right to full and complete medical advice.

No doctor, no health clinic director, no patient, should be faced with such choices—particularly in a free society.

As I reflect on this issue I cannot help but be struck by the outrageousness of the administration's action. How could we have reached the point where, in the United States of America, the Government seeks to control the flow of medical information to its citizens?

At a time when the Soviet Union is moving headlong toward freedom of speech are we to move in the opposite direction?

Are the radical abortion opponents in the administration so afraid of what women will do if they receive full information about their options, that they would intrude into the doctor-patient relationship and endanger a woman's health?

Do they really believe that if they gag doctors, women will choose not to have abortions?

All of this reminds me of an Orwellian horror story. Control the flow of information and you control both minds and actions.

Congress must stand up to the administration and the antichoice zealots and ensure that every woman has the right to receive full and complete medical advice.

Supporters of the gag rule clearly understand that their position does not have the support of the American public. They claim that there never was any gag rule.

That is wrong and they know it. There was a gag rule and the administration sought to impose it on every doctor who works at a health clinic which receives Federal funds.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in supporting this conference report and a woman's right to choose, and, if the President chooses to veto this legislation, to override his veto.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2707, which makes appropriations for the Department of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, numerous accounts reveal that the Job Corps Program, administered by the Department of Labor, has been successful in catapulting the lives and careers of youth in our inner cities. It is clearly a program that works.

There are approximately 100,000 disadvantaged youth in the city of Chicago who have not succeeded in the traditional public school setting, or are unemployed and lack requisite education and skills to obtain meaningful employment. Additionally, there is a sizable gap between the supply and employer demand for skilled workers in Chicago. In 1989 the unemployment rate for black teenagers was 40 percent in the city of Chicago. So, it is an understatement when we conclude that young people in Chicago, as in many other urban and rural centers, face immense disadvantages that exclude them from opportunities to be successful and productive citizens.

I am pleased that this conference report contains funds for six previously approved Job Corps centers. I believe that these new centers, which will be selected on a competitive basis, will create geographies of opportunity for the youth of this Nation. I am certain that every urban center, Chicago included, can appreciate the great need for these additional centers.

Finally, I would like to commend Chairman NATCHER and all the members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-Health and Human Services and Education for their hard work and dedication on this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the program before us has become a lightning rod for the debate on the question of whether a woman has a right to an abortion. But the simple truth is—the Supreme Court has decided that a woman does have that right—and the title X program has not, and will not under this bill, pay for abortion services. The family planning program has proven its value and rightfully deserves reauthorization.

The focus of our debate today is the discriminatory policies the administration has selected to restrict a woman's access to her constitutional right to an abortion and the denial of physicians' and counselors' rights to free speech.

The administration's regulatory gag rule requires that physicians treat patients differently depending on their financial status.

Women with money can receive full and truthful counseling about their options, including abortion; those who are forced to rely on the Government for their health care and family planning services are denied comprehensive pregnancy counseling.

Over 20 national medical and nursing associations oppose the gag rule including such eminently conservative groups as: the American Medical Association, the American Nurses Association, and the American Academy of Pediatrics.

These groups are opposed to the gag rule because it represents unprecedented and unacceptable Government interference with sound medical practice.

The regulations require health professionals to violate their code of ethics and to expose themselves to malpractice lawsuits.

There is no precedent whatsoever for such a radical department from medical practice or medical ethics over the decades which not only encourages but requires a doctor to withhold information critical to a woman in making informed judgments about her health options.

The Government is limiting what doctors can say confidentially to patients, an abridgement of both patients' and doctors' rights, and the doctor's hippocratic oath.

It is a perversion of medical practice.

The implications are frightening.

The Government can now tell doctors, "We don't like this treatment—so you can't discuss it with your patients. And if you do discuss it you forgo your rights to any Federal benefits."

Under this logic, tobacco companies could now put pressure on Federal authorities to prohibit doctors from informing patients of the links between tobacco smoking and lung cancer because, as the companies have continually maintained, no absolute cause and effect relationship has been established.

If you forget for one moment that the issue before us is abortion, it is inconceivable that Americans would tolerate a similar policy affecting a doctor's absolute right to advise patients freely, or their ability to consult the full range of health care options available to them.

If passed, H.R. 2707 has the power to restore fairness to family planning services and give women the information necessary to make their own health care decisions.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress today has the chance to ungag the doctors and unlock funds for neglected women's health. Poor women are the chief victims of the gag rule which, by shutting doctors up, shuts women off from vital information concerning abortions if they are dependent on federally funded clinics. And all women have been victims of insufficient national attention to health problems that have now assumed epidemic proportions—from breast cancer to osteoporosis.

Polls show that 71 percent of Americans believe that the gag rule is unfair to poor women. Ninety-one percent of Americans agree that it is important that poor women have access to clinics where they can seek advice on family planning and birth control. Seventy-six percent believe that "it makes sense for family planning clinics which receive Federal moneys to

give poor women advice about abortion." This is more than the two-thirds needed to make this bill veto proof. These majorities should rally the courage of this body.

May I make a special plea for indigent women in the District of Columbia. There is a double jeopardy. Thanks to a Presidential veto exercised now for three straight years, we cannot use our own tax raised funds to finance abortions, in derogation of every principle of democracy and home rule. On top of this burden, the gag rule adds the outrage of perhaps deadly silence from the trusted authority figure. The physician may not advise poor women of where to go for funds or advice in lieu of seeking help in the district. This is not a rule. It is a cruel edict unworthy of any American court or the Congress.

The gag rule gives us a two tiered system of reproductive rights. This bill declares all women to have equal reproductive rights. And this bill will finally remove the label "low priority" from the health problems that affect women of every race and background.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased that the conferees for the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill have provided at least \$1.5 million for new outreach initiatives to migrant farmworkers and their families. This provision is in response to a migrant farmworker mobile clinic grant program included in the Senate committee report accompanying the bill. I am particularly proud of the program because it is based upon a successful mobile health clinic program in my district operated jointly by the Virginia Garcia Memorial Migrant Health Center and Northwest Medical Teams, a nonprofit volunteer physicians organization.

In my district, the mobile medical and dental clinic provides primary care and dental services to over 13,000 migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families each year. It is a proven, cost effective way of overcoming health care barriers experienced by migrant and seasonal farmworkers, including isolation and the lack of transportation. The use of mobile clinics can take health care services directly to farm labor camps and other nearby locations.

Because I have seen firsthand the benefits of mobile medical outreach, I am a strong proponent of the Mobile Clinic Outreach Grant Program. I look forward to working with HRSA to develop a grant program that will help overcome the access barriers experienced by migrant farmworkers.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the conference report that the House considers today is the single most important piece of legislation affecting the well-being of all Americans. There is funding in this \$205 billion bill for health maintenance and health research; there is funding for quality of life programs such as LIHEAP energy assistance, child care, job training, and safety, and there is funding through Head Start and chapter 1 to educate America's young people to help create a better future.

This legislation is the yardstick by which we measure our degree of care for our fellow citizens. There are a number of programs in this bill that I have vigorously supported throughout my service in the Congress. I fought for funding for library services when the Reagan

administration proposed the elimination of this program. I led the fight against reductions in the LIHEAP energy assistance program, as I have done since the inception of LIHEAP, and I have continuously supported increased funding for cancer research, especially breast cancer research. All of these programs receive important levels of funding in this bill.

Most of my colleagues know my personal and intense reason for supporting increased funding for breast cancer research: The loss of my wife, Jo, to the relentless advance of this disease. I remain deeply distressed and offended by Secretary Louis Sullivan concerning breast cancer research. Earlier this year, Secretary Sullivan wrote: "The \$50 million earmark for breast cancer research and the development of a test for early detection of ovarian cancer is unnecessary." I will not be deterred from my mission to assure increased funds for breast cancer research, to provide women and scientists with the resources they need to fight this disease which has reached epidemic proportions, a disease which robs children of motherly love, guidance, and support.

There is, however, one offending provision concerning the prohibition of funds to be used to enforce the title X regulations, promulgated by the Department of Health and Human Services in 1988, the constitutionality of which was sustained by the Supreme Court this past May. The title X program was created to provide family planning services, not abortion services. President Bush has stated that he will veto the bill because of this provision. If he does so, I am confident that the Congress will sustain the veto and that the Subcommittee on Labor, HHS, Education will bring back to the floor this bill with the necessary corrective language. I will support the veto if the President expressly states that he finds only the Porter language concerning the title X regulations objectionable and that the President does not ask Congress for reductions in funding contained in this conference report. I will not support a veto if the President is critical of funding levels for programs under the jurisdiction of this appropriations bill. The White House congressional liaison staff have said that the President needs encouragement to veto this bill because of the offending title X provisions, and today I am offering that encouragement, but only on the title X issue and no other.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for this legislation—legislation vital to every American woman.

Significant attention has been given today to the provision in the conference report that would bar enforcement of the administration's "gag rule." As it should. The "gag rule" is a draconian attempt to withhold important medical information from women. It goes against everything we hold important in a free society.

But there is another, equally important, reason for supporting this conference report—it will dramatically improve the health of women. Included in this legislation are vital increases in funding for research into diseases that affect only women. Deadly diseases that kill over 50,000 women each year. This legislation proposes significant increases in research that will improve methods of early detection in cases of breast and ovarian cancer.

With these diseases, only early detection saves lives. I am here today because my can-

cer was detected early. I was lucky. But the sad reality is, too many women are diagnosed after it is much too late. And as a result, too many women are dying. It is a travesty that need not happen.

By increasing funding for the NIH and the CDC in the areas of women's health, we are signaling the Nation's health research establishment and women across the country that we are taking their situation seriously. By increasing funding we are reversing years of unwritten health care policy in this country that has treated women as an afterthought.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the committee for its work on this bill. Passage today is a matter of life and death for every American woman who is vulnerable to these diseases. I urge my colleagues to consider the needs of women who are endangered by these diseases as they cast their votes. And I urge the President not to play politics with such an important matter if this bill reaches his desk.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 2707, this motion contains several important programs that are crucial to my constituents.

Earlier this year I testified before Chairman Natcher, requesting that his committee appropriate funds for the only Federal program that would provide funding to States to reduce the number of dropouts. Since the School Dropout Prevention Basic Skills Improvement Act was passed and signed into law last year the dropout rate has worsened. According to the U.S. Department of Education, the number of high school graduates is expected to decline by 4 percent for this year.

However, I congratulate Chairman Natcher for appropriating funds for the current dropout demonstration assistance act, which has focused on demonstration programs that are, unfortunately, limited in the number of schools and students they actually serve. I hope that maybe next year P.L. 101-600 will receive an appropriation to aid States to alleviate the high dropout rates. Funding is urgently needed for this program that will encourage students to complete their high school education, and I will continue to urge the gentleman from Kentucky to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to compliment Chairman Natcher for increasing funds for the Job Corps. I supported the Job Corps 50-50 plan which would increase the quality of services offered by existing Job Corps centers and will add an additional 10 centers each year for the next five years.

My constituents are fortunate to have a great South Bronx Job Corps Center in their neighborhood. The South Bronx Job Corps Center is recognized by the U.S. Office of Job Corps as one of the ten best performing centers in the country. Last year it was awarded the prestigious director's award.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to note for the record that the unemployment rate for New York City is 8.9 percent, and for youth in the South Bronx it is estimated at almost 50 percent. Job Corps is a symbol of hope for the unemployed youth in the South Bronx. It is a second chance for the school dropout. Job Corps also is a service to employers who are facing shortages of qualified youth even in time of rising unemployment. Job Corps is a sound investment. It gives young people a second chance.

I am disappointed that there was not a significant increase in funding for the bilingual education act. Most recently the Department of Education's own longitudinal study indicated that children who receive bilingual education programs achieve higher than children who have no access to these programs.

Mr. Speaker, we need to reward successful academic programs that promote equity and access with funding. If these programs are fully funded at the elementary level, I am convinced that we will have less of a need for remedial programs in the higher grades.

Also of importance to my constituents, is an increase in programs: To curb and reduce infant mortality, fully fund the maternal and child health block grant, for the elderly, substance abuse and, the CDC breast and cervical cancer screening initiative. These increases are vital for communities such as the Bronx where the infant mortality rates and pediatric AIDS cases are the highest in the Nation.

I believe that with better funding for health, education and job training programs we can better prepare for our future. I urge my colleagues to support this pro-family bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 156, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

YEAS—272

Abercrombie	Cardin	Dwyer
Ackerman	Carper	Dymally
Alexander	Carr	Early
Anderson	Chandler	Eckart
Andrews (ME)	Chapman	Edwards (CA)
Andrews (NJ)	Clay	Edwards (TX)
Andrews (TX)	Clement	Engel
Anthony	Clinger	English
Aspin	Coleman (MO)	Erdreich
Atkins	Coleman (TX)	Espy
AuCoin	Collins (IL)	Evans
Bacchus	Collins (MI)	Fascell
Bellenson	Condit	Fawell
Bentley	Conyers	Fazio
Bereuter	Cooper	Feighan
Berman	Coughlin	Fish
Bevill	Cox (IL)	Flake
Bilbray	Coyne	Foglietta
Boehlert	Cramer	Ford (MI)
Bonior	Darden	Ford (TN)
Boucher	DeFazio	Frank (MA)
Boxer	DeLauro	Franks (CT)
Brewster	Dellums	Frost
Brooks	Derrick	Gallo
Browder	Dickinson	Gejdenson
Brown	Dicks	Gekas
Bruce	Dingell	Gephardt
Bryant	Dixon	Geren
Bustamante	Dooley	Gibbons
Byron	Dorgan (ND)	Gilchrest
Campbell (CA)	Downey	Gilman
Campbell (CO)	Durbin	Glickman

Gonzalez	McHugh	Sanders
Goodling	McMillen (MD)	Savage
Gordon	McNulty	Sawyer
Grandy	Meyers	Scheuer
Green	Mfume	Schiff
Guarini	Miller (CA)	Schroeder
Gunderson	Miller (WA)	Schumer
Hamilton	Mineta	Serrano
Harris	Mink	Sharp
Hatcher	Molinari	Shays
Hayes (IL)	Moody	Sikorski
Hefner	Moran	Sisisky
Hertel	Morella	Skaggs
Hoagland	Morrison	Skeen
Hobson	Mrazek	Skelton
Hochbrueckner	Murtha	Slattery
Horn	Myers	Slaughter (NY)
Horton	Nagle	Smith (FL)
Houghton	Natcher	Smith (IA)
Hoyer	Neal (MA)	Smith (TX)
Hubbard	Neal (NC)	Snowe
Hughes	Oakar	Solarz
Jacobs	Oberstar	Spratt
Jefferson	Obey	Stark
Jenkins	Olin	Stokes
Johnson (CT)	Olver	Studds
Johnson (SD)	Owens (NY)	Sweet
Johnston	Owens (UT)	Swift
Jones (GA)	Pallone	Synar
Jones (NC)	Panetta	Tanner
Jontz	Pastor	Thomas (CA)
Kaptur	Patterson	Thomas (GA)
Kennedy	Payne (NJ)	Thornton
Kennelly	Payne (VA)	Torres
Kildee	Pease	Torricelli
Kleczyka	Pelosi	Towns
Klug	Penny	Trafcant
Kopetski	Perkins	Traxler
Kostmayer	Peterson (FL)	Unsoeld
Lancaster	Pickett	Upton
Lantos	Pickle	Valentine
LaRocco	Porter	Vento
Laughlin	Price	Visclosky
Leach	Pursell	Washington
Lehman (CA)	Ramstad	Waters
Lehman (FL)	Rangel	Waxman
Levin (MI)	Ravenel	Weiss
Levine (CA)	Reed	Weldon
Lewis (GA)	Regula	Wheat
Lloyd	Richardson	Whitten
Long	Ridge	Williams
Lowe (NY)	Roemer	Wilson
Machtley	Rose	Wise
Markey	Rostenkowski	Wolpe
Martin	Roukema	Wyden
Matsui	Rowland	Yates
McCloskey	Roybal	Zeliff
McCurdy	Russo	Zimmer
McDermott	Sabo	

NAYS—156

Allard	Dreier	Kyl
Annunzio	Duncan	LaFalce
Applegate	Edwards (OK)	Lagomarsino
Archer	Emerson	Lent
Armey	Ewing	Lewis (CA)
Baker	Fields	Lewis (FL)
Ballenger	Gallely	Lightfoot
Barnard	Gaydos	Lipinski
Barrett	Gillmor	Livingston
Barton	Gingrich	Lowery (CA)
Bateman	Goss	Luken
Bennett	Gradison	Manton
Bilirakis	Hall (OH)	Marlenee
Bliley	Hall (TX)	Mavroules
Boehner	Hammerschmidt	Mazzoli
Borski	Hancock	McCandless
Broomfield	Hansen	McCollum
Bunning	Hastert	McCreery
Burton	Hefley	McDade
Callahan	Henry	McEwen
Camp	Herger	McGrath
Coble	Holloway	McMillan (NC)
Combest	Huckaby	Michel
Costello	Hunter	Miller (OH)
Cox (CA)	Hutto	Moakley
Crane	Hyde	Mollohan
Cunningham	Inhofe	Montgomery
Dannemeyer	Ireland	Moorhead
Davis	James	Murphy
de la Garza	Johnson (TX)	Nichols
DeLay	Kanjorski	Nowak
Donnelly	Kasich	Nussle
Doolittle	Kolbe	Ortiz
Dornan (CA)	Kolter	Orton

Oxley	Ros-Lehtinen	Stump
Packard	Roth	Sundquist
Parker	Santorum	Tallon
Paxon	Sarpalius	Tauzin
Peterson (MN)	Saxton	Taylor (MS)
Petri	Schaefer	Taylor (NC)
Poshard	Schulze	Thomas (WY)
Quillen	Sensenbrenner	Vander Jagt
Rahall	Shaw	Volkmer
Ray	Shuster	Vucanovich
Rhodes	Smith (NJ)	Walker
Riggs	Smith (OR)	Walsh
Rinaldo	Solomon	Weber
Ritter	Spence	Wolf
Roberts	Staggers	Wylie
Roe	Stallings	Yatron
Rogers	Stearns	Young (AK)
Rohrabacher	Stenholm	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Hayes (LA)	Martinez	Slaughter (VA)
Hopkins	Sangmeister	

□ 1537

Mr. RITTER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DURBIN and Mr. HUGHES changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the amendments in disagreement are considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 15, strike out "\$4,027,907,000" and insert "\$4,059,821,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$3,861,338,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE].

□ 1540

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee.

I would like to congratulate the gentleman for another fine conference report. As he knows, I am one of the biggest fans of him as chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the funding provided in the bill for new Job Corps centers. The House bill origi-

nally did not include any money for new centers, is that correct?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. PEASE. The Senate bill included funding for five new centers and certain locations were mentioned in the committee report. Is that correct?

Mr. NATCHER. That is correct.

Mr. PEASE. It is my understanding that the bill reported by the conference committee includes money for new centers, and that no specific center was earmarked in the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. NATCHER. That is correct.

Mr. PEASE. The city of Mansfield, OH, in my district, has put together a proposal for a Job Corps center. They feel their proposal is unique because it targets youth from smaller communities who historically do not fare well in centers located in urban areas. They have met with representatives at the Department of Labor and have received very positive feedback. It is my understanding that under this bill the city of Mansfield's proposal would be given equal consideration for one of the new Job Corps centers to be funded by this bill. Is that correct?

Mr. NATCHER. That is correct. The city of Mansfield's proposal would be considered on an even basis with any other proposal for a Job Corps center.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this clarification.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY].

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to thank my colleague from Kentucky, Congressman WILLIAM NATCHER, for his support for an increase in the appropriation for Job Corps. The \$4.3 million in the capital account of the Job Corps appropriations bill will enable priority site acquisition and planning for new Job Corps centers.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I support Job Corps because it helps so many poor young people obtain an education, learn a skill and get a job. Job Corps has shown that it helps young people and I am for any program that is effective.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman is aware, I have worked hard to attempt to bring a Job Corps center to Compton because we have so many young people who need help. Our unemployment rate is 17.6 percent, twice that of Los Angeles. Among young black males in Compton, unemployment is at 42 percent. Many of my constituents are young, poor, and low-income. The Compton Job Corps Center would offer a tremendous opportunity to young people who have little hope for the future.

Mr. NATCHER. You have made an excellent case for the needs of the youth of Compton. I hope you are suc-

cessful in the competition for new centers.

Mr. DYMALLY. I wish to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], my friends, Representatives STOKES, ROYBAL, and DIXON and Members in the other House who were so helpful in increasing funds for the Job Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a resolution of the city council of the city of Compton supporting a new Job Corps center, and various letters in support thereof as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 16.723

Whereas, there has been an increase in youth who are African-American, Hispanic, poor, homeless and disadvantaged and are more difficult to integrate into our society and economy; and

Whereas, youth (ages 16-22) unemployment in the City of Compton presently stands at 42% or three times the national rate; and

Whereas, one-fourth of all children born in the United States will be on some sort of welfare at some time in their lives, according to statistical trends; and

Whereas, the U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Job Corps has established a detailed step-by-step process of planning, developing building and contracting for the operation of new Job Corps Centers in the United States; and

Whereas, Job Corps has demonstrated that it has been successful in educating, training and job placing disadvantaged at-risk youth between the ages of 16 and 22; and

Whereas, local statistics substantiates the need for a new Job Corps Center in the City of Compton.

Now, therefore, the city council of the city of Compton does hereby resolve as follows:

Section 1. That the City Council of the City of Compton supports the construction and operation of a new Job Corps Center in the City of Compton.

Section 2. That the City Manager on behalf of the City Council be authorized to proceed with all efforts to assure the establishment of this facility and to assure a proportionate number of jobs will be reserved for the City's residents throughout each phase of this project.

Section 3. That a certified copy of this resolution shall be filed in each office of our elected, federal representatives and offices of the City Manager, City Clerk and Grants Management.

Section 4. That the Mayor shall sign and the City Clerk shall attest to the adoption of this resolution.

Adopted this 5th day of November, 1991.

COMPTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Compton, CA, October 14, 1991.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HARKIN: I am writing you to urge your support of the City of Compton as it relates to the upcoming consideration of cities to possibly receive appropriations for a Job Corps Center. It is my understanding that the Senate Bill includes \$10 million for the construction of five new centers, and that the Senate report language acknowledges Compton, along with four other cities, that have demonstrated great need and strong community support for a Job Corps Center to ensure opportunities for our disadvantaged youth.

The City of Compton is in an employment crisis! In a recent study made pursuant to the adoption of a new general plan for Compton, it was revealed that the overall unemployment rate of Compton (17.6 %) is twice that of the City of Los Angeles. Of the 17 surrounding Southern California cities researched in that study, Compton's unemployment rate ranked highest. The Los Angeles County average is 8.6%. Thus making the City of Compton the unemployment capital of Los Angeles County.

We have other egregious problems inasmuch as our students' test scores perennially rank lowest in the State of California. Compton youth desperately need job training and job opportunities of the vocational nature consistent with the Job Corps program.

As to Black males between the ages of 16-24, it is estimated that the unemployment rate is 42%. This is particularly noteworthy in light of the fact that the population of our community (90,454) is 52% African-American and 44% Hispanic.

Within the State of California, nowhere is the need for a Job Corps Center as great as Compton, where minorities make up 99% of the population. Approximately 75% of the population in Compton falls into the low to moderate income category. Unemployment is rampant to the extent that Compton's Western neighborhoods currently have a 72.7% unemployment rate.

The Compton Job Corps Center, if established, will also serve the Los Angeles County area, where an estimated 47,000 youth were referred to the county probation office last year. The single Job Corps Center in Los Angeles serves an average of 735 youth aged 16-22 at any one time. While this Job Corps Center performs a valuable service to the Los Angeles community, its 3 to 4 month waiting list demonstrates the need for another Job Corps Center to serve the Los Angeles County.

I appeal to you to reconsider the Job Corps program a priority item, and in receding to the Senate version of the bill and the report language allowing for the establishment of five new centers, which would include the Compton Center.

Thanks in advance for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

DR. J.L. HANDY,
Superintendent.

CITY OF COMPTON,
Compton, CA, November 5, 1991.

Hon. MERVYN DYMALLY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DYMALLY: I am writing to thank you for all of your work toward the establishment of a Job Corps Center in the city of Compton. I now understand that \$4.3 million dollars is available for the construction of new centers. The city of Compton has a great need, as well as strong community support, for a Job Corps Center to ensure opportunities for our disadvantaged youth.

As you are aware, Compton is in an employment crisis. In a recent study made pursuant to the adoption of a new General Plan for the city, it was revealed that Compton's overall unemployment rate (17.6%) is twice that of the city of Los Angeles. Of the 17 surrounding Southern California cities researched in that study, Compton's unemployment rate ranked highest. The Los Angeles County average is 8.6%; thus making the city of Compton the unemployment capital of Los Angeles County.

There are approximately 20,124 disadvantaged youth between the ages of 16-22 that

reside in Compton. This represents approximately 22.3% of our total population. The unemployment rate for this target group is approximately 23%.

As for Black males between the ages of 16-22, it is estimated that the unemployment rate is 40%. This is particularly noteworthy in light of the fact that the population of our community (90,454) is 55% African-American and 44% Hispanic. We have other egregious problems inasmuch as our student's test scores perennially rank lowest in the State of California. Compton youth desperately need job training and job opportunities of the vocational nature consistent with the Job Corps Program.

Finally, our community is being devastated by the highly disproportionate number of single family homes (22,593) and a drop-out rate estimated as high as 70%. Our medium family income is only 23,949 and our city has been designated as a special impact area by the Department of Commerce. If there is any community that qualifies for a Job Corps Center, we most certainly are it!

I am pleased to inform you that we have an excellent site available, and look forward with much enthusiasm to hearing a positive response from you and your colleagues. On behalf of the city of Compton, I thank you for your effort.

Sincerely,

WALTER R. TUCKER III,
Mayor, City of Compton.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SOCIAL
SERVICES,

El Monte, CA, October 15, 1991.

Hon. ALAN CRANSTON,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: I am writing to support the efforts of the residents of Compton, and their elected representatives, to secure passage of currently pending Federal legislation that will expand the Job Corps program and provide for a new Job Corps site in the City of Compton. The respected and successful education, training and rehabilitation programs administered by the Corps are well-suited to address the critical economic needs of the youth and young adults of Compton.

I welcome additional human services efforts that are intended to help meet the needs of persons served by the L.A. County Department of Public Social Services. Development of marketable skills and enhancement of job readiness are key Job Corps components that will be of considerable benefit in accelerating the movement of public assistance recipients into the job market.

Very truly yours,

EDDY S. TANAKA,
Director.

CITY OF COMPTON,
POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Compton, CA, August 8, 1991.

Hon. MERVYN M. DYMALLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DYMALLY: I am writing this letter to express my sincere appreciation for the recent action taken by you in securing a job corps training center for the City of Compton.

The fact that only five new job corps training centers were authorized by Congress for the entire nation clearly demonstrates your persuasive abilities and tenacity in obtaining this most worthwhile project for our community.

I would also like to extend thanks to your Chief Legislative Director, Mr. Marwan Burgan, who has been in constant contact with members of my staff on this and other important matters.

Again, thank you for your efforts on behalf of the citizens of Compton.

Sincerely,

TERRY R. EBERT,
Chief of Police.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN CAUCUS,
CALIFORNIA DEMOCRATIC COUNCIL,
Carson, CA, November 4, 1991.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DYMALLY: Knowing of your years of dedication as a champion for your district, I am positive it is not necessary to quote statistics relevant to the numbers of poor and minority untrained and unemployed youth that compose Compton and its surrounding communities. What is important is that we as an afflicted community support you as you act as an emissary of our impassioned concerns to your colleagues. It is important that your fellow members of Congress understand the depth of the desperation and despair existing within our communities.

Recently, I heard Los Angeles referred to as becoming a vanquished wasteland. If this is so, it is because of the inequitable burden of the disenfranchised massed within our urban boundaries. The circumstances that exist within these demographics were not of our doing. It is the results of great influxes of poor immigrants. Years of inadequate education and an inundation of alcohol, drugs and weapons dumped in our communities while exploiting our children for profit. It is the systematic undermining of our family structure. The decades of government band-aid approaches, denials and apathy to the social ills of minority, poor, urban communities.

As you carry this message, please convey the fact that the lack of incentive; the lack of employment; the lack of self actualization in mainstream America has victimized our communities, and that the victims historically have been blamed for the crime when in fact the real travesties live far from our communities under the guise of respectability.

Our communities have been exploited for so long that its problems are wearing on the fibers of the nation. The vast expansion of the under class in recent years is the result of this neglect and exploitation. It is the core of decomposition of our urban cities.

Now is the time, if ever, for concentrated reconstructive efforts. Comprehensive training and employment must be a priority. With economic mobility comes self worth and self respect. The establishment of a Job Corps Center in Compton, California is not just needed, it is crucial to the future development of Compton and its neighbors.

Sincerely,

VICTORIA MCKINNEY,
State Chairperson.

YWCA EXECUTIVE OFFICES,
Los Angeles, CA, October 15, 1991.

Hon. MERVYN M. DYMALLY,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DYMALLY: The YWCA of Los Angeles, the contract operator for the Los Angeles Job Corps since 1965, strongly urges you to ensure that a new Job Corps Center is located in Compton, California. From the perspective of a Job Corps operator, we know the demands of the program, as well its successes. It is from this perspective

we can see no more appropriate, or needed location for such a program anywhere in the State of California, or in the country for that matter.

Ethnic minority groups make up almost 100% of the population of the city of Compton. The unemployment rate is significantly higher than any of the surrounding municipalities, and approximately 75% of the residents fall in the low/moderate income category. Through its Compton Center, the YWCA of Los Angeles has provided support services to this community for over 10 years. This has included a solo program offering services to the displaced homemaker, Minority Women's Employment Seminars and other job readiness programs. However, this is just not enough.

Your support of a Job Corps Center in the City of Compton will expand the base of services provided in the municipality. Such a Center will not only enhance the potential of many community youth, but will also broaden the economic base of the City through additional trade opportunities, as well as an increase in available jobs.

Should you desire more information about the community and its employment service needs, and the needs of the youth, please do not hesitate to call either of us (Mrs. Harris (213) 636-1429 or Dr. Wiltz at (213) 482-3470).

Sincerely,

ELAINE HARRIS,
Director, Compton
Center.

LAURA S. WILTZ, Ph.D.,
Chief Executive Officer.

COMPTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Compton, CA, October 18, 1991.

Hon. TOM HARKIN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HARKIN: I am writing to support the efforts of the residents of Compton, and their elected representatives, to secure passage of currently pending Federal legislation that will expand the Job Corps program and provide for a new Job Corps site in the City of Compton. The respected and successful education training and rehabilitation programs administered by the Corps are well-suited to address the critical economic needs of the youth and young adults of Compton.

I welcome additional human services efforts that are intended to help meet the needs of persons served by the Compton Unified School District. Development of marketable skills and enhancement of job readiness are key Job Corps components that will be of considerable benefit in accelerating the movement of public assistance recipients into the job market.

Sincerely,

RILEY JOHNSON, Jr.,
Assistant Superintendent.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to bring to the attention of this body a funding reduction in the Labor-HHS bill which will seriously impair our ability to save taxpayers' dollars. Mr. Speaker, as you know, last November the Chief Financial Officers Act was passed by this body and the other body without dissent, and later signed by the President.

The CFO Act was passed in response to the gross abuse of taxpayers' dollars resulting from the HUD scandal, and because of numerous other examples of executive branch mismanagement. The legislation was designed to establish a front-line defense against fraud, waste, and abuse, and will help to restore the American public's confidence in the Federal Government.

When the appropriations bills for agencies with CFO's went to conference, I wrote letters urging the conferees to support the important goals of the CFO Act by either providing the requested funding or by restoring funding cut by the House and the other body. Despite my best efforts, however, certain agencies were hit hard during the conference process, including the Department of Health and Human Services. The Department requested funds for the inspector general so that it could implement the CFO Act. The House reduced that request by \$9.5 million, and the other body reduced the request by another \$5.65 million. The inspector general is at risk of losing an additional \$2 million if he is asked to share in the Department's across-the-board reductions.

The Department's budget of \$550 billion requested for fiscal year 1992 represents 36 percent of the total Federal budget. The inspector general's audits, investigations, and evaluations cover Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and some 260 other programs to assure the Congress and the administration that we do not have another HUD scandal.

Additionally, the Department's inspector general, Richard P. Kusserow, has been a leader within the inspector general community in implementing the CFO's Act. The Congress simply cannot afford to show a lack of support to an outstanding inspector general at a time when the country desperately needs funds for domestic needs.

Unfortunately, the conferees did not see fit to restore the amounts requested. The Department's office of inspector general pays for itself many times over. Last year the inspector general's work resulted in \$5.8 billion in savings, settlements, recoveries and restitutions—a payback of \$62 for every dollar funded for inspector general operations.

Since the requested funding was not approved in conference, the Department's inspector general will need to reduce its staff by an estimated 120 positions. The Department hopes to make these reductions through the normal attrition process, but because of the economy, its turnover rate is lower than usual. Therefore, other options are being considered, including furloughing its staff for up to 10 days per person. Eliminating these dedicated, hard-working, experienced, and invaluable employees' positions will place the inspector general in jeopardy of being

unable to fulfill the requirements the Congress has placed upon the agency.

And, Mr. Speaker, I could not come to speak on this legislation without addressing the gag rule on title X public clinics. Although many people are trying to paint this as a fight on abortion, in fact, the gag rule, if implemented, would represent a much more frightening blow to the Bill of Rights. Because just as ominous as the erosion of personal choice is the erosion of elementary democratic tenets of free speech. Requiring the withholding of pertinent medical information by a health care professional is absolutely unthinkable. Anyone who has read this morning's memo from President Bush to Secretary Sullivan knows perfectly well that the creative rewording of the President's position is actually nothing new—George Bush is telling my constituents, those unable to afford private physicians, that they are second-class citizens. That they are going to receive inferior and severely limited medical information; that their doctor-patient relationships will be dictated by the Bush administration holding the Federal purse strings. I encourage each of my colleagues, regardless of their views on abortion rights, to join me in protecting the constitutionally guaranteed rights and privileges of all Americans.

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 3, line 4, strike out "\$52,464,000" and insert: "\$80,464,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Natcher moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$187,700,000 is appropriated for part B of title II of the Job Training Partnership Act, as amended, in addition to amounts otherwise provided herein for part B of title II, to be available for obligation for the period October 1, 1992 through June 30, 1993; and, in addition, \$73,000,000".

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I intend to rise in several instances this afternoon to highlight those amendments in disagreement which deal with programs that involve forward funding. If the managers of this bill would be so kind as to share with me some additional information on this particular item, I would be greatly appreciative.

I see by the amendment in disagreement that we are talking about \$187,700,000 appropriated for part B of title II of the Job Training Partnership Act. Of that there would be \$73 million that would be forward funded. Is that a correct interpretation?

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

Mr. PENNY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, \$187,700,000 would be delayed obligations.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, there are several provisions such as this in this bill, not all of them are in disagreement, but in total there is 4.3 billion dollars' worth of funds which will not be obligated until September 30. Most of those outlays will then occur in the next fiscal year, crowding our budget in fiscal year 1993. I strongly object to this process. The only opportunity we will have today to express our disagreement with that type of funding is to single out these various amendments for a separate vote, and I would intend to do so on this item.

□ 1550

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that when the President sent us his budget request for the fiscal year 1992, it had \$1.4 billion of the delayed obligations for this bill. The House has approved delayed obligations in seven other appropriation bills this year. That includes \$3.3 billion in the House-passed version of the Defense appropriation bill. I believe in VA-HUD, Mr. Speaker, in the President's budget that he sent to the Congress there was \$380 million in delayed obligations.

Mr. Speaker, all down through the budget as presented we had delayed obligations. I say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], Mr. Speaker, that this is a procedure that we on our Committee on Appropriations have never had to contend with before.

We had all of these requests in the budget as presented, and I would hope that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] would not insist upon a rollcall vote on these matters, knowing, as he does, where it started, and how it got up to the Hill.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman again relate for the membership the dollar amount involved in

forward funding as requested by the White House?

Mr. NATCHER. The forward funding as requested by the White House for this bill was \$1.442 billion, and I say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], and I say this to the gentleman because he is our friend, and I do not know of a provision in this bill pertaining to the health and the education of our children that the gentleman is not in favor of. I do not know of one that is in this bill, knowing the gentleman like I do.

You see, the position that we were put in in the very beginning with the budget as presented and, I say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], I would respectfully request that he not insist upon a rollcall vote on these matters. The gentleman knows the situation we were put in in the very beginning starting with the budget.

If there was a matter where we on the subcommittee and on the Committee on Appropriations had brought in a bill and we had all of the delayed obligations in there starting with our committee, it would be a different matter. This starts, and it has started, from OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, and not only the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the chairman that it seems to me that when this House passed the Defense appropriations bill, there was something like \$3.3 billion in forward funding in that bill, and the membership saw the uses and the need in those instances. No complaint was made in that instance.

Am I correct, I ask of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], the chairman, was it \$3.3 billion in the Defense appropriations bill?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct. That is the amount.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, how about the space station? Was that not on a forward-funded basis?

Mr. NATCHER. There was \$754 million in delayed obligations in the VA-HUD bill.

Mr. AUCOIN. If the chairman will continue to yield to me, I would join him in urging my colleague, and I have a great deal of respect for him, I would urge him to not seek a separate vote on this question.

In the case of Defense, at \$3.3 billion, in the case of the space station, in those cases, a vote of this kind was not requested here, because those were found necessary. We are dealing here with programs that are absolutely vital to human beings in this country, people who feel like they have been left

out and forgotten. I am talking about the American people.

I would just urge him not to get a separate vote on this question.

I think, as the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] said earlier today, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, this is a perfectly appropriate procedure, and he is the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. I do not know of any chairman on the Committee on Appropriations subcommittees, any committee chairman who is a straighter arrow when it comes to the straight use of procedure on appropriations than the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], my colleague, the chairman of this subcommittee.

So I join him in urging the gentleman not to ask for a vote on this subject.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], one of the able Members of this House.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to indicate that I agree with the chairman and the gentleman from Oregon in their remarks about other legislation, appropriations legislation, that has used this same tactic to fund various programs and purposes.

In particular, I opposed the space station funding for the very same reason that I am alarmed by some of the items in this bill, because next year that increased funding for that space station is going to further crowd research, is going to further crowd VA health care and other valuable programs.

It is that kind of obligation in one fiscal year that creates headaches and problems for us in the out years. I am fearful that we may be doing the same thing with this legislation, and it is for that reason that I wanted to draw attention to the fact that in this bill there is \$4.3 billion worth of spending that will occur on September 30 and carry forward into the next fiscal year. That is not the way we ought to be setting our priorities here in this Congress.

If I wanted to press the point, I could not only call for a vote on amendment No. 7 affecting the Job Training Partnership Act, I could call for a vote on the amendment in disagreement No. 9, because there is forward funding involved there as well; I could call for a vote on amendment No. 38, which involves forward funding for the Centers for Disease Control; amendment No. 41, National Institutes of Health, here again, forward funding; amendment No. 47, affecting the National Institute for Allergies and Infectious Diseases; amendment No. 49 involving forward funding for the National Institute of Children's Health; amendment No. 52

involving funding for the National Institute on Aging; and amendment no. 55, including forward funding for various other programs and purposes; amendment No. 68, forward funding on alcohol and drug abuse; amendment no. 90, an amendment calling for funding of refugee assistance programs; amendment No. 93 for farm worker programs; amendment No. 94 for child-care programs; amendment No. 96 for human development services; amendment No. 112 for Department of Education programs; amendment No. 124, similarly in the Department of Education; amendment No. 158, student financial aid; amendment No. 164 involving certain higher education block grants. The list goes on.

The argument today is not so much over the independent merits of these various proposals. The argument is that altogether they amount to \$4.3 billion worth of spending above and beyond the limits we set for ourselves for the coming fiscal year.

We did not evidently find room anywhere else in this appropriation bill to make the necessary cuts to provide for these priority items.

My frustration is that this bill, as so many other bills, involved choices, and we have shown an unwillingness to make those choices. Consequently, you are asking the membership today to vote for spending for health, human services and other programs way above the amount that we thought we had agreed to not only last fall with the budget agreement but earlier this year with our own budget resolution.

Again, I think it is important to stress the process that has been utilized in order to allow for these higher funding levels. It is important that we stress today the problems we are going to create for ourselves next year as we begin to experience the squeeze that these higher spending levels cause for the very programs in this bill that we all claim to support.

In deference to the chairman of the committee, for whom I have the greatest respect, I will not proceed to call a vote on each and every one of these items, but I do hope that as we proceed with next year's budget, we are careful to stay within the limits we set for ourselves.

□ 1600

It is the very least that we ought to do to honor our own limits. I would venture to say that the public at large is not terribly impressed without known spending lids, because even within the spending agreements that have been reached here on Capitol Hill, we have allowed the deficit to grow.

Again, I will not call for a separate vote on this item or the other items. I appreciate the opportunity the chairman has given me to draw attention to this practice of forward funding and I intend to object to this practice as it is

utilized in other measures as they come before this House.

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

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the gentleman that I appreciate and admire him for bringing this to the attention of the body. The gentleman has proposed amendments over the last few years to cut 2 percent, 3 percent, 4 percent, 1 percent, out of various spending bills, and I think I supported him on all of those. I believe the gentleman's supported me on a number of the pork barrel amendments that I sponsored in the past 6 to 8 months.

I would just like to ask the gentleman this question. I mean, we are forward funding \$4.3 billion over the current limits that have been set, and we are obligating money on the last day of the fiscal year and we are going to have to rob Peter to pay Paul.

I mean, next year when we start setting spending limits, this money will not be there. That means there is going to be a compressed amount of money with which we pay the bills of this country.

I would just like to ask the gentleman this question. Why not call for a vote on these amendments? I have great respect for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]. He is one of the finest men in this House, but we have to set a record for the people of this country to follow as far as the spending practices of the Congress of the United States, whether it is on pork barrel spending or whether it is on forward spending.

I mean, this is a way to circumvent the budget agreement. I would just like to encourage the gentleman to call for votes on these things. I think it is extremely important that we set a record. The people of this country are facing a \$400 billion deficit this year. The national debt has gone from \$1 to \$4 trillion in just 4 years. Interest on the national debt is up to 18 cents on a dollar. We have got to do something. Spending is out of control and here is one way to draw attention to \$4.3 billion in spending that was not authorized.

So Mr. Speaker, I just would encourage the gentleman to reconsider doing that, and if the gentleman does not, I think I might.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 250, nays 175, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

YEAS—250

Abercrombie	Frank (MA)	Morella
Ackerman	Gallo	Morrison
Alexander	Gaydos	Mrazek
Anderson	Gejdenson	Murtha
Andrews (ME)	Gephardt	Myers
Andrews (NJ)	Gibbons	Nagle
Andrews (TX)	Gilman	Natcher
Annunzio	Gonzalez	Neal (MA)
Anthony	Goodling	Neal (NC)
Applegate	Gordon	Nowak
Aspin	Gradison	Oakar
Atkins	Green	Oberstar
AuCoin	Guarini	Obey
Bacchus	Hall (OH)	Olin
Bennett	Hamilton	Olver
Berman	Harris	Ortiz
Bevill	Hatcher	Orton
Boehlert	Hayes (IL)	Owens (NY)
Bonior	Hefner	Owens (UT)
Borski	Hertel	Pastor
Boucher	Hochbrueckner	Payne (NJ)
Boxer	Horn	Pease
Brewster	Horton	Pelosi
Brooks	Houghton	Perkins
Browder	Hoyer	Peterson (FL)
Brown	Hubbard	Peterson (MN)
Bruce	Jacobs	Pickett
Bryant	Jefferson	Poshard
Bustamante	Jenkins	Price
Byron	Johnson (SD)	Rahall
Campbell (CO)	Johnston	Rangel
Cardin	Jones (GA)	Reed
Carr	Jones (NC)	Regula
Chapman	Jontz	Richardson
Clay	Kanjorski	Rinaldo
Clement	Kaptur	Roe
Clinger	Kennedy	Roemer
Coleman (TX)	Kennelly	Rogers
Collins (IL)	Kildee	Rose
Collins (MI)	Kiecicka	Roybal
Conyers	Kolter	Russo
Costello	Kopetski	Sabo
Cox (IL)	LaFalce	Sanders
Coyne	Lantos	Sarpalius
Cramer	LaRocco	Savage
Darden	Lehman (CA)	Sawyer
Davis	Lehman (FL)	Scheuer
de la Garza	Levin (MI)	Schiff
DeFazio	Levine (CA)	Schroeder
DeLauro	Lewis (CA)	Schumer
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Derrick	Lipinski	Sharp
Dicks	Lloyd	Sikorski
Dingell	Long	Skeen
Dixon	Lowey (NY)	Slaughter (NY)
Donnelly	Machtley	Smith (FL)
Dooley	Manton	Smith (IA)
Downey	Markey	Smith (NJ)
Durbin	Matsui	Solarz
Dwyer	Mavroules	Spratt
Dymally	Mazzoli	Staggers
Early	McCloskey	Stallings
Eckart	McDade	Stark
Edwards (CA)	McDermott	Stokes
Edwards (TX)	McGrath	Studds
Emerson	McHugh	Swett
Engel	McMillen (MD)	Swift
Erdreich	McNulty	Synar
Espy	Mfume	Tallon
Evans	Miller (CA)	Tanner
Fascell	Mineta	Thomas (GA)
Fazio	Mink	Thornton
Feighan	Moakley	Torres
Flake	Mollohan	Torricelli
Foglietta	Montgomery	Towns
Ford (MI)	Moody	Traficant
Ford (TN)	Moran	Traxler

Unsoeld
Vento
Viscolsky
Volkmer
Walsh
Washington
Waters

Waxman
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson

Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NAYS—175

Allard	Hammerschmidt	Penny
Archer	Hancock	Petri
Armey	Hansen	Pickle
Baker	Hastert	Porter
Ballenger	Hefley	Pursell
Barnard	Henry	Quillen
Barrett	Herger	Ramstad
Barton	Hoagland	Ravenel
Bateman	Hobson	Ray
Bellenson	Holloway	Rhodes
Bentley	Huckaby	Ridge
Bereuter	Hughes	Riggs
Bilbray	Hunter	Ritter
Bilirakis	Hutto	Roberts
Billey	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Boehner	Inhofe	Ros-Lehtinen
Broomfield	Ireland	Roth
Bunning	James	Roukema
Burton	Johnson (CT)	Rowland
Callahan	Johnson (TX)	Santorum
Camp	Kasich	Saxton
Campbell (CA)	Klug	Schaefer
Carper	Kolbe	Schulze
Chandler	Kostmayer	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Kyl	Shaw
Coleman (MO)	Lagomarsino	Shays
Combest	Lancaster	Shuster
Condit	Laughlin	Sisisky
Cooper	Leach	Skaggs
Coughlin	Lent	Skelton
Cox (CA)	Lewis (FL)	Slaterry
Crane	Lightfoot	Smith (OR)
Cunningham	Livingston	Smith (TX)
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)	Snowe
DeLay	Luken	Solomon
Dickinson	Marlenee	Spence
Doilittle	Martin	Stearns
Dorgan (ND)	McCandless	Stenholm
Dornan (CA)	McCollum	Stump
Dreier	McCrery	Sundquist
Duncan	McCurdy	Tauzin
Edwards (OK)	McEwen	Taylor (MS)
English	McMillan (NC)	Taylor (NC)
Ewing	Meyers	Thomas (CA)
Fawell	Michel	Thomas (WY)
Fields	Miller (OH)	Upton
Fish	Miller (WA)	Valentine
Franks (CT)	Molinari	Vander Jagt
Galegaly	Moorhead	Vucanovich
Gekas	Nichols	Walker
Geren	Nussle	Weber
Gilchrest	Oxley	Wolf
Gillmor	Packard	Wyllie
Gingrich	Pallone	Young (AK)
Glickman	Panetta	Young (FL)
Goss	Parker	Zeliff
Grandy	Patterson	Zimmer
Gunderson	Paxon	
Hall (TX)	Payne (VA)	

NOT VOTING—8

Frost	Martinez	Sangmeister
Hayes (LA)	Murphy	Slaughter (VA)
Hopkins	Rostenkowski	

□ 1623

Mr. DICKINSON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Messrs. DORGAN of North Dakota, COLEMAN of Missouri, PANETTA, BILBRAY, and KASICH, Mrs. PATTERSON, and Messrs HUCKABY, SKAGGS, and HOAGLAND changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. EMERSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 3, line 22, after "1993" insert "": *Provided further*, That for the period July 1, 1992, through June 30, 1993, no State shall receive more than 130 percent of its allotment percentage under section 201 of the Job Training Partnership Act for the program year July 1, 1991, through June 30, 1992: for additional amounts as follows:

"(a) In addition to amounts appropriated in this Act, there are appropriated to the Centers for Disease Control for "Disease control, research, and training", \$10,000,000, which shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992.

"(b) In addition to amounts appropriated in this Act, there are appropriated to the Administration for Children and Families for "Low Income Home Energy Assistance", \$200,000,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, \$405,607,000 shall become available for making payments on September 30, 1992.

"(c) In addition to amounts appropriated in this Act, there are appropriated to the Department of Education for "Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged", \$152,000,000, which shall become available on September 30, 1992, and shall remain available through September 30, 1993, of which \$138,000,000 shall be available for basic grants under section 1005 and \$14,000,000 shall be available for concentration grants under section 1006 of Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended.

"(d) In addition to amounts appropriated in this Act, there are appropriated to the Department of Education for "Impact Aid", for construction and renovation of school facilities under section 10 of Public Law 81-815, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall become available for obligation on September 30, 1992.

"(e) In addition to amounts appropriated in this Act, there are appropriated to the Department of Education for "Vocational and Adult Education", \$60,000,000, which shall become available on September 30, 1992 and shall remain available through September 30, 1993.

"(f) In addition to amounts appropriated in this Act, there are appropriated to the Department of Education for "Student Financial Assistance", \$62,000,000 which shall be available for Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, and which shall become available on September 30, 1992 and shall remain available through September 30, 1993.

"(g) In addition to amounts appropriated in this Act, there are appropriated to the Department of Education for "Higher Education", \$24,000,000, which shall become available on September 30, 1992 and shall remain available through September 30, 1993, of which \$3,000,000 shall be available for carrying out section 602(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and \$1,000,000 shall be available for carrying out section 604 of the Act, and \$20,000,000 shall be available for carrying out title IV, part A, subpart 4 of the Act: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, of the amounts made available in title II for the Health Resources and Services Administration, "Health Resources and Services", \$86,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for Centers for Disease Control, "Disease Control, Research, and Training",

\$94,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992 but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Cancer Institute", an additional \$63,446,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute", \$54,555,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Institute of Dental Research", \$7,903,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases", \$28,457,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke", \$27,357,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases", \$45,627,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Institute of General Medical Sciences", \$48,104,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Eye Institute", \$12,504,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences", \$8,846,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Institute on Aging", \$16,308,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases", \$7,593,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Institute on Deafness and Other

Communication Disorders", \$7,486,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Center for Research Resources", \$15,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Center for Nursing Research", \$2,646,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Center for Human Genome Research", \$10,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "John E. Fogarty International Center", \$800,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "National Library of Medicine", \$3,500,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available in title II for the National Institutes of Health, "Office of the Director", \$12,500,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992.

"SEC. 100. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on or before December 1, 1991, the Secretary of Labor, acting under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, shall promulgate a final occupational health standard concerning occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens. The final standard shall be based on the proposed standard as published in the Federal Register on May 30, 1989 (54 FR 23042), concerning occupational exposures to the hepatitis B virus, the human immunodeficiency virus and other bloodborne pathogens.

"(b) In the event that the final standard referred to in subsection (a) is not promulgated by the date required under such subsection, the proposed standard on occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens as published in the Federal Register on May 30, 1989 (54 FR 23042) shall become effective as if such proposed standard had been promulgated as final standard by the Secretary of Labor, and remain in effect until the date on which such Secretary promulgates the final standard referred to in subsection (a).

"SEC. 100A. (a) The Senate finds that since the 1990 Budget Summit Agreement, extraordinary events in the world, particularly in Central Europe and the former Soviet Union may provide our country with an opportunity to re-examine the broad spending priorities embodied in the 1990 Budget Summit Agreement.

"(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States and the Democratic and Republican leadership of the Congress should consider establishing new priorities. If it is so determined, based on current and changing world events, the defense spending path negotiated in the 1990 summit could be reduced in the future, then any such reduction should be made available

for reducing Federal budget deficits, reducing Federal tax burdens, increasing domestic spending, or any combination thereof".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

On page 16 of the House engrossed bill, insert after line 19 the following:

SEC. 100. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on or before December 1, 1991, the Secretary of Labor, acting under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, shall promulgate a final occupational health standard concerning occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens. The final standard shall be based on the proposed standard as published in the Federal Register on May 30, 1989 (54 FR 23042), concerning occupational exposures to the hepatitis B virus, the human immunodeficiency virus and other bloodborne pathogens.

(b) In the event that the final standard referred to in subsection (a) is not promulgated by the date required under such subsection, the proposed standard on occupational exposure to bloodborne pathogens as published in the Federal Register on May 30, 1989 (54 FR 23042) shall become effective as if such proposed standard had been promulgated as a final standard by the Secretary of Labor, and remain in effect until the date on which such Secretary promulgates the final standard referred to in subsection (a).

(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require the Secretary of Labor (acting through the Occupational Safety and Health Administration) to revise the employment accident reporting regulations published at 29 C.F.R. 1904.8.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 5, line 19, strike out "\$3,151,825,000" and insert "\$3,178,485,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$3,148,655,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 18, line 5, after "VIII," insert "X".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert "X, XII".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 18, line 16, strike out "\$86,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$125,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 shall be for the Healthy Start program".

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Indiana will be recognized.

Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] seek time on the motion?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Michigan seek time?

Mr. PURSELL. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. PURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr.

PURSELL] for yielding, and, through him, I would like to speak to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] just briefly.

I say to the gentleman, "Please listen just a little bit. When we went to conference on this bill, there were several projects specifically earmarked. Now they were earmarked by the most senior Members in the other body. On each and every one of these there was the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Michigan insisting there be no earmarks. They were not easy fights. They were fights that went on for several hours. In every one of them, in every one of them, the earmark was removed. Every single item in this bill is open to open competition.

Now, when we speak for forward funding, I say to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], and I really would like him to listen on this, that the two people most opposed in the subcommittee were the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL]. They were vehemently opposed to it in all instances.

Now they also noted the fact that it was initiated by the administration. They did not like that, but it was initiated by OMB. The chairman swallowed hard, and he accepted that, and then we proceeded on.

As far as it was brought up in the conference, the defense bill had forward funding, and, when one thinks about the Defense bill, if they think of the billions and billions of dollars that are in the pipeline, that have been in the pipeline for several years, that is really just forward funding.

□ 1630

But the chairman insisted that he was vehemently opposed, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] could not have been more opposed to it, but it had been initiated by the President. It had been done to a certain degree, it had been done in the HUD bill, it had been done in the defense bill, and it had been signed by the President. So despite that, the chairman and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] did not prevail because we could not make it work, because we could not get to it.

My final point, I say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], is that in the last rollcall you made your point. I really think if you think about it a little bit, you will have achieved what you wanted to do. You let anyone that wanted to get on record in opposition to forward funding be in opposition. Now, I think there is a courtesy here other than a rhetorical courtesy. I think there is a courtesy that when you speak here, you realize this is the only Member of this House who has been here over 30 years and who has made 13,071 consecutive votes, has never missed a vote, and the gentleman

from Kentucky is probably the most respected person in this body. So you could just recognize that you made your point, having given a courtesy to the gentleman on your side and to the gentleman from Kentucky who vehemently opposed forward funding.

Mr. Speaker, I really think it would be in the best interest of everyone in this House and in the best interest of Government if the gentleman would do that.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, on these motions on amendments in disagreement, those who are opposed get some portion of the time. I was not allocated any time, nor was the question put by the Chair on whether or not the gentleman from Tennessee or the gentleman from Michigan was opposed. If they are opposed, they get the time, and I will ask them for time, but if they are not opposed, according to the rules, I believe I get part of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that ordinarily the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Michigan would be recognized on each amendment. However, at the time the motion is offered, if another Member challenges the minority Member and the minority Member is not opposed, then that Member making the challenge would be entitled to one-third of the time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. As a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, usually the Chair puts the question to those involved, the chairman and the ranking member: "Are you opposed to the motion?" And if they are not opposed, then those who are opposed are granted part of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair normally does not put that question to the two managers unless there is a challenge.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. With all due respect to my colleague from Tennessee and my colleague from Michigan, Mr. Speaker, I make that request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this amendment, the gentleman's request is not timely. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] controls the time. The gentleman from Indiana would have to ask for time from the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my dear friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], that if he wants 10 minutes, I am going to yield him 10 minutes.

Mr. BURTON, let me say this to you: We have 13 appropriation bills that were sent up here by the President

through OMB. Let me say, Mr. BURTON, that I like the President. In 7 of the 13 appropriation bills we have delayed obligations of \$8,700 million, of which \$2 million was requested by President Bush. He sent it up here.

I say to the gentleman, frankly, that I agree with him. As my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. EARLY], pointed out, in the conference we had some problems with it. It was sent up here by the President.

Mr. BURTON, I am going to yield you this time, but let me ask you something. Just as a matter of common decency, Mr. BURTON, you are a good Member of the House, and I say, don't put these Members through the eye of a needle. They sent this up here from downtown. We did not start it up here. We did not start it, Mr. BURTON. That is one thing you cannot blame on the Congress of the United States. You cannot blame us.

Every time you pick up a newspaper in the last few days they blame the Congress for something. I say, don't blame us for this. I say, Mr. BURTON, I like you, you are a good Member of the House, but don't do that to us, Mr. BURTON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has yielded 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], and the gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for my colleague, Mr. NATCHER, of Tennessee, and my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, Tennessee is right next door to me, and we love them all. We love everybody in Tennessee and Kentucky, but I am from Kentucky.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am sorry, sir. I apologize, Mr. NATCHER. My wife is from Corbin, KY, and she would shoot me if I did not mention her great State.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, after all these niceties, that if the President of the United States circumvents the budget agreement or the Congress, it is wrong. That is wrong. We made a budget agreement, and we said we were going to live within those budgetary constraints. Today, on the last day of the fiscal year, we are now going to circumvent that to the tune of \$4.3 billion.

Let me just say this: I do not care if it is in this bill or the Defense bill, if there is forward funding, I am going to oppose it. We have a \$400 billion deficit staring us in the face this year. We have quadrupled the deficit; we have gone from \$1 trillion to \$4 trillion with the national debt in the last decade.

For the past 6 months I have been fighting pork-barrel spending on this floor. I have fought and had amendments down here for \$65,000, \$1 million,

\$5 million, \$10 million, and \$700 million. But in this particular piece of legislation there is \$4.3 billion in forward funding, and we are saying, "Well, the White House asked for a lot of it, and we asked for a lot of it, and because of that we should turn our backs on it and not pay any attention."

The budget agreement is being circumvented. We are going beyond what we agreed to spend, and because of that, we are obligating next year \$4.3 billion and we are going to have to take that out of spending next year. In other words, the pie next year is going to be smaller. So what do we do? We are forward funding into it next year. What we are doing is misleading ourselves and the American people. We are spending way beyond our means.

This is even worse than pork-barrel spending. We tell the American people we made an agreement, a budget agreement, that we are going to live with it, and then we forward fund to circumvent it. Give me a break. I have said this so many times, and I do not know how many people have even listened to it. I do not know how many times I have said this, but I know people are tired of hearing it. But I am going to say it again and again and again.

Listen to this: We raised taxes last year by \$181 billion, the largest tax increase in history, to get control of spending, and here we are 1 year later with the largest deficit in history, \$400 billion in 1 year. We have an economy that is stagnating, we have people out of work, and we just keep on spending. The national debt has gone from \$1 trillion—and it took us 200 years to get there—to \$4 trillion in 10 years, and we keep on spending. So here we are after we make a budget agreement circumventing that budget agreement to the tune of \$4.3 billion.

□ 1640

Mr. Speaker, I would just say I think I am not making a point that is important to me, I am making a point that is important to 250 million people in this country and their kids. Now, think about that. Who is going to pay these bills? Four trillion dollars in debt. Eighteen cents out of every dollar is going to just pay the interest. And it is going to get worse and worse, and we are circumventing the budget.

Come on, guys. We have got to get control of spending. You say, "Well, Dan, you have made your point. You have called a vote. You lost. So let's all go home and forget about it."

I am not going to forget about it. You bring these things down here and I am going to call votes. I am just telling you right now: you circumvent the budget agreement and do forward funding on any of them, and we are going to stay here. You may hate my guts, but we are going to do it.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say simply that in my conscience and I think in my voting record on budget issues, I agree with the substance of the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has pointed out, we have these problems not just in the Congress, but with the executive branch, which engages in the same process as well. I recognize that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], perhaps more than anyone I can think of on the Committee on Appropriations from his side of the aisle, has fought and resisted this practice of forward funding. I think that should be in the RECORD. I also think we ought to reemphasize the fact that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] has consistently fought that practice.

But I agree with what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is saying. This is one of the reasons people back home question whether this institution as an institution is working. But I have to say to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], I disagree with his tactics and the means for employing it and making the point.

I am wondering if we could not have a unanimous consent request, an opportunity to group these 16 or 17 forward-funded items that are in dispute, and give an opportunity to vote them all up or down en bloc. We could set aside some time for debate so everyone knows and the record clearly shows what the issue is.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is fair to the American people, it is responsible, and our records will show one way or the other where we stand on these things.

But as a matter of procedure to have this House contending on these issues one by one in a process that may take us to midnight, and stands in interruption of the other work before this body, I have to say that, quite frankly, I think it is counterproductive. I think it creates anger and the temptation for misspoken words between Members, and is also counterproductive to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] in what he seeks to get from the House.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has made a constructive suggestion. I have to say I agree with some of the concerns expressed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. But I would ask if the gentleman is intending to make such a motion, if he would be kind enough to exempt

amendment 41 from that, because amendment 41 has another issue involved as well which I think needs airing before the House today.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think we could very quickly resolve which ones ought to have separate votes or not. That would be fine with me. I am not sure I can name the amendments by number. I would leave that to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] or the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] to work out with the Members.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply say as a matter of record, I think all of us could do this. I will vote with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] on each of these questions if they are offered individually. The question is not where I stand; the question is whether or not we can have a procedure which facilitates consideration of the issue, while at the same time lays the record bare before the American public. I think a unanimous-consent request, if it could be offered by the chairman, if it would be accepted by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], would certainly be something I would be willing to support.

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

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY] for his statement. I want the gentleman to know I appreciate it.

With the exception of the amendment that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has talked about, there would be 15 under a unanimous-consent request and, Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that in the event the "no" vote carries, then the gentleman from Kentucky would need 16 separate amendments to amend the amendments in disagreement. So you will have to include a unanimous-consent request for permission to make the amendments substitute amendments, or we will be in real trouble with this bill.

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

Mr. HENRY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I will have to change the statement that I just made on this side. We have several Members who would object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. EARLY].

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], probably the most respected

Member of this Chamber, to ask the membership to stay on the floor for the next vote. After we vote on the next vote, if a quorum will stay in this House, we will dispose of every amendment quickly. I would urge all Members to participate and cooperate in what we are trying to do.

We are not trying to fool anybody, we are just asking the Members to remain in the House. If the membership wants to have a vote, then there will be a vote. As a courtesy to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], which falls on deaf ears in many places, where people talk about what they want to earmark, when somebody does something about it and it is not a political approach, it means nothing. Mr. NATCHER stood in that conference and rejected every single earmark, but that does not mean anything with some Members. Also the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] did it.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] to ask the Members after the next vote to stay on the floor.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. That is the hope of the subcommittee chairman and the subcommittee.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 168, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

YEAS—253

Abercrombie	Borski	Collins (MI)
Ackerman	Boucher	Conyers
Alexander	Boxer	Costello
Anderson	Brewster	Cox (IL)
Andrews (ME)	Brooks	Coyne
Andrews (NJ)	Browder	Cramer
Andrews (TX)	Brown	Darden
Annunzio	Bruce	de la Garza
Anthony	Bryant	DeFazio
Applegate	Bustamante	DeLauro
Aspin	Byron	Dellums
Atkins	Campbell (CO)	Derrick
AuCoin	Cardin	Dicks
Bacchus	Carr	Dingell
Berman	Chapman	Dixon
Bevill	Clay	Donnelly
Bilbray	Clement	Dooley
Boehert	Coleman (TX)	Downey
Bonior	Collins (IL)	Durbin

Dwyer	Lent	Rinaldo
Dymally	Levin (MI)	Roe
Early	Levine (CA)	Roemer
Eckart	Lewis (CA)	Rogers
Edwards (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Rose
Edwards (TX)	Lipinski	Roybal
Emerson	Livingston	Russo
Engel	Lloyd	Sabo
Erdreich	Long	Sanders
Espy	Lowey (NY)	Sarpalius
Evans	Machtley	Savage
Fascell	Manton	Sawyer
Fazio	Markey	Scheuer
Feighan	Matsui	Schiff
Flake	Mavroules	Schroeder
Foglietta	Mazzoli	Schumer
Ford (MI)	McCloskey	Serrano
Ford (TN)	McDade	Sharp
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Sikorski
Gallo	McGrath	Skaggs
Gaydos	McHugh	Skeen
Gejdenson	McMillen (MD)	Slaughter (NY)
Gekas	McNulty	Smith (IA)
Gephardt	Mfume	Smith (NJ)
Gibbons	Miller (CA)	Solarz
Gillmor	Mineta	Spratt
Gilman	Mink	Staggers
Gonzalez	Moakley	Stallings
Goodling	Mollohan	Stark
Gordon	Montgomery	Stokes
Green	Moody	Studds
Guarini	Moran	Swett
Hall (OH)	Morella	Swift
Hamilton	Morrison	Synar
Harris	Mrazek	Tallon
Hatcher	Murphy	Tanner
Hayes (IL)	Murtha	Thomas (GA)
Hefner	Nagle	Thornton
Hertel	Natcher	Torres
Hochbrueckner	Neal (MA)	Torricelli
Horn	Neal (NC)	Towns
Horton	Nowak	Trafficant
Houghton	Oakar	Traxler
Hoyer	Obey	Unsoeld
Hubbard	Olin	Vento
Jacobs	Oliver	Visclosky
Jefferson	Ortiz	Volkmer
Jenkins	Orton	Vucanovich
Johnson (SD)	Owens (NY)	Walsh
Johnston	Owens (UT)	Washington
Jones (GA)	Pastor	Waters
Jones (NC)	Payne (NJ)	Waxman
Jontz	Pease	Weiss
Kanjorski	Perlosi	Weldon
Kaptur	Perkins	Wheat
Kennedy	Peterson (FL)	Whitten
Kennelly	Peterson (MN)	Williams
Kildee	Pickett	Wilson
Klecza	Poshard	Wise
Kolter	Price	Wolpe
Kopetski	Quillen	Wyden
LaFalce	Rahall	Yates
Lantos	Rangel	Yatron
LaRocco	Reed	Young (AK)
Lehman (CA)	Regula	
Lehman (FL)	Richardson	

NAYS—168

Allard	Combest	Goss
Archer	Condit	Gradison
Army	Cooper	Grandy
Baker	Coughlin	Gunderson
Ballenger	Cox (CA)	Hall (TX)
Barnard	Crane	Hammerschmidt
Barrett	Cunningham	Hancock
Barton	Dannemeyer	Hansen
Bateman	Davis	Hastert
Bellenson	DeLay	Hefley
Bennett	Dickinson	Henry
Bentley	Doolittle	Herger
Bereuter	Dorgan (ND)	Hoagland
Bilirakis	Dorman (CA)	Hobson
Bliley	Dreier	Holloway
Boehner	Duncan	Huckaby
Broomfield	Edwards (OK)	Hughes
Bunning	English	Hunter
Burton	Ewing	Hutto
Callahan	Fawell	Hyde
Camp	Fields	Inhofe
Campbell (CA)	Franks (CT)	Ireland
Carper	Galleghy	James
Chandler	Geren	Johnson (CT)
Clinger	Gilchrest	Johnson (TX)
Coble	Gingrich	Kasich
Coleman (MO)	Glickman	Klug

Kolbe	Pallone	Shays
Kostmayer	Panetta	Shuster
Kyl	Parker	Sisisky
Lagomarsino	Patterson	Skelton
Lancaster	Paxon	Slattery
Laughlin	Payne (VA)	Smith (OR)
Leach	Penny	Smith (TX)
Lewis (FL)	Petri	Snowe
Lightfoot	Pickle	Solomon
Lowery (CA)	Porter	Spence
Luken	Pursell	Stearns
Marlenee	Ramstad	Stenholm
Martin	Ravenel	Stump
McCandless	Ray	Sundquist
McCollum	Rhodes	Tauzin
McCrery	Ridge	Taylor (MS)
McCurdy	Riggs	Taylor (NC)
McEwen	Ritter	Thomas (CA)
McMillan (NC)	Roberts	Thomas (WY)
Meyers	Rohrabacher	Upton
Michel	Ros-Lehtinen	Valentine
Miller (OH)	Roth	Vander Jagt
Miller (WA)	Rowland	Walker
Molinari	Santorum	Weber
Moorhead	Saxton	Wolf
Nichols	Schaefer	Wyllie
Nussle	Schulze	Young (FL)
Oxley	Sensenbrenner	Zeliff
Packard	Shaw	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—12

Fish	Martinez	Roukema
Frost	Myers	Sangmeister
Hayes (LA)	Oberstar	Slaughter (VA)
Hopkins	Rostenkowski	Smith (FL)

□ 1709

Mr. SWIFT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BEILENSON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 19, line 17, strike out all after "program" down to and including "\$260,000,000" in line 20.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$290,000,000".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1710

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I plan to make a unanimous consent request

for the benefit of our caucus and on both sides so that we can go home early.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 38, 49, 52, 68, 90, 93, 96, 112, 124, 135, 151, 158, 164, 188, and 219 be considered en bloc, and printed in the RECORD, and that the motions to dispose of said amendments as printed in the Joint Statement of Managers be considered as read and that the motions not be subject to a division of the question.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not want to keep all of my colleagues here all night, but I would like to make a point that I think is very, very important.

You know, we had some elections yesterday all across this country, and it was pretty evident that the people of this country do not like incumbents or people who are in very much, and the reason that they do not like us is because they do not trust us.

One of the reasons they do not trust us is because we do things like this.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have everybody's attention for a minute if I can get it.

We made an agreement, and we are circumventing that agreement with this group of amendments. There is \$4.3 billion in forward funding, and that means that we are going to spend \$4.3 billion more, and we are going to set it into the next year, \$4.3 billion, and the people of this country are concerned about their jobs, they are concerned about their incomes, they are concerned about health care and all of these things, and we are spending ourselves into such a hole that we are never going to get out.

The interest, the interest is 18 cents on \$1 of taxes collected. I hope the Members are listening to this. We are not doing anything about it. We are exacerbating the situation.

We all look at each other and say, "Yes, we know it. He is right. That is right." But we do not do anything about it. And I am telling the Members that we are hurting the country very much and we are hurting ourselves and this institution, and the President, I submit, is hurting himself as well by this forward funding. We are all in this together even though we have strong ideological differences.

We have got to come to grips with spending. We have got to come to grips with it, or the future generations of this country are going to really, really suffer. This is just not rhetoric. It is a fact, and you know it, and I know it.

I would just like to say to my colleagues that I hope, I hope that if I acquiesce this time, the next time we will do something about this.

I am not going to object to this tonight, but I would like to say the next

time we come up with any bill that involves forward funding, I am going to call for votes on every single one of the motions in dispute.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Further reserving the right to object, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, my motion puts the amendments en bloc so that we have a record vote on the approximately \$4 billion the gentleman speaks of, so he is going to get his vote.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, I appreciate that, but I want you to know that the next time we have this kind of forward funding I am going to object to every single motion so that everybody can plan on it, and we are going to have votes on every single one of them that I can get a vote on.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to make three points. No. 1, this bill, despite our concerns about it being advanced funding, does not violate the budget agreement or the Budget Act or the budget resolution. It is well within the Budget Act and the outlays for the fiscal year 1992.

As to the advanced-funding issue, the fact is that the President himself asked for advanced funding of \$1.5 billion in this bill, and when we passed the defense bill, it included \$3.3 billion in advanced funding. I did not hear the gentleman complain at that time when we pass the legislation.

So the point is that there are precedents for the advanced funding. It does not involve a violation of the budget agreement, and the priorities that are in this bill are the right priorities for this country.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as I pointed out a few minutes ago, in 7 of the 13 appropriation bills that were sent to the Congress from the President and OMB, we have a total of \$8.7 billion in delayed obligations and, Mr. Speaker, to be quite frank and honest with you, I do not agree with that procedure.

We had a little over \$1 billion in our bill.

As my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], has said, during the conference on this bill, we had all kinds of problems with this matter, but, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object to the unanimous-consent request for many reasons, one of

which is that I believe down deep in my heart that every Member in this House on both sides of the aisle are for this bill, because this is the bill that appropriates the money for all of health and all of education, and I will take my chances with the Members in the House.

Let us have a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not prolong this, but the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] made some very strong remarks.

I would just like to say that regardless of what has been said, the deficit is going to be close to \$400 billion this year. We are forward funding in this bill. I do not care whether it is the White House or the Congress that is doing it, if it was Defense, and if I had known about it, you had better believe I would have been down here objecting to that as well.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the only reason why the gentleman from California can make those remarks about the Budget Act is because of the gimmicks that are being used in this bill in order to avoid the Budget Act.

So the gentleman from Indiana is right on target with regard to what is happening here. This is a specific attempt to evade the provisions of the Budget Act.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The texts of the various Senate amendments referred to in the unanimous-consent request are as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 20, line 22, strike out all after "facilities" down to and including "1992" in line 25.

Senate amendment No. 49: Page 24, line 18, strike out all after "development," down to and including "1992" in line 21 and insert "\$523,826,000: *Provided, however,* That funds made available under this heading to conduct the SHARP survey of adult sexual behavior and the American Teenage Survey of adolescent sexual behavior shall instead be expended, at the same outlay rate, to carry out title XX of the Public Health Service Act".

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 25, strike out all after line 14 down to and including "1992" in line 17 and insert "\$397,176,000: *Provided,* That of the funds made available under this heading, \$22,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall remain available until October 30, 1992".

Senate amendment No. 68: Page 28, line 18, strike out "\$2,917,742,000" and insert "\$3,175,832,000: *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, funds ap-

propriated for salaries and expenses of the Department of Labor are hereby reduced by \$4,939,000; salaries and expenses of the Department of Education are hereby reduced by \$1,646,000; and salaries and expenses of the Department of Health and Human Services are hereby reduced by \$20,415,000".

Senate amendment No. 90: Page 37, strike out all including line 1 down to and including "1992" in line 4 and insert "\$410,630,000: *Provided,* That of the funds made available under this heading for State cash and medical assistance, \$116,616,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992".

Senate amendment No. 93: Page 37, line 22, after "program" insert ": *Provided,* That the funds made available under this heading for carrying out section 681(a)(2)(A) of the Community Services Block Grant Act shall not become available for obligation until September 25, 1992".

Senate amendment No. 96: Page 39, line 15, strike out all after "Act," down to and including "management" in line 17 and insert "\$3,563,063,000: *Provided,* That of the amounts appropriated, \$21,470,000 shall be available for carrying out the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act of 1988: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available under the heading for carrying out the Older Americans Act of 1965, \$25,000,000 shall not become available for obligation until February 1, 1992".

Senate amendment No. 112: Page 46, line 22, strike out "\$7,042,750,000" and insert "\$6,256,202,000".

Senate amendment No. 124: Page 47, line 26, after "2" insert ", \$1,952,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for payments for decreases in Federal activities under section 3(e)".

Senate amendment No. 135: Page 50, line 11, after "gram" insert ", not less than \$55,000,000 of these funds shall be transferred to the Community Health Centers program, and not less than \$20,000,000 shall be transferred to the Comprehensive Child Development Centers".

Senate amendment No. 151: Page 52, line 10, strike out "of which".

Senate amendment No. 158: Page 53, line 6, strike out "\$6,853,000,000" and insert "\$6,900,356,000".

Senate amendment No. 164: Page 55, line 8, strike out "\$821,438,000" and insert "\$810,557,000".

Senate amendment No. 188: Page 58, line 12, after "education;" insert "\$18,404,000 shall be for star schools (of which \$1,000,000 shall become available for obligation on September 30, 1992) and, of which \$4,000,000 shall be to establish a demonstration of a statewide, two-way interactive fiber optic telecommunications network, carrying voice, video, and data transmissions, and housing a point of presence in every county".

Senate amendment No. 219: Page 74, after line 10, insert:

SEC. 513. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, funds appropriated for salaries and expenses are hereby reduced by 1 per centum.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 38, 49, 52, 68, 90, 93, 96, 112, 124, 135, 151, 158, 164, 188, and 219 and concur therein with the amendments as printed in the joint statement of the managers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 38, 49, 52, 68, 90, 93, 96, 112, 124, 135, 151, 158, 164, 188, and 219 and concur therein with amendments.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 188, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

AYES—234

Abercrombie	Flake	McMillen (MD)
Ackerman	Foglietta	McNulty
Alexander	Ford (MI)	Mfume
Anderson	Ford (TN)	Miller (CA)
Andrews (ME)	Frank (MA)	Mineta
Andrews (NJ)	Gallo	Mink
Andrews (TX)	Gaydos	Moakley
Anunzio	Gajdenson	Molinari
Anthony	Gekas	Mollohan
Applegate	Gephardt	Moran
Aspin	Gibbons	Morella
Atkins	Gilchrest	Morrison
AuCoin	Gilman	Mrazek
Berman	Gonzalez	Murphy
Bevill	Goodling	Murtha
Bibray	Gordon	Myers
Boehlert	Green	Nagle
Bonior	Guarini	Natcher
Borski	Hall (OH)	Neal (MA)
Boxer	Hamilton	Nowak
Brewster	Hatcher	Oakar
Brooks	Hayes (IL)	Obey
Brown	Hefner	Olver
Bruce	Hertel	Ortiz
Bryant	Hochbrueckner	Owens (NY)
Bustamante	Horn	Owens (UT)
Byron	Horton	Pastor
Campbell (CO)	Houghton	Payne (NJ)
Cardin	Hoyer	Pease
Carr	Hubbard	Pelosi
Chapman	Jacobs	Perkins
Clay	Jefferson	Peterson (FL)
Clement	Jenkins	Peterson (MN)
Coleman (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Pickett
Collins (IL)	Jones (GA)	Poshard
Collins (MI)	Jones (NC)	Price
Conyers	Jontz	Quillen
Cox (IL)	Kanjorski	Rahall
Coyne	Kaptur	Rangel
Darden	Kennedy	Richardson
Davis	Kildee	Rinaldo
de la Garza	Kleczka	Roe
DeFazio	Kolter	Rogers
DeLauro	Kopetski	Rose
Dellums	LaFalce	Roybal
Derrick	Lantos	Sabo
Dicks	LaRocco	Sanders
Dingell	Lehman (CA)	Sarpalius
Dixon	Lehman (FL)	Savage
Donnelly	Lent	Sawyer
Dooley	Levin (MI)	Scheuer
Downey	Levine (CA)	Schiff
Durbin	Lewis (CA)	Schroeder
Dwyer	Lewis (GA)	Schumer
Dymally	Livingston	Serrano
Early	Lowe (NY)	Sharp
Eckart	Manton	Sikorski
Edwards (CA)	Markey	Skaggs
Edwards (TX)	Matsui	Skeen
Emerson	Mavroules	Slaughter (NY)
Engel	Mazzoli	Smith (IA)
Espy	McCloskey	Smith (NJ)
Evans	McDade	Snowe
Fascell	McDermott	Solarz
Fazio	McGrath	Spratt
Feighan	McHugh	Staggers

Stallings
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torrice

Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman

Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—188

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bellenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Billrakis
Billey
Boehner
Broomfield
Browder
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Carper
Chandler
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
English
Erdreich
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Geren
Gillmor
Gingrich
Glickman
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Gunderson
Hall (TX)

Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Holloway
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Kasich
Kennedy
Klug
Kolbe
Kostmayer
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Laughlin
Leach
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lukens
Machtley
Marlenee
Martin
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McEwen
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nussle
Olin
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone

Panetta
Parker
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Pursell
Ramstad
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Riggs
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Russo
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Sweet
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Walker
Weber
Weldon
Wolf
Wylie
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—11

Boucher
Fish
Frost
Hayes (LA)

Hopkins
Martinez
Oberstar
Rostenkowski

Sangmeister
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)

□ 1739

Mrs. LLOYD changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. BYRON, Ms. SNOWE, and Messrs. JOHNSON of South Dakota, BORSKI, and VOLKMER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 41: Page 22, strike out all after line 16 down to and including "1992" in line 19 and insert "\$2,010,230,000, of which \$184,647,000 shall not be available for obligation until September 30, 1992, but shall be available until September 30, 1993".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "\$1,989,278,000: Provided, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$223,446,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992: Provided further, That the Director of the National Institutes of Health, within thirty days of enactment of this Act, may transfer such portion of \$160,000,000 which becomes available on September 30, 1992 as she deems appropriate to other Institutes for research directly related to the prevention, treatment or cure of cancer".

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1740

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that, if the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], are both in support of this motion, as a Member who is opposed to it, I would be entitled to a portion of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is correct.

Does the gentleman seek recognition?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Michigan opposed to the motion?

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I will oppose it, but I will give the gentleman from Wisconsin time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am rising in opposition to this motion, and I

hope people understand there is absolutely nothing political or partisan in this debate. We have had a lot of those arguments today, but this debate is different. It is very much on substance.

Mr. Speaker, I think the committee has made a big mistake in the way it is funding NIH research, and I want to explain what I mean. It is going to take a little time.

The conference report accepted the amendment from the Senate which earmarked \$160 million of the funding provided to NIH on a delayed basis, but it targets that only to cancer. I want to explain that I think that this is a very bad idea, not only for persons who are afflicted with diseases other than cancer, but also I think it is a bad idea for anyone concerned about our ability to make progress on cancer research.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by saying to those in this Congress who are concerned about and who are supportive of what the committee did with respect to encouraging support for breast cancer and other cancers like that, that this issue has nothing whatsoever to do with that argument. This is a very different issue. Basically, what we are dealing with is this:

Back in the early 1970's, very bluntly, we had a competition. We had a bidding war between then-President Richard Nixon and Senator KENNEDY to demonstrate who was most against cancer politically. So, we had very large amounts of additional money that went into the Cancer Institute. There was a 400-percent increase in the Cancer Institute over the 1970's. The problem with that is this:

Yes, we needed more money in cancer research, but, as we focused only on that institute, we starved a good many of the other institutes at NIH, and very specifically we starved the General Medical Science Institute at NIH. If my colleagues understand medical research, they will understand that research is serendipitous and in fact many of the most important discoveries that enable us to fight cancer today originated at an institute other than the Cancer Institute. A number of them originated at general medical sciences, which devotes almost all its budget to basic medical research, which is the basic building block upon which all other institutes eventually build.

So, Mr. Speaker, we had almost a disease-of-the-month-club approach to funding NIH in those days. We had lobby groups come in here pushing for cancer research, for Alzheimer's disease, for Huntington's disease, for Lou Gehrig's disease. You name it. This committee decided that that was bad for medical research. It was going to hinder our ability to make progress on all diseases.

So, for the last 10 years, with a couple of rare exceptions, we have followed the principle that we would allocate

dollars to NIH on the basis of where science led us, not on the basis of where politics led us.

So, what we did is we followed an approach which enabled each institute to fund roughly the same percentage of the best science that researchers wanted to do, fund it out of their institutes.

This year, because of the action of the other body, and because of our failure to stop that in conference, we now, I think, have slipped back into the old habits, and we have this \$160 million which is targeted only at cancer.

I was willing to accept that if it was broadened enough so that some of that money could be used by the director of NIH for other life-threatening diseases, but I did not win the argument. In fact, I was the only vote for my position, and I do not expect to win anything here tonight. But I think my colleagues have a right to know why I think this is bad business because we are going to be debating this issue again.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of reasons why I think it is bad business. First of all, it will very much squeeze our ability to fund other institutes. We already have the genome research project, which is going to take \$105 million this year, which is going to squeeze down our ability to fund other institutes, and next year what will happen is what every lobby group concerned about heart disease, concerned about Parkinson's disease, concerned about Lou Gehrig's disease, and all the rest, they will come in here and say, "Hey, we want you to do for us what you did for cancer last year," and we are going to have immense pressure to politicize the entire research operation at NIH, and that is bad business because we ought to be allocating those dollars on the basis of where the best scientific opportunity is, not on the basis of where the biggest squeeze comes from, the lobbies around town.

The other problem we have with this approach is that we will twist what researchers try to do. There will be a tremendous pressure on researchers who want to get dollars for their research grants to find some way to claim that they have a cancer angle in their research, and that means we are going to have all kinds of researchers in the country going through pretzel twists in order to justify what they are doing. I think that is bad business, and it just seems to me that we ought not to do this.

Now, if the Cancer Institute had been hurt over the last 5 years more than other institutes, I would say maybe we ought to make an exception. But the fact is that from 1988 through this year the Cancer Institute's budget went up by 35 percent. Meanwhile heart-lung-blood went up 24 percent. Almost twice as many people die of those diseases as die of cancer, and the research funding for the Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke went up by a minus-

cule 9 percent. So, I do not think that we are helping the institute that has been hurt the most.

Secondly, what we are doing is creating a very anomalous situation. Right now what NIH does is they take all of the research grants that come in, and then they toss out the research which is least justifiable, and then they try to fund as much as they can of the remaining approved scientific research that has come in through the grant process. If this amendment is approved tonight, and all the money were to go for competitive grants, we would be funding 48 percent of that research at NCI, but we will be funding only half that research at heart-lung-blood. We will only be funding 22 percent at the Institutes for Deafness and Communicative Disorders, assuming the same percentile as last year's. We will have created a very warped research pattern.

□ 1750

We will have created a very warped research pattern, and I think we will have done a disservice to all science in the process. I know that some people outside this room will walk away and say, "My God, look at OBEY. He is against cancer research."

That is absolute nonsense. I have fought for cancer research for almost the entire 20 years I have been a member of this committee, given my own life history, I suspect that is the disease that is going to get me, because when I was younger, I used to work with asbestos and I smoked at the same time, and I know what the odds are of avoiding cancer once you have done both of those things simultaneously.

So I do not do this because I have any objection to progress in cancer research. Obviously I do not. But I think the best way to achieve progress in cancer research, in heart disease, in neurology problems, in all of these things, is to give the most flexibility possible to NIH to allocate those dollars, and when we start saying that this pot of money is only going to be able to be available without exception to this disease or that disease, we invite research based on the desire of lobby groups, not research based on the best judgments of the best scientists in the country in terms of where our best research opportunities lie.

So that is why I am opposing this amendment. I very much regret doing this. I love this subcommittee and I respect its work, but my conscience will not let me support the committee in this instance, and I think I need to keep my conscience more than the committee needs to keep my vote. That is why I oppose this amendment as I am opposing it here this evening.

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

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

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. He has been extremely challenging in the committee to keep our discipline and our position fair and properly balanced within the various NIH institutes.

This spring we are going to see that Dr. Healy proposes to us in Congress strategic plans for each of the institutes. I think that although we will have an opportunity to review and to go back and rethink it, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] pointed out tonight, that we should not be looking at powerful lobbies for individual institutes but rather we should look at the professional decisions that are made for good public policy and good results.

So I concur in the gentleman's concern and the concern in the Senate after that point was made in conference. He has made an excellent point, one that we ought to think about very seriously, and we will have a chance to address that issue come spring in our hearings.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee, for yielding time, and I am sorry that I must take the floor to oppose the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], whom I consider a friend.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I tried to make the point that the earmarking I am concerned about has nothing whatsoever to do with the other provision in this amendment that I know the gentlewoman is supporting. They are very different issues.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I feel like we were the skunk at the garden party, because the Congresswomen have been after the gentleman from Kentucky and many others to put more specific things in the bill. The gentleman from Kentucky made the same eloquent arguments that the gentleman from Wisconsin made, that he did not want to interfere and he did not want to micromanage, but the thing we were saying over and over again was that we found defined as good science and good research never had any women in it, that the norm turned out to be a 190-pound male, and that women were left out of everything.

What we wanted to do was this: We wanted specific earmarks, and we did not get specific earmarks. This was a compromise the gentleman from Ken-

tucky tried to work out to accommodate some of the leverage we were trying to get as we moved to close the gap between where we are and where we want to be in the next 10 years. I think that that is what he was trying to do.

So I felt guilty as I listened to the gentleman from Wisconsin talking. So that is the problem we have. The White House accused us of micromanaging, and everybody else did, too, but let me just tell the gentleman that we tried to do this with the legislation in the mid-1950's. The Congresswomen went to NIH and tried to increase some of the focuses on different diseases and different things. They promised it was going to happen, and then it did not happen. That is why we have gotten much more issue-specific, because it does not turn out to be good science but male science.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentlewoman is interested, for instance, in the ability of the Heart-Lung Institute to do research on coronary diseases, which is relevant to women's problems. The problem is that the earmarking that is done for NCI on this will get in the way of the Heart-Lung-Blood Institute's ability to do that, and I do not think she wants to do that.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the things that is very important to point out to the gentleman is that the very critical research the gentleman from Kentucky and the committee did fund is cutting through all those institutes. It is the big megastudy that will go on for 10 years. It will be the Blood-Lung Institute. It will be everything filling in the gaps and putting women into the research that they have been left out of for the last 10 years. It is going to be one of the biggest things around.

They initially funded it for \$25 million, but that makes it a little unique from what NIH normally does. We are just saying that we want to play catch-up ball. So in a way the figures are not quite what the gentleman thinks they are if he looks at the other pieces the gentleman from Kentucky has put in for women.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to comment on the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], but let me tell the Members what I think the real problem is. The problem is that we are giving \$34 billion in research for the Defense Department on new creative ways to have destruction, and we have \$8.5 billion for trying to find cures for diseases.

I think the American people are saying, "Listen, it's about time we find cures for diseases in this country," which would, by the way, reduce the cost of health care dramatically.

So I am for taking money out of the military so we do not have this conflict within the discussion here and give us \$4 billion. They will still have \$30 billion in the military. Then we could add that to the NIH budget, and believe me, it would go a long way toward finding cures for diseases.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee. I have been testifying before the gentleman's committee, and we asked for \$50 million for new funds for breast cancer research. We did that because it is so underfunded now. As I understand it, the total funds provided in the bill for the National Cancer Institute exceed the level at which the NCI Director assured us it provided at least \$42 million over the 1991 level for breast cancer research; is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, the gentlewoman is correct. This is the amount estimated by the National Cancer Institute. At the time I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for her assistance and support not only in the program pertaining to breast cancer, cervical cancer, and screening, but everything in this bill. Ever since the gentlewoman has been a Member of the Congress, she has walked right down that road with us in all matters pertaining to health and the education of our people, and we appreciate it.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. He is very kind, and I certainly owe the gentleman tremendous respect.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, as I understand it, also provides a 67-percent increase, which is \$8 million, so that with the efforts of the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] and others, we have funds for ovarian cancer, a 37-percent increase, or \$8.6 million in funds for cervical cancer, a 100-percent increase for prostate cancer, because that is a disease that afflicts a lot of men; is that correct, I ask the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is correct. These are the estimates of the National Cancer Institute.

□ 1800

The bill also funds the comprehensive women's study at \$25 million, and fully funds the CDC Medicaid breast and cervical cancer screening initiative at \$50 million.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this is a victory for the families of this Nation, and that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] is a man of his word. And lest anybody wonder why women want diseases targeted and line

ited, and I know that goes against the grain of some Members, I want to say that I think if you just take breast cancer, and you could name just about any of the diseases, but breast cancer is an epidemic. We do not have a Breast Cancer Institute; we have an AIDS Institute that is funded at about \$1.7 billion.

I support that. But since 1980, 100,000 Americans have died of AIDS. Since 1980, 400,000 women have died of breast cancer. Now, if that is not an epidemic, I do not know what is. So here we try to get a few more dollars in that are targeted for these diseases, and we are told by some that we ought to let NIH decide.

Baloney. Even though I respect tremendously Dr. Bernardine Healy, who has been turning things around since she took over about a year ago, the first woman in its history, I have to tell you that there is a dramatic need in this country to focus in on what we are doing to cure diseases.

In 1987, only 13.7 percent of the funds were spent on research related to women's health. So if you do not think that there is a need to go ahead and target some of these diseases, in a small way, by way of comparison, then I do not know what else we should do.

But I do want to thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], my chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL], Senator BROCK ADAMS, and Senator HARKIN.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. EARLY].

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]. I disagree with the comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the comments of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL].

Since 1981, in constant dollars the National Institutes of Health as a whole has grown 27 percent, while at the same time the National Cancer Institute has decreased 6.2 percent. Since 1980, in constant dollars, the Cancer Center's budget had decreased 14 percent, clinical cooperative groups have decreased 32.4 percent, cancer prevention and control has decreased 32.9 percent, and cancer contracts for research and development have decreased 47.9 percent. The \$160,000,000 increase in this appropriations bill will only bring the National Cancer Institute back to the 1980 level of funding in constant dollars.

Currently, one person dies every 62 seconds in this country of cancer. However, as a result of the National Cancer Act which was passed 20 years ago, the cancer survival rate has increased from 39 percent to 52 percent resulting in over 7 million cancer survivors today

during those two decades. Also as a result of the Cancer Act, death rates for persons under age 65 from colon/rectal cancer have decreased by 15 percent; bladder cancer by 25 percent; and cervical cancer by 40 percent. Though death rates from childhood cancers have decreased 36 percent, cancer still remains the leading cause of death by disease in children under 15.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address some of the comments that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] has made. I commend the gentlewoman for her work with breast cancer and in the medical field, but I do take exception with the people that want to keep cutting defense, cutting defense, cutting defense.

Mr. Speaker, we are cutting defense by 25 percent. I would like to remind Members that the men and women that came back from Desert Storm came back alive. There is even a more critical disease called a bullet that we want to keep from happening in the future.

Mr. Speaker, if our oil supplies had been shut off, thousands of people that we want to see safe would be freezing this winter. The defense is being cut so much. The other side of the aisle is lambasting the President on unemployment. Hundreds of thousands of jobs have been cut and lost because of some of the cuts in defense. That in itself has people unemployed, no health insurance coming forward. They are not paying taxes, they are drawing unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, we have all this concern about people. Quit firing people and quit cutting the defense of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] that it is also important to know that a lot of those defense dollars went toward space research, toward some of the medical facilities and the very things the gentlewoman is talking about.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I was talking specifically about research dollars, which, by the way, has completely turned around. In 1980, we spent about 80 percent of our research dollars, and remember, 90 percent of all research dollars are Government-sponsored. But we spent 80 percent of that on health and education, how to find cures for disease. Twenty percent went for the Pentagon.

Today it is just the reverse. We spent \$34 billion on the Pentagon, and \$8.5 billion on research.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that all Americans, including myself, were astounded at the great ability of the Patriot missile. But that missile is 1970's

technology. We are way ahead of the eight ball in terms of finding creative ways to find more creative weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add one last thing. I was a sponsor, along with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES] and others on the economic conversion bill; \$200 million is not enough to convert defense jobs to civilian jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is what we ought to be doing, have more conversion so that we do not have any jobs relative to decreasing the defense budget.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I agree with the gentlewoman. We should do some of those conversions. But we cannot do it overnight. We are cutting defense by 25 percent. We must have time to carry over those conversions.

Mr. Speaker, we have a bill coming up to take out \$1 billion and give it to the Soviet Union in aid. To me that is ridiculous. In the first place, I would not give any money.

As for the men and women in our armed services, I flew in a squadron that did not have the necessary parts, did not have the technology. The Patriot missile, that shows, yes, if we have missiles coming into this country one day, I want beyond 1970 technology defending your children and mine.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take my few minutes here to extend my deepest appreciation to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor-Health and Human Services-Education of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. Speaker, certainly from the moment that I came to Congress this year, bringing an idea with respect to additional research funds for early detection of ovarian cancer, he gave me all the support that I could have possibly expected from this committee. The gentleman encouraged me to bring the matter before the subcommittee and testify and bring witnesses and demonstrate the tremendous need in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I have an absolute admiration for the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR], who has single-handedly raised the level of perception of this country and understanding of this Congress on the tremendous neglect that women's health issues have had over the decades. She has made possible the additional moneys that we are now putting into such vital areas as breast cancer.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of ovarian cancer, the problem is much more difficult. It is not a case of looking through research to find a cure. What we have to do here is to find an early detection test.

The women who have been found afflicted with ovarian cancer generally are found in the terminal stages. They have no chance of recovery. They are dying young, in the late thirties and early forties, some few perhaps in the sixties.

Mr. Speaker, this is an affliction which brings tremendous tragedy to families all across the country. There are 28,000 new cases every year, of which 12,000 from past cases die. It is a silent killer because no one has been able to make a test that could determine whether a woman actually is afflicted with this disease.

So I am hoping through the generosity of this committee, with the additional \$8.5 million that has been earmarked of this money to the Cancer Institute, that there will be aggressive efforts made to help this country find a test so that these thousands of women can go in to their doctors and to their clinics and be assured that, once found in the early stages, they have a chance to survive.

Mr. Speaker, there are countless victims in my own community who raised this issue to me, and I could not believe the statistics that I found at the Cancer Institute at NIH, that there was no basic research being done. This is a distinct place for the Government to have a role.

Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased that this committee has seen fit to increase the money.

Mr. Speaker, I say to our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], I assure you, as happy as I am here today in acknowledging the work of this subcommittee, I will be back next year asking for additional funds, because I know that the funds that we are appropriating this year will bring us that much closer to accomplishing the necessary task and saving the lives of these thousands of women. I thank you very much.

□ 1810

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

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education of the Committee on Appropriations, who is my chairman on that subcommittee and who has done an extraordinary job on behalf of education and health in putting together this remarkable bill, I would like to ask the gentleman a question regarding congressional intent with respect to the use of funds appropriated in this legislation to the Department of Labor for use with respect to the targeted job tax credit [TJTC].

Mr. Chairman, TJTC is a program jointly administered by the Department of Labor and the Internal Revenue Service. The Department of La-

bor's role is to coordinate the processing by the State jobs services of TJTC claims filed by employers, while IRS' role relates to ensuring that the technical TJTC requirements in the Tax Code are followed. This legislation appropriates approximately \$20 million to DOL for distribution to the State job services for processing TJTC claims.

Unfortunately at this time the enactment of an extension of TJTC in the Tax Code beyond its December 31, 1991 expiration date in this session of Congress is in doubt, leaving the possibility that TJTC will have to wait until early in the next session for further extension. As a firm believer in TJTC, I deeply regret we may be unable to extend the credit in a timely fashion this year.

Mr. Chairman, it is expected that employers will continue to file numerous TJTC claims with the State jobs services through December 31, 1991, the date when the current credit expires. These claims, even absent an extension of TJTC in this session, are valid and must be processed. I am concerned, however, that absent an extension, the State jobs services will terminate TJTC operations after December 31, and might be tempted to use their TJTC appropriations for other purposes, causing a potentially costly and inefficient pile-up of unprocessed claims to exist when TJTC is extended next year.

I wish to ask the chairman whether it is his understanding that the TJTC funds which are appropriated in this bill are to be used exclusively for the purpose of processing those TJTC claims and that because funds are being appropriated for that purpose, the State job services should remain in operation as long as it is necessary to process TJTC claims filed through December 31, 1991.

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

Mr. MRAZEK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my distinguished colleague that he is correct in his understanding, and I call upon the Secretary of Labor to instruct the State job services to stay open after December 31, 1991, to process targeting jobs tax credit claims using the funds which we are appropriating for that purpose.

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman for the colloquy that we have just had. I want him to know that he is one of the good members of our committee and one of the good Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I commend his committee for providing \$10.3 million in the bill for the NIH Office for Women's Health Research. This Office will be charged with overseeing

clinical trials and monitoring the status of women researchers. I commend my friend and esteemed colleague, Congresswoman MARY ROSE OAKAR, for her leadership on this important issue. She has worked long and hard to see that women's health research is funded, and her efforts have come to fruition in this bill. She has done all the women of America a great service.

Twenty-five million dollars will facilitate the women's health initiative, a long-term study on women's health proposed by the Director of the NIH. In addition, funding is included for the establishment of a comprehensive gynecological and obstetrical research program at the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

This is very critical research which is desperately needed. Women in our Nation feel disenfranchised by our medical system. And no wonder, considering the past policy of our standard in medical research. The result of this shortsighted policy has been serious, substandard health treatment and diagnosis for women.

Diagnosis and treatment for women lags far behind those for men, and the result has been human tragedy. Breast cancer alone is an epidemic in this country, and we need to get serious now if we are to prevent the needless suffering and death of more women from this disease. The day has come for women's health care to be given equal weight.

The establishment of an office at NIH for women's health research is a milestone in the quest to find cures and treatments for diseases such as breast, cervical, and ovarian cancer. By passing this legislation, we send a strong signal that women's health care is important to all of us.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 22, line 19, after "1992" insert "": *Provided further*, That within the funds provided under this heading the Institute shall establish a Matsunaga-Conte Prostate Cancer Research Center".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 28, line 5, after "only" insert ": *Provided further*, That \$10,000,000 of this amount shall be available for extramural facilities construction grants if awarded competitively".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That \$7,500,000 of this amount shall be available for extramural facilities construction grants if awarded competitively".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 28, line 5, after "only" insert ": *Provided further*, That the Director may direct up to 1 percent of the total amount made available in this Act to all National Institutes of Health appropriations to high-priority activities the Director may so designate: *Provided further*, That no such appropriation shall be increased or decreased by more than 1 percent by any such transfers and that the Congress is promptly notified of the transfer".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65 and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the term "high-priority" named in said amendment, insert "emergency".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 66: Page 28, line 8, after "Health," insert "including the acquisition of real property".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66 and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 71: Page 28, line 25, after "XVII," insert "XX,".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71 and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 73: Page 29, line 21, strike out "\$95,756,000" and insert "\$69,283,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$101,870,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 79: Page 32, line 5, after "achieved" insert ": *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall make a determination prior to October 31, 1991, and thereafter prior to the first day of each quarter of the fiscal year, about the extent to which such contingency funds may be necessary to be expended and that the distribution of such funds shall be made on the same basis as funds otherwise provided in this account".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert ": *Provided further*, That the use of the term

"unanticipated costs" in the foregoing proviso refers only to costs associated with unanticipated workloads: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall make a recommendation upon enactment of this Act and thereafter prior to the first day of each following quarter of the fiscal year, about the extent to which contingency funds may be necessary to be expended".

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. EARLY].

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, the language in our committee report which pertains to the Worcester City Hospital is of critical importance to the city of Worcester. As the committee is aware, litigation is pending to recover damages which were caused when HCFA's fiscal intermediary, Blue Cross/Blue Shield, made duplicate payments to City Hospital for more than 20 months during fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990. It is my understanding that the clear intent of our report language is to instruct HCFA that no funds from this appropriations bill are to be used to collect this overpayment from the city of Worcester until the litigation is complete and the responsible parties have been identified and held accountable through court action. Is that correct?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, his interpretation of the committee report's language is absolutely correct.

Our committee recognizes the severe financial crisis which would be caused if HCFA presses the city of Worcester to repay the duplicate payments at the present time. The language inserted directs HCFA and its fiscal intermediary to suspend all activity regarding the collection of overpayments until the pending litigation is resolved. We believe strongly that it is appropriate to defer payment until the matter is resolved by the judicial system, and the intent of the committee is set forth in the report language.

Mr. EARLY. Thank you for elaborating on the committee's clear mandate to HCFA and its fiscal intermediary. May I raise one other issue regarding HCFA's actions in this matter. Unfortunately, the consequences of HCFA's aggressive actions to date have been drastic. The agency's demands for repayment, widely publicized in the press, have struck devastating blows to the stability of City Hospital as an acute-care facility. Cash flow to support operating expenses has been great-

ly destabilized by HCFA's withholding of current Medicare payments to which the hospital is fully entitled. In some cases, HCFA has used the payments as offset to the alleged debt. More recently, the regional office of HCFA has ordered a total freeze on all Medicare funds to City Hospital. Due to the hospital's inability to obtain full Medicare payments currently due, Worcester City Hospital ceased operating as an acute-care facility in September 1991.

Our committee report language addresses payment activity during the duplicate payment period only, the period from December 1987 through September 1989. Am I correct in asserting that all Medicare-related payments to which the hospital is entitled, since September 1989, should be flowing freely and on a timely schedule—with no freezes and no arbitrary withholding of payments on HCFA's part? City Hospital must have a cash-flow base on which they may depend, even as the hospital is undergoing a conversion to a subacute facility. Is it the committee's intent that all current Medicare payments to which the hospital is entitled, and to which it would have been entitled in the absence of the duplicate payment dispute, should be released immediately?

Mr. NATCHER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, that is precisely the committee's intent. The on-hold status which HCFA is to institute by direction of the committee pertains only to the duplicate payment issue. All other Medicare funds to which Worcester City Hospital is entitled should be released without delay. Our committee is deeply concerned about the damage which has already been sustained by City Hospital as an acute-care facility, and we recognize that a stable cash flow is essential to the continual delivery of services at this facility.

□ 1820

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

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

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, we concur with Chairman NATCHER in confirming that this is the committee's intent, that HCFA should suspend all activity related to the recovery of all overpayments made in Worcester City Hospital until the pending litigation is resolved.

We also believe that all Medicare payments to which the city hospital is entitled should be released immediately.

Mr. EARLY. I want to thank both the ranking member and the chairman very much.

Mr. NATCHER. 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 Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 87: Page 36, line 7, strike out "\$1,000,000,000" and insert "\$1,300,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$1,500,000,000, of which \$80,000,000 is hereby designated by Congress to be an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 94: Page 38, line 2, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$13,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "no funds are provided for fiscal year 1992".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 95: Page 38, line 12, strike out all after "100-485," down to and including "Act" in line 15 and insert "\$89,828,000, together with amounts to be

transferred from the account 'Family Support Payments to States' equal to the reduction in payments from that account because of the costs incurred by the Secretary of Health and Human Services in reviewing sample cases for quality control purposes as required by section 408(b)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act, and because of the offsets applied for fees owed by the States for their use of the Federal Parent Locator Service authorized under section 453 of the Act".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert "\$92,500,000, together with such sums as may be collected, which shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, from fees authorized under section 453 of the Social Security Act".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 99: Page 39, line 17, after "management" insert "": *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided under this heading \$3,400,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for the White House Conference on Aging".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert "": *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided under this heading \$2,000,000 shall be for the White House Conference of Aging, which shall only become available for obligation upon enactment into law of authorizing legislation and shall remain available until expended".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 108: Page 46, after line 13, insert:

SEC. 215. During the twelve-month period beginning October 1, 1991, none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to impose any reductions in payment, or to seek repayment from or to withhold any payment to any State under part B or part E of title IV of the Social Security Act, by reason of a determination made in connection with any review of State compliance with the foster care protections of section 427 of such Act for any Federal fiscal year preceding fiscal year 1992.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108 and concur therein.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 109: Page 46, after line 13, insert:

SEC. 216. Section 499A(c)(1)(C) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 289i(c)(1)(C)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "9" in the matter preceding clause (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "11"; and

(2) by striking out "3" in clause (iii) and inserting in lieu thereof "5".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109 and concur therein.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 122: Page 47, line 22, strike out "\$764,756,000" and insert "\$769,708,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$771,708,000".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 126: Page 48, line 25, after "1991" insert " ", except that any percentage increase or decrease in the cost of an equivalent level of education described in section 3(d)(2)(B)(i) shall be multiplied by two in making such determinations under section 3(d)(2)(B)".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert " : Provided further, That none of the previous provisos related to revisions in the use of prior year data in determining payment amounts provided for under this account or related to preliminary payments shall be effective for fiscal year 1992 and preliminary payments shall be authorized on the same basis as provided for prior to the enactment of P.L. 102-103".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 130: Page 49, line 10, strike out "\$1,238,709,000" and insert "\$1,249,117,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$1,236,963,000".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 132: Page 49, line 14, after "I," insert "\$3,800,000 shall be for civic education programs under section 4609, \$1,162,000 shall be for programs for Native Hawaiians under section 5134, \$30,304,000 shall be for emergency grants under section 5136".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert "\$3,800,000 shall be for civic education programs under section 4609, \$30,304,000 shall be for emergency grants under section 5136".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 133: Page 49, line 24, after "Act," insert "section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (Community Health Centers), and section 670T of the Comprehensive Child Development Act."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from the disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133 and concur therein

with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert "sections 329 and 330 of the Public Health Service Act (Migrant and Community Health Centers), and section 670T of the Comprehensive Child Development Act."

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 140: Page 51, line 7, strike out "\$1,998,501,000" and insert "\$2,071,158,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate Numbered 140 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$2,077,158,000".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 141: Page 51, line 7, strike out "\$18,368,000" and insert "\$25,103,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$31,103,000".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 142: Page 51, line 9, after "(c)" insert ", including \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended, for a continuation of a grant, begun in fiscal year 1986 under this section, to a hearing research center to support basic and applied research activities".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert ", including \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended, for a grant to a hearing research center to support applied and basic research activities, which shall be awarded competitively, and \$6,000,000 for grants to establish regional comprehensive head injury prevention and rehabilitation centers, which shall be awarded competitively".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 143: Page 51, line 9, after "(c)" insert ": Provided, That, until October 1, 1992, the funds appropriated to carry out section 711 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 796e) shall be used to support persons currently receiving grants under the section".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the word "persons" named in said amendment, insert "entities".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 150: Page 52, line 10, after "education" insert ", \$2,500,000 shall become available on October 1, 1991, for tribally controlled postsecondary vocational institutions under title III, part H."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 150 and concur therein.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 156: Page 53, line 2, after "384" insert ", and \$10,000,000 shall be for State Literacy Resource Centers under the National Literacy Act of 1991".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 156 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert "\$5,000,000 shall be for State Literacy Resource Centers under the National Literacy Act of 1991, and \$5,000,000 shall be for prison literacy activities as authorized under section 601 of the National Literacy Act of 1991, as amended by Public Law 102-103."

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 161: Page 54, strike out lines 14 to 25 and insert:

For the costs of guaranteed loans, including administrative costs other than Federal administrative costs, as authorized by title IV, part B, of the Higher Education Act, as amended, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the program: *Provided*, That such costs, including costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, \$40,000,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the costs of guaranteed loans, including administrative costs other than Federal administrative costs, as authorized by title IV, part B, of the Higher Education Act, as amended, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the program: *Provided*, That such costs, including costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, \$45,000,000. In addition to amounts appropriated in this Act for liquidation of contract authority in the "Guaranteed Student Loans (Liquidation)" account, there is also provided for payment of obligations incurred under contract authority entered into pursuant to title IV, part B, of the Higher Education Act, as amended, \$1,114,748,000 which shall be transferred to the Guaranteed Student Loans (Liquidation)" account, there is also provided for payment of obligations incurred under contract authority entered into pursuant to title IV, part B, of the Higher Education Act, as amended, \$1,114,748,000 which shall be transferred to the Guaranteed Student Loans (Liquidation) account.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 167: Page 55, line 23, after "improvements" insert "*Provided further*, That funds appropriated for Special Programs for Students from Disadvantaged Backgrounds may be allocated notwithstanding section 417D(d)(6)(B) (20 U.S.C. 1070d) to the Ronald E. McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167 and concur therein.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 172: Page 56, after line 26, insert:

COLLEGE HOUSING AND ACADEMIC FACILITIES
LOANS PROGRAM

For the costs of direct loans, as authorized by title VII, part F, of the Higher Education Act, as amended, \$7,539,000: *Provided*, That such costs, including costs of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and that these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans of not to exceed \$30,000,000: *Provided further*, That obligated balances of these appropriations will remain available until expended, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1552(a), as amended by Public Law 101-510. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, \$566,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 172 and concur therein.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 176: Page 57, line 20, strike out "\$228,999,000" and insert "\$255,893,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of

the Senate numbered 176 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$258,684,000".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 179: Page 58, line 1, strike out "\$28,000,000" and insert "\$20,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 179 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$29,900,000".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 181: Page 58, line 4, strike out all after "Education" down to and including "programs;" in line 5.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert ", including \$6,000,000 for a high technology demonstration grant, including equipment, which shall be awarded competitively;".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 197: Page 61, after line 25, insert:

SEC. 306. Subsection (e) of section 1321 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1221-1(e)) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) GIFTS AND DONATIONS.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of money, gifts or donations of services or property."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 197 and concur therein.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 200: Page 62, line 8, strike out "\$32,693,000" and insert "\$34,683,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 200 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$32,688,000".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 205: Page 63, line 22, strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$3,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 205 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$1,750,000".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 206: Page 63, after line 22, insert:

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CHILDREN
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Commission on Children, as established by section 9136 of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1987, Public Law 100-203, \$950,000 to remain available through December 31, 1992.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 206 and concur therein.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 213: Page 66, line 25, after "1992" insert "credited in 12 approximately equal amounts on the first day of each month in the fiscal year".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 213 and concur therein.

Mr. PURSELL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent

that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 214: Page 67, line 20, strike out "\$74,037,000" and insert "\$73,287,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 214 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: "\$72,287,000".

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the last amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 218: Page 73, strike out all after line 23 over to and including line 10 on page 74.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 218 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

SEC. 513. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, funds appropriated for salaries and expenses of the Department of Labor are hereby reduced by \$31,991,000; salaries and expenses of the Department of Education are hereby reduced by \$10,660,000; and salaries and expenses of the Department of Health and Human Services are hereby reduced by \$142,349,000, including \$8,000,000 of funds appropriated in this Act for travel costs of the Public Health Service: *Provided*, That the reduction for travel costs shall be from the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations.

Mr. PURSELL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent

that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1830

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions and on the conference report was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2950, INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE ACT OF 1991

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2950) to develop a national intermodal surface transportation system, to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transit programs, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. HAMMERSCHMIDT

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT moves that the managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2950, be instructed to insist on those provisions contained in title I of H.R. 2950 (as passed by the House) providing for a strong national highway system program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT].

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

Mr. Speaker, the motion I am offering today would instruct the conferees on H.R. 2950 to insist upon House provisions that establish and fund a strong National Highway Program.

The proposed National Highway System is a system of those highways that have the greatest national significance. The system would include the existing Interstate System plus approximately 110,000 additional miles of

roads that carry the most traffic in interstate commerce and serve other national goals, such as access to ports and airports and national defense needs.

This system is really the centerpiece of the restructured highway program that is being proposed for the post-interstate era. The focus of the National Highway Program will be both to maintain the enormous investment we have put into the Interstate System, as well as to improve and maintain other principal arterial routes. These other routes, which were left off the original Interstate System, are not adequate, in most cases, to serve traffic needs that have developed due to economic growth in the last 35 years. Many of these routes are two-lane roads that carry heavy volumes of truck traffic and are consequently unsafe. Nationally, the need for improvement on these roads is great.

The House bill provides for a level of funding and a structure for decision-making that will enable us to begin to meet the needs of the National Highway System. The Senate bill, on the other hand, provides a level of dedicated funding for the National Highway System that is inadequate to address the demonstrated needs of that system. Indeed, the establishment of a National Highway System in the Senate bill was not originally a part of the basic structure of the bill; it was really an afterthought, and the levels of funding reflect that fact.

In the administration's view, the levels of funding in the House bill are not sufficient to address the needs of the proposed National Highway System. I would note in this regard that in crafting the House bill we struck a balance by providing significantly increased funding for mass transit, by providing much "greater flexibility" for States to use highway funds for mass transit, and by providing metropolitan areas with more direct funding. At the same time, this balance included what we felt was a minimally adequate level of funding for the National Highway System.

It is vitally important for the national transportation system that the conference report on H.R. 2950 maintain the House provisions of the National Highway System. I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct the House conferees to insist on the House position providing for a strong National Highway System.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT], the ranking member of our Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

I think in his statement he has expressed the view and the intent of the

committee, and we on this side would strongly support this motion to instruct.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify some information regarding the motion to recommit that was before the House on this bill and the representation at that time under the motion to recommit that we would not have any projects left in the bill that did not have matching State money, 80/20. In that, one of the sections struck was section 149.

However, one of the specific complaints I had had in the course of the deliberations was section 150 of the bill. Section 150 states:

Any Federal expenditure under this section and section 149 for such project shall be treated as a part of the non-Federal share of the cost of such flood control project.

That does not refer to the bridges that were in the Molly Ann's project, but it does refer to flood control projects which go along with those bridges. The responsibility rests with the Army Corps of Engineers to do the project.

The Federal share of that project is \$16.2 million which will come out of the general funds of the Treasury. However, because of the language that was included in the bill, the \$5.4 million that is the State's matching amount will not have to be paid, and the Federal Government must pay for the non-Federal share of the project, and so by not pulling out that section, we have, in fact, in that part of the bill, created another situation where the State is going to be relieved from having to pay its share of the project.

Now, it is my understanding that the motion to recommit was supposed to correct all of these problems, and it did not, in fact, correct the problem with regard to section 150.

My question is as you go to conference whether or not there is an intention to correct this particular problem with matching share as well.

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

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, from listening to the earlier colloquy between the gentleman and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the gentleman's concern was that they believed the language of section 150 would operate to relieve the State of New Jersey from the 20-percent local match that would otherwise be required by section 149.

The motion to recommit was intended to correct any ambiguity that

might exist with respect to the Federal share on any of the special projects including that Molly Ann's Brook project that the gentleman mentioned in his colloquy.

Just to repeat for the RECORD, the instruction in the motion to recommit reads as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Federal share payable on account of any project authorized to be carried out under section 128(h), 134(c), 140, 149, 157, or 505 (other than a project for a Federal lands highway or a federally owned bridge) shall be 80 percent.

This instruction makes it clear that "notwithstanding any other provision of this Act" the Federal share on any project in section 149 of the bill shall be 80 percent. Since it is section 149 that authorizes \$9.5 million for the Molly Ann's Brook project, the motion to recommit guarantees that a 20 percent local match will be required on the project, notwithstanding any ambiguity that might be created by the language in section 150 of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman's concern, and now it goes a little beyond that, and all I can say is that we are aware of his concern and we will try to recognize it as we go to conference.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the gentleman correctly that the intention of the committee was that problems such as 150 were also going to be dealt with, and that we were going to assure that every section of the bill assured local share?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. If the gentleman will yield further, in my view, by guaranteeing that the State of New Jersey will have to match the \$9.5 million in Federal funds for the Molly Ann's Brook project with a 20-percent local share, the motion to recommit addresses the concerns raised by the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. The problem is that the gentleman is right on the \$9.5 million which is the bridge portion of the act. That is section 149. The gentleman did address that. But the problem is that I raised the questions with regard to section 150.

□ 1840

That was not addressed, and section 150 still remains in the language of the bill, and under section 150 you would still be able to have the state relieved of its matching share.

It was my understanding with all the debate we had that night that we were intending that all of these projects that had matching problems be dealt with, and all I am asking here is whether or not that is going to be compiled with or whether or not we have carved out a special exemption here which in my mind ought to be done.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Well, I cannot, of course, speak for the conferees. All I can say to the gentleman is that we know his concern and we will certainly take it into account as we go to conference.

Mr. WALKER. Well, Mr. Speaker, with that assurance I will not pursue it further, but I do want to make the point that I think the House accepted the motion to recommit on good faith that we were dealing with the entire range of projects that were in the bill that had matching share problems. I think it is incumbent upon the committee then to deal with these in a way which assures there are no matching share problems in the bill when it comes back.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, will my good friend the gentleman from Arkansas, yield?

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, as the author of that motion, it was indeed my intention that we would require a match of 80-20 on all the projects for which there was money in the bill.

The problem is that this is a different section and a different matter that relates to water resources. Frankly, we did not focus on that. We thought by saying all the money would indeed cover that; however, this is a different section and it in fact is not in the bill. It is part of the water resources bill.

So I join with my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, in saying that we know the gentleman's concern and will attempt to address it.

Mr. WALKER. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is even more of a problem then, because what we are doing is we are including language that is making a mandate on another bill somewhere that is evidently out of scope with this bill. One has to wonder then how it got in this bill and just what exactly it was doing there and why we are trying to relieve the State of its matching share in an area where there is not even any money in the bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, whatever the gentleman's concern might be, the facts are what we were trying to address was the 80-20 split in the highway bill and that is what this gentleman intended to address.

Now it has been brought to our attention that indeed there is another section here beyond that which we did attempt to address.

All we can say is that we are aware of the gentleman's concern and we will certainly consider it as we go to conference.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 394, noes 3, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—394

Abercrombie	Dellums	Hunter
Ackerman	Derrick	Hutto
Alexander	Dickinson	Hyde
Allard	Dicks	Inhofe
Anderson	Dingell	Jacobs
Andrews (ME)	Dixon	James
Andrews (NJ)	Donnelly	Jefferson
Andrews (TX)	Dooley	Jenkins
Annunzio	Doollittle	Johnson (CT)
Applegate	Dorman (CA)	Johnson (SD)
Archer	Downey	Johnson (TX)
Armey	Dreier	Johnston
Aspin	Duncan	Jones (GA)
Atkins	Durbin	Jones (NC)
AuCoin	Dymally	Jontz
Bacchus	Early	Kanjorski
Baker	Eckart	Kaptur
Ballenger	Edwards (CA)	Kasich
Barrett	Edwards (OK)	Kennedy
Barton	Edwards (TX)	Kennelly
Bateman	Emerson	Kildee
Bellenson	Engel	Kleczka
Bennett	English	Klug
Bentley	Erdreich	Kolbe
Bereuter	Espy	Kolter
Berman	Evans	Kopetski
Bevill	Ewing	Kostmayer
Billirakis	Fawell	Kyl
Bliley	Fazio	LaFalce
Boehlert	Feighan	Lagomarsino
Boehner	Fields	Lancaster
Bonior	Flake	Lantos
Borski	Foglietta	LaRocco
Boucher	Ford (MI)	Laughlin
Boxer	Ford (TN)	Leach
Brewster	Franks (CT)	Lehman (CA)
Brooks	Gallely	Levin (MI)
Broomfield	Gallo	Levine (CA)
Brown	Gaydos	Lewis (CA)
Bruce	Gejdenson	Lewis (FL)
Bryant	Gekas	Lewis (GA)
Bunning	Geren	Lightfoot
Burton	Gibbons	Lipinski
Bustamante	Glichrest	Livingston
Byron	Gillmor	Lloyd
Callahan	Gilman	Long
Camp	Gingrich	Lowery (CA)
Campbell (CA)	Glickman	Lowey (NY)
Campbell (CO)	Gonzalez	Luken
Cardin	Goodling	Machtley
Carper	Gordon	Manton
Carr	Goss	Markey
Chandler	Grandy	Marlenee
Chapman	Gunderson	Martin
Clement	Hall (OH)	Matsui
Clinger	Hall (TX)	Mazzoli
Coble	Hamilton	McCandless
Coleman (MO)	Hammerschmidt	McCloskey
Coleman (TX)	Hancock	McCollum
Collins (IL)	Hansen	McCrery
Collins (MI)	Harris	McCurdy
Combest	Hastert	McDade
Condit	Hatcher	McDermott
Conyers	Hayes (IL)	McEwen
Cooper	Hefley	McGrath
Costello	Hefner	McHugh
Coughlin	Henry	McMillan (NC)
Cox (CA)	Herger	McMillen (MD)
Cox (IL)	Hertel	McNulty
Coyne	Hoagland	Meyers
Cramer	Hobson	Mfume
Crane	Hochbrueckner	Michel
Cunningham	Holloway	Miller (CA)
Dannemeyer	Horn	Miller (OH)
Darden	Houghton	Miller (WA)
de la Garza	Hoyer	Mineta
DeFazio	Hubbard	Mink
DeLauro	Huckaby	Moakley
DeLay	Hughes	Molinari

Mollohan	Richardson	Stenholm
Montgomery	Ridge	Stokes
Moody	Riggs	Stump
Moorhead	Rinaldo	Sundquist
Moran	Ritter	Swett
Morella	Roberts	Swift
Morrison	Roe	Synar
Mrazek	Roemer	Tallon
Murtha	Rogers	Tanner
Myers	Rohrabacher	Tauzin
Nagle	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (MS)
Natcher	Rose	Taylor (NC)
Neal (MA)	Roth	Thomas (CA)
Neal (NC)	Roukema	Thomas (GA)
Nichols	Rowland	Thomas (WY)
Nowak	Roybal	Thornton
Nussle	Russo	Torres
Oakar	Sabo	Torricelli
Obey	Sanders	Towns
Oliver	Santorum	Trafficant
Ortiz	Savage	Traxler
Orton	Sawyer	Unsoeld
Owens (NY)	Saxton	Upton
Oxley	Schaefer	Valentine
Packard	Scheuer	Vander Jagt
Pallone	Schiff	Vento
Panetta	Schroeder	Visclosky
Parker	Schulze	Volkmer
Pastor	Schumer	Vucanovich
Patterson	Sensenbrenner	Walker
Paxon	Serrano	Walsh
Payne (VA)	Shaw	Washington
Pease	Shays	Waters
Pelosi	Shuster	Waxman
Perkins	Sikorski	Weber
Peterson (FL)	Siskiy	Weiss
Peterson (MN)	Skeen	Weldon
Petri	Skelton	Wheat
Pickett	Slattery	Whitten
Pickle	Slaughter (NY)	Williams
Porter	Smith (IA)	Wilson
Poshard	Smith (NJ)	Wise
Price	Smith (OR)	Wolf
Pursell	Smith (TX)	Wolpe
Quillen	Snowe	Wyden
Rahall	Solarz	Wyllie
Ramstad	Solomon	Yatron
Rangel	Spence	Young (AK)
Ravenel	Spratt	Young (FL)
Ray	Staggers	Zelliff
Reed	Stallings	Zimmer
Regula	Stark	
Rhodes	Stearns	

NOES—3

Gradison	Green	Penny
----------	-------	-------

NOT VOTING—36

Anthony	Gephardt	Olin
Barnard	Guarini	Owens (UT)
Bilbray	Hayes (LA)	Payne (NJ)
Browder	Hopkins	Rostenkowski
Clay	Horton	Sangmeister
Davis	Ireland	Sarpalius
Dorgan (ND)	Lehman (FL)	Sharp
Dwyer	Lent	Skaggs
Fascell	Martinez	Slaughter (VA)
Fish	Mavroules	Smith (FL)
Frank (MA)	Murphy	Studds
Frost	Oberstar	Yates

□ 1903

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. SCHIFF changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 2950, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Infrastructure Act of 1991 and, without objection, reserves the right to appoint additional conferees:

From the Committee on Public Works and Transportation for consideration of the entire House bill—except title VII—the entire Senate amend-

ment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROE, ANDERSON, MINETA, OBERSTAR, NOWAK, RAHALL, APLEGATE, DE LUGO, SAVAGE, BORSKI, KOLTER, HAMMERSCHMIDT, SHUSTER, CLINGER, PETRI, PACKARD, BOEHLERT, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of title VII of the House bill, and sections 140E, 141 through 144, 271(b)(12), and 305 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROSENKOWSKI, GIBBONS, PICKLE, RANGEL, STARK, ARCHER, VANDER JAGT, and CRANE.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of sections 5, 121(a), 123, 124, 134 (a) and (b), 143, 184, 209, 322(m), 335, title V—insofar as it addresses railroads—sections 601(b), 608 through 610, 617, and 620 of the House bill, and sections 103(b) (1), (2), and (9), 106(a), 107, 113, 114, 115 (a)(2) and (d), 116, 117, 122(b), 127, 128, 131, 140G, 140T, 140U, 239, 261, 262, 319, and 336 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DINGELL, SWIFT, SIKORSKI, LENT, and RITTER. Provided that Mr. DANNEMEYER is appointed in place of Mr. RITTER for consideration of sections 123 and 124 of the House bill, and sections 103(b)(2), 106(a)—insofar as it addresses 23 U.S.C. 133(a)(10)—107, 113, 114, and 319 of the Senate amendment.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of sections 140I, 140N, part A of title II—except sections 204, 218, and 226—264, and 271 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DINGELL, SWIFT, SHARP, ECKART, TAUZIN, SLATTERY, BOUCHER, MANTON, BRUCE, HARRIS, SYNAR, LENT, MOORHEAD, RINALDO, DANNEMEYER, RITTER, FIELDS, and OXLEY.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for consideration of sections 125, 143, 144 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. MILLER of California, VENTO, KOSTMAYER, LAGOMARSINO, and MARLENEE.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of section 409 of the House bill, and section 238 and title IV of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BROOKS, EDWARDS of California, FRANK of Massachusetts, FISH, and MOORHEAD.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, for consideration of sections 5, 108, 317(b), 320, and 321 (a) and (e) of the House bill, and section 106(a) of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. JONES of North Carolina, STUDDS, HERTEL, DAVIS, and YOUNG of Alaska.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Science, Space, and

Technology, for consideration of sections 141 (a) and (e), 202, 317, 405, 502, 601, 604 through 609, 616 through 618, 651 through 659, and 671 through 673 of the House bill, and sections 103(b) (9) and (10), 106(a), 107, 115, 116, 127(g), 136(b), 203(e), 204, 232(a) 329, and 341 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BROWN, VALENTINE, GLICKMAN, WALKER, and LEWIS of Florida.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, because of family obligations I was unable to be present to vote on the motion to instruct conferees on consideration of H.R. 2950, the Transportation bill. I wish to record that, had I been present, I would have voted against the motion to instruct on rollcall No. 384.

NATIONAL WOMEN VETERANS
RECOGNITION WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 145) designating the week beginning November 10, 1991, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to acknowledge the work of our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], who is the chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 145, which designates the week beginning November 10, 1991, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week." I would also like to thank my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] who was the chief sponsor of the House bill honoring our women veterans.

As you may know, the Department of Veterans Affairs currently estimates that there are more than 1.2 million women veterans in this country, representing 4.2 percent of the total veteran population.

Women have played a vital role in our Nation's armed services. Official military participation for women began in 1901 with the formation of the Army Nurse Corps and was followed in 1903 with the formation of the Navy Nurse Corps. During World War I, 13,000 women were enlisted by the Navy as telephone operators, clerical workers, typists, and stenographers. During

World War II, the number of enlisted women in all four services was approximately 350,000. Additionally, women continued to play an active role in Korea and Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to recognize the valuable contributions that women veterans have made throughout our Nation's history. Most recently, the contributions that our women veterans made during Desert Storm were vital. They served in a wide variety of jobs, such as: pilots, truck drivers, cargo handlers, intelligence specialists, flight controllers, communications experts, and ground crew chiefs. It is time for our Nation to learn more about the important role women have played in our Armed Forces, and to express our gratitude to them for their dedicated service.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this important resolution.

□ 1910

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUKEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 145

Whereas there are more than 1,200,000 women veterans in the United States representing 4.2 percent of the total veteran population;

Whereas the number of women serving in the United States Armed Forces and the number of women veterans continue to increase;

Whereas women veterans have contributed greatly to the security of the United States through honorable military service, often involving great hardship and danger;

Whereas women are performing a wider range of tasks in the United States Armed Forces, as demonstrated by the participation of women in the military actions taken in Panama and the Persian Gulf region;

Whereas the special needs of women veterans, especially in the area of health care, have often been overlooked or inadequately addressed by the Federal Government;

Whereas the lack of attention to the special needs of women veterans has discouraged or prevented many women veterans from taking full advantage of the benefits and services to which they are entitled; and

Whereas designating a week to recognize women veterans will help both to promote important gains by women veterans and to focus attention on the special needs of women veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning November 10, 1991, is designated as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week," and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a mo-

tion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1745, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1991

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-291) on the resolution (H. Res. 270) providing for the consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1745) to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to strengthen and improve Federal civil rights laws, to provide for damages in cases of intentional employment discrimination, to clarify provisions regarding disparate impact actions, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL RED RIBBON MONTH

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 188) designating November 1991 as "National Red Ribbon Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to acknowledge the work of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], the chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], for an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 188, designating November, 1991 as "National Red Ribbon Month," and I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] the ranking minority member or our Select Committee on Narcotics for his leadership in bringing this measure to the floor of the House for consideration.

Senate Joint Resolution 188 is the companion measure to House Joint Resolution 312, a measure which Mr. COUGHLIN sponsored and which I am proud to have cosponsored. Mothers Against Drunk Driving have played an important role in supporting "National Red Ribbon Month," and I would like to commend their invaluable participation in this effort. Red ribbons have long symbolized the MADD campaign and their tireless contributions to stopping drunk driving in our Nation. It is estimated that about two in every five Americans will be involved in an alcohol-related crash, approximately 10 percent of car crashes involved alcohol, and an astounding 25 percent of drivers involved in fatal traffic crashes were drunk.

These disparaging statistics are only the tip of the iceberg. Figures are even more discouraging in those studies that concentrate on our young people.

Mr. Speaker, more than 40 percent of all teenage deaths result from motor vehicle crashes, about half of these involve drunk driving. In 1987, nearly 27 percent of the fatally injured 15-19-year-old teenaged drivers were intoxicated.

Just as we cannot afford to turn our back on Americans who are experimenting and regularly using illicit narcotics, we cannot ignore the abuse of alcohol. Drunk driving, drunk driving accidents, and drunk driving fatalities have reached unprecedented proportions. We must send out a clear, strong message to all our Nation, especially our young. We must send them a clear message that drunk driving is not only wrong, not only foolish, but fatal.

I am pleased this legislation is on the floor of the House today, and I ask all my colleagues to join me in support of Senate Joint Resolution 188.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, before Congress adjourned for the August break, I introduced House Joint Resolution 312, a resolution designating the month of November 1991 as Red Ribbon Month. The Senate has already passed an identical resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 188, which we are considering today.

During November, as our Nation enters the traditional holiday period, Mothers Against Drunk Driving [MADD] will launch a major public awareness campaign aimed at ridding our Nation's highways of the scourge of drunk driving. I am proud to join MADD in this effort.

MADD is currently observing its 10-year anniversary as a grass roots advocacy organization. MADD's first 10 years have been marked by hard work and success. Part of MADD's success is a new awareness on the part of the general public of the tragic consequences of drinking and driving. MADD pioneered the phrase "Tie One On For Safety," a clever use of words urging all of us to tie a red ribbon on our vehicles as a reminder not to drink and drive.

This November, MADD will distribute more than 90 million red ribbons nationwide. These red ribbons will serve as a reminder to all of us that each year on our highways fully half of the deaths resulting from auto crashes are caused by drunk driving. Each year more than 345,000 injuries result from drunk driving. This is a problem we can do something about. In fact, over the last 10 years thousands of lives have been saved as our Nation has become increasingly aware of the dangers of drinking and driving. Congress has played a role in this effort by encouraging the States to maintain a minimum drinking age of 21 years old.

Additional legislation has been passed providing incentive grants to States to combat drunk driving and provisions to better serve the victims of this violent crime.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my association with the cause of fighting drunk driving on our Nation's highways and am pleased to offer this resolution for the consideration of my colleagues.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows.

S.J. RES. 188

Whereas the most frequently committed crime in America is drunk driving;

Whereas each year on our Nation's highways more than forty-five thousand people lose their lives due to auto crashes, approximately half of these involving alcohol;

Whereas more than three hundred and forty-five thousand people are injured in alcohol-related crashes each year;

Whereas Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) is an organization of nearly three million members and supporters across the Nation which has had a major impact on reducing death on our highways;

Whereas in November 1991 MADD will launch a major holiday public awareness campaign by asking America to "Tie One On For Safety" this holiday season; and

Whereas beginning in November MADD and other concerned groups will distribute more than ninety million red ribbons nationwide to create awareness about the dangers of drinking and driving: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That November 1991 is designated as "National Red Ribbon Month," and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate activities devoted to reducing death and injury on our Nation's highways due to drinking and driving.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FAMILY CAREGIVERS WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 125) to designate the week beginning November 24, 1991, and the week beginning November 22, 1992, each as "National Family Caregivers Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], the chief sponsor of this resolution.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. SAWYER, chairman of the Census and Population Subcommittee and the ranking minority member, Mr. RIDGE, for bringing to the floor House Joint Resolution 125 to des-

ignate the week of Thanksgiving as "National Family Caregivers Week" for 1991 and 1992.

For the past 6 years, I have sponsored legislation to designate the week of Thanksgiving as "National Family Caregivers Week." I believe that this is a time to give special recognition and commendation to the many individuals who face demanding and often stressful situations in caring for older family members.

Caregivers are in great need of our support. While such commitment to a family member offers many rewards, many caregivers often find themselves under a great deal of pressure in their attempt to juggle the competing demands of their immediate families, their careers and their own personal needs.

As you are probably aware, most of the disabled elderly are cared for at home. Caregivers often go to extraordinary lengths to keep a loved one from institutionalization. Family caregivers continue to provide care to parents, spouses, sisters, and brothers even at great expense to themselves. They give their money, their time, and their love in order to allow their family member to have a more comfortable and independent life.

Independence, dignity, and respect. Who among us does not strive to enjoy each of these characteristics? In fact, we work a lifetime to achieve these traits and, in reality, we may be stripped of them within a matter of minutes or days because of a chronic or disabling illness. Certainly we need to work harder to enhance the home care programs, respite and support groups available to the disabled elderly and their family caregivers to allow all family members to maintain their independence, dignity, and respect.

As individuals, we need to understand the daily concerns of caregivers and, as a society, we need to devise better options to alleviate the pressures family caregivers face. As the population ages, the pressing need for caregiving will increase. Through improved public/private partnerships, elder care, tax credits, and expanded family medical leave policies, I believe that we may begin to address the seriousness of caregivers' concerns.

Mr. Speaker, to most of us, Thanksgiving connotes family. Thanksgiving gives us a vacation from work and all of our everyday problems so that we may spend a little time with loved ones. However, caregivers rarely get a vacation from caregiving. On Thanksgiving, family caregivers will continue to help dress, and bathe, and prepare meals for their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we can once again celebrate our Nation's caregivers during "National Family Caregivers Week." But this year, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I will have the Congress' support for family caregivers

not only during the week of Thanksgiving, but also in the many weeks of continual caregiving that are certain to follow throughout the year.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 125 designating the week beginning November 24, 1991, and the week beginning November 22, 1992, each as "National Family Caregivers Week" and I commend the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] for introducing this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, more than 5 million of our elderly have disabilities that render them in need of basic daily care. Statistics show that between 80 and 90 percent of the families provide for the daily care of our elderly and in doing so incur many additional expenses. These family members not only give of their time and energy, but often make great financial and personal sacrifices. This involvement of caregiving strengthens the family bonds and fulfills a functional need in our society as well as provides the younger generation an opportunity to know, respect, and serve their elders.

We all know the value of a loving, caring family. These caregivers go beyond the normal responsibilities to family and freely offer help and service to their loved ones in need.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 125 calls for a greater public awareness of family caregivers and encourages support of these dedicated people. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this resolution and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1920

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUKEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 125

Whereas the number of Americans who are age 65 or older is growing dramatically, with an unprecedented increase in the number of frail elderly age 85 or older;

Whereas approximately 5,200,000 older persons have disabilities that leave them in need of help with their daily tasks, including food preparation, dressing, and bathing;

Whereas families provide help to older persons with such tasks, in addition to providing between 80 and 90 percent of the medical care, household maintenance, transportation, and shopping needed by older persons;

Whereas 80 percent of disabled elderly persons receive care from their family members, most of whom are their wives, daughters, and daughters-in-law, who often must sacrifice employment opportunities to provide such care;

Whereas family caregivers are often physically and emotionally exhausted from the

amount of time and stress involved in caregiving activities, and therefore need information about available community resources for respite care and other support services;

Whereas the contributions of family caregivers help maintain strong family ties and assure support among generations; and

Whereas there is a need for greater public awareness of and support for the care that family caregivers are providing older persons: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning November 24, 1991, and the week beginning November 22, 1992, are each designated "National Family Caregivers Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such weeks with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

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

NATIONAL ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE MONTH

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) to designate the months of November 1991 and November 1992 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, clearly I would encourage my colleagues to support this legislation, and I simply take this reservation to acknowledge the work of the chief sponsor, the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY].

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY].

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 36, which will designate November 1991 and November 1992 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month." This resolution is a valuable tool in calling our Nation's attention to the terrible toll of Alzheimer's disease.

For the past 8 years I have had the honor of being the sponsor of this resolution in the House. I am pleased to report that during this time we have made some progress in the fight against this insidious illness. But, sadly, I must also remind my colleagues that Alzheimer's continues to ravage the lives of millions of Americans and their families.

Over 4 million Americans are affected by Alzheimer's and it has be-

come the fourth leading cause of death in the United States. Alzheimer's is the most common form of dementing illness. It strikes without warning and slowly and irreversibly destroys brain cells causing loss of memory, loss of muscle control, impaired judgment, violent mood swings, and aimless wandering. These changes are more than simple medical symptoms; when they occur we see someone who was our mother, father, or grandparent become a seemingly vacant shell. A lifelong loved one becomes almost a stranger, someone who doesn't recognize his or her own children, or remember where they were or what they did only 5 minutes before.

In addition to the medical impact on the victim, the decline caused by Alzheimer's takes a massive emotional toll on a family member who has acted as care giver. The Alzheimer's Disease Association estimates the disease costs the United States more than \$90 billion a year in direct and indirect costs and lost productivity. Millions of families spend vast amounts of time and money trying to find proper care for their loved ones. When one combines our general health care woes with Alzheimer's unique challenges, the outlook for America's aging population is truly frightening.

Still, the news is not all bad. Families and patients now have care alternatives and support groups they can turn to for help. In my home area of San Diego, I salute the Alzheimer's Association and the Alzheimer's Family Center for their work in helping families manage the tremendous burden of this disease.

We are also making progress on the medical front. Last Friday, November 1, researchers at the University of California, San Diego, found there may be a potential treatment for memory loss caused by Alzheimer's. These doctors believe that the human protein, nerve growth factor, prevents the degeneration of key nerve cells involved in memory. This is the type of research that will enable us to eventually control or even defeat Alzheimer's. But we are not there yet; we still have a long way to go.

Congress has provided important financial support for Alzheimer's research; over \$100 million in fiscal year 1991, and this support must continue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, BUTLER DERRICK, who has been the original cosponsor of this resolution for the past 8 years, as well as the 226 Members who cosponsored House Joint Resolution 198 this year. In addition, Chairman SAWYER, Congressman RIDGE, and the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee deserve thanks for their prompt consideration of the resolution.

Senate Joint Resolution 36 will heighten national awareness of Alzheimer's disease. It will also serve as

an expression of gratitude and support for the organizations that have advanced research and provided care for the victims of Alzheimer's. Let's work together to develop treatments and perhaps even a cure for Alzheimer's.

I urge passage of Senate Joint Resolution 36 to designate National Alzheimer's Disease Month.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his words and his effort on this resolution. I thank him for all his good work.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 36

Whereas over 4 million United States citizens are affected by Alzheimer's disease, a surprisingly common degenerative disease which attacks the brain, impairs memory and thinking, alters behavior, and renders its victims incapable of self care;

Whereas it is estimated that by the middle of the 21st century, Alzheimer's disease will strike 14 million United States citizens, affecting one in every three families;

Whereas Alzheimer's disease is not a normal consequence of aging, but a disorder of the brain for which no cause has been determined and no treatment or cure has been found;

Whereas Alzheimer's disease is the quintessential long-term care problem, requiring constant full-time care for its victims, who can suffer from the disease for 3 to 20 years, at a total annual cost to the Nation of at least \$90 billion;

Whereas families of Alzheimer's patients bear the overwhelming physical, emotional, and financial burden of care, and neither public programs, including medicare, nor private insurance provide protection for most of these families;

Whereas 80 percent of all Alzheimer's patients receive care in their own homes;

Whereas nearly half of all residents of nursing homes suffer from Alzheimer's disease or some other form of dementia; and

Whereas increased national awareness of Alzheimer's disease and recognition of national organizations such as the Alzheimer's Association may stimulate increased commitment to long-term care services to support Alzheimer's patients and their families and a greater investment in research to discover methods to prevent the disease, delay its onset, and eventually to find a cure for the disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the months of November 1991, and November 1992, are designated as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such months with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1991

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

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, now offered as a compromise to the bill passed earlier this year by the House. There are few issues, regardless of the point of view, that evoke a more emotional response than civil rights. In my district, the very term elicits a veritable cornucopia of memories. There are members of this body that were active participants in the civil rights movement. They have every right to take an emotional stand on this issue. Others of you have no concept of what the term really means. Twice, I voted against earlier versions of this bill. Unlike some members of this body, for the past 2 years I refused to play political games with my constituents' emotions. I resent some of the tactics which have been used. We have an obligation to produce meaningful legislation that represents the best interests of our constituents, not to use labels to pit them against one another. There should be great shame in this body today the shame of making civil rights a toy in the game of political one-upmanship.

The President shares equally in our shame. It is reprehensible that compromise legislation such as we now will consider could not have been passed earlier in the year. It was not because the compromise language was not offered. Mr. GEREN, Mr. STENHOLM, and I engaged in negotiations with the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and other groups interested in this legislation to develop language that is really no different than what we are now to vote on. We took our ideas to the White House. But our efforts were unsuccessful. Perhaps it was because we are not Republicans or maybe it is because we are not Senators. The President said that we still had a quota bill. In the political arena, a referendum on quotas was more important than a Civil Rights Act. And now, as if by magic—by pronouncement—our language has been declared quota-free. Personally, I never believed that any of the bills that have been offered would require quotas. Quota bill Civil Rights Act—these are just labels, names that allow supporters and opponents alike

to ignore the real issue—to avoid even trying to understand the legal ramifications of our actions.

There have been some courageous moments. When considering a similar bill last year, a compromise was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE]. It was roundly denounced by many members of my party. No one can say that the LaFalce substitute was not a more encompassing, more far-reaching alternative than the measure before this body today. I watched—over a period of a few short hours of debate—as that bill moved from the LaFalce substitute to the LaFalce-Michel substitute to the Michel-LaFalce substitute to finally the Michel substitute. I watched JOHN LAFALCE castigated on this floor. Constituents in my district thought he was a Republican instead of the Democratic chairman of the Small Business Committee. This House owes an apology to JOHN LAFALCE—and I regret that his bill is now no more than yet another opportunity lost by this body.

The House, the Senate civil rights groups, and the administration have wasted over 2 years posturing to gain political advantage out of this bill. To some degree, they have each gained an advantage. Each group can say to their constituency that they have stood up for what they believed. But what have they really accomplished? Have they succeeded in making our environment more race neutral, where everyone has an equal opportunity? Have they made the racial environment more harmonious? Have they helped create an environment where a person is not judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character? Sadly, the answer is no.

By this posturing, every special interest group involved in this process has made civil rights more contentious, more fracturing, and more ideologic. I am glad that this day has finally arrived. I would like to think we have learned a lesson, but that perhaps, is only wishful thinking.

□ 1930

VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER AND REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate my special order for 60 minutes today and speak for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC INEQUITY IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the voters of America—and particularly those of Pennsylvania—sent an urgent wake up call to their elected leaders yesterday:

Pay attention to the growing economic desperation here at home;

Deliver essential services—particularly health care—desperately needed by millions of our own citizens;

Stop wasting our time with political gimmicks, empty rhetoric, and excuses.

Did we get the message?

This morning, the President flew off on yet another high profile, overseas trip, this time to defend spending nearly half our defense dollars defending Western Europe. I hope Mr. Bush remembers to insist that our Allies pay their fair share of their own defense costs.

In one sense, I understand why George Bush continues to fly off to some foreign country every chance he gets. When you examine the condition of this country, of the millions of Americans and families who constitute the mass of middle America, you very quickly understand the terrible condition of our economy, and the failure of Republican economic policy.

The administration's response to the unending flow of bad economic views has been to deny the crisis, deny the pain, and most unacceptably, to deny compassion to the victims of this unending recession.

Over the course of the past dozen years, the economic theories of the Bush and Reagan administrations have launched this Nation onto the uncharted seas of economic experimentation. Call it "Reaganomics"; call it "supply side"; call it "trickle down"; call it, as did George Bush in 1980, "voodoo economics."

After nearly three terms of Republican control of the White House, it is clear that the benefits of this irresponsible policy have been vastly exaggerated. And even more importantly, the blind adherence of the administration to these theories has insulated President Bush and his advisory from the daily suffering of the American people, and the dangerous signs of deterioration in the economy.

The administration's economic gameplan was founded on a Faustian bargain: sacrifice the traditional American commitment to equity in return for economic growth.

At best, it was wishful thinking. At worst, it was an irresponsible strategy, an effort to wrap right wing economic fundamentalism in populist clothing. And it has failed.

Now, it has not failed for everyone, of course. And perhaps that was the goal all along.

Between 1977 and 1988, those in the top 10 percent of incomes realized a 34 percent increase in their income, and a 7 percent reduction in their taxes.

But in the meantime, the real income of middle-income taxpayers rose by just 4 percent, and their tax burden—far from dropping—actually increased.

Despite the glitter of the 1980s, millions of Americans slid backwards into poverty and economic marginalism. For every Donald Trump, there are millions who are unable to buy a home, unable to send their children to college, unable to afford medical bills and unable to increase their savings.

And yet, the Bush administration has no comprehensive plan for addressing our disastrous economic state. But what is even more distressing is the failure of the President and his advisory to acknowledge, or understand, that a true crisis exists.

I am reminded of the unwarranted "new era" optimism that filled President Hoover on the eve of the Great Depression. Amid stock crashes, mounting unemployment and business collapses, Hoover and his Cabinet maintained a rosy outlook for the economy.

"I see nothing in the present situation that is either menacing or warrants pessimism," said Hoover's Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew Mellon, in 1930.

"There is nothing in the situation to be disturbed about," echoed his Commerce Secretary, Robert Lamont.

Hoover himself predicted the crisis would end by the spring of 1930.

These examples don't mean we are headed for a catastrophe of the magnitude of the Great Depression. But I do notice a similarity between President Bush's buoyant enthusiasm about the state of the economy and what Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., described as Hoover's tendency toward "Bending the facts to sustain his optimism, and then believing his own conclusions."

Like Hoover, President Bush has summoned the energies of volunteerism and community service to respond to the national economic crisis, instead of utilizing the great energies of the Government and the Nation as a whole.

Like Hoover, who rejected the recommendations of the Emergency Committee for Employment, President Bush has dismissed the need for expanded assistance to millions of long-term jobless Americans.

Like Hoover, President Bush calls on the hard-pressed State and local governments and small businesses to shoulder the burden of recovery and services.

President Bush is drawing his economic program from the historic Republican tradition. His tax plan is pure Reaganomics; his antirecession strategy is pure Hoover.

History has proved both to have been utter failures for middle class America.

President Bush misreads the past and he misunderstands the present. And I think growing numbers of Americans share that view.

The economic growth promised by the Republicans has been vastly exaggerated. In the 5 years before we embarked on the "supply side" folly, economic growth was measured at 2.9 percent. During the period 1981-86, that rate fell to 2.7 percent. And for the entire decade of the 1980's, economic growth averaged only 2.8 percent.

Republican economics has similarly failed in another key goal: Increasing savings and business investment to stimulate business growth.

In fact, personal savings actually fell by 23 percent and national savings dropped by over 18 percent during the decade. Meanwhile, business investment as a percent of GNP fell from 3.6 percent to 2.8 percent.

A major factor in the slow rate of investment continues to be the historically high real interest rates—the highest in half a century, and substantially higher than those denounced by the Republicans during the 1980 Presidential campaign.

In the area of debt, too, the Republican failure dwarfs the situation in 1980, when the Reagan-Bush ticket was elected to stop deficit spending.

The debt then stood at about \$70 billion for the year. As a result of the Reagan tax and spending policies, which gave tax rebates to the rich and blank checks to the Pentagon, deficits in excess of \$200 billion became standard fare during the last decade. Our national debt, which took every President from Washington to Carter to reach \$1 billion, tripled in just 8 years of Republican rule, rising from 2.8 percent of GNP to more than 5 percent.

And, or course, we simultaneously became the biggest debtor Nation in the world.

Now, of course, Republicans have continually argued that we could correct all this debt if we just passed a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Let's go no further before observing that Ronald Reagan and George Bush, who both want a balanced budget amendment, never have come close to sending a balanced budget to the Congress, which they could do anytime they like.

Focusing on emotionally charged issues like a balanced budget amendment—or flag burning, or the ACLU, or Willie Horton—has been a Republican smokescreen to obscure the real issues confronting our Nation. It hardly seems surprising that the Republican candidate for Governor of Louisiana, David Duke, is building on these divisive and alarmist themes in his speeches.

Without question, the most significant impact of the Republican economic program has not been the growth and prosperity we were promised, but growing inequity and economic marginalism.

It's funny: I don't hear George Bush asking middle America whether they

are better off today than they were 10 years ago.

And we know why.

The fiscal policies of these two Republican administrations have constituted an assault on the stability and security of the overwhelming majority of Americans.

In the key years 1978-87, when we would have expected to see the 1981 tax law stimulate the economy, we began instead an era of growing income disparity.

According to the Commerce Department, 60 percent of all households lost ground economically during the decade of the 1980's. About 86 percent of the increase in family income went to the top 20 percent of families, and most of it went to the top 5 percent.

Increasingly, the growing army of poor Americans is made up not of the jobless, but of millions of men and women who go to work every day. The number of Americans who were employed at full-time, year-round jobs, but who still remained impoverished, rose by 43 percent over the same period. And for 2 million more who could not find full-time jobs, the poverty rate rose by 23 percent.

It is particularly distressing that this deterioration in family income has occurred despite a dramatic demographic change in the American family. As women moved in unprecedented numbers into the work force during the 1970's and 1980's, millions of families became two-earner households just to maintain their current standard of living.

And yet, because of declining wages, fewer benefits, additional costs and unfair tax policy, these two-earner families are, in many cases, fortunate just to maintain the standard of living enjoyed by a single earner a decade or two earlier. Last year alone, the typical family's real income dropped by 1.7 percent, and 2 million more Americans—including 800,000 children—became poor.

In 1990, after 11 years of Republican economic efforts, nearly 34 million Americans were living in poverty, not only unable to contribute to economic growth, but dependent on a host of public support programs—from housing to health care to food assistance—that force the deficit higher and higher just to keep people alive with the barest of necessities.

The Republican trickle-down tax strategy was a fraud from beginning to end. It has not made America competitive or productive; it has made America poorer, unequal, and angry. And unleashing the old assaults on Jimmy Carter isn't going to do the trick any longer.

According to Robert McIntyre of the Citizens for Tax Justice, next year the richest 1 percent of all Americans will make \$678 billion before taxes. That is more than the bottom 40 percent of all

Americans will earn in the same time period.

That richest 1 percent has seen its real income more than double since 1977, thanks to Republican tax and income policy. The richest 2 percent enjoyed an increase of 84 percent.

But for the rest of us, real income has either stagnated or fallen. And in the case of the poorest Americans, income has fallen most dramatically.

According to the supply-side mantra, we were all going to get something for this tax windfall we gave to the wealthy in 1981. What a surprise to learn it hasn't worked out that way.

In fact, the tax cut Ronald Reagan gave to the richest 1 percent will cost the other 99 percent of Americans \$164 billion in 1992 alone.

In addition to the \$84 billion in lower taxes that richest 1 percent will enjoy, we will all pay another \$81 billion in interest payments necessitated by the additional debt generated by the tax cut for the rich.

The \$164 billion in revenue losses attributable to tax relief for the richest 1 percent is almost exactly the same as the additional debt we will accumulate in 1992 compared to 1977-78.

The response of Republican true believers, whenever these indictments are laid at their feet, is that the problems of the economy are due not to flawed fiscal policy, but to excessive spending by those Democrats in the Congress.

I have already noted that the Congress regularly has appropriated less spending than proposed by Presidents Reagan and Bush. But let me be even clearer about the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on spending.

During the decade of Republican rule, George Bush would have the average voter believe that we maintained high taxes on the middle class to pay for domestic spending, which Congress refused to cut. The facts show quite the contrary.

During the 1980's, as tax revenues plunged and military spending became stratospheric, spending on the rest of Government dropped rather dramatically: A drop in 1990 alone of some \$10 billion.

Education and training programs were slashed by 40 percent. And Americans wonder why our schools are failing and our young people are unskilled in the world competition for jobs.

Environment and infrastructure spending have been cut by 39 percent. And we wonder why we face congestion and hazards on our highways and airports, and toxic contamination in our neighborhoods and water supplies.

As a result of these cuts and many, many others in virtually every facet of domestic endeavor, the average middle-income taxpayer—that family that has watched its tax bill increase and its annual earnings decrease—is receiving a fourth less in Government services today for every dollar in taxes than a decade ago.

No wonder middle America is angry. No wonder middle America is anxious about the state of the economy and doubts that our political leadership really cares about the precariousness of their economic security.

For a decade, the American public has been fed a steady diet of glib and misleading generalities, of rosy predictions that have brought our economy to our current, sorry state, or fingerpointing, racebaiting and smear politics.

But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a sea change has come over the American public in the last few weeks.

You hear it in your congressional districts: Concern about economic security, about college affordability, about growing unemployment and reluctant consumers.

You see it in the Congress: Bafflement as the administration attempts to dismiss the latest unemployment numbers and vetoes bill after bill to aid the long term unemployed.

You read it in the press and see it in the media: Newsweek's cover story on "The Bite on the Middle-Class" last week.

The American people are worried. They don't believe the optimistic hype. They don't want to be told that important issues like national health care are too complex to address, as Mr. Bush's candidate in Pennsylvania did.

The American people want action, courage and compassion, not vetoes and Hoover-like predictions of false prosperity.

We in the Democratic Party are undertaking an effort to repair the damage done to progressivity and fairness in the Tax Code by the Reagan administration. But only leadership at the Presidential level is going to create a national economic gameplan.

Not every problem can be solved by climbing into a golf cart, racing off in a speedboat, or heading for Europe.

It seems only fair to ask a President who has time to travel to Spain, Italy, Holland, Japan, Korea, Singapore, and Australia to devote a similar amount of time to repairing the damage caused by the voodoo economics he decried, and then imposed, on the American people.

Barbara Tuchmann, the Pulitzer prize winning historian, wrote several years ago on the role of folly in history. Folly, she wrote, was not the making of an error, but rather the refusal of leaders to alter a flawed and fatal course despite being forewarned that proceeding meant disaster.

The economic policies of the Bush administration are classic historic folly. They have not corrected the problems they were designed to fix: Indeed, they have led to deeper deficits, poorer savings, slower growth, higher unemployment, a deeper recession, and a greater polarization of our population.

The time has come for dramatic changes in the economic program of our political leadership. And if that leadership fails to change, then it is the leadership itself which must be replaced.

□ 1940

VACATING SPECIAL ORDER AND GRANTING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order for 60 minutes on today be vacated, and that I be granted, instead a 5-minute special order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUKEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, before my good friend, the gentleman from California, leaves, there ought to be an opportunity for somebody on this side of the aisle to set the record a little straight.

I mean, it is kind of crooked, after listening to what the gentleman had to say.

First of all, in the early 1980's, we had just come out of the Carter years, and we had suffered 21½-percent interest rates, 14-percent inflation, and we had employment that was double-digit.

Ronald Reagan, during the 1980's, cut the top tax rate from 70 percent to 28 percent, and as a result, during the latter part of the 1980's, we created 21 million new jobs. Those 21 million new taxpayers were responsible in large part for more than doubling the amount of tax revenues coming in. During the early 1980's, we were bringing in about \$500 billion a year in tax revenues. It is up to, now, \$1.1 trillion.

The problems we face are not due to a lack of revenues. We have more than doubled the revenues. The problems we face lie at the feet of the Democrat-controlled Congress who are spending way beyond our means. Now, granted, the President is not entirely blameless.

Let me just tell you why I think the President is not entirely blameless. Let me finish, and when I will yield. The reason I think that the President is not entirely blameless is that because during his campaign for President, he said, "Read my lips, no new taxes." And then he yielded to the majority party in this House and the other House, the Democrats. He said, "OK, I will sign a compromise budget summit that will allow for \$181 billion in new taxes." I think that that hurt the President.

But the main responsibility for the deficit, the main responsibility for the

deficit is the Democrat Party, which has had control of this Chamber for my entire lifetime except for 4 years. The last time the Republicans had control of this Chamber I was 16 years old back in 1954. And so all of the spending that goes on and the deficits that we are dealing with should be laid directly at the feet of the majority party in this House, because all spending and all taxes originate here, not at the White House, but here, and so I just say to my colleagues that they should not be casting these kinds of aspersions at the White House when they know full well that the spending problems that we are having today originate right here.

Today we moved \$4.3 billion in forward spending in one of our spending bills to circumvent the budget agreement. You violated the budget agreement today, or circumvented the budget agreement, by spending \$4.3 billion, or authorizing \$4.3 billion in spending beyond this fiscal year, which is not technically a violation of the budget agreement, but the fact of the matter is it does exacerbate the budget-deficit problem.

The budget deficit this year is going to be \$400 billion, the largest in U.S. history. The national debt is \$4 trillion, 400 percent of what it was 10 years ago.

I submit to my colleagues, whom I love dearly as people, as individuals, that you are responsible, and not the White House, because you know the Congress is responsible for spending of tax funds.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, let me say first two things. I am going to tell the gentleman, as soon as his time runs out, that I am going to ask that my time be contributed so we can have a discussion.

In the 10 years that we have had a Republican President, he had an opportunity to veto every one of those budgets, as he has just vetoed two unemployment bills. That did not happen.

The fight at the budget conference was not over taxes. The fight was that the Democrats wanted to put a surtax on people with a million dollars' worth of income. George Bush drew his line in the sand right there: "I am not taxing millionaires." And when it came to taxing average people, they have always been in favor of that.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Reclaiming my time, sure, you wanted to tax the very rich. You taxed the boat industry, and so the rich do not buy boats anymore.

Who is out of work? The blue-collar workers that produced the boats, and they are up here lobbying that you remove that tax so they can get their jobs back.

The fact of the matter is when you tax anybody, whether they are upper income or lower income, it hurts the economy.

The \$181 billion in tax increases is one of the main reasons we have the recessionary problems we have today, and we are responsible, or you are responsible, the Democrat Party in this House, for forcing that compromise.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman points out, and he is as disturbed as I am about the legacy of what we have left, and that is that we have gone from at the beginning of the Reagan years from a \$60 billion deficit to something that next year could be as high or over \$400 billion in deficit.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Right.

Mr. MILLER of California. The point I think made by the gentleman from Connecticut is that neither President Reagan nor President Bush ever sent a balanced budget nor did they ever veto a budget. They, in fact, embraced this policy of simply borrowing and spending.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just reclaim my time, and it will only take just a minute.

The reason the President is unable in many cases to veto those spending bills is because you fellows put about one-third garbage and pork in there, and the other two-thirds, and you say that if you want it you have got to take the garbage, and the fact of the matter is the President is put in a very untenable situation, and you know it.

VACATING SPECIAL ORDER AND GRANTING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my 60-minute special order on today be vacated, and that I be granted a 5-minute special order.

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

There was no objection.

THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, let me say just a few words, and then I will yield to my colleagues here.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent the last decade with a golden American Express card for the Government, and the people of this country, and now the administration's economic policy seems to be to blame the American people that they are not spending enough, "Please go out and spend more."

They feel they have got too much debt in this kind of uncertain economy. We are not better off today than we were 4 years ago or 10 years ago.

When you take a look at tax policy, President Carter signed one tax increase on gasoline as part of an overall energy policy. That was it in the Carter years.

Since Reagan gave the big tax cuts away to the billionaires of this country in 1981, he has done nothing, and Bush has done nothing but sign tax increases on middle-class people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY] first, and then I will be happy to yield to others.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make two political points that I expect have been made before.

Let us assume for the moment that there is a lot of blame to go around, because I think there is. There are a couple of inescapable political realities.

Not only has President Reagan served 8 years, of that 8 years, 6 of them with a Republican majority in the Senate, but President Bush has served 2 years as President, and we have been unable, as the gentleman pointed out, to veto, or to override any of his vetoes, so I think it is a little bit disingenuous to suggest somehow that Democrats are to blame for everything when in fact we have not controlled the agenda.

Indeed, I remember very vividly Donald Regan, the Secretary of the Treasury in the summer of 1981, saying, "Our program is in place." We had enacted the tax cut that the President wanted, and his budget policies.

So before we cast the Democrats or the Republicans, let us just recognize what has happened.

There are things that are not attributable to either Democrats or Republicans that have been happening in the national economy that are also inescapable, and that is that the people who have fewer skills are greater in number, and the jobs that require low skills are fewer in number. Many of those manufacturing jobs have gone overseas. That has nothing to do with whether we had a Democrat or a Republican as President. That is an economic phenomenon.

As a result of that, you see black male wages or individual wages of manufacturing workers declining over that period of time.

Now, we can, or Democrats might make the point, "Well, that is Ronald Reagan's fault," and you can say it is our budget policy, but I happen to think that those are international economic events that both parties contribute to in some small degree, but they are forces pretty much beyond our control.

□ 1950

The question comes, to what extent can Government policy fill in the gaps

for those people who now want to work full time and are prepared to work full time, but even if they do, they are not going to make living wages?

Here it seems to me the Government has a responsibility to try to help those people who if they want to work full time should not be poor. We have to figure out in our own minds what series of policies we can enact here that will help ordinary Americans live a life in some degree with some respect.

Here I think we have some major disagreements. If you take a look not at what happened to the bottom, but what happened to the top, you will also see a couple interesting macroeconomic and political questions at work. The first thing is that those people who had skills, people who are college educated, with post-college educations, were in demand and their salaries increased.

At the same time that their real earnings increased, it not only occurred to the top 1 percent of the population that did very, very well, but it also occurred to the top 5 percent who did well, but not as well as the people at the very top.

During that 10-year period of time because of macroeconomic consequences, their real incomes increased and their taxes were cut. That is basically what the 1981 Reagan proposals did.

Now, the consequences of those cuts are that we have less revenue than we have today.

Let me make the gentleman's point. He is going to say that those tax cuts also helped to stimulate the economy, and to a certain extent they did, and I will be happy to concede that.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, 21 million new jobs.

Mr. DOWNEY. Well, I do not think that the 21 million new jobs were directly attributable to that, but let me just give you a couple of million jobs.

The reality is that those people have seen their real incomes increase. I am only sorry that I was not one of them, and I do not begrudge their real incomes going up, do not get me wrong, but their taxes went down significantly.

What the Democratic Party I think stands for, and I stand for and would like to see happen, is that in the years to come we take away some of the tax benefits that these people have had and redistribute them to those people who have seen their incomes go down and their taxes go up.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I just say that there are places where we can do this. We are spending \$140 billion subsidizing Western European defenses.

We just had the unemployment bill vetoed twice. We do not have health care in this country for a large number of our citizens.

In Germany, if you are 55 and you get unemployed, you get 130 weeks of bene-

fits. Do you know how they can afford that? We are paying for their defense. Their kids can go to college and have the Government help them get a college education so they end up with a better educated work force.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is the gentleman advocating 130 weeks of unemployment in this country?

Mr. GEJDENSON. I am not.

VACATING SPECIAL ORDER AND GRANTING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate my request for a special order of 60 minutes and instead at this time ask for a 5-minute special order.

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

There was no objection.

THORNBUSH

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I want to thank all the staff who is staying on for these special orders, from the pages to the Presiding Officer. I appreciate their endurance and patience.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have reflected on the events of the last 10 years and certainly it is a good exercise to do that. The past is indeed prologue.

I would like to reflect on the events of the last 24 hours in America. In particular, I would like to call to mind an editorial or commentary this evening by Daniel Schorr of National Public Radio in which he referred to last night's election in Pennsylvania as Thornbush. I do not know if this will become a common term in the American political lexicon, but it does raise a question as to what the voters in Pennsylvania and across the United States were trying to say yesterday.

We spent dozens of 1-minute speeches today trying to figure out what that meant. I think there are several elements that we can all agree on that were part of all the decisions made by the voters across the United States yesterday. One of them was reflected in a magazine several weeks ago, Newsweek magazine, which had a cover story entitled "The Bite on the Middle Class."

I happen to believe that some of the votes, if not all the votes cast yesterday were part of the economic unrest we see in America today. This particular Newsweek article went into detail to tell us about the lives of several American families who are struggling on what appears to be a comfortable income just to survive, families across

the United States who are making \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000 and yet finding it exceedingly difficult to provide for their own families and to provide futures for their children.

The question is, quite honestly, why is the middle class struggling, according to Newsweek magazine. Reaganomics is part of the story, that is their conclusion. They relate it back to the loss in earning power of American families over the last 10 years.

Last night on television I was watching as they interviewed some voters in Pennsylvania and asked them what they were thinking about as they went off to cast their votes in that historic senatorial election. One lady who appeared to be retired said something very interesting. She said, if I can remember correctly, "America can't be great if we just have the rich and the poor."

I think that is what this discussion tonight should be all about. Is this country becoming a country of wealth and opportunity or in fact is it being broken down into separate classes that are growing in size. I am afraid the statistical evidence is very clear that it is the latter.

As has been said by Robert Wright in an article which he wrote for the New Republic, in recent years working Americans have been traveling on two escalators, one going up, the other going down. We know the escalator that is going up. It is for the wealthy in America. They have done very well. The escalator going down is for working families. Their purchasing power has been eroded.

Now, we see a lot of reasons and explanations for this. There has been some discussion of tax cuts in the Reagan era, what they meant for the economy. My colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, believes that they can be credited with giving a boost to the economy and creating 20 million or more jobs. Some would argue with that conclusion, but let us ask what price we have paid for that economic boost.

Let me tell the gentleman, for example, that according to a study which was recently released by Citizens for Tax Justice, the cumulative impact of the tax cuts enjoyed by the richest 1 percent of American families, and let me tell you who these people are, these are American families making an average income of \$676,000 per year. That is \$676,000 grand per year. We are talking about these folks. If you added up the tax cuts during the Reagan era given to these folks, it comes to \$1.1 trillion that has been added to the national debt. Literally one-quarter of our national debt has been added because we gave tax cuts to people making \$676,000 per year.

Now, if the gentleman would concede or argue that this has created jobs and opportunities for some, I believe he also has to concede that it has created

at least one-fourth of our present national debt to be carried on by future generations.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield for just about 30 seconds?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Reagan tax cuts stimulate additional investment, capital investment. That capital investment led to an economic expansion which created 21 million new jobs and hence 21 million new taxpayers. We more than doubled the tax revenues coming in from the time we made those tax cuts, so the problem is not that we do not have enough tax revenues. It is we are spending too much, and that is causing a lot of the inflationary problem that the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, let me reclaim my time. I yielded to the gentleman because he was kind enough to yield earlier, but I happen to believe that we paid a price for those 21 million new jobs. We created a debt which we are now carrying, as the gentleman has said in many of his eloquent floor statements, 18 cents out of every dollar being paid for interest on that debt, so if the Reagan legacy was 21 million new jobs and a boost to the economy, the Reagan legacy was also quadrupling a national debt which we are now carrying on our shoulders.

The gentleman was on the floor today arguing against medical research at NIH because we could no longer afford it.

Mr. Speaker, that is where the priorities come down to.

I thank the Chair for this time period. I believe we should continue this discussion. I appreciate my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, participating in it.

THE HIV CRISIS, THE B-2 BOMBER, TERM LIMITS, AND THE NEA

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, as is my wont when I do these things, I will call attention to the audience out there. It is about a million and a half now, Mr. Speaker, who watched that brilliant exposition by all my good Democratic friends on the state of the economy. A million and a half people watched, and yet our cameras will troll around here under an order by a Speaker, three Speakers ago, and show an empty Chamber as though nobody is listening, Mr. Speaker; but the Speaker is here. This unbelievable excellent staff is here and we have got 1½ million people watching out there. That is 11 L.A. coliseums filled with people, and if I could refer

to the gallery I will talk about, oh, 8 or 10 handsome people up in the gallery, but I cannot refer to them, Mr. Speaker.

So let us wake up on this word comity, meaning gentlemanliness, and good-naturedness to one another and do away with this decade-old rule of panning the empty Chamber.

□ 2000

The House is in session, the gavel has not come down. There is no difference here than during the 1-minute speeches at the beginning of the day when there are no more than 10 or 12 people in the House except those waiting to get a chance to let a little steam off, whether it is their left viewpoint, their right viewpoint, or that terrible mishmash of moderate, stand-for-nothing viewpoint in the middle.

As is also my wont, I am going to cover three subjects in my special order tonight. I am going to ask Mr. BURTON, so he does not have to wait until I am through, to join me with some of his thoughts about the horror of the human immunodeficiency crisis, the HI virus sweeping through Africa.

Then I am going to talk about the B-2 bomber. Then I am going to talk about term limits, which everybody has been discussing from sea to shining sea.

But before I do that, a horrible flash from the NEA. In spite of all of the intense debate in this Chamber and the other Chamber, the National Endowment for the Arts, Mr. John Frohmayr, whom I have told you, Mr. Speaker, to please convey my feelings to the President of the United States that he must fire this liar, John Frohmayr. He has lied again to us and thumbed his nose at us with arrogant contempt and not interrupted the process where some of these phony so-called artistes have awarded grants, \$8,000 of our tax money across this country to four more of these weirdos who have already shown that all they are interested in is shock on the stage, working stark naked with chocolate smeared all over them. I cannot even begin to describe what they do on the stage, these four sodomite performers, because it would violate the decorum, the dignity and, yes, the comity of this Chamber.

Well, they have been awarded, in spite of this degrading debate last week where we traded corn, that is, grain fees not being raised on our cattle farmers across this country, so that we would cave on this side with our strong language about funding obscene, degrading and, yes, blasphemous art through the National Endowment for the Arts.

The title itself has become a joke now.

So I just want to point out something in this House and then go to my friend,

the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], whose brilliant exposition today to a full House of attentive people because of the elections in Virginia and New Jersey yesterday, the antitax angry voters speaking yesterday. And everyone listened to Mr. BURTON as he explained that this House continues to go lower and lower and lower in the esteem of the American people. The focus of Mr. BURTON's righteous concern was forward funding, billions, \$4.3 billion, into the future. The President was creating problems for himself.

But here is what I want to point out about this NEA art. In this great Chamber—and again, if this were under control of the cameras, I would say to the cameras in the corner of the House to please pan the beautiful 3-foot medallions of 23 lawgivers around the House. I call our west wall here the wall of saints; St. Edward I, the Confessor; St. Alfonso X of Spain; St. Gregory, the ninth Pope of Rome; the great St. Louis of France, who began the run of all the Louis names; a Roman emperor whose name lent itself to justice, Justinian.

Over here on this wall, Pope Innocent III, another saint. But coming around the walls, two great believers in term limitation, after Napoleon and Portier, we have here George Mason, born in 1725; Thomas Jefferson, only 33 when he wrote the Declaration of Independence, born in 1743. These two great men believed in term limits.

So I will come back to them. But between them are two portraits, the Father of our Country, George Washington, who believed in term limits, and limited himself to two terms. He could have gone on till the day he died. He died 2 years after he retired anyway. So he knew it was time to go to Heaven.

Over here, an honorary American, along with Raoul Wallenberg and Winston Churchill, is the great Marquis de Lafayette, who at 23 years of age was a lieutenant colonel on George Washington's staff.

So all of this symbolism and all of the names, right under Moses' face, looking down on the great Rabbi Maimonides, from the 1100's, in Spain; under their names under there, and their faces, there are no words on the two big portraits, but the only words other than "sic semper tyrannus" on the great seal of the State of Virginia, so always with tyrants, then Eureka on the California seal, "agnus dei," the Latin for the Lamb of God, the beautiful seal of the Virgin Islands right over the Speaker's head.

One of these days, if Speakers do not involve themselves, Mr. Speaker, in these moral arguments of our day, that crest is going to come right down on the crown of your head, and "agnus dei" is going to be imprinted across some Speaker's forehead.

Then these great words here that all the atheists in America would like to

chip off the wall, "In God We Trust." But that is it. Names, slogans, and mottos on the crests of our States, and "In God We Trust," except for this gold segment. If you want to pan the cameras up and pick up the words of Daniel Webster right over the Speaker's head at the top of the Chamber, if the camera is on that, one we know that it is not, because of the creepy rules of the House, I will read it for you. Here are the words of Daniel Webster, among all of the great sayings of this man who compromised on slavery and cost himself the Presidency, a great, great American; born in New Hampshire, served in Massachusetts. Well, here is what he said and what it says on the wall:

* * * Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.—Daniel Webster.

Those are beautiful words to guide the men and women in this great legislative Chamber.

Here is another quote that I stumbled across the other day. Think of the NEA, art funding for perverts and sodomites, putting on filthy stage shows across this country. The latest grants have no strings attached. They are going to write crummy, rotten, blasphemous material and are going to have these \$8,000 grants to buy their groceries while they defile and further pollute the American public marketplace.

Here is what Daniel Webster said about religious books, including the Bible. Same as the words I just read that are etched in gold up there on that big marble plaque; Daniel Webster said:

If religious books are not widely circulated among the masses in this country, I do not know what is going to become of us as a nation. If truth be not diffused, error will be; if God and His Word are not known and received, the devil and his works will gain the ascendancy; if the evangelical volume does not reach every hamlet, the pages of a corrupt and licentious literature will; if the power of the Gospel is not felt throughout the length and breadth of the land, anarchy and misrule, degradation and misery, corruption and darkness will reign without mitigation or end.

What would Daniel Webster or George Washington or Abraham Lincoln or Thomas Jefferson or George Mason of Virginia, what would they think of our Nation and these graphs?

Now, to these words I turn to my great colleague from Indiana and ask him to inform this House about what the wife of the President of Uganda has to say about the AIDS plague, the pandemic plague sweeping across the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank my colleague for yielding to me. I really

appreciated his eloquent remarks because they lead right into the theme of what I want to say for about the next 5 or 6 minutes. I want to start off by saying that we have been spending a lot of money for education in this country to try to stem the tide of AIDS, to try to make young people re-evaluate what they are doing, change their sexual attitudes.

They just did a poll at Ball State University, right on the edge of my district, and they found that 80 percent of the young people there said they were sexually active, 80 percent. I imagine that is pretty consistent with most of the colleges and universities across this Nation.

Now, that should be of great concern to us because the segment of our population that is going to be most adversely affected by the AIDS virus in the years to come are the teenagers and the college-age young people. Here in Washington, DC, the head of the health system, one of our leading health care experts in Washington, DC, recently said there has been over a 300-percent increase in the number of teenagers in Washington, DC, who have contracted AIDS, not from drugs but through sexual contact, in the last 3 to 4 years. A 300-percent increase. It has gone from four tenths of 1 percent to 1.3 percent. Now, that is indicative of a real dramatic increase that is going to hit all segments of our teenage and college-age population.

Now, what does that have to do with Africa?

Well, Africa, particularly Uganda, is today about 5 or 6 years ahead of us; we are today where they were 5 or 6 years ago. Let me tell you what the President's wife, of Uganda, said to our committee today, Mrs. Museveni. She said that 10 percent of the population of Uganda, at least 10 percent, has AIDS virus.

□ 2010

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] to spell the President's wife's name. I want to memorize the name.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me give that to the gentleman; just 1 second.

M-u-s-e-v-e-n-i.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Museveni.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Eighty percent of those who have the AIDS virus there, it was contracted heterosexually. Eighty-three percent of all the AIDS cases in Uganda have been among individuals between the ages of 15 and 40 years of age. Curative services are being strained by increasing AIDS cases. Forty percent of the hospital beds and 80 percent of the beds in the tuberculosis wards are occupied by HIV AIDS patients.

Now here is what she says about education, and this is what we have been

relying on in this country, and bear in mind we are today where they were about 5 or 6 years ago.

She said, "However, after 5 years of intensive information, education, and communication activities, it is evident that, although the majority of Ugandans have been sensitized by AIDS, there has not been a significant behavioral change to reduce the transmission."

So, all the money they spend on AIDS education over there has gone for naught as far as changing the patterns of behavior of the people of that society.

She went on to say, "Information providing AIDS education strategies were necessary, but have not been sufficient to stem the spread of HIV. The Ministry of Health cannot cope with the socioeconomic problems posed by AIDS."

I think the point I want to get across is that we have to have a comprehensive program to deal with AIDS in this country. Otherwise this country is going to experience the same things they are experiencing in Africa and, in particular, Uganda. They are going to have 10 million people dead or dying of AIDS by the turn of the century, minimum, in Africa, and many people believe that in a very short period of time we are going to see 40 or 50 million people dead or dying, and so we need to address this, not just through education, but through scientific research, through education, through contact tracing, through testing, through psychological help, through making sure that civil rights of HIV-infected people are protected. We just need a comprehensive program to deal with it and penalties for those who know they have AIDS and continue to spread it, and I just want to end by reading the final couple of paragraphs that she had in her speech because it bears upon what the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] said a few moments ago about us turning our backs on what Daniel Webster said about us turning our back on our religious beliefs, and on believing in a supreme being and the moral, moral attitudes that he imparted to us through the Holy Bible. We are ignoring those. Let me read to my colleagues what she says, and she is a Christian lady:

My own personal view is that the AIDS epidemic raises very basic moral and ethical issues. In fact AIDS is a loud and urgent symbol of a malady which has pervaded the whole human condition.

She is not just talking about Uganda. She is talking about the whole world.

It is a physical manifestation of a deep-seated disorder in the spirit of man. This flower of death has its roots in centuries of human misuse of God-given life forces and resources. There are other symptoms, if you care to look around: Environmental degradation, senseless violence in our communities, rampant corruption in high offices and so forth. The question must be asked whether

this epidemic is not nature's way of making us halt in our tracks and change directions. Ours—

Listen to this part. This is extremely important.

Ours is a spiritually illiterate generation. This is not a Ugandan problem. It is a human problem. Therefore, as we struggle together to find a cure for AIDS and to cope with the chaos that it will leave behind when it is gone, let us together look beyond AIDS. Let us use science and technology to find solutions to our problems on the material level, but let us look to our Creator, to God, for answers to the basic questions that confront our present generation. How well we survive may depend on how well we listen and change.

And I would just like to say that we do not talk on the floor of the House about the Holy Bible and what the Old Testament and Moses talked about, whose picture is up there on our wall, and what Jesus Christ talked about in the New Testament, but the fact of the matter is, if we adhere to the moral principles taught in that book, the AIDS virus and the tide of it would be stemmed because we would not have a multiplicity of sexual partners. We would have monogamistic relationships. We would not be saying to our young people in this country that condoms are the answer because they would not need condoms because they would not be having a promiscuous affair with person, after person, after person.

So, we have gotten away from that, and we accepted all kinds of immoral behavior, to which the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] alluded to moments ago, and that is one of the major problems with the AIDS epidemic. We should not be telling young people that safe sex involves condoms. We should say that safe sex involves sound moral principles and one sexual partner, your wife, for life. That should be it. One should not be having multiple sexual partners because it only spreads the disease and the terror that comes with it.

So, I would just like to say to my colleagues who may or may not be paying attention tonight that I think we have a commitment to a new moral outlook in this country, a new moral attitude.

Mr. DORNAN of California. I would like to say on Africa, if I could, for a second because the President's First Lady in Uganda has really, in calling it the flower of death, the venus fly trap of death—sexual promiscuity, as pitched by our motion picture industry, by television, by every possible aspect of advertising in this country.

Rooney, Mr. Rooney, did a tremendous piece on 60 Minutes this week talking about sexual harassment and showing articles from the great paper of record, all the news that fits, the New York Times, and, as he turned page after page, reading on the same pages of articles about sexual harass-

ment, he would pan down to what used to be the fare of Playboy magazine, the most erotic and exotic underwear ads, and bathing suits—no, we are not even talking about bathing suits—all underwear ads, in the New York Times, page after page. I have not seen this in the L.A. Times, the other big paper on the west coast or the Washington Post to this extent. It was incredible, and at the end of it he said, "Give us a break," talking to the ladies—the whole America. "Give us a break. We can't keep exciting all the sexual interests and urges of young people at any age and then expect not to have this degradation of the public marketplace," and then the lead is thrown back to Leslie Stahl, the newly added lady reporter on 60 Minutes from her anchor position on Face the Nation. She completely missed the point and says, "Oh, Mr. Rooney, you're going to get us in a lot of trouble with that, and you can answer all that mail."

As the gentleman knows, the point he was making with humor was a deadly serious point. Our society is saturated in the pathetic glorification of easy and promiscuous sex, and now the lady, First Lady of Uganda, says that nature, to most of us, at least on the election stump in this Chamber and in the U.S. Senate, when we talk about nature, we are talking about God, and some of us are not ashamed to come right out and say "God."

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. DORNAN of California. But if it is said that this is some sort of a natural warning because of the lack of sanitation involved with promiscuous sex, they are considered to be cruel and making victims out of the people who have AIDS or are dying of AIDS.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think that whether it is the Koran or our Holy Bible there are certain moral guidelines that are set down for humanity, and, if we adhere to those guidelines, we avoid an awful lot of problems. When we start deviating dramatically from those guidelines set down in the Scriptures, I think what we do is travel at our own peril because we are getting into uncharted waters because we, as a world, not just as an American or a Ugandan, but we as a world are in very deep water right now with this AIDS virus because there is no cure because we have a long latency period. It is up to 10 years before there is any manifestation of the disease, and all during that time they can spread it, and nobody knows whether they have it or not.

So, we are in very deep waters. Until we get back to these charted moral waters, we are going to continue to travel at our own peril, and I think it is a very sad thing, and we keep seeing on television and hearing from NIH and from CDC: Safe sex. We see commercials on TV. But we do not talk about the very important thing, and that is

the moral fiber of the country which has come apart.

Mr. DORNAN of California. I would like to add something to what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] said about Africa.

From the Soviet Union there was a front-page story in USA last week. It just jumped out at me because of the date. In 1986, the fall of 1986, there was one known AIDS case in all of the 15 so-called republics of the then forcefully unified Soviet Union—one case. Now they knew there were others, but they thought there were still only a handful. On September 26, 1986, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and I went to a meeting that all the Members were asked to come to in a "Dear Colleague," 435 Members. I think every seat was filled then. There was no deaths, or vacancies or special elections, and out of 435, 6 of us showed up, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], me, the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER], one Member who has left, Bobbi Fiedler who also left in a Senate race, and Dr. James Mason who was then head of the Centers—all six of them down in Atlanta's Centers for Disease Control. He is now the No. 2 doctor in the biggest bureaucracy in the world, the Department of Health and Human Services.

□ 2020

He is that middle letter "H." He is the director, the Secretary of Health, Dr. James Mason. He told us what was in store for this country. Rock Hudson, his case had not come forward yet. We had not seen a series of movie stars or stage performers or ballet or fashion designers or haute couture leaders in fashion die off yet, but he warned us what was coming, and that month, September of 1986, one dead in the Soviet Union.

Here is the headline that jumped at me: "AIDS is going to cut a swath of death across the Soviet Union that may take out tens of millions of people." They have 700 or 800 registered cases, but they know that represents thousands, and the gentleman went to the floor that next day, I went to the floor, and Mr. DANNEMEYER did. If we took BOB DORNAN and DAN BURTON and BILL DANNEMEYER and the chairman of our Health Subcommittee, Mr. WAXMAN, if you took the four of us out of this House there would not be five speeches on AIDS in all of the last 5 years. It is amazing. The people in this Chamber and the other Chamber do not want to go near this issue, and it is not just the death factor. That would be understandable, people just overwhelmed, so terrified by the scythe of death that this is cutting across Africa and soon the Soviet Union and Europe and the United States and South America, Central America.

What they are afraid of is going against the popular feeling that sex is

somehow the birthright of all young kids, the end to a much-maligned but very happy fifties, when we did not have the freedom that these kids have today to couple like strange dogs in an alley.

Now, when we see the results of all this lack of sanitation, for want of secularizing the argument, and this is why they believe it is just going to cut through the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union's hospitals are a filthy disgrace. I have been in them, from Armenia to Leningrad. I have heard our embassy staff say that if anybody gets any type of approaching serious illness, right in an airplane off to Helsinki, Finland; even from Moscow or anywhere, back to Poland, anywhere but going into a Soviet hospital. More people come out of Soviet hospitals sick, sometimes to death, with staph infections than go into the hospitals, because of lack of sanitation. If we take poor health facilities, open sores, the worst sanitation, as bad as most Third World nations, in the Soviet Union, a population of 290 million people, 130-some languages, a communication system that cannot be relied on, that is spinning out of control, we are going to see those former so-called Republics in the Soviet Union as damaged by this disease of lack of sanitation, this sexually transmitted venereal disease, and what is not sexually transmitted by sexual promiscuity is transmitted by drug abuse, when you have the true victims. I know the homosexual activist movement hates to have us refer to Ryan White or anybody who is a hemophiliac or anybody who got it through a blood exchange, or a doctor injured in the hospital, stuck with a needle, but there are about 8 percent that are pure, innocent victims whose conduct did not bring them into jeopardy with this amazing killing machine that she calls the flower of death.

But just watch what unfolds in the next 5 years, what the gentleman and I and Mr. DANNEMEYER have been talking about on this House floor, and it has gone from one to thousands in the Soviet Union.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would let me conclude with just two quick remarks, we are going to have with the new counting method at the CDC probably close to 300,000 people dead or dying by the end of this year. When you project that out, it means by the mid-1990's, it means we are going to be pretty close to a million. They are still saying we only have a million and a half infected after 5 years. They said that 5 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make two quick points. The first point is, the next segment of our society that is going to be hit and probably hit harder than any other segment—and I include the homosexual community—the hardest hit section of our society is going

to be the teenagers and the college students who are the future of America tomorrow. That is what is happening in Uganda. It is wiping out an awful lot of people who are going to be the productive people in years to come and the leaders of tomorrow.

If that happens in America, it is going to have tremendous economic problems for us. We have 1.3 million hospital beds in this country. We are going to fill them up with AIDS patients. It will cause a tremendous drain and problem for the health care industry. We already have enough problems.

Finally, the last thing is, we are not like Africa. We are not like the Soviet Union. We have resources. We have the technology necessary, the people necessary, the health care facilities necessary right now to come to grips with it and to come up with a comprehensive program to deal with it, and we are not doing it. So we are destined, if we do not come up with the comprehensive program that I am talking about, timely getting this on the floor to deal with it, we are destined to go down the same path as Uganda and the Soviet Union and these other countries are going to suffer.

I would just like to plead with my colleagues one more time tonight, we have to come up with a program that consists of testing, contact tracing, education, psychological help, penalties for those that have the AIDS virus and know they have it and continue to spread it with other people, and protection for those who have the virus. If we came up with a comprehensive program that did that, we could stem the tide of the AIDS virus. But of course, coupled with that there will have to be a moral change as well.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, what is the district number of the gentleman from Indiana, DANIEL BURTON?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The Sixth District.

Mr. DORNAN of California. DANIEL BURTON, of the great Sixth, we have been saying it for 5 years, that the sheer weight of the horror of the death toll is going to get us each one of those things the gentleman has named eventually, but eventually may mean 5 more years or 4 years or 3 years. One by one, we will win each of those victories.

I said 5 years ago or so this House would probably not start to think about it until the case numbers had reached 200,000, I think I saw on your figures today. You called Health and Human Services, and we are pushing through 200,000 right now.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. With the new figures they are using, the way they are compiling these figures, we are going to be close to 300,000.

Mr. DORNAN of California. It was always 20 percent low because of the unreported cases in 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985,

and 1986. That means that homosexuals, because they count for 73 percent of all of those cases, the homosexuals of this country have already passed 100,000 deaths. That is double those on the Vietnam wall, the 47,369 combat deaths on the Vietnam wall; the 33,629 dead in Korea. They have tripled the deaths in the 3-year war in Korea.

So we have been saying it. We are going to win all those eventually. If we win them sooner rather than later, point by point, we will save tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of lives.

If this House keeps digging in its heels and caving in on this issue, as you said ad nauseum, trying to save lives, treating it like a public relations problem instead of a public health problem, then millions more will die before we wake up.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. That ends the first third of my special order on AIDS.

We now go to national security, the defense budget, which at this point is falling apart, the conference report. I am prepared to vote against it, not only because people are fighting to put the abortion language back in there to allow people in military hospitals, even though they pay for it themselves, to use our defense facilities and all of the dollars that come with the maintenance of facilities to have abortions.

I turned on "Good Morning, America" this morning and Fort Stewart, GA, the home of the great 24th Infantry Division, the spear of our invasion into occupied Kuwait and that great Hail Mary end run around our left flank into Iraq, the spear of that was Barry McCaffery's, the division commander of the great 24th. Guess what, their hospital was geared up for about 350 to 400 births during this winter season. They are expecting more than double that. Eight hundred or more births will be in the base hospital there at Fort Stewart, so a lot of people came back from this near total victory, and we still have Saddam Hussein on the loose, the mass killer and prospective nuclear bomber; until we get him, we cannot close the chapter on that. But well done, 24th Division, in bringing a lot of beautiful little Army brats into this world. I use the term "brats" lovingly, as the military does.

Now to the B-2 bomber as one aspect of the defense budget that deserves to be voted down in this Chamber. It will not be because too many people are demagoguing this defense issue, but it will certainly be vetoed by the President in its current form.

I want to put into the RECORD two articles, Mr. Speaker, one an interview with our great Chief of Staff of the Air

Force, Gen. Merrill A. McPeak, and another with the retired Gen. Larry Skantze. When General Skantze was wearing four stars on his shoulder, he was the commander of the Air Force Systems Command out at Andrews Air Force Base.

□ 2030

We have had some good people in there, like Lou Allen, who is now the commander of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. I should not say the commander, the civilian head, in retirement of JPL in Pasadena.

But Gen. Dr. Lou Allen would concede that Larry Skantze built upon his leadership and was one of the finest four stars that we have ever had at Systems Command.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put in this article by Larry Skantze, and the give-and-take interview by Glenn Goodman and Jim Hyde at Air Force Journal with Gen. Merrill McPeak.

Mr. Speaker, then, just to enhance your interest, some of the people who follow this Chamber by electronic means; for example, television, since the printed RECORD will not be out until tomorrow and everybody in these 435 districts across this country, all the way to retired Marine general, Congressman BEN BLAZ's district across the dateline in Guam, they can all write and get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow to get these two articles. But I want to at least tantalize you a bit with some of the things that General Skantze said about the B-2 bomber.

Now, here are at least 10 points that I have extracted from this trenchant analysis of lack of vision in the Congress on the B-2 bomber that I hope we call the Shadow.

I am 58 years of age, so I was raised with a radio show called "The Shadow." It would begin with this deep voice saying what evil lurks in the hearts of men? "The Shadow" knows.

Well, there is going to be a Saddam Hussein evil pop up on this planet in 5 years, 10 years, 15 years, and I think this Congress is going to be a sorry body if we get term limits, which I am going to close my special order with. Maybe there will not be anybody here to have to answer up to future generations why we only have 15 B-2's, instead of a minimum of 40 or the 75 that has already been cut down from the initial plan for 132 B-2 Shadows.

Imagine that we have already spent almost \$35 billion on this amazing stealth weapon system for the defense of the free world. It would have performed magnificently in Desert Storm had it been already on the line as a combat ready SAC aircraft, or the new Air Tac Combat Command aircraft.

I repeat, we are going to rue the day if we only build 15 of them. The Air Force may not be able to operate a small half a squadron, as 15 of them.

But here are some of the points that now-retired general to a superior position as citizen, with his full first amendment rights, here is what Larry Skantze says. Since the Air Force cannot occupy land or sea, is one of the points he makes, it has been looked upon in the past as only a supporting force.

Some supporting force in the gulf, Desert Storm.

However, World War II demonstrated that power projection in the form of long-range strategic bombardment was another vital Air Force mission.

Point 2 he makes: When a nuclear threat from the U.S.S.R. became credible, the Air Force refocused its mission on strategic deterrence to air power. Implicit in this force structure was deterrence at all levels, conventional as well as nuclear. Thus conventional capability became a historical role. He fleshes that out beautifully in his article.

Point 3: The Air force also wants a force that can be tailored to meet changing threats, not only in the short term, but in the next 20- to 30-year context. While Air Force ballistic missiles are fairly restricted to the nuclear role, strategic bombers have historically been adaptable to multimission roles.

In point 4 he talks about the B-52 Stratofortress, a prime example of a strategic bomber designed to carry nuclear bombs in the fifties, conventional bombs in the sixties and in the seventies, in the seventies in Vietnam, back to nuclear cruise missiles in the eighties, and conventional bombs again in the nineties.

I visited with some of the crews at Fairfield, England, that were about to leave one evening on a 14-hour 45-minute trip, flying right through the entire night, from daytime through the night back to daytime if they did not recover at Diego Garcia about 2,000 clicks south of Baghdad. But many of them came back home with many refuelings. That was a heck of a mission they were flying as conventional bombers projecting force to bring that madman to bay.

Likewise, the B-2 Shadow, which was originally designed to carry nuclear weapons, will now be designed to also carry conventional weapons or various types of weapons, whatever the mission would dictate in the future.

Point 5: As the Air Force attempts to satisfy the security requirements of the United States in a declining defense budget, a flexible force such as strategic bombers becomes more valuable than ever and more cost effective.

Point 6: General Skantze goes on to talk about how, as the defense budget declines, the number of available weapons systems also obviously decreases.

So the use of high technology emerges as a key for increasing the combat capability of those fewer weapons systems.

High technology, to quote him directly, such as stealth, must be exploited to gain combat leverage.

Point 7: Although the future Air Force will be considerably smaller in numbers, it must retain equal capability, if not greater capability. Limiting the B-2 to a force of only 15 aircraft does not make any sense economically, and it certainly does not make any sense militarily, he maintains, when designing an overall smaller force that has the power and flexibility to support national security requirements well into the next century.

Point 8: The question is not how many B-2 Shadows or F-6 Falcons, F-15-E Strike Falcons, F-22 Lightning II's need to be built, but what type of an Air Force needs to be crafted.

The big picture here, Mr. Speaker.

Here is a direct quote of his, point 9: The American people are investing in the future security over the long term. The makeup of our future Air Force structure must be reviewed in that context, here in this House and in the Senate.

And the tenth of many points, there are some that I did not extract in my own exegesis of his excellent article, he says in the context of a smaller, more capable force that can fulfill defense requirements beyond the year 2000, full-scale production—he is talking about not the 132, but the 75 that the President and our great Defense Secretary, Mr. Cheney, decided on, 75—and now we are down to 15, because people do not understand what is happening in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I submit these two important articles for the RECORD.

[From Defense News, Nov. 4, 1991]

AF STRUCTURE, NOT B-2, IS ISSUE

(By Retired Gen. Larry Skantze)

The fundamental difficulty with the B-2 debate is that the terms of reference are myopic. The current major issues seem to be unit cost, system test, demise of the Soviet threat and competing domestic needs. Visionary arguments carry precious little insight.

The B-2 budget battle is not unlike those that surrounded the development and production of the Airborne Warning and Control System, the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System, the EF-11A, the Low-Altitude Navigation and Targeting Infrared system for Night (LANTIRN) and the infrared Maverick. The principal arguments then were the same: too expensive, doesn't have a mission, won't work. Fortunately Desert Storm proved their effectiveness.

A nation, particularly a democracy, should be capable of seeing its Air Force in a long-term perspective. What is its basic mission? How does it execute that mission? What are the forces required to successfully do that? The Air Force has been looked upon as a supporting force since it occupies neither land nor sea. However, with the advent of World War II, air power projection in the form of long-range strategic bombardment came into its own, in Europe as well as the Far East.

The vision of air power, as perceived in the 1930s, came to pass. And while much of the U.S. recollection is of the 8th Air Force cam-

campaign against Germany, the B-29 campaign against Japan was more devastating, though it was overshadowed by the dropping of two atomic bombs on Japan in 1945.

With the nuclear threat from the Soviet Union, Air Force doctrine had to refocus and deterrence became the primary role of U.S. aerospace power. Combat forces and strategic employment were tailored to emphasize the credibility of U.S. deterrent forces. The steady buildup of strategic bombers and land- and sea-based ballistic missiles in the 1950s and 1960s were evidence of the U.S. commitment.

Implicit in U.S. force posture was deterrence at all levels of warfare, conventional as well as nuclear. While the ballistic missiles did not have the capability, conventional strategic bombardment had always been a characteristic of the bomber force. The B-52 has convincingly demonstrated its conventional capability. The B-1B, though not demonstrated, has the capability. The B-2 had been designed for major conventional munitions capability from the outset.

Tailoring aerospace power to meet changing needs and threats requires long-range vision as well as hindsight. Those who serve or have served as long time members of the U.S. Air Force tend to see it in at least a 20- to 30-year context. The difficulty comes when one tries to translate that vision to congressional and civilian leaders, who normally have short-term perspectives of military forces. However, the Air Force, for its part, has not been effective in lifting the dialogue to long-term considerations.

In its real perspective the debate is about what capabilities are needed in the future Air Force to satisfy the security needs of the nation. The Air Force already is being drastically reduced, and within this construct the B-2 is just one of several force structure options. The major issue is the creation of an effective Air Force within a smaller budget while sustaining a force that can deal with a variety of threats into the future.

Critical to the debate over how to fashion that force is the awareness of the steadily increasing usage of all of our aircraft in age and operational employment. The B-52s have been in use 25 to 35 years. On that basis the B-1Bs could fly until 2020 and the B-2s until 2030 or later. Most people don't realize that some U.S. F-15s are about 20 years old. The F-111s that did so well in Desert Storm are more than 20 years old. The transport force, C-5s, C-141s and C-130s are older than the fighters.

The message is that we have built a longer-lived force, and now the challenge is to shape the capabilities of that force to make it an enduring, survivable force. High technology is the key.

Many of the high-technology systems that were combat proven in Desert Storm went through difficult budget battles and in some instances, barely survived. Responsible military planners must structure a force with a healthy regard for uncertainty in the years ahead. Clairvoyance is not a staple of defense planning. Last spring, before Desert Storm, prominent defense spokesmen were advocating sharp cuts in realistic training exercises because of the long period they assumed it would take the Soviets to reconstitute a conventional threat to Europe. Several talked of rapidly cutting the defense budget by 50 percent. It is clearly time to elevate the debate on the future of the U.S. Air Force.

It is imperative that we increase the combat capability and leverage of individual weapon systems and units as the Air Force shrinks in size. The lessons of Desert Storm

must be reaffirmed and articulated. U.S. forces showed a dramatic capability to fight at night with forward-looking infrared sensors FLIRs and LANTIRN pods.

A secondary result was to allow commanders to exploit the high sortie rates inherent in F-15s and F-16s by utilizing fewer aircraft day and night. U.S. forces showed the enormous impact of precision-guided munitions, particularly laser-guided and infrared munitions.

And finally, there is the lesson of stealth, as embodied in the F-117 strike aircraft. While it has not created immunity, it has challenged potential adversaries with devising other detection methods that rely on drastically less effective means.

Restructuring the U.S. Air Force requires long-range cohesive planning. High technology such as stealth must be exploited to gain combat leverage.

While the final numbers associated with a force mix of F-15s, F-16s and F-22s has yet to fully evolve, the capabilities the F-22 brings to the U.S. Air Force fighter force over the next two decades will be unmatched by any potential adversary. Similarly, the contribution of the B-2 to a much smaller bomber force is enormous.

The B-2 has long range, greater payload and can respond to a wide range of future challenges. With the reality of Desert Storm, a retaliatory threat verbally posed by the president would have icy credibility. The threat to take out a sizable portion of the aggressor's economic infrastructure, including energy, communication and transportation using the B-2 force, could hardly be ignored.

While the future bomber force will be considerably reduced, limiting the B-2 force to 15 aircraft makes no sense economically or militarily.

Defense leaders need to describe the characteristics, the power and the flexibility of the smaller U.S. force that can support national security requirements over the next two decades and beyond.

The debate is not over how many B-2s or F-16s we buy this year, but what sort of Air Force is to be created. That projection will provide both the vision of what will constitute a smaller combat-capable Air Force, and the investment over a 20- to 30-year period that is being asked of the American people.

By visualizing a new era in national security and defense, the U.S. Air Force contribution will allow us to put aside the narrow annual budget debate and raise the interchange. The American people are investing in their future security over the long term. We need to review the makeup of the total U.S. Air Force force structure being proposed, the total investment. And final, as the architects of this force, the U.S. Air Force leadership must lead this dialogue.

[From the Armed Forces Journal, September 1991]

AN EXCLUSIVE AFJI INTERVIEW WITH GEN. MERRILL A. McPEAK, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. AIR FORCE

(General McPeak became Air Force Chief of Staff last October after two years as Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Air Forces, where he received his fourth star in August 1988. He commanded 12th Air Force and US Southern Command Air Forces from 1987-88. McPeak entered the Air Force from ROTC in 1957 and flew F-104 and F-100 fighters in the early 1960s. From 1966-68, he flew on USAF's "Thunderbirds" aerial demonstration team in nearly 200 air shows around the world.

McPeak logged 269 combat missions in Vietnam in 1968-69 as an F-100 pilot and forward air controller. He commanded an F-111 wing in the UK from 1980-81 and held a variety of senior staff positions from 1981-87. McPeak is current and qualified in the F-15 fighter.)

(By Glenn W. Goodman, Jr., and James C. Hyde)

AFJI: Are there any lessons of the Gulf War that may have been overlooked?

McPEAK: The biggest lessons concern the performance of human beings. What won the war was competence. We had people there who knew what they were doing. So the real question is, How do you get people like that? It's really no secret. First, you have to recruit and retain good people and, second, you have to train them.

We should also remember that defeat is a much better teacher than victory. So the important lessons are the ones the Iraqis learned, like the importance of air superiority. If I were the commander of the Iraqi Air Force and you asked me what lesson I learned, I would say: "Never enter a fight with the second-best air force."

AFJI: The Air Force today appears to be sky-high in terms of people, equipment, training, readiness, and sustainability. How do you maintain that quality as resources decline?

McPEAK: It is not an inconsiderable problem. Our resources are going to shrink by about 25% in just about every dimension: people in uniform, the number of bases we operate, the number of aircraft we fly, the amount of dollars we have to spend, etc. So I'm spending a lot of time figuring out how to organize the Air Force, and how to consolidate where that makes sense economically.

We're also trying to decentralize, which I believe will streamline our operations, make them more efficient, and return power to where the actual work is done.

AFJI: How far down will your powerdown concept reach? To the airmen?

McPEAK: Yes. In my judgment, the key organizational unit in the Air Force is a team of 10 to 12 people. You empower that team to solve the question, How can we do a task most efficiently? That means you go right down to the flight line crew chief, who's in charge of about six aircraft, and right down to the flight commander, who has six or eight pilots in his flight. The power needs to flow all the way down to that small team level, well below the squadron level, if we're going to improve productivity with fewer resources.

I'm trying to ensure that as we restructure our organization, we remove all the impediments that keep power from flowing down. For instance, we've eliminated the air division, the echelon above the air wing. But the key question is, What happened to the power that used to be held by the air division commander? Did it go up or down? Well, we've reorganized the numbered air force, the echelon right above it, so that it's a very lean, highly tactical operational echelon that doesn't have the staff to pull power up that used to belong to the air division commander. It has to go down to the wing commanders, whom we see now as brigadier generals. So we will pull power down in the way we distribute rank in the Air Force.

AFJI: What kind of changes do you envision for the Major Air Commands?

McPEAK: We've already merged Systems Command and Logistics Command, and we've deactivated Air Force Communications Command as a major air command. We're standing up a new command called Air

Force Intelligence Command and deactivating the old Electronic Security Command. It may well be that we will see a gradual consolidation of Strategic Air Command and Tactical Air Command. It's really too early to say exactly how that's going to pan out, but it's apparent that the dichotomy between strategic and tactical air power has become artificial. We had B-52s doing tactical bombing missions during Desert Storm and F-117s and F-16s doing strategic missions.

AFJI: What's the status of your composite wing initiative?

MCPEAK: There are already many, many composite operation all over the Air Force. We've created a composite wing at Seymour Johnson AFB, NC, for example, where we merged two existing wings on the base, an F-15E fighter wing and a KC-10 refueling tanker wing. And we will soon have a composite wing at Kadena AFB in Okinawa that will have fighters, tankers, and AWACS in it. Those aircraft have been there together for a long time but just haven't been organized in a composite wing.

When we talk about building composite wings from the ground up, people say, "You can't do that, it costs too much." But the answer is, we can create composite wings overnight that don't cost us anything. As a matter of fact, they're saving us a lot, because where we used to have two wing commanders, two wing vice commanders, two wing commanders' secretaries, two staff cars, and so on, now we've got one. We're saving a lot of money at Seymour Johnson, at Kadena, and elsewhere, where we're simply consolidating the composite operation that's already there into one organization.

Now in some places we will be spending some money to stand up designed composite wings. Mountain Home AFB, ID, is an example. We're going to build there what we call an "intervention wing." It will have F-15Cs, F-15Es, F-16s, tankers, and AWACS. It could be deployed as a package to a trouble spot anywhere in the world. It will cost us something to bed that operation down but probably less than the \$50-million it would cost to close Mountain Home, which is what would happen because we're moving all of our F-111s to Cannon AFB, NM.

We'll also put a composite wing at Pope AFB, NC, right next to Ft. Bragg, where we can work with the Army's 82nd Airborne Division. The 82nd is going to be the organization tapped for all of the contingencies we see in the future, so having a wing that works with that division all the time as an air-land team makes a lot of sense.

So I think the composite wing will save us a lot of money over time as well as provide a quantum increase in our combat capabilities.

AFJI: Will most of the new composite wings be overseas?

MCPEAK: That looks like the logical place to put most of them, because there the idea is that you fight in place on those overseas bases. And if you're going to fight there, you really need a composite of aerospace capabilities.

Not every wing needs to be composite. Many of them back in the continental US can better be organized as monolithic wings. The 388th wing at Hill AFB, UT, would be a good example, where its F-16 squadrons could fly forward and join an existing composite wing to beef up in fighter capability.

AFJI: Could you tell our readers about your pilot surplus problem?

MCPEAK: The reason we have a pilot surplus right now is that our force structure is

coming down so rapidly that we don't have the squadrons. We're going from 36 wings to 26 roughly, and that's just the tactical force. We're also drawing down on the strategic force and the airlift force and so forth, so the net result is that the pilots that we've produced for a 36-wing force structure are there and they're obligated. The ones that are graduating from pilot training today have an eight-year service obligation, but there aren't 36 wings anymore.

What we're trying to do is cut back on pilot production as quickly as possible. We're also taking over half the pilots we do produce and not sending them to squadrons right now. They will serve three or four years in a behind-the-line support specialty, and then hopefully we'll feed them back in downstream after we've got some slack in the system. I'm taking some draconian measures up front to try to handle this problem of the younger pilots that we have a surplus of, not as a result of anything we did wrong, but simply because the force structure was cut out from under us.

Once you get past this service obligation point, we are losing pilots in very large numbers, so that we don't have the middle experience we need in the 10 to 15 year group. Those guys are going to the airlines because the airlines continue to hire in very, very large numbers. So there we have to work a different, pilot retention problem. We have to go to Congress and say we need bonuses, we need to compensate these people better, to keep them in the Air Force. So I'm in the embarrassing position of having to argue that I need more money for pilots and that I've got too many pilots.

AFJI: The Senate Armed Services Committee's Authorization report not only embraced the arguments for the B-2 bomber that the Air Force has made but went further. It said the B-2's global force projection capability could make possible major force structure tradeoffs across Service and mission lines, such as substituting B-2s for large packages of nonstealthy fighters or even for Navy carrier battle groups. What's your reaction to that?

MCPEAK: There is absolutely no question that the B-2 provides a significant increase in our capability to project power quickly to any spot on the globe. I wouldn't argue that it means we don't need to have fighter aircraft anymore or aircraft carriers or any other force segment. But I do think what it says is that the high cost of the B-2 needs to be put in that context. It's a revolutionary capability. It will make all other air forces obsolete overnight, in a sense.

So although there's a lot of money being spent on the B-2 program, the point we need to focus on is that it puts us in a league by ourselves for a long time. It's a long-term investment, and I hope that's what these [force structure trade-off] studies the Senate Armed Services Committee has asked for will show.

AFJI: Congress appears likely this year to repeal the law prohibiting women from flying combat aircraft. How do you feel about that?

MCPEAK: My feeling is one of ambivalence. On the one hand, I believe the Services ought to reflect the best aspects of our society: where if you've got the capabilities, nobody should stop you from doing something because of your race, religion, sex, age, or anything else. We have a lot of highly capable women in the Air Force, and I would like them to have unlimited opportunity.

But, personally, I have a lot of problem with it. For me, combat is a grim activity.

I'm not talking about the risk, because women are already at risk in their noncombat jobs. Some of them were killed in Desert Storm. But combat, for me, is not about dying. It's about killing. There's no qualification needed for dying. It's killing that has to be learned. And I'm reluctant to ask women to go kill people when I'm available to do it myself. It's hard enough to ask men to go do it, as I recently found, without going along with them.

If the law is repealed, though, then the American people have spoken, and I will not recommend to the Secretary of the Air Force that he impose an artificial policy barrier that bars women from combat duty. We're probably going to open up all jobs to women, and I will not be real comfortable with that. But that's probably the way it's going to come out.

Mr. Speaker, I will read just the last paragraph of General Skantze's record. "By visualizing a new era in national security and defense, the U.S. Air Force contribution will allow us to put aside the narrow annual budget debate and raise the interchange," intelligent dialog around here, is what he is speaking about.

The American people are investing in their future security over the long term. We need to review the makeup of the total U.S. Air Force force structure being proposed, the total investment. And finally, as the architects of this force, the U.S. Air Force leadership must lead this dialogue.

Well, I appeal to General McPeak and his retired leaders and current active-duty leaders, because I know they have more four stars recalled from around the world over there the last week trying to figure out how to create this total-force structure, with a little vision. I hope they will frequent the halls of this place next week and help us defeat the defense conference report, which is flawed from top to bottom, particularly those cuts in strategic defense on the strategic defense initiative. It is finally starting to make sense around here to some very, to be kind, very thick heads, at least that come up thick on the sensitive radar that we should spend some defense dollars on something other than offense.

How about spending some defense dollars on defending the American homeland, as it says in the Preamble to the Constitution passed September 17, 1787? Provide for the common defense. And that comes before promoting the general welfare, which is what all my majority Democrat colleagues were discussing just before this.

So that ends the B-2 part of my special order tonight. Section 4, NEA, AIDS, B-2, section 4, let us call it the case for term limits.

THE CASE FOR TERM LIMITS

Mr. Speaker, I will try not to take my remaining 20 minutes, because I want people to stay following the proceedings of the House to hear my good colleague from Maryland, Mrs. BENTLEY, who I hope is a Senator there across the river some day. She will be following me with always one of her

fascinating special orders on trade problems around the world and the state of the U.S. economy.

Now, I can honestly say, forewarning myself like a good lawyer, that before—and I am not a lawyer—that before the fall comes pride. I am going to say something. I have never lost a debate in 14 years on term limitations. And I have got some terrific friends in this Chamber on both sides of the aisle, including my hero in this House, the defender of life, the great HENRY HYDE of Illinois.

□ 2040

I will let him take a point or two when we are in friendly conversation on these great benches and back in the Cloak Room, but in front of an audience around America, without resorting to any demagogic, sweeping statements that get the crowd cheering like, "We will get more women in this House, we will get more Hispanics in this House, we will get more new ideas," I honestly have never even come close to losing a debate on term limits. Let me explain, just briefly.

Thomas Jefferson, remember I pointed to that great medallion up there, one of the 23 great lawmakers from all of history. In spite of his despotism, even Napoleon is up there because Napoleonic law is still the law in the State of Louisiana. Remember the Academy Award nomination performance of Marlon Brando in "A Street Car Named Desire," according to the Napoleonic code, what belongs to the husband also belongs to the wife and vice versa. That is Napoleonic law, and it still prevails in most of Europe today. So Napoleon is up there, despot. Most of these people, pretty decent folks up there, but it ends with George Mason, who because he was born in 1825, that means in the year of our Declaration of Independence by 33-year-old Thomas Jefferson, he was 51. By the time 12 years later we got the Constitution cranked out and gave birth to this Chamber, the Senate, the Supreme Court, and the U.S. Presidency, he was 12 years older. So he was 63.

By the time George Washington put in his great years, George Mason was 71 years old. So like Ben Franklin, this great Founding Father of our country was just too advanced in years to ever have the great opportunity to serve, as did the Father of Our Country, George Washington.

George Mason writes reams about why we must limit the Presidency. George Washington himself, we see his beautiful portrait over there. He bought it. And here is what George Washington said:

A rotation in elected officers may be most congenial with the ideas the people have of liberty and safety.

Beautiful words from a man who is first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.

This city is named after him, the State of Washington and cities and boulevards and little hamlets all across this great country, a giant of a man. As Jefferson said, the greatest moral character of all the people in our country.

Now let us turn to the man that President John F. Kennedy said, when he had filled the White House east ballroom with Nobel laureates and prize winners of every field from art to literature to music, he said:

We haven't had this much intellectual talent in the White House since possibly when Thomas Jefferson dined alone.

Here is what Thomas Jefferson, our great lawmaker, would the cameras please pan up to Mr. Jefferson's handsome face. That is the same portrait on our nickel.

Oh, that is right. We have these unfortunate rude rules that will only pan the empty Chamber while a million and a half people watch.

Here is what Mr. Jefferson says, 1787, the birth year, in a letter to the father of the Constitution, Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, our fourth President. He writes to Mr. Madison, to James Madison, the author of the Constitution, about 5 feet, 4 inches, but a brain unparalleled in our country.

Mr. Jefferson says:

James, I dislike and greatly dislike in the new Constitution the abandonment in every instance of the principle of rotation in office.

We know what the word "rotation" means. It is a simple word, common usage today.

Benjamin Franklin, like George Mason up here, the real senior father of our country:

In free governments, the rulers are the servants and the people their superiors. For the former to return among the latter does not degrade the politicians but promotes them.

Now, am I a Johnny-come-lately on an issue that polls about 74 percent with the American people on term limitations? No. I put in a bill in my freshman year, my first go-around here in 1977. I put it in in 1979. Here is an even more simplified version, House Resolution 650. I waited for an even number one week, April 29, 1980.

I insert for the RECORD a copy of the resolution at this point.

H. RES. 650

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE XLIX.

"LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF TERMS OF MEMBERS.

"1. No person may serve any term or portion thereof as a Member if such person has served as a Member for each of the six terms immediately preceding such term.

"2. For purposes of this rule, service as a Member in any term which commences before 1981 may not be included in determining the number of terms served.

"3. This rule may only be amended or repealed by a recorded vote."

Listen to how with a few words we could change the whole complexion of

this Chamber: "Limitation on number of terms of Members."

It is only three points:

1. No person may serve any term or portion thereof as a Member if such person has served as a Member for each of the 6 terms immediately preceding such term.

In other words, in those few words, a person can serve 12 years and can come back. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the reason that you, the great TOM FOLEY, prevailed in your own home State of Washington is because the authors of that resolution up there that failed yesterday, it was not grandfathered, meaning it was retroactive. It was telling people, we are going to tear your careers up. You do not have time to plan for it.

But if they had it start with the next election, even if it had been 6 years, 8 years, 10 years, it would have probably gone through. But certainly at 12.

My second point in my Dornan-submitted resolution, 11 years ago:

2. For purposes of this rule, service as a Member in any term which commences before 1981—

We would now change that to 1992 or 1993—

may not be included in determining the number of terms served.

So the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] who has been here for almost three decades, could stay another 12 years. Forty-two years he could have here, if we grandfathered this.

And No. 3, "This rule may only be amended or repealed by a recorded vote." In other words, the lights go up there, all of our votes are recorded. Once we would get this passed, we could not change it.

This Congress that convened in January of this year, I put in this legislation again. This time it becomes House Resolution 46, January 28, 1991, the exact same words as my amendments of 11 and 13, 15 years before.

I include for the RECORD a copy of House Resolution 46.

H. RES. 46

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE

"LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF TERMS OF MEMBERS.

"1. No person may serve any term or portion thereof as a Member if such person has served as a Member for each of the six terms immediately preceding such term.

"2. For purposes of this rule, service as a Member in any term which commences before 1991 may not be included in determining the number of terms served.

"3. This rule may only be amended or repealed by a recorded vote."

Then I put in a House joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution limiting the number of consecutive terms Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives may serve. I included the Senate 14 years ago, but I did it again earlier

this year. It says, "Mr. DORNAN of California introduced the following joint resolution," that the President would sign and it would become an amendment to the Constitution.

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)," that is why we will not see this unless the people do it State by State, "That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States."

We could get that done, but we could never get the two-thirds in each House. And then "within 7 years after the date of its submission for ratification," if we got all those States, it is basically the same thing that I have in the House Resolution. Six terms, a nonconsecutive but you can come back again.

No person may serve any term or portion thereof as a Member of the United States Senate if such person has served as a Member of the Senate for each of the two terms, or a portion of any such term, immediately preceding such term.

And then:

For the purposes of this article, service as a Member in the United States Senate or House of Representatives in any term which commenced before the ratification of this article may not be included in determining the number of terms served.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of House Joint Resolution 93.

H.J. RES. 93

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein). That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of its submission for ratification:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. No person may serve any term or portion thereof as a Member of the United States House of Representatives if such person has served as a member of the House for each of the six terms, or a portion of any such term, immediately preceding such term.

"SECTION 2. No person may serve any term or portion thereof as a Member of the United States Senate if such person has served as a member of the Senate for each of the two terms, or a portion of any such term, immediately preceding such term.

"SECTION 3. For purposes of this article, service as a Member in the United States Senate or House of Representatives in any term which commenced before the ratification of this article may not be included in determining the number of terms served."

So if this were to be passed tomorrow, you would get all next year and 12 more years. Why did I arrive at 12

years instead of 10 or the group from Florida that has gained national prominence, 8 is enough?

I will tell my colleagues why. It is very simple. The President has two terms, 4 years each. Mexico has a one-term 6-year President. This is all stuff that has been in my head since 1977. The Confederacy, Jefferson Davis, one term 6 years. Do my colleagues think Nixon wished he had had one term of 6 years? No little piece of tape on that door at the Watergate Complex to break into Larry O'Brien's office and steal a playbook from a team that was losing every down and going down in flames with the score about 60 to 0 against them at half time? What a tragedy that was. And Mr. Nixon would have gone out, President Nixon, with flags flying.

Do my colleagues think President Reagan and his great lady Nancy Reagan did not wish there had been one term of 6 years that he could have gone out of office 6 years, having had the Senate in the Republican column all those 6 years, flags flying, no Contra scandal, no Iran-Contra deals, just 6 good years.

I leave that to other people. We have already limited the Presidency to two terms.

Take the Senate, which is supposed to be a body of our senior men and women, only two women at this point, it could be more under term limitations. In the Senate we have two terms of 6 years each. So rather than play around with that and limit the House, I said, let us reverse that. Here we would have 6 years of two terms. Six terms of 2 years, 12 years in the House, 12 years in the Senate. Here is what is unique to some of these proposals and which I think is necessary to ever get this passed. You can come back.

□ 2050

You see, that is what was wrong, I think, with the California limit last year that they passed in November of 1990. How can you tell a man or a woman who has served in this Chamber, particularly if they came here young at the minimum age, 25, as did our great colleague, JOHNNY BREAUX, who has gone on to glory in the Senate, from Louisiana. He won at 25 years of age. I remember seeing that front-page newspaper headline in Los Angeles. I was then 39 years old, and I thought I saw my life flashing before me.

Not only did all of the Kennedys get a jump-start on me for a whole decade because of a multimillionaire father, but JOHN BREAUX, 25 years of age, who would have left at 37. He would have been a fellow who never would have been allowed to come back, run again, 2, 4, 10 years later, or to serve later as a senior like George Mason, or Ben Franklin, contributing with the wisdom of many decades, fourscore and 10, or the Biblical threescore and 10.

No, you must be allowed to come back. You cannot be branded as a felon because you served in the Congress 2, 4, 6, or up to 12 years.

Now let us take a great American, and I deliberately have picked a liberal from a different State, Texas, and the other side of the aisle. He has that beautiful walnut room named after him out those doors, the Rayburn Room, and he has our biggest office building on this Hill named after him. He is a stalwart in American history and served as Speaker longer than any other Member in the 204 years that this great deliberative body has been in existence, Sam Rayburn.

Sam was born in 1882. That is about the same vintage as MacArthur, and Churchill, and Roosevelt, that great generation. It was 10 years before my father. He came here in 1913. He was a young man, 31 years of age, and he served many years up until 1940. He served 27 years and he was here and became the Speaker in 1940. Over the next 21 years, because he was elected Speaker due to the death of Speaker Bankhead, he was elected Speaker on September 16 of 1940, and he died on November 16 of 1961. So in that 21 years and 2 months to the day he was Speaker all that time, except for when Harry Truman was President during what was called the do-nothing Congress, the Republican Congress that got elected out of World War II in 1946. So he was not Speaker in 1947 and 1948. And then President Eisenhower, when he was elected President in 1952, his first 2 years, 1953 and 1954 we had a Republican Speaker sitting up there where you are, Mr. Speaker, Joe Martin, a great Republican. So if we subtract 4 years from the 21 years and 2 months, then Sam Rayburn was Speaker for 17 years.

Tip O'Neill, our great Speaker from Massachusetts, two Speakers ago, he took a historical record in his own right. He was Speaker for 10 years without a Republican interruption.

Let us now look at Sam Rayburn's career. From 1913 to 1961 when he died with his boots on, and he never drew a nickel of pension, served all his life, was a bachelor, gave up family, gave up everything to serve his country. I understand that. That is why the antitermination argument can be compelling on the other side when we talk about Thomas Jefferson or George Mason or James Madison or someone like Sam Rayburn. Under my bill, he comes here in 1913 at 31 years of age, serves to age 43. That is my age when I got elected.

Then we see if he becomes a lobbyist and if he goes for the easy money, and if he has Potomac fever, or whether he goes home and teaches at Texas A&M or the University of Texas. Or does he find the girl of his dreams and get married at age 43, not uncommon in those days, and for Irish people that is youth for the man to get married.

Then he comes back 2 years later, and here is his way to come back. He picks some bozo in his own party in an adjoining district, and every State has them, and he knocks off this embarrassment to his own party, and he comes back 2 years later if that is his wish. Then he serves another 12 years.

And then, the next 2 years after that, after again going back and teaching law in Texas, or teaching anything, teaching political science in one of the great universities of Texas, or traveling around the world, taking a little sabbatical, or he reads all of those books sitting there building up in his bedroom. My bedroom is being swallowed by books that I cannot get to read. I fall asleep reading every night with the pace of events around here. That is if you are an activist, which I like to think most of us try to be.

Then he comes back for his third go-round. This time he finds a bozo in the other party, and each party has them, and he knocks off that person in a general election.

Do you know what I think? I do not think most people who serve 12, and then 2 out, and 12, and then 2 out, and then 12, and that is 40 years, and guess how long that person has been in office? Thirty-six years out of 40. Big denial of great talent. And get this: The day he comes back in his second go-round, there is no restriction on the internal leadership elections in this chamber. Democrats can caucus in the Cannon Caucus Room, or in the Rayburn Building named after Sam Rayburn, and they could elect him the Speaker of the House before he is even sworn in for his second burst of 12 years. And if he came back for a third burst of 12 years, he could be elected Speaker again. As a matter of fact, he could be Speaker in his freshman year for all 36 years and break every record. There is nothing that says you cannot be elected to the House leadership in either party in your freshman year. So it does not restrict the talent of leaders.

But here is why I do not think anybody would ever do that. I have seen brilliant people in both parties in this Chamber after they have been here a while pass up a natural run for the U.S. Senate or for the Governor's seat to be the first political leader in their State. I have seen them pass it up. Do you know what the deadly point around here is? I have never reached it in one burst, because at 6 years I was gerrymandered out of my seat, against my will, and then 2 years later I moved to a totally different county, and knocked off a person that I considered to be a liberal, who had been conning people that he was a conservative when he was in the middle of Reagan country, Orange County. Then I came back, and now I am in the seventh year of my second burst, and 7 and 6 makes 13 years out of 15 that I have been in this

Chamber. I have already announced my retirement. If you want me to do it again, Mr. Speaker, I have announced that I will retire at the end of 12 years, before the 1996 election. I will only serve 12 years in this current 38th District, which will probably change its number and boundary lines by the 29th of this very month.

Is that going to limit my life? Does it mean that I cannot go back into the world, as Ben Franklin said, and get a promotion, to be the people who hire the people around these two Chambers? Of course not. Are there other things I can do? I have already proven that I can come back again.

There is a lack of confidence around here with a lot of men and women who think that they cannot come back again. If they did not make it in reaching up, as did a great Attorney General and two-term Governor of Pennsylvania who reached for the Senate seat and was pulled down by circumstances beyond his control, is Richard Thornburgh through? Of course not. He can return for that Senate seat again. It is a short term and will be up again in November of next year. Or President Bush could put him in another different Cabinet position, the way he moved his good friend and excellent Cabinet officer, Jim Baker, around from Treasurer to Secretary of State. Richard Thornburgh is not through serving the United States of America. We have not heard one cruel or harsh word about this great public servant from anybody in this Chamber from either side of the aisle or in either House. We know that he is not through. Sometimes you are pulled down by his historical circumstances or other circumstances.

But back to the theme of good men and women in both parties passing up opportunity. The deadly point is at 10 years. You get about 10 years here. First of all, it was a horrible awakening when I saw that I was never going to be in the majority in this House. You do not know what it is like, Mr. Speaker, to never, ever have anybody from your side, except Mr. MICHEL for a few brief moments when we swear in a new Speaker, and he gets to sit at that chair, like Walter Mitty, and play with the gavel, and say a few nice words to you, and then you say a few nice words back to him, and that is about it from my side, from my party. Not since I was 21 years of age, in my very first election, because it was in 1954. I was in pilot training. I was at Bryant Air Force Base in Texas, and I voted for a Congressman who lost. The Republican Speaker, Joe Martin, and his party were defeated. Sam Rayburn took the gavel, and was back up and stayed there from that year, 1955 when he was sworn in, and another Speaker, Jim Wright, was sworn in Speaker that very month of January, and I got my wings 3 months later, February 7, and

this House has been controlled by the Democratic party ever since, since 1955, to 1965, to 1975, to 1985, 36 years.

What have I done in those 36 years? I got married a few months later. I have five grandchildren. My baby daughter, Kathleen, an actress in Hollywood, just turned 30. I have eight grandchildren, and the two youngest, not married yet. So I have a long way to go. That is a lifetime, Mr. Speaker.

I say that term limits will bring in, Mr. Speaker, and I will close on this, more young people, more ideas. And anybody who cannot burn out all of their ideas in 12 years, if they cannot do it in 12 years, then there is something wrong, they are holding back. Then they can go back and recharge their batteries, and come back with more ideas.

There will be more women, more Hispanics, particularly on my side of the aisle, which is too white and too male, too much the same age. We need diversity in this Chamber and in the other Chamber in the United States of America.

I had a real bozo from the time that I was 24 to 43 burn up my seat, and he never got off any committee except for Science and Technology. He was the wealthiest man in my State, and he had five cities named after him, Belaire, Belmont, several others, a multimillionaire who held my seat during all of my youth and never did a bloody thing the whole time that he was here.

I say it is time for term limits, and I am glad to end my special order. And do not anybody turn off that television set, Mr. Speaker, until HELEN BENTLEY has finished with what she has to say to this great body.

□ 2100

TIME FOR ACTION NOT RECRIMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I watched with dismay the all night oration by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle about unemployment.

My reaction to these remarks is a pox on both your Houses—on both Republicans and Democrats. No one is blameless in this situation. Instead of pointing fingers at one another we should put the effort necessary to solve the problems.

No one argues that unemployment for Americans is shameful. It not only wrecks families, it is a blight on the glory of America. We should do better than turn people out of jobs or on the streets without a hope or a promise to have a decent wage. We are in this economic dilemma as a result of short-

sightedness and a failure to recognize the interrelationship of our actions and policies to the economy.

Members of both Houses and our Government officials have been making policies contributing to this economic problem and robbing our citizens of their future. Let me explain why and how.

We have proceeded to debate policies affecting the American economy without agreeing on the terms of the debate. All of us have ignored Economics 101 where we learned that perfect competition meant perfect knowledge.

Instead we made a grand mental leap that free trade meant perfect competition and perfect knowledge on the part of all the participants—and from there we proceeded to debate policies grounded on inaccurate premises. We have conducted a debate and formulated policies on an ideal that does not exist. It is time for government policymakers to come into the real world.

In 1986 I did not support the Tax Reform Act of 1986 for several reasons. It was harmful both to the taxpayers and to business. That tax act eliminated the IRA's and deductions were eliminated or reduced on real estate investments. By eliminating real estate shelters low income and senior housing was set back. Chairman Bill Seidman at the FDIC warned us at the time that changing many of the tax items retroactively would seriously affect the S&L crisis. It certainly did, wiping out shelters retroactively lowered the value of properties and accelerated losses and, as we know, the S&L crisis really took off after 1986. And now the banks are fearful of making loans.

By wiping out interest deductions and amortization, car sales fell.

I repeat, I did not support the 1986 tax bill.

The Federal Tax code enabled the money men to ruin companies through leveraged buyouts. Now when we are warned in stories that the country is poised for another bout of leveraged buyouts, I suggest we examine just what this earlier raid on the U.S. Treasury has meant to America—and that we not repeat it.

A recent Baltimore Sun story about the Simplicity Co., tells the tale. Simplicity is a company that almost every family in America would know—or they would have known in earlier times before the money men got hold of the company.

The article by Donald L. Bartlett and James B. Steele points out that in 1979 the "money men descended on Simplicity Pattern Co.

"By the time they were finished a decade later, a company that once had \$100 million in the bank was more than \$100 million in the hole."

The story explained:

For more than half a century, Simplicity was as much a part of the American home as the radio and the sewing machine. It helped

dress generations of girls and boys, women and men, through the sale of billions of patterns for the home-sewing market.

This Simplicity Co. story sounds like the story of American business and also helps explain what has happened to our tax base. So listen closely.

When the money men got through with Simplicity the company was near bankruptcy. This is what the financial wizards did to the company.

Bought and sold the company four times and made tens of millions of dollars running up the price of Simplicity stock in threatened and actual takeovers.

Drained \$100 million that Simplicity had in its bank account and investment portfolio.

Raided the company's pension funds on two occasions, taking out \$10.7 million.

Issued bonds and borrowed from banks, sending the company's debt soaring from near nothing to \$100 million.

Sold off properties to raise badly needed cash after they had depleted the company's \$100 million cushion.

Created so much debt that Simplicity could no longer generate enough cash to make the interest payments.

Defaulted on the interest payments on bonds and bank loans.

Just how could these modern day robbers get away with mistreating a company like the Simplicity Co.? According to the newspaper article the answer is simple:

They got help from the U.S. Government rule book. Thanks to several provisions of the Federal Tax Code, including the net operating loss deduction and deduction for interest expense, they were able to build their empires on debt and write off the interest.

So the raids that cost hundreds of Americans their jobs and made millions for the raiders were, in effect, subsidized by the taxpayer.

I will leave the full article for the RECORD—but the tragedy of this story Mr. Speaker—is that it has been repeated over and over and over again in the United States in the 1980's. Leveraged buyouts have been like a flu virus running through our business community.

Another example of the plundering of business is a story which is not in the papers, but is currently going on in my area. A tank manufacturing company recently was purchased by an outsider who proceeded to strip the company by selling off its equipment. Now the company has orders for underground storage tanks and there is no way to fill orders. All of this was done in absolute disregard of the people employed at the company or in the future of the company * * * just for the quick buck.

There have been other abuses section 8 set asides for small business and industrial purchasing.

This abuse must be stopped and only the Government can stop it.

We must make the necessary changes in the Tax Code to favor business and not make it a convenient tax dodge for greedy, unethical money men. The American taxpayer cannot afford to and should not subsidize the lifestyle of the high rollers in this society.

Another victim of the 1986 Tax Act was American home ownership. With the phase out of deductions on consumer loans we made it advantageous to pay off debts with home equity loans. This one act resulted in a 15.7-percent drop in the equity that American homeowners held in their homes. Home equity loans are being sold as a reverse mortgage to senior citizens which means there will be little equity actually left in the homes.

Last week's Newsweek had a story "Living on the Edge" explained that "millions of families are losing the struggle to improve their living standards, as the affluent consume a larger share of the Nation's wealth."

We must act quickly without delay and work together to change the course of America.

Our major cities are in trouble. Philadelphia, the city where our Declaration of Independence and Constitution were written cannot pay its bills. Private citizens and companies are now lining up to loan money to the city. Bridgeport, CT, made news earlier this year by declaring bankruptcy.

In Maryland Gov. William Schaefer announced drastic cuts of \$450 million and now has announced another \$150 million and he may have to come back with another \$800 million in cuts in 1992. Maryland has the same troubles as other States and Government units. Almost half the counties in the United States are in deficit and 21 of the 50 States have budget deficits. Newspapers report daily on the difficulties and struggles of the States and local communities to meet the demand for services—which are being cut all over the country.

To solve these serious economic problems we need to interrupt the drift rapid roll toward a service economy and move toward revitalization of the industrial base of this country.

We must produce things. Manufacturing plants are important, because plants are also people. Manufacturing greatly adds to the country's capacity to be self-sustaining and independent. I do not want to read again as we did in Desert Storm that the United States was dependent upon foreign parts to make our technology work.

We must begin to solve these problems. I have been urging a Marshall plan for America since my election to Congress. I introduced a Marshall plan for America resolution which would have created a commission composed of industrial, technical, economic and educational experts from the private sector to address our chronic economic problems by establishing clear national priorities and long-range goals.

In that original speech about a Marshall plan for America I stated that:

In certain areas of government activity such as taxing, regulatory control, purchasing, and trade, new and clear-cut policies and priorities must be established because many

of these activities and policies have been counter-productive and have contributed to the decline of America's industrial might.

I further stated that:

U.S. tax laws, instead of stimulating domestic investment in new plants, equipment and technology, have encouraged American corporations to move offshore.

To survive our companies were told they must compete globally and the tax laws helped that along.

The Marshall plan speech stated:

Prior to 1972, the IRS only allowed deductions for companies that practiced "Buy America," but then the tax law was changed to allow for writing off the purchase of foreign business equipment. More American products disappeared from the shelves, more American companies went under, and more American workers lost their jobs.

And now we can see the price of those early policies coming home in the form of a poor economy and rising unemployment. We need some remedies and soon for these problems.

Before making suggestions for revitalizing American industry today, I would like to share some remarks made by the chairman of a world class company. Mr. Akio Morita, chairman of Sony Corp., a Japanese company, stated in a New York speech:

The world economy is increasingly resting on what seems to me a very unsound, unhealthy foundation.

There is a supposition that nation's economies as they mature move through a series of phases. In the first phase, the economy is agriculture-based, then as a nation learns to feed itself efficiently and begins to develop an industrial base, labor moves from agriculture into manufacturing.

Then at some point, some economic theorists feel, a manufacturing economy will enter a third and somehow more highly refined phase in which the economy becomes a service based economy.

It is clear, at any rate, that this shift from manufacturing to services is well advanced in the United States, a country which since 1950 has lost half of its manufacturing jobs and where almost three quarters of all jobs are service oriented.

We see a similar trend in the United Kingdom.

What I would like to suggest to you today is that this trend, far from being the natural progression of a maturing economy and something to be encouraged is destructive, for in the long run an economy which has lost its manufacturing base has lost its vital center.

A service-based economy has no engine to drive it. Thus, any complacency about the world's most powerful economy moving from manufacturing to services is entirely misplaced.

It would seem obvious that the service elements of any economy are entirely dependent upon a manufacturing industry which can develop the new technology that defines our civilization.

I agree with Mr. Morita.

There are some things we can do to help the individual more quickly and others are long range under the Marshall Plan.

I believe we should raise the outside earning limits of social security recipients. If they can contribute to their in-

come—then we should not penalize them. Often social security recipients are hard hit by medical bills or other expenses—so any added income would be a welcome relief to them.

We should give a tax break for individual retirement accounts and raise the limits from \$2,000 to \$3,000. Americans have been criticized for not saving and the IRA's are a way to increase our savings rate to provide a capital base.

Remember the story about the Simplicity Co.? Unfortunately, we need to rework the 1986 tax bill to stop this financial nonsense that is a raid on the U.S. Treasury and on the pocketbooks of the American taxpayer.

Elements we must consider in a Marshall plan are creating a permanent R&D tax credit for business to create long-term horizons for American companies. The permanent tax credit will take away some of the risk. Let's make sure it not only applies to pure research but to applied research.

There should be tax benefits also for long-term investment in manufacturing ventures and in stock investments. I stress long-term investment because we must stop the speculative binge this country has been on for the last 10 years. Investors must be convinced that it pays to leave money alone for a respectable amount of time to allow it to work creatively.

And any new investment tax law—after the retroactivity of the destructive 1986 tax bill—would have to bind future legislators to grandfather any long-term contracts or the investors would have little confidence in tying their money up.

□ 2120

By developing some links in the chain of information, we can maximize the efforts for small- and medium-sized business in their efforts to export. If we are going to be engaged in global business then let's get our businesses in it.

Let's give fellowships to scientists to go into industry, give them some financial analysis training and let them see how things are done and vice versa. We need to understand what we are creating and whether or not the customer wants it. We must decide whether or not American business should export by chance or by a conscious decision to be engaged in the world market.

To do that we need an information link for applied research for American companies. Right now we are having difficulty matching up sources and products and research. Why not supply this information link in a center and agency for new technology utilization at the Department of Commerce under the vision of business?

By gathering information and sharing it more efficiently we are ultimately cutting the cost of capital which in turn will help American business be more competitive. Why not make it easier for small business to form consortia to export.

We need to put some more effort into the Export-Import Act of 1982 and encourage our banks to utilize the act. For the first time an export trading company of a group of companies can join with a bank with the specific objective of selling goods and services abroad.

The act allows bank holding companies to take a direct equity interest in export trading companies. The ammunition is there, we are just missing the inspiration to act.

According to the National Research Council, "two of the leading U.S. exporters are actually Japanese trading companies, Mitsui and Mitsubishi, which are licensed to sell U.S. goods as part of their worldwide activities."

Hopefully, with this act, American trading companies will be competitive on a broader scale than before.

We also need to examine the information provided by the Department of Commerce for business, specifically, the Input and Output Table has to be published more frequently than every 9 years. The 1982 figures must have must come out. How can business tell how much goes into a product without those figures?

Using semiconductors as an example a CRS analyst recently explained that the data clearly shows that production of so-called "high tech" products depend on basic industries for many of their inputs directly or indirectly. To have a semiconductor industry, it will be a source of demand—directly or indirectly—for the outputs of over 300 sectors of the economy. The analysis shows that the 15 manufacturing sectors involved produce \$171 million in outputs for the semiconductor sector to help \$1 billion of its market.

He said, "you cannot have semiconductors without steel."

American business is selling in a world economy but they are crippled in the process by the Government. William Dietrich, president of Dietrich Industries and author of "In The Shadow Of The Rising Sun" has pointed out that Japan has a State-market balance and works with business, but in the United States the Government often works against business. I agree with him. Incidentally, Bill Dietrich is in the steel business and has a plant at Sparrows Point in my district.

I have pointed out a few pitfalls which have been disastrous for our economy which includes our tax act, timely information from the Government and lack of information and help from the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I need to add and elaborate on the fact, and I will do it on another night, about how we expect our businesses to compete in the global market against governments, which is actually what it is. They are not competing business for business, because most of the foreign businesses have their government right in the pocket

with them or in heavy subsidizations of those foreign companies.

We need on this side, we need to work together, government, academia and citizens to straighten out America's affairs.

We need to revitalize our industrial base. To that end I suggest we enlarge the participation of a Marshall Plan Commission to having a White House conference composed of a triad of business, government and academia.

Under the auspices of the Secretary of Commerce for a 6-year period, the conference will identify the problem areas of business and industry and the work force, and make recommendations to the President for accomplishing the stated goals of the conference.

Membership in the conference would consist of three people from each State, two appointed by the Governor, and one by the President. Staff for the conference would come from experts in the Government who would be charged with translating recommendations of the conference into appropriate legislation.

Conference participants would be expected to hold meetings and generate papers and ideas from business and industry and summarize their findings each year in a report to the President. Hopefully, this will stimulate our thinking and will allow the American people a real process in repairing our systems.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we use the creative ability of the American people—of our business community and industry leaders in solving our problems. It is not enough to say Mr. White has a good idea—or did you hear his suggestion—and then let it drop.

It is time to develop information links for business—to encourage our research—to manufacture here and get the end product into the marketplace—to export as a conscious decision so we can have our rightful share of the world market. We must think outward to an international market, and be able to participate in a fair market without losing our country in the process.

This morning someone at Congressional Research Service told me "it is time to get the plaque off the way we think of our industrial dynamism." Coming from a merchant marine background I would say it is time to scrape the barnacles off our thinking before we are truly a Third World country. It is time for action not recriminations. Thank you.

PUT HELPFULNESS AND REALISM BACK INTO FARMERS HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, I was joined by my colleagues—

RAY THORNTON and GLENN ENGLISH—in conducting a farm credit forum in my State.

I want to start by thanking them for their participation.

I came away from that event convinced that two things must be done to improve the delivery of credit by the Farmers Home Administration.

The clear message coming from the witnesses we heard was that FmHA should be more realistic and more helpful.

More realistic in terms of setting loan caps high enough so they more nearly reflect today's high cost farming operations.

Currently, the loan limit is set at \$400,000 which is not realistic in light of the costs a farmer must incur to buy equipment and pay other expenses related to making a crop.

My friend Rusty Berry of DeWitt is a lawyer who grew up in southern Arkansas County—rice country.

I would like to quote his testimony. He told us that the current loans limits are far from adequate since "today's farmer faces operating costs that dwarf those that faced farmers in the 1960's and 1970's."

Rusty is right.

Since farmers who deal with FmHA cannot get credit elsewhere, they have no choice but to take loans they know are not adequate to carry them through to the payoff at harvest time.

Their money is exhausted before the crops are gathered and that leaves those they buy from waiting for their money—hoping, along with the farmer, that all goes well.

Wayne Rupe of Lonoke represents the Arkansas Agricultural Aviation Association. He told us that by mid-summer, most farmers have spent their loan money. But, of course, they can't stop at that point.

So, the aerial applicators, fuel suppliers, implement dealers, companies which sell fertilizer and insecticide and others have to carry farmers on their books until harvest.

It makes for a very fragile economy, an economy which is damaged from top to bottom in the event of a poor crop.

My State of Arkansas has certainly suffered the swift and devastating blows caused by downturns in the agricultural sector.

It is felt at the feed store and the food store, with businessmen on Main Street suffering right along with the farmer.

Another friend, Harvey Joe Sanner, is a farmer in my district and past national president of the American Agriculture Movement.

Harvey Joe told us that Congress should force FmHA to do what it was intended to do. Make loans.

And to make those loans in as timely and hassle free a manner as possible.

That's where the helpfulness comes in.

I return to the testimony of Rusty Berry. Rusty told us that the worst problem farmers encounter in his area is what he termed the "incompetency and refusal to act in a timely manner by FmHA staff at all levels."

He said that "hindrance is the rule and helpfulness is the exception when dealing with FmHA."

That should not be.

The American people do not work for Government, Government works for the people and that rule should extend to all agencies of Government—including FmHA.

Yes, paperwork must be done. And, yes, information must be provided by farmers to the agency. But, this process should not be so burdensome that planting time arrives with farmers still bound in redtape, not knowing if they can make a crop or not.

That is not what Congress intended. That is not what Congress should tolerate.

FmHA should also develop a system whereby loans from previous crops can be refinanced over a longer period, a period which would more realistically reflect the life of a farmer's assets.

And, other lenders should do so as well.

Raising the loan limits, cutting redtape and making other adjustments in the loan procedure are not impossible goals. They are reachable and Congress should insist that USDA reach them.

During the last dozen years or so, agencies of the executive branch seem to have forgotten that they exist to serve, not hinder.

I have promised my farmers that I would address the problem and I will.

But, it will take some cooperation from the executive branch.

I fear that this problem is yet another symptom of administration neglect of the domestic agenda.

The administration seems perfectly capable of speeding help to foreign lands, but drags it feet when dealing with programs set up to help our own people here at home.

Something is very wrong with those priorities.

The disastrous agricultural policies of the 1980's broke many farmers and the ripple effect in Arkansas was severe.

It is now time to set a new direction for farm policy. And, we can begin by insuring that more realism and helpfulness is injected into the loan process at Farmers Home.

The ultimate solution to all these problems is, of course, a better price for the commodities farmers sell.

But current administration policy will only ensure that more and more family farmers will go broke and have to leave their land.

The issue will be revisited next year—but, frankly, without the cooperation of the administration all of the best intentions will go for naught.

And there are actions which could be taken to help sweeten the bottom line for our farmers.

Markets in Cuba could be opened.

The door to the Japanese rice market could be kicked down, since it apparently will not be opened willingly.

The administration cannot continue to allow other countries to protect their farmers while throwing American farmers to the wolves.

This country should also make our farmers our fuel suppliers. Instead of sending money to foreign oil producers by the shiploads, America must move toward the day when it derives its energy from the grain fields of the Midsouth rather than the oil fields of the Midwest.

I have already started to seek solutions to the problems outlined at the recent farm credit forum.

There is much more work to be done, however. I would invite President Bush to join Congress in seeking solutions to this most pressing domestic problem.

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 Member (at the request of Mr. DORNAN of California) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RIGGS, for 60 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PARKER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAUZIN, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GEJDENSON, for 60 minutes, today.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, for 60 minutes each day, on November 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, and 25.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GEJDENSON) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. MCDADE.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. MCCOLLUM.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. MACHTLEY in two instances.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. CRANE.

Ms. MOLINARI.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in 10 instances.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. GRADISON.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

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

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. HERTEL.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. OLVER.

Mr. BEVILL.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. FUSTER.

Mr. TOWNS in two instances.

Mr. WEISS.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. STALLINGS.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. DURBIN.

Mr. HUBBARD.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1117. An act to establish the Bureau of Land Management Foundation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

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

H.J. Res. 140. Joint resolution designating November 19, 1991, as "National Philanthropy Day";

H.J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to designate November 16, 1991, as "Dutch-American Heritage Day"; and

H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning November 10, 1991, as "Hire a Veteran Week."

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

S. 1848. An act to restore the authority of the Secretary of Education to make certain preliminary payments to local educational agencies, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 7, 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:

2317. A letter from the Vice President, Congressional Affairs, Oversight Board of the Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting a duplicate of the original report with missing papers provided of the audited financial statements of the Resolution Trust Corporation as of December 31, 1990, pursuant to Public Law 101-73, section 511(a) (103 Stat. 404); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2318. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to Mexico (Transmittal No. DTC-1-92), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2319. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's study of payment for portable x-ray services, pursuant to Public Law 101-239, section 6134 (103 Stat. 2222); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

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. 645. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to authorize the States to regulate the disposal of low-level radioactive waste for which the Nuclear Regulatory Commission does not require disposal in a licensed facility; with amendments (Rept. 102-289, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2556. A bill entitled the "Los Padres Condor Range and River Protection Act"; with amendments (Rept. 102-290, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHEAT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 270. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill S. 1745, a bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to strengthen and improve Federal civil rights laws, to provide for damages in cases of intentional employment discrimination, to clarify provisions regarding disparate impact actions, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-291). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 939. A bill to provide eligibility to members of the Selected Reserves for the veterans home loan program; with amendments; referred to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period ending not later than February 28, 1992, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(v), rule X (Rept. 102-292, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LENT, and Mr. RINALDO):

H.R. 3715. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to prescribe regulations governing the use, by television and radio broadcasters, of bulk time sale agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 3716. A bill to prohibit certain use of the terms "Visiting Nurse Association," "Visiting Nurse Service," "VNA," and "VNS"; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3717. A bill to correct the tariff treatment accorded zinc printing type; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GOSS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. WILSON):

H.R. 3718. A bill to provide remedies for consumers who purchase unfit dogs from pet dealers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H.R. 3719. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on composite vials of timolol maleate/pilocarpine hydrochloride solutions and diluent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMERSON (for himself and Mr. ESPY):

H.R. 3720. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain personal property of the Mississippi Delta Development Commission to the Lower Mississippi Delta Development Center; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOAGLAND:

H.R. 3721. A bill to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 to exempt certain research and educational licensees from annual charges; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 3722. A bill to repeal provisions of the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations Act, 1992, relating to requirements for Federal agency leases in the Omaha, NE-Council Bluffs, IA, geographical area; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Appropriations.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 3723. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that, in determining whether an individual applying for or receiving benefits based on disability is engaging in substantial gainful activity, a portion of the cost of acquiring a van which is specially equipped for the individual's disability and which the individual needs for transportation to work shall be excluded from amounts treated as such individual's earnings, and to make conforming changes in title XVI; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. KOSTMAYER):

H.R. 3724. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to authorize appropriations for Indian health programs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOODY:

H.R. 3725. A bill to require Senators and Members of the House of Representatives to pay for medical services provided by the Office of the Attending Physician, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 3726. A bill to prevent foreign persons from owning national landmarks and areas included in the National Park System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 3727. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to increase the loan levels and target prices for wheat and feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. MCCOLLUM):

H.J. Res. 369. Joint resolution to encourage a national policy enhancing commercial financial liquidity for the promotion of a speedy and robust economic recovery; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. ATKINS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEILENSON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MINETA, Mr. CONYERS, and Mrs. MORELLA):

H. Res. 271. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should rescind Department of Defense Directive 1332.14, section H.1, which bans gay, lesbian, and bisexual Americans from military services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 193: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 300: Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 325: Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 431: Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.
 H.R. 461: Mr. STUMP, Mr. MINETA, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. MAZZOLI.
 H.R. 643: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 791: Mr. SCHEUER.
 H.R. 843: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. MURTHA.
 H.R. 939: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. GINGRICH.
 H.R. 1186: Mr. GOSS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SWETT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. ROBERTS.
 H.R. 1393: Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. MACHTLEY.
 H.R. 1472: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. PACKARD.
 H.R. 1574: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FROST, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. INHOPE.
 H.R. 1575: Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. MOORHEAD.
 H.R. 1598: Mr. CONDIT and Mr. WILLIAMS.
 H.R. 1655: Mr. HAYES of Illinois.
 H.R. 1777: Mr. TALLON.
 H.R. 1889: Mr. CAMP.
 H.R. 2215: Mr. FEIGHAN.
 H.R. 2343: Mr. MINETA and Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 2385: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HENRY, and Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 2419: Ms. MOLINARI.
 H.R. 2535: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 2580: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BACCHUS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. YATES.
 H.R. 2598: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. DOOLEY, and Mr. OLIN.
 H.R. 2612: Mr. MCCLOSKEY.
 H.R. 2634: Mr. KOSTMAYER.
 H.R. 2731: Mr. BENNETT and Mr. PICKLE.
 H.R. 2763: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.
 H.R. 2766: Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.
 H.R. 2800: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 2806: Mr. HUBBARD and Mr. CHANDLER.
 H.R. 2832: Mrs. BYRON, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUTTO, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mrs. BENTLEY.
 H.R. 2838: Mr. TORRES, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. ROE.
 H.R. 2876: Mr. COX of California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. McCANDLESS.

H.R. 3015: Mr. EVANS and Mr. INHOPE.
 H.R. 3070: Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. BARRETT.
 H.R. 3128: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. GRANDY, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 3130: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 3142: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 3164: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 3236: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3283: Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 3285: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FROST, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEHMAN of California, and Mr. ROBERTS.

H.R. 3314: Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 3344: Mr. ROE.

H.R. 3360: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. POSHARD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PERKINS, and Ms. Horn.

H.R. 3376: Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 3395: Mr. CRANE, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 3407: Mr. ROE, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 3417: Mr. HORTON and Mr. COUGHLIN.

H.R. 3463: Mr. DANNEMEYER and Mr. INHOPE.

H.R. 3473: Mr. YATES, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 3488: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 3515: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 3526: Mr. FISH, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. GUARINI.

H.R. 3550: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 3553: Mr. NAGLE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3570: Mr. HORTON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ROE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3571: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 3595: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 3619: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. JAMES, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. McDADE, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.J. Res. 201: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. BACCHUS.

H.J. Res. 242: Mrs. BOXER.

H.J. Res. 312: Mr. PETERSON of Florida.

H.J. Res. 326: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. WOLPE, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. WISE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. RHODES, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. YATES, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.J. Res. 353: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FROST, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NEAL of

North Carolina, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PARKER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROE, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. WEBER.

H.J. Res. 358: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HAMILTON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DE LUGO, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SPRATT.

H. Con. Res. 168: Mrs. BOXER.
H. Con. Res. 212: Mr. HORTON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ROE, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. WEBER.

H. Con. Res. 216: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MOODY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H. Con. Res. 221: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H. Res. 152: Mr. COUGHLIN.
H. Res. 161: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. WALSH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ORTON, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. VENTO.

H. Res. 233: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. BENNETT.

H. Res. 244: Mr. LOWERY of California and Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 257: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. SARPALIUS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 446: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.